

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

DECEMBER 14, 2012

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, December 14, 2012, at 2:00 pm EDT.

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)	Absent
Tim Fitzpatrick, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Present
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co., (Other)	Present
Lee Wolf, Columbia Analytical Services (Lab)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Dale Rushnek

2 – Minutes from November 30

It was moved by John and seconded by Francoise to approve the minutes as presented. All were in favor. The minutes were therefore approved.

3 – Posting of the WDS on Calibration

Ken reported that the WDS had been posted in readiness for its discussion at the Denver meeting. All Committee Members except Nancy had voted by e-mail to release the WDS from Committee.

4 – Procedure for the Determination of MDL

Section 7. This is an added piece titled “Required procedure to determine if the MDL provides reasonable protection from false positives”. Section 7a reads “This section is only required for procedures that return numerical results for blanks (if all blanks are non-detects then protection from false positives has been demonstrated)”. It was discussed if this was necessary language. Nancy questioned whether the numerical results for blanks are meant to be after the LIMS system has processed the numbers, or if they are straight off the instrument. She was concerned that some instruments return a zero, which some people might consider to be numeric, so this section needs to make it clear what a numerical result is. Richard said the intent was for it to be the first point at which the user has the chance to look at a result; i.e., not the result after filtering out everything below the MDL in the LIMS system, but what came off the instrument. In GC, if there is no peak it would be a non-detect, which could be described with a result of zero.

Tim said if there was a data set with only 7-10 points, and all results might be quantitated but less than the MDL, then the recalculated MDL might be greater than the MDL calculated with the spikes. He suggested removing that possibility by deleting the parenthetical. Richard expressed the need to define what numerical means and the point at which you evaluate whether there are numerical results or not. Brooke added that there could be a zero in the population so it cannot say non-zero. She suggested instead of numerical results, it could say signals. At Nancy's suggestion, Richard re-worded 7a to read "This section is not required for procedures that always return the result of zero or non-numerical results for blanks." It was agreed to re-number 7a to 7b and put in a new 7a to read "For this section raw concentration or amount from the instrument or analytical system are used. In the next sentence "variance" was changed to "standard deviation".

Nancy added that it should be stated somewhere that you only need to do the MDL initially and when you change something, and not necessarily every year. Richard suggested leaving that until the verification section.

4 – Next Steps

There was a short discussion on the upcoming Denver meeting in January. It was hoped the WDS could be dealt with in the morning, and then Richard would present some slides to summarize the progress made on the MDL document. Then, time permitting, the Committee could continue to work through the language. Richard said, to meet the deadline for the next EPA method update rule, the Committee will need to finish the MDL document by the end of August. He suggested discussing at the Denver meeting what the role of the TNI Board of Directors will be; e.g., if they will just need to endorse it. It will be necessary to submit the document to ELAB, but there would be no requirement to wait for ELAB to finish its deliberations. John added that his draft letter should be sent to the TNI Board, asking EPA who should go on the group for stakeholder input.

5– Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm EST. The next conference call will be on January 4, 2013 at 2:00 pm EST.

LIST OF ACTION ITEMS TO BE COMPLETED

Item No.	Date Proposed	Action	Assigned to:	To be Completed by:
1	1/31/12	Add a definition of Reporting Limit or Quantitation limit to the standard.	Committee	Defer to quantitation sections
2	1/31/12	Continue to consider the concept of routine low-level QC in the standard.	Committee	Ongoing
3	1/31/12	Review Sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the 2009 standard's chemistry module to determine if current calibration requirements are adequate.	Committee	Not determined
4	1/31/12	Spacing of calibration standards will be considered for the guidance document.	Committee	Ongoing
5	2/17/12	Draft language for items in the calibration standard	Richard (Items 1 and 2) Anand (Item 3) Nancy (Item 5) Anand and Francoise (Item 6) Tim (Item 11)	Complete
6	2/17/12	Review Volume 1 Module 4 of the 2009 standard to identify any inconsistencies with the new language	All Committee Members	Complete
7	3/2/12	Add 1-2 sentences under the header 1.7.1 to explain that method is also included in calibration.	John	Complete
8	3/2/12	Clean up the parts of Section 1.7.1 referring to initial calibration and the parts referring to continuing calibration.	Committee	Complete
9	3/2/12	Add criteria for rejection of calibration standards to the guidance document.	Committee	Not determined
10	3/2/12	Add to the guidance document discussion of	Committee	Complete (done in the

Item No.	Date Proposed	Action	Assigned to:	To be Completed by:
		analysts using the most recent calibration rather than choosing which of 2 or more curves to use.		standard)
11	3/2/12	Include a paragraph in the standard that addresses a single-point calibration for P/A testing.	Committee	Complete
12	3/30/12	Check the language does not contradict the existing standard regarding meeting method requirements vs. standard requirements for calibration.	Committee	Not determined
13	3/30/12	Sections 1.7.1.1 j and k will be modified further as a result of the March 30 discussions.	Anand and Francoise	Complete
14	3/30/12	Have the guidance document consider orders of magnitude in deciding the minimum number of standards, and keep a placeholder in Section 1.7.1 to refer to it.	Committee	Not determined
15	3/30/12	Add a definition for threshold testing	Committee	Not determined
16	3/30/12	Richard's, John's and Anand's March 30 changes will be incorporated into a single document.	Ken	Complete
17	5/4/12	Add to the guidance document that Section 1.7.1.1 (g) requirements should also be applicable for average response, when you evaluate with the RSD, and that is numerically the same value as the RSE.	Committee	Not determined

Item No.	Date Proposed	Action	Assigned to:	To be Completed by:
18	5/4/12	Discuss in the guidance document how to check quarterly (ref. Section 1.7.1.1 (j) (i).	Committee	Not determined
19	6/1/12	Bullet points will be drafted for a proposed PowerPoint presentation	Brooke, Richard, Tim, Francoise, Anand	Complete
20	6/1/12	Bullet points will be drafted for a slide that will describe the items to be discussed in the guidance document.	John	Complete
21	7/20/12	Explain in the guidance document the difference between MDL and the true detection limit.	Committee	Not determined
22	10/5/12	A note will be appended to the draft language of Section 1.7.1.1 n until the CCV language has been written.	Anand	Complete
23	11/2/12	For the MDL document, language will be drafted in the scope to limit the use.	John	Complete
24	11/2/12	In the Scope and Application section of the edited MDL document, the sentence "To accomplish this, the procedure was made device- or instrument-independent." Will be re-worked.	John	Complete
25	11/30/12	A letter will be drafted to the EPA OW, asking what kind of stakeholder composition they want ELAB to put together for reviewing the modified MDL procedure.	John	12/14/12