

**SUMMARY OF THE
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING**

JUNE 13, 2014

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, June 13, 2014, at 2:00 pm EDT. Chair Richard Burrows led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Richard Burrows, Test America (Lab)	Present
Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Present
Brooke Connor, USGS (Other)	Present
Dan Dickinson, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Mandi Edwards, Envirochem (Lab)	Absent
Tim Fitzpatrick, Florida DEP (Lab)	Absent
JD Gentry, ESC (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Present
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co., (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, IL DEP (AB)	Absent
Gary Ward, OR DPH (AB)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee members present: Lynn Boysen; Reed Jeffery; Chuck Lytle; Dixie Marlin.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Francoise and seconded by JD to approve the minutes of May 16, 2014. All were in favor. It was moved by Anand and seconded by Francoise to approve the minutes of May 30, 2014. All were in favor.

3 – Standard Interpretation Request

Standard Interpretation Request SIR 112 was revisited. (It was previously discussed on April 11, 2014). John and Anand had prepared a response, but the laboratory Accreditation System Executive Committee (LASEC) had returned it suggesting the interpretation went beyond clarifying the words of the standard. A proposed shorter version had then been suggested by LASEC. It was again discussed whether the standard requires qualification of the surrogates or the analytes, and Anand suggested that could not be addressed since the standard is vague. Brooke disagreed with the LASEC proposed wording, especially where they suggested the standard is “clear”. Dan also disagreed with the LASEC draft, saying it did not answer the question what “evaluated for the effect” means. Gary said his state program requires laboratories to qualify analytes related to the surrogates (they must map out the surrogates to the analytes). They then have to flag that surrogate is out. Chuck confirmed they do that in his laboratory.

Richard said the standard does not state the surrogates must be mapped, so that cannot go in the response. He also reminded the committee that the standard only requires “appropriate” data qualification. Dan volunteered to draft a new response.

4 – Comment on the Calibration Interim Standard (IS)

Roger Kenton had sent in a comment on the Voting Draft Standard that the committee had found persuasive. He asked if the standard should limit the allowance to use a linear range standard to only single-point calibrations, or whether it should also be able to apply to multi-point calibrations. In the response-to-comments the committee had agreed it could apply to multi-point calibrations, but in the IS the committee had not modified the language appropriately. John recalled the committee had said the linearity would have to be demonstrated initially. It was agreed the section of the IS would have to be re-drafted, and Richard said he would handle it.

5 – Options for the Quantitation Limit Standard

Based on earlier discussions, Richard had prepared and circulated a multi-vote spreadsheet outlining six options. Committee members would have 10 votes each that they could divide among the options. These were discussed, resulting in the list being reduced to four options, which were also modified at the request of the members who had submitted the options.

Richard said he would distribute the revised spreadsheet, and asked all participants to return their votes within a week. He also invited the Associate Committee Members to vote, to get a sense of their wishes. Richard stressed even the Committee Members’ votes would be non-binding, but would give an indication of which option(s) would be worth developing further. Nancy said if biased, there could also be high variability, so maybe bias is accounted for in general. Françoise said she would like to know how the options would treat outliers. John thought it would be important to look at recovery data and also the population size. He suggested running some data sets through each proposed option. If similar answers were obtained it would make sense to choose the simplest option.

6 – Upcoming Webinar on the Calibration Interim Standard (IS)

Richard asked if Gary, Scott and Dan could be on the next week’s upcoming webinar to help answer any questions from State Accreditation Bodies. Ken reminded the Committee Members what the IS is about. Its purpose is to provide an opportunity for those who submitted persuasive comments on the Voting Draft Standard (VDS) to review the changes made in response to those comments; i.e., the tracked sections of the posted standard. Most of the standard was approved in the VDS vote and so is not subject to further review

3 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm EDT.