

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

**JUNE 27, 2014**

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, June 27, 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)	Present
Tim Fitzpatrick, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
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)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee members present: Arthur Denny; Reed Jeffery; Dixie Marlin.

**2 – Previous Minutes**

A correction was suggested to the minutes of June 13, 2014. Mandi pointed out that SIR 112 was originally drafted by John and Anand. With this change in place it was moved by Anand and seconded by Francoise to approve the minutes. All were in favor, except Tim who abstained.

**3 – Options for the Quantitation Limit Standard**

Richard reported the multi-vote results on the four options. These were; Dan 47; John/Francoise 32; Tim/Mandi 12; and Nancy 29. He suggested none of the options had received enough votes to clearly stand out from the others. However, Tim and Mandi agreed to drop their proposal, leaving just three. John had suggested finding data to plug in to the proposals and find what it produces for Quantitation Limits. Arthur had offered data with results at spiking levels around expected quantitation limits. These data, collected from laboratories over a period of several years, were a large accumulation of spiked recoveries for Methods 6010, 6020, 8260, 8270 (with 19000 data points) , and 7470 (Mercury). Richard offered to apply the data to some of the proposals, looking particularly at what compounds would not meet the quantitation limit criteria at any of the concentrations.

In response to a question by Dan, Arthur said the preparation method information was also available. John said he would also look for some data sets. Nancy asked if a single concentration could be pulled out for a single lab that has only about 7 replicates. She suggested choosing some “good” analytes (such as metals) to come up with MDLs based on the new MDL approach . Then if the initial selection of an LOQ was (say) 2x the MDL, that would be a starting point. A time was set up for a small group of people to work on this idea.

#### **4 – Webinar on Calibration Interim Standard**

Richard anticipated a number of comments that should be received in time for the Washington DC session. He suggested considering these during the committee’s Monday session, and then continuing with quantitation during the half-day session on Tuesday. Richard had identified during the webinar a fear of statistical concepts; e.g., degrees of freedom, so he was nervous about the confidence interval approach. It had also become evident that the use of the word “may” should be re-examined in some places. On the call, it had been promised to give an extension for submitting comments to 45 days. Ken said he would make sure that information, with the deadline date, was posted on the website.

#### **5 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 pm EDT.