SUMMARY OF THE
TNI ENVIRONMENTAL MEASUREMENT METHODS EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

JUNE 1, 2012

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, June 1, 2012, at 2:00 pm EDT.

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
Tim Fitzpatrick, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Absent
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co., (Other)	Present
Lee Wolf, Columbia Analytical Services (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, TNI administrative support staff	Absent

Associate Committee member present: Arthur Denny

2 – Minutes from May 4 and May 18

It was moved by Anand and seconded by Francoise to approve the May 4 minutes. All were in favor. It was moved by John and seconded by Anand to approve the May 18 minutes. All were in favor.

3 - Working Draft Standard

Richard reported that the draft standard had been approved by the e-mail vote. Some proposed editorial changes were discussed.

Tim commented on Section 1.7.1.1 g). The first sentence beginning "Measurement of the residual at or near…" requires two checks at two different levels. In the past EPA has only specified one at the mid-point, and not typically at the quantitation limit. He questioned if there is enough confidence that the arrived-at number can be applied at both the LOQ and the mid-point. Richard responded that the intent was to specify two different levels. If only a mid-point precision and accuracy was specified you would make your own determination of the precision and accuracy at the low point. Perhaps this should be clarified by saying the error must be less than or equal to the maximum specified for the specific level in the method. Francoise was concerned that the level at the LOQ has to be wider than the mid-point. Richard proposed rewording to read "The error at these levels must be less than or equal the maximum specified in the method. If

no criterion for the LOQ level is specified in the method, an appropriate level shall be specified in the laboratory SOP". There was general agreement on this change.

Tim's next comment was on Section 1.7.1.1 m). In the sentence beginning "Non-detected analytes may be reported without qualification..", he suggested adding "in the event of calibration failures". His rationale was that laboratories may reason they do not need to qualify the data if they have a surrogate failure. There was general agreement on this change.

In 1.7.2 d), Tim suggested "methods" is better than "analytical systems". The others agreed to that change. In part iii of this section he felt it was unclear what time period was being referred to. Francoise said the laboratory could decide on the time period, and Tim suggested saying "defined" time period. The others agreed. Tim said part iv does not make a good distinction between initial and continuing calibration verification, and perhaps the reader would believe they do not have to do a calibration verification if they have done an initial calibration, but you are required to check with a second source standard (according to 1.7.1.1 f)) and there might be a conflict the way it is worded. At Richard's suggestion it was agreed to add to the end of the sentence "and an initial calibration verification".

In Nancy's absence, her comments were considered. In 1.7.1.1 j) iv, she had suggested this section partly repeats an earlier section, but it was generally agreed the repeat wording does not do any harm. She also questioned the wording "instrument calibration" in 1.7.2 d), but it was agreed the word "instrument" had been added for consistency with other parts of the document.

4 – Proposed presentation at the Washington DC meeting.

Members were assigned as follows to draft bullet points for a PowerPoint presentation that will explain the reasons for some of the changes made to the standard.

1.7.1 through 1.7.1.1 d) – Brook

1.7.1.1 e) through g) – Richard

1.7.1.1 h) through j) – Tim

1.7.1.1 l) through n) – Francoise/Anand

1.7.2 – Lee

John will make sure the list of items for the guidance document (captured in the action items) is complete, and will prepare some bullet points for a slide that will describe the items to be discussed in the guidance document in broad terms. Richard asked for them prior to the next call on June 22, to give him time to compile them for that call.

4 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm EST. The next meeting will be June 22, 2012 at 2:00 pm EDT.

LIST OF ACTION ITEMS TO BE COMPLETED

Item No.	Date Proposed	Action	Assigned to:	To be Completed by:
1	1/31/12	Add a definition of Reporting Limit or Quantitation limit to the standard.	Committee	Defer to quantitation sections
2	1/31/12	Continue to consider the concept of routine low-level QC in the standard.	Committee	Ongoing
3	1/31/12	Review Sections 1.5 and 1.6 of the 2009 standard's chemistry module to determine if current calibration requirements are adequate.	Committee	Not determined
4	1/31/12	Spacing of calibration standards will be considered for the guidance document.	Committee	Ongoing
5	2/17/12	Draft language for items in the calibration standard	Richard (Items 1 and 2) Anand (Item 3) Nancy (Item 5) Anand and Francoise (Item 6) Tim (Item 11)	Ongoing
6	2/17/12	Review Volume 1 Module 4 of the 2009 standard to identify any inconsistencies with the new language	All Committee Members	Not determined
7	3/2/12	Add 1-2 sentences under the header 1.7.1 to explain that method is also included in calibration.	John	Complete
8	3/2/12	Clean up the parts of Section 1.7.1 referring to initial calibration and the	Committee	Complete

Item No.	Date Proposed	Action	Assigned to:	To be Completed by:
		parts referring to continuing calibration.		
9	3/2/12	Add criteria for rejection of calibration standards to the guidance document.	Committee	Not determined
10	3/2/12	Add to the guidance document discussion of analysts using the most recent calibration rather than choosing which of 2 or more curves to use.	Committee	Complete (done in the standard)
11	3/2/12	Include a paragraph in the standard that addresses a single-point calibration for P/A testing.	Committee	Complete
12	3/30/12	Check the language does not contradict the existing standard regarding meeting method requirements vs. standard requirements for calibration.	Committee	Not determined
13	3/30/12	Sections 1.7.1.1 j and k will be modified further as a result of the March 30 discussions.	Anand and Francoise	Complete
14	3/30/12	Have the guidance document consider orders of magnitude in deciding the minimum number of standards, and keep a placeholder in Section 1.7.1 to refer to it.	Committee	Not determined
15	3/30/12	Add a definition for threshold testing	Committee	Not determined
16	3/30/12	Richard's, John's and Anand's March 30 changes will be incorporated into a single document.	Ken	Complete
17	5/4/12	Add to the guidance document that Section	Committee	Not determined

Item No.	Date Proposed	Action	Assigned to:	To be Completed by:
		1.7.1.1 (g) requirements should also be applicable for average response, when you evaluate with the RSD, and that is numerically the same value as the RSE.		
18	5/4/12	Discuss in the guidance document how to check quarterly (ref. Section 1.7.1.1 (j) (i).	Committee	Not determined
19	6/1/12	Bullet points will be drafted for a proposed PowerPoint presentation	Brooke, Richard, Tim, Francoise, Anand	6/18/12
20	6/1/12	Bullet points will be drafted for a slide that will describe the items to be discussed in the guidance document.	John	6/18/12