

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

FEBRUARY 7, 2018

The Committee held a conference call on Wednesday, February 7, 2018, at 2:00 pm EST. Chair Valerie Slaven led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Absent
Eric Davis, Austin Water Utility (Lab)	Absent
Deb Gaynor, Phoenix Chemistry Services (Other)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Neptune (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, PDC Labs (Lab)	Absent
Valerie Slaven, Consulting Services (Other)	Present
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Absent

Associate Committee Members present: Arthur Denny; Anand Mudambi; Nevein Narouz; Chuck Neslund

2 – Guidance on Detection and Quantitation

Previously, Val had circulated a revised draft incorporating changes made as a result of comments received during the January Forum on Environmental Accreditation, in Albuquerque, NM. Jerry Parr had edited that document, and the committee agreed those changes were mostly good. Therefore, on Val's suggestion, the committee worked through Jerry's comments page by page.

Page 1. The committee agreed with the updated disclaimer box. The first sentence after the box referred to the module in question, and it was suggested adding the standard revision number. There was no agreement on whether this would be necessary, so Val said she would ask Jerry.

Page 2. Jerry's "Overview of the Section" was accepted by the committee, and no further changes were recommended on this page.

Page 3. Several further changes to the flow chart for the Determination of LOQ and DL were agreed. The description after the third box was modified to state that spikes must meet qualitative id criteria. The statement "Results must be above zero" should be "Results must be above DL". However, the statement then became redundant so it was struck out. Similar changes were made in the Flow Chart for Ongoing Verification of LOQ and DL. Gale identified a typographical error in the equation for calculation of DL_b , where an "=" sign should be "+".

Page 4. No further changes.

Page 5. An editorial change to “an DL” was made. Gale suggested adding a statement in the second paragraph on use of preservatives. This had been stated on page 6, but Jerry had removed it because it was taken out of the standard. On discussion, the committee felt it should be put back in, because laboratories should be encouraged to add preservative when possible. However, it would be made clear it is not a standard requirement. Anand suggested saying it is recommended that preservation be applied.

Page 6. Anand noticed that the guidance on standard clause 1.5.2.2.b) said “sample preparation and analysis”, and it should be changed to use the same wording as the standard; i.e., “sample processing and analysis”.

Page 7. No further changes.

Page 8. Deb commented on Jerry’s section “Methods that do not require and LOQ and/or a DL” where microbiological methods were mentioned. Since microbiology was not relevant to this chemistry module, it was agreed to delete the first sentence, and to include “presence/absence methods” in the second sentence (i.e., the new first sentence). The statement “If all the DL_{blank} give numerical results..” was changed to “If all the method blanks give numerical results..”

Page 9. The statement “The 99th percentile is the more robust statistic and ensures 99% confidence” was changed to state “.. 99% confidence interval..” Deb pointed out the next sentence needed editing to include a verb. The sentence “Assuming that the same low-level spikes or samples spiked at the same concentration were used for the determination of the DL and the initial verification of the LOQ, then the ongoing verifications may use the same concentration” had been changed by Jerry, since “concentration” was originally “samples”. Colin disagreed with the change, and suggested changing “concentration” to “one set of low level spikes”. Jerry had removed the sentence “If there are multiple instruments, then a single extract may be analyzed on some or all of the instruments”. Val thought this was a valuable note that should be retained. Chuck agreed, but felt it was confusing as written. He suggested re-wording it to read “A single extract may be analyzed on one or more instruments”. On Deb’s suggestion, this was made into a separate note.

Page 10. Colin had two minor editorial changes in the last paragraph. The first sentence beginning “For the spike analysis..” should be changed to “For a spike analysis..” In the sentence “Examples of a technically valid reason are; prepared incorrectly, instrument failure, calibration error, instrument performance indications show a change in sensitivity, etc.”, he suggested changing the semicolon to a colon and “prepared incorrectly” to “incorrect preservations”. Also on Colin’s recommendation “If the spiking level must be raised and a new initial study performed, within 30 days. The existing DL and LOQ are used for reporting during this 30 day (or less) period.” was edited to read “If the spiking level must be raised and a new initial study performed within 30 days, the existing DL and LOQ are used for reporting during this 30 day (or less) period.”

Page 11 – On Gale’s suggestion, it was agreed for consistency, under the header **Blanks**, to include the formula for calculating them. She also felt the guidance paragraph under clause 1.5.2.4 should include something about preservation. Val said she would add a note that, if preservation is applied to these samples, the type of preservation should be documented. Chuck suggested the wording “including appropriate preservation if utilized” could be added to the second sentence.

Pages 12/13. No further changes.

3 – Guidance on Calibration

Although this was completed, Bob Wyeth had suggested including guidance on all items of the calibration section of the standard, and not just those modified in the 2016 standard. Val said she would look through the standard and determine which items really needed guidance. She would then report back to the committee.

4 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm EST