SUMMARY OF THE
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

JANUARY 4, 2013

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, January 4, 2013, 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)	Present
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co., (Other)	Present
Lee Wolf, Columbia Analytical Services (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Diana Shannon; Gale Warren

2 – Minutes from December 14

It was moved by Anand and seconded by John to approve the minutes as presented. All were in favor, except Lee who abstained. The minutes were therefore approved.

3 – Procedure for the Determination of MDL

Section 7. Tim suggested, for the second sentence, the Committee should go back to the language in Section 4a regarding blanks being prepared and analyzed on 3 separate days. He suggested adding "as described in Section 4a". Lee questioned if the next sentence, stating up to a full year of blanks may be used, means the analyst is required use a full year of blanks if available. This led to a protracted discussion on the number of blanks to be run. In response to a suggestion that you only need to run 7 to be statistically significant, Richard argued if you have data from more than 7 why not use them? This raised the question of where there should be an upper cut-off, if not one year. Nancy said the Committee was following an ill-advised path and argued for reverting to the original EPA procedure for this step and use a non-parametric approach. Tim pointed out you need a lot of data points before you can apply a non-parametric approach. Nancy also made the point it should be explained that 7 blanks should mean 7 useable blanks (i.e. returning a numerical value). At this point, the following was moved by Anand and seconded by John:

"Keep the evaluation of method blanks in the initial determination of the detection limit".

In favor were John, Richard, Francoise, Lee, Brooke, and Tim. Opposed were Anand, Dan and Nancy. The motion passed.

Discussion followed on language that would explain that useable blanks need to produce numerical results. Richard suggested running the 7 blanks, and taking the highest value if all of them do not produce a useable value. This was added as a new section c). The next paragraph, explaining how many method blanks need to be run, was discussed. Richard suggested moving it above a), and after some discussion the first paragraph of Section 7 was reworded to read "Required evaluation of method blanks to determine if the MDL provides reasonable protection from false positives. Evaluate the most recent method blanks. A minimum of 7 method blanks are required. Up to a full year of method blanks may be evaluated". Section c) was then re-worded to read "If less than 7 method blanks give a numerical result, use the highest result as the MDL_b value."

Some discussion of the next paragraph followed without reaching a conclusion. Therefore, further changes were deferred to the next meeting.

4 – Denver Meeting

Plans for the session in Denver were discussed. Richard suggested dealing with the Calibration WDS in the morning and the MDL procedure in the afternoon. Brooke agreed to provide 1-2 slides on what is being considered in the MDL procedure.

5– Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at3:30 pm EST. The next meeting will be in Denver with available conference call capabilities.

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)	Complete
6	2/17/12	Review Volume 1 Module 4 of the 2009 standard to identify any inconsistencies with the new language	All Committee Members	Complete
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 parts referring to continuing calibration.	Committee	Complete
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	Committee	Complete (done in the

Item No.	Date Proposed	Action	Assigned to:	To be Completed by:
		analysts using the most recent calibration rather than choosing which of 2 or more curves to use.		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 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.	Committee	Not determined

Item No.	Date Proposed	Action	Assigned to:	To be Completed by:
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	Complete
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	Complete
21	7/20/12	Explain in the guidance document the difference between MDL and the true detection limit.	Committee	Not determined
22	10/5/12	A note will be appended to the draft language of Section 1.7.1.1 n until the CCV language has been written.	Anand	Complete
23	11/2/12	For the MDL document, language will be drafted in the scope to limit the use.	John	Complete
24	11/2/12	In the Scope and Application section of the edited MDL document, the sentence "To accomplish this, the procedure was made device- or instrument-independent." Will be re-worked.	John	Complete
25	11/30/12	A letter will be drafted to the EPA OW, asking what kind of stakeholder composition they want ELAB to put together for reviewing the modified MDL procedure.	John	12/14/12