

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

**MARCH 14, 2014**

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, March 14, 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
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	Absent

Associate Committee members present: Arthur Denny

Guests Present: J.D. Gentry (ESC Laboratory) and LeAnn Wilson

**2 – Previous Minutes**

The previous minutes from February 28<sup>th</sup> were discussed, John moved to approve the minutes, Anand seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by all with Nancy and Tim abstaining.

**3 – Method Detection Limit (MDL)**

Comments were received from the Office of Water on the TNI proposed revisions to the EPA Method Detection Limit procedures (MDL) as found in 40 CFR Part 136, Appendix B. Each comment or suggested revision was reviewed, discussed and a response formulated.

The committee agreed that the sentence added to the end of section 2.b. allowing the use of existing data for the initial determination of the MDL was acceptable. The suggested revisions to footnote 1 were acceptable; however Francoise suggested changing the “30X MDL” to “33X MDL” to be more precise.

In section 2.d.ii. Francoise recommended changing the “S” in the MDL<sub>S</sub> equation to “S<sub>S</sub>”, for clarity and for consistency with the equation for the MDL<sub>b</sub> in 2.d.iii.3. The committee agreed. The committee also accepted the other minor revisions proposed by the EPA in section 2.d.ii. The title of Student’s t table

was also revised to read, “Single-Tailed Students’ t Values at the 99th Percentile t Statistic” for consistency.

The proposed revisions to section 2.d.iii.2&3 and footnote 4 were accepted as improvements to the method.

In comment [HA10] the EPA expressed concern that blank contamination may elevate the quantitation range and proposed new wording in section 2.f. There was much discussion on the suggested addition of 2.f. requiring that if the MDL was higher than the lowest calibration standard, corrective action should be taken. The committee did not believe that the comment was technically correct or workable. The calibration range can include the MDL, for example when zero is used in the calibration. The committee did agree that the MDL can’t be in the quantitation range. It was decided not to include the proposed section 2.f. in the procedure.

The EPA proposed revised wording for section 3.d, which was discussed. Francoise and Nancy suggested removing the “should” so that re-determining the MDL was a requirement and not an option if the method performance is altered.

Section 4.b. and footnote 6 were removed as suggested, because this was now covered in section 2.d.iii.2 and footnote 4.

Francoise said that she agreed with the last sentence of comment [HA17], in regards to using the most data that are available for estimating the MDL. There was much discussion by Nancy, Francoise, John, Richard and Arthur about adding “all” to 4.c. and/or moving footnote 7 earlier in the document to section 4 on Ongoing Annual Verification. In the end the committee agreed to move footnote 7 to the end of section 4.a. and change footnote 7 to read “Include all routine data, with the exception of the batches that are rejected and the associated samples reanalyzed.”

This concluded the review of the comments and proposed changes the committee received from the Office of Water

#### **4 – Quantitation Limits**

Because the committee felt it was more important to review and respond to the comments on its proposed revisions to the MDL any work on Quantitation Limits was tabled until the next call. At the end of the meeting Richard asked the committee to review the Quantitation Limit characteristics table, which he had previously distributed, and asked the members to include pros or cons for each characteristic if they had not already done so. In particular Richard was seeking input on what range of spiking levels should be allowed. The committee members’ suggestions on the number of replicates per instrument were added next.

#### **5 – Next Call**

The next call was scheduled for Friday, April 11<sup>th</sup> from 2:00-3:30 P.M. eastern time.

#### **6 – Adjournment**

The call was adjourned at 3:30 pm Eastern.