

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

**JULY 24, 2015**

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, July 24, 2015, at 2:00 pm EST. Chair Richard Burrows led the meeting.

**1 – Roll call**

Richard Burrows, Test America (Lab)	Present
Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Present
Brooke Connor (Other)	Absent
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Absent
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co. (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, IL DEP (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Laboratory)	Present
Gary Ward, OR DPH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Tom Dziedzic, Diana Shannon

**2 – Previous Minutes**

It was moved by Francoise and seconded by Valerie to approve the minutes of July 10, 2015. All were in favor.

**3 – Consideration of Comments on the Detection/Quantitation VDS**

These comments had been discussed publicly during the Environmental Measurement Symposium in Chicago.

The first was to make the advice to follow the EPA MDL procedure into a note. This would be put at the end of Clause **1.5.2.1.1**. The committee agreed with the proposed language.

Next was to separate the allowance for not doing an MDL where no spiking solutions are available to those where a detection limit is inappropriate. The proposed language was discussed and finalized. It was decided to edit the language for clarification, and Richard expressed some concern that readers might think more substantive changes had been made. However, editing is allowed and it was agreed to include a preamble to the published Interim Standard to explain such changes.

In the paragraph at the start of **1.5.2.1.1**, “determination” was removed and “the laboratory MDL procedure” was added. This was an editorial change based on a voter’s comment.

Several instances of “must” were changed to “shall” for consistency.

A possible controversial issue in **1.5.2.1.1 b** was the use of “preservation”, where several preservation procedures could be used in the same method, and this could multiply the number of MDLs required to be done. However, in the absence of a comment this could not be changed.

In **1.5.2.1.1 c**, “low level spikes and routine method blanks” was put in to clarify what had been described as “samples”.

A comment on **1.5.2.1.1 e** had been that it said you should evaluate blanks, but did not say in what way they should be evaluated. Language was modified to clarify this.

Clause **1.5.2.1.1 g** was about when the detection and LOQ study had to be done again, and that was moved into the on-going verification section.

In **1.5.2.1.2** the committee had considered re-listing the criteria in **a** through **f**, but it now stated you have to evaluate in the on-going verification those criteria evaluated in the initial verification. Richard thought the language in the second paragraph: “If the method is altered in a way other than routine maintenance and the change can be expected to elevate the detection limit, then prepare and analyze a spike at the LOQ concentration and a blank.” might still be open to interpretation, but he felt it could not be clarified further.

Clause **1.5.2.1.3** had been modified to state when a new MDL is determined, the laboratory must verify that the LOQ value is at least 3 times the MDL.

Clause **1.5.2.2.d** was an important one. In the sentence “The laboratory shall establish acceptance criteria for the LOQ verification spikes”, Richard proposed adding “for accuracy” after “acceptance criteria”. The laboratory could set the accuracy requirement it wants, but this important addition would show there are some criteria that would be considered quantitative.

In clause **1.5.2.2.1 c**, the word “quantitative” was also added concerning all results. It was also added that recovery of each analyte is within the laboratory established accuracy acceptance criteria. John was concerned that the wording “quantitative (above zero)” could indicate that quantitative is being defined as just above zero. The committee agreed with his slight re-wording to read “All results are quantitative (above zero and meet the qualitative identification criteria of the method)”. The phrase “under routine operating conditions” was removed. On John’s suggestion “is not above zero” was inserted after “If a result from an LOQ verification sample..”. Anand suggested “LOQ and LOQ spikes” should be changed to “LOQ verification.”

An editorial change was made to clause **1.5.2.3** (Documentation), by adding directions on documenting on-going verification after removing this language from sub-clause (c) of the on-going verification section. Colin observed this section seemed to focus just on the LOQ verification, and on his suggestion, MDL was added.

This completed the discussion and on Richard's request for volunteers, Francoise said she would go through the comment spreadsheet to make sure all comments had been addressed. Anand volunteered to edit the responses on the spreadsheet to make the language suitable for returning to the commenters.

#### **4 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm EDT