

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

APRIL 11, 2014

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, April 11, 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)	Absent
Brooke Connor, USGS (Other)	Present
Dan Dickinson, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Mandi Edwards, Envirochem (Lab)	Present
Tim Fitzpatrick, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
JD Gentry, ESC (Lab)	Absent
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)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee members present: Arthur Denny; Diana Shannon; Dixie Marlin.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Anand and seconded by Mandi to approve the minutes of March 14. All were in favor (Nancy did not vote, having not yet joined the call).

3 – Standard Interpretation Requests (SIR)

Three SIRs remained outstanding and were discussed.

SIR 17

This questioned whether the 2003 NELAC standard required performing continued proficiency for 8 Aroclors and Toxaphene in screening method 505. Mandi had drafted a response, and it was moved by John and seconded by Anand to accept this response. All were in favor.

SIR 112

This request concerned qualifying results when surrogate recoveries failed to meet acceptance criteria. This generated a protracted discussion, due to the standard being vague and it not being clear what the questioner was asking. It was specifically asked what “evaluated for the effect indicated for the individual sample results” in the 2009 V1M4 Section 1.7.4.3c means. John and Anand, who had worked on the draft response, suggested it to mean in the absence of method defined criteria the laboratory shall establish its own criteria taking into account any client specific criteria of a failing surrogate. However, Brooke asked if it meant if a surrogate fails for a known reason that has nothing to do with the associated samples, then it can be assumed the samples results are acceptable. There was a long discussion whether the standard is meant to say the surrogate should be qualified or the analyte should be qualified, and John added it was unclear in the standard if surrogates have to be linked to specific analytes to allow qualification of an analyte response. Richard said if a surrogate fails it is normal to flag that surrogate but not put a flag on every analyte. However, Tim said in his laboratory, through use of deuterated surrogates, they are able to link surrogates with specific analytes. Since the standard is unclear, the committee agreed the committee could not categorically state if it is the surrogate or the analyte that must be qualified. Small language changes were made to John and Anand’s response. It was then moved by Anand and seconded by Mandi to approve the modified response. All were in favor.

SIR 125

This questioned whether measured pH values outside the buffer range need to be flagged. The committee agreed it should be qualified as “outside the calibration range”. It was thought the response had originally been rejected by the AB Council, because it had said either a flag or narrative could be used. Gary said the problem with just a narrative was that the narrative does not always accompany the data. Appropriate wording was drafted to state the result must be qualified and the use of flags would depend on client and state regulatory requirements. It was moved for acceptance by John and seconded by Anand. All were in favor.

Ken said he would format the 3 SIR responses and send them in.

4 – Quantitation Limits

In the time remaining, the committee continued to fill in the Quantitation Limit characteristics table. The committee members’ opinions on number of replicates for initial QL verification were added. A new line was inserted for number of batches for initial demonstration, and multiple instrument requirement, and it was agreed to match the MDL procedure, with a reminder that a note might be needed in the standard regarding emergency startup. On Nancy’s suggestion, another new line in the table asked if a statement of uncertainty in the quantitation limit was needed. Richard suggested coming back to that after the acceptance criteria for the replicates had been discussed. Since time was almost up, Richard asked the committee to think, in preparation for the next call, about acceptance criteria for the quantitation limit standards.

5 – Next Call

The next call was scheduled for Friday, April 25th from 2:00-3:30 P.M. Eastern time.

6 – Adjournment

The call was adjourned at 3:30 pm Eastern