

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

**OCTOBER 23, 2015**

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, October 23, 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)	Absent
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, PDC Labs (Lab)	Absent
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Lab)	Present
Gary Ward, OR DPH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Eric Davis; Arthur Denny; Tom Dziedzic; Reed Jeffery; Chuck Neslund; Diana Shannon

**2 – Previous Minutes**

Francoise offered a correction to the draft minutes of September 25 in the second sentence of the third paragraph on page 2. She pointed out “failed sample” should be “failed QC sample”. With this change in place it was moved by Valerie and seconded by John to approve the minutes. All were in favor.

**3 – Future Standards Development**

The committee continued its discussions on Demonstration of Capability (DOC). Colin had been contacted by a member who had a problem with the Interim Standard, but the commenter’s concern would be better addressed in the DOC section. The member was concerned that a laboratory could retain its accreditation for an analyte even though it did not continue to run the analyte. The standard would no longer require testing the LOD or LOQ once per year. On discussion, the committee agreed it would consider this when DOC was being considered.

Richard had circulated a table for insertion of laboratory requirements for initial and on-going DOC. Considered first was the initial DOC the first time a laboratory performs a method for a single analyte with preparation (e.g., cyanide). The following were inserted in the table, with the understanding these would all be laboratory requirements though all would not necessarily be part of the DOC language: SOP; Calibration curve; LOQ / MDL study; Mid-level LCS replicates; High level LCS replicates?

(Although the calibration checks the upper end of the range, Valerie commented there are some methods that have saturation points); LCS in different matrices? (Valerie stressed even if the matrix is “water”, for waste-water the evaluation should be done in several different water streams); Blanks; Blind spike (could be PT study); Whatever the method requires; Does not require all analysts; Does not require all instruments. Richard asked if there was anything different from this list if there is a method like 8082 where there are 4 different LCS mixtures. If there are several matrices, that would result in a lot of work. Anand remarked the need for these items should all be considered based on the value added. Richard agreed, quoting as an example the value of the high level LCS replicates, especially when there are 4 different LCS mixtures. Valerie, saw as an example having to analyze all the different Arochlors by 1016/1260 without having to take all of them through the extraction process. Richard and Anand suggested requiring replicates at the mid-level LCS for 1016/1260, but only calibration standards for the other ones. Considered next was method 8270 with 3 separate calibration mixes, plus a few analytes not routinely (but occasionally) analyzed. Anand asked, if you just do one will you get all the poor performers? Richard thought replicate LCS samples were needed for all mixtures (unless they could be spiked together).

The committee moved on to the initial DOC when there was a new analyst, and the example of a single analyte with preparation (e.g., cyanide) was used. Valerie pointed out the preparation technician needed to be considered first. The preparation technician would have to read the SOP and complete the training; perform replicate LCS (that could be a different number than the initial DOC for the laboratory); and blanks. Valerie stressed it is important to have the analyst demonstrate competency in all the steps they, as an individual, perform. John agreed, saying some laboratories only have certain individuals preparing reagents, and they need to demonstrate capability in doing so. Richard cautioned that this discussion was going a lot further than the current Initial DOC language. Next considered was the analytical technician, who would have to work up a calibration curve; run a blind sample (that could be a PT); run an instrument blank; and spike at the quarterly LOQ/MDL verification level. The analyst would not necessarily have to run an LCS, as long as they ran a known (e.g., QC) sample.

#### **4 – Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm EDT. The committee agreed to continue this DOC discussion on November 6.