SUMMARY OF THE
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING

MARCH 10, 2017

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, March 10, 2017, at 2:00 pm EST. Chair Valerie Slaven led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Francoise Chauvin, NYC DEP (Lab)	Present
Eric Davis, Austin Water Utility (Lab)	Present
Deb Gaynor, Phoenix Chemistry Services (Other)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Neptune (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, PDC Labs (Lab)	Present
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Lab)	Present
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present
Lynn Bradley, AC Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee Members present: Richard Burrows; Nicole Cairns; Carl Kircher; Sara Hoffman; Scott Hoatson

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Shawn and seconded by Colin to approve the minutes from February 10, 2017. All were in favor.

3 – Non-Editorial Changes to V1M4

The committee discussed a list of proposed changes that would go into a new revised module, to meet the requirements of the NELAP Accreditation Council (AC). Valerie had presented these changes to the AC during its conference call earlier that week.

#1. *The reference to 40 CFR Part 136 Appendix B would be removed from the foot note and the procedure would be added to the previously created Guidance document. That guidance document would then be referenced in the foot note instead of 40 CFR Part 136 Appendix B.*

The AC members had not objected to the above, but it was considered this would require waiting until the guidance document was complete. Following a short discussion of options, it was moved by Shawn and seconded by Eric to add the 40 CFR Part 136 Appendix B reference to the Chemistry pages on the TNI website. All were in favor. This change would also have to be made to the 2016 standard, since the existing reference was incorrect unless EPA chose to publish the Method Update Rule. Therefore, it was agreed this should be done as an editorial change to the 2016 standard.

#2 *"including sample preservations" would be removed from section 1.5.2.1.1 b) to be consistent with both the current version of 40 CFR Part 136 Appendix B and the Pending updated version.*

The AC members had not objected to this proposed change, and it was not discussed further.

#3 *The requirement that the LOQ must be at least 3X the DL would be either reduced to 2X or removed and replaced by the LOQ must be greater than the DL. The Committee feels comfortable removing the 3X all together or lowering it to 2X given all the other requirements put in place for the LOQ such as the quarterly quantitative monitoring and the additional requirements for the DL which will naturally protect the quality at the DL as well as the LOQ. This also ensures we are writing a standard that everyone can use. I have attached a word document that includes both potential changes in language.*

The AC members had favored the option of removing the 3X requirement, and replacing it with the requirement for the LOQ to be greater than the DL.

#4 *The word "mean" would be added before the word recovery in sections 1.5.2.2 d) and 1.5.2.2.1 c) so that the committee original intent of the initial LOQ being evaluated based on the mean recovery of all the spikes is clear. It was also decided to add the words "of each analyte to this section" for clarification as well.*

Although the AC members had not objected to this, the committee decided "mean" could not be added here, because section 1.5.2.2 referred to both the initial and on-going LOQ. Therefore, it was agreed to just put "mean" in section 1.5.2.2.1 c) (ii).

#5 The following draft language had been proposed to make the ongoing LOQ quantitative:

1.5.2.2.2 a) Results of each LOQ verification sample analysis shall be evaluated at the time of the testing and shall meet the qualitative identification criteria in the method and laboratory Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). The quantitated result shall be greater than the DL and meet the laboratory established accuracy criteria.

If a continuing LOQ verification test does not meet this requirement, the laboratory shall take corrective action. Corrective actions shall include (i) correcting method or instrument performance and repeating the verification test, (ii) evaluating the laboratory established control limits to ensure they reflect current performance or (iii) raising the spiking level (and the quantitation limit if the spiking level is above it) and repeating the initial verification study. Any samples analyzed in a batch associated with a failing LOQ verification shall be reanalyzed or reported with qualifiers.

An AC member had commented the second paragraph could be made clearer if "include" in the second sentence was replaced with stating that the corrective actions shall be either of the 3 options listed.

4 – Standard Interpretation Request (SIR)

SIR 297 had been dealt with earlier, but was returned to the committee for further action. The commenter had asked if the DOC requirements in V1M4 sections 1.6.2 and 1.6.3 of the 2009 standard were specific to each Matrix-Method-Analyte combination for which a laboratory seeks or maintains

accreditation. The committee had responded that Section 1.6.2 (IDOC) is specific to each matrix-method-analyte combination, but Section 1.6.3 is not necessarily specific to each matrix-method-analyte combination. The LASEC had returned this to the committee, because "not necessarily" was considered to be unclear. Valerie commented that a laboratory is allowed to use a Laboratory Control Sample for its on-going DOC, so every analyte does not have to present. Nicole agreed every analyte does not have to be present in an on-going DOC. Therefore, the committee removed the word "necessarily", and Valerie re-worded the response. It was moved by Deb and seconded by Francoise to approve Valerie's re-wording. All were in favor.

5 – Concern by the FL AB on LOD/LOQ Verification

Carl Kircher re-visited a comment he had made during the voting process. His comment was that the current requirement to verify the LOD or the LOQ for each matrix, method, and analyte annually is the only standard left in the Volume 1, Module 4 Chemistry section that explicitly specifies any kind of requirement and frequency for the accredited laboratory to prove to its AB that it can achieve accuracy, precision, sensitivity, and selectivity for each accredited analyte, method, and matrix if it is not routinely performing the analysis at least annually. Therefore, he was unable to approve the proposed Section 1.5.2.3 in the 2016 standard without any concurrent change to require a continuing DOC for each accredited matrix, method, and analyte for the laboratory on an on-going annual basis. This was discussed at some length, with Nicole pointing out that Section 1.6.2 of the 2016 standard requires an IDOC if the laboratory has not performed a particular method within a year. Carl agreed to submit an SIR asking for confirmation that a DOC was required at leat once per year.

6 – Adjourment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm EST.