

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

OCTOBER 7, 2016

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, October 7, 2016, at 2:00 pm EST. Chair Valerie Slaven led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Richard Burrows, Test America (Lab)	Present
Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Present
Brooke Connor (Other)	Present
Eric Davis, Austin Water Utility (Lab)	Absent
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Absent
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co. (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, PDC Labs (Lab)	Absent
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Lab)	Present
Gary Ward, OR DPH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Deb Gaynor; Reed Jeffery; Shawn Kassner; Chuck Neslund.

2 – Consideration of Accreditation Council Comments

The NELAP Accreditation Council (AC) had rejected Module 4 of the 2016 standard. Valerie said she had received from Judy Morgan, Chair of the Laboratory Accreditation System Executive Committee (LASEC), a list of items that the AC had problems with. She had also received, from Jerry Parr, some suggested edits that he felt could address the concerns. Ken explained what had happened. The standard had gone through a very rigorous process and had been finalized. The AC, most of whose Accreditation Body members had failed to vote on the standard, had now raised 4 issues they wanted to be addressed. Ken said this was highly irregular, none of those issues having been raised during the voting process. The standard was final and the only changes that could be made would be purely editorial clarifications that did not substantively change the standard. Richard thought it was not the committee's task to decide if changes are editorial, and that determination should be made by the Consensus Standards Development Executive Committee or the TNI Board of Directors. Ken agreed, but suggested the committee was the best qualified to recommend if the changes were editorial. The following issues were discussed.

Change MDL to LOD

The AC felt MDL should not be used for detection limit, because MDL was widely accepted to refer specifically to the EPA Method Detection Limit. Richard reminded the committee they had decided not to use LOD, because the Department of Defense (DoD) uses that to refer to Currie's L_D . He thought DL

would be better (DoD uses DL to refer to Currie's LC or MDL), and Ken pointed out that DL is used elsewhere in the TNI standard.

Allow exceptions to the rule that the LOQ must be 3X the LOD

The ABs agreed the LOD/LOQ relationship of at least 3 times is founded on good science, but some EPA methods or programs may have codified language that would conflict with this. Everywhere else in the standard, such exceptions are allowed. The same should be true for the 3X rule. Elsewhere in the standard, it is made clear that the standard requirements can be superseded by state or federal mandated program or method. That should have been understood without stating it here, but the committee felt that could be added editorially for clarification. The language would be added to Clause 1.5.2.2.1 (c) (iii). Francoise suggested it should also be added to 1.5.2.1.3.

Have equivalent criteria for evaluating the initial and on-going LOQ

Richard explained they wanted the recovery requirement in the initial verification to also be present in the on-going verification. However, the on-going verification is just a single sample, so a failure could precipitate a lengthy and rigorous verification schedule. The committee had discussed this issue at considerable length before putting the language in the standard. Richard suggested explaining their rationale to the AC, and reminding them that the current (2009) standard had no recovery requirement at all. Therefore, the committee was moving in that direction, but was concerned that a statistical sporadic failure would be too disruptive. Ken said a change such as the AC was requesting could not be editorial.

Method vs Instrument calibrations

The ABs felt that it should be made clear the LOD determination is by instrument., especially since the new EPA MDL definition will specify "each instrument every quarter" for ongoing MDLs. This was clearly just a clarification, and the committee would consider how best to word it. The ABs felt the sentence in Section 1.7.1 reading "Calibrations may be performed at the instrumental level (analytical step only) or the method level (analytical plus preparation steps)." could create confusion and since this is not enforceable, the sentence should be deleted. The committee did not see why this sentence would be a problem, but was willing to remove it.

3 - Next Steps

Valerie said she would touch base with Judy, tell her what the Committee would be prepared to do, and perhaps schedule a call with her.

4 – Next Call

The next conference call would be scheduled for October 21, when the committee would verify the changes it was prepared to make.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm EDT.