

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

DECEMBER 12, 2014

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, December 12, 2014, at 2:00 pm EST. Chair Richard Burrows led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Richard Burrows, Test America (Lab)	Present
Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Present
Brooke Connor (Other)	Present
Dan Dickinson, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Tim Fitzpatrick, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
JD Gentry, ESC (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Absent
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Absent
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: Steve Arpie; Chuck Lytle; Dixie Marlin; Diana Shannon.

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Francoise and seconded by Tim to approve the minutes of November 14. All were in favor. It was moved by John and seconded by Tim to approve the minutes of October 31. All were in favor.

3 – Interim Standard on Calibration

Richard reminded Committee members they must vote on the standard which was currently out for voting. It was aimed to discuss the comments at the February 2015 meeting in Crystal City.

4 – Working Draft Standard on Detection and Quantitation

A webinar had been conducted that morning. It was generally felt it went very well, with all questions being answered. However, there were a few questions that could be considered on this call. First, it was asked if laboratories should be required to set recovery criteria for initial and quarterly LOQ verification. All the WDS said was that they had to meet the qualitative identification criteria and then at the end of the year they must develop a precision and accuracy statement. It was discussed whether a requirement

should be added that a laboratory must put in its SOP a set of recovery limits for those LOQ spikes. Tim said, since data are collected throughout the year, the laboratory will not know until the end of the year what limits would apply. Richard agreed, saying the laboratory could only set limits based on its original 7 spikes. John agreed that would make it quite arbitrary. The next question was whether LOD was required, and this may have come about through language in the WDS that says “if an LOD is determined”. Françoise recalled that an LOD was required because of the requirement that the LOQ is 3 times the LOD. Richard suggested the language should be clarified that an LOD is required. The third comment expressed concern that the 3x LOD requirement for the LOQ makes it difficult to meet drinking water levels. Richard agreed that may be true, but if that separation of the LOD and LOQ was not maintained, the LOQ would start to become less reliable as a quantitation limit. He added the only way round this might be to change the 3x multiplier to 2x. Françoise agreed there is at least one drinking water method where this would not be met, and commented that Aaron Alger had questioned whether the committee had spoken with EPA on this. Richard asked Françoise to send that drinking water example to him, and said he would then check that with his own laboratory. John said he would also check on analytes where that cannot be met. Richard said, with the drinking water MRLs, the requirements are quite stringent for precision and accuracy of the MRL level spikes, and if the laboratory is meeting those precision and accuracy requirements the calculated MDL would almost certainly be more than 3x lower than the spiking level. The next question was if LOD/LOQ is required for gravimetry, titration, alkalinity etc. Richard said some of the language from the MDL procedure regarding when the MDL is not required needs to also go into the LOD/LOQ procedure. Tim thought it should be clarified what is meant by “quarterly” and “annually”; i.e., if it means approximately within those time frames, or specifically so. He added this is an inconsistency throughout the standard. Richard suggested something should be in the definition section.

John suggested preparing a summary presentation on detection and quantitation. He shared his slides with the committee as a starting point, and suggested merging these with the slides Richard had used for the webinar. Richard thought a subcommittee might be formed. John also volunteered to continue looking at data to verify the effectiveness of the committee’s LOQ criteria.

5 – Consideration of Next Areas of the Standard to Work on

Since the committee would not be able to move the Detection/Quantitation standard to a VDS until all comments from the webinar were received, Richard suggested looking at future areas. The current standard on precision and bias was considered to be minimal. John said he would like to see measurement uncertainty included. Richard commented evaluation of selectivity was a difficult topic and there is not much in the current standard. He was doubtful if more could be put in the standard, because it is so method specific. Françoise suggested, when a method uses an automatic extractor, the blank has to be in randomly selected positions. John added that the method blank section could use some clarification. Richard wanted the standard to say matrix spikes shall not be reported to anyone except the client whose sample was spiked.

6 – Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for January 9, when the committee would expect to have some comments from the Calibration Interim Standard and the Detection/Quantitation Voting Draft Standard.

This had been Tim's last meeting as a Committee Member and Richard thanked him for all his hard and effective work over the previous 4 years.

7 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm EST.