

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

APRIL 25, 2014

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, April 25, 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)	Absent
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)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee members present: Arthur Denny; Dixie Marlin; Chuck Lytle

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by John and seconded by Nancy to approve the minutes of April 11. All were in favor.

3 – Quantitation Limits

The committee continued to fill in the Quantitation Limit (QL) characteristics table. The next item discussed was the relationship of the spiking level to the QL. It was agreed exactly at the QL would be best, but it leads to complications with multi-component methods. Arthur added that it would require allowance to be made for poor-performing compounds. Nancy agreed it should be at or below the QL except for poor performers. She said spiking above the QL would be unacceptable, because the precision and accuracy at the QL would not then be known. John concurred and added that MDL spikes could not be used for all analytes. Dan said a laboratory should be given options and Chuck agreed there should be flexibility in the standard; e.g., a laboratory might change its QL daily.

Richard added a line to the table for “Minimum multiple of MDL”, saying it was a criterion that may or may not be needed. It was noted, however, the standard does not require laboratories to have a detection

limit. Nancy, Brooke, Richard, John and Nancy all agreed on a minimum multiple of 2, but it may be necessary to return to this when precision was considered.

Discussed next were acceptance limits for QL standards. Nancy was concerned about the precision and accuracy. Richard suggested saying that all standards must meet the recovery limits, and then there would be no need to worry about precision limits. This was added as another bullet in the table.

The committee now moved to on-going verification of QL. Under “what range should be allowed” it was suggested it would be necessary to accumulate data and evaluate periodically, rather than an individual run basis. As the discussion proceeded it became evident that this tabular approach had limitations, because of the interdependence of the options; i.e., changing an option could then cause other options to have to change. Richard felt the discussion was going round in circles, so he suggested he should try to draft a procedure for QL. He volunteered to then circulate it to the committee as a basis for continued discussion.

5 – Next Call

The next call was scheduled for Friday, May 16 from 2:00-3:30 P.M. Eastern time.

6 – Adjournment

The call was adjourned at 3:30 pm Eastern