

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

APRIL 1, 2016

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, April 1, 2016, 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
Eric Davis, Austin Water Utility (Lab)	Present
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co. (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, PDC Labs (Lab)	Present
Valerie Slaven, Teklab (Lab)	Present
Gary Ward, OR DPH (Accreditation Body)	Absent
Gale Warren, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Absent

Associate Committee Members present: Diane Shannon; Chuck Neslund; Karen Olson

2 – Previous Minutes

It was moved by Anand and seconded by Valerie to approve the minutes of March 4, 2016. All were in favor.

3 – Guidance Materials

Discussed were Committee Members' first drafts of sections that would go in the guidance document on the new standard.

Francoise guided the committee through her section on **two points calibration and linear range methods**. She had split the document into the two sections described in the title, and said she had tried to highlight the differences between the old and new standard. In describing how to establish the upper reporting limit, Francoise had written that one of the concentrations should be at or below the LOQ. Richard suggested removing that bullet, saying it was not pertinent to that paragraph. Francoise had put it in because this was about testing the linear range with the assumption it would be linear throughout the reporting range, but she agreed it could be removed.

Scott described his document on **removal and replacement of calibration standards**. He explained he had written it as if he wanted to give guidance to someone in his own laboratory, to help them implement the standard. His introductory paragraph emphasized the laboratory needs a written procedure addressing all the requirements in 1.7.1.1 e. He also stressed this procedure should also be

addressed/discussed within the Data Integrity program and training. Scott had inserted the standard language and then added an explanatory paragraph, and Richard suggested others might follow a similar approach. The section on replacement of calibration standards generated a protracted discussion on the situation where a laboratory puts on a set of calibration standards and samples to run overnight and then finds in the morning there was a bad standard that needed to be replaced. It was questioned whether the laboratory would have to re-run the samples or if they could fit the response for those samples into the new calibration curve. Richard was concerned this might be limited by language in the standard (1.7.1.1 c) that requires samples to be run based on the most recent calibration curve. Scott had written that the replacement standard must be re-run within 24-hours and inserted into the original calibration, and he suggested adding this “typically should” occur before any samples are analyzed. This was agreed, though there was some concern it might generate a Standards Interpretation Request that would then allow the committee to clarify the requirement. Additionally, a few minor clarifications changes were agreed.

Colin’s section on the **minimum number of standards** started by comparing with the 2009 standard that only has one requirement concerning the number of standards that should be used in a calibration. It states if the number of standards is not specified in a method then the minimum number should be three, but this requirement allows for inappropriate calibrations to be used. He agreed to edit the document by putting in the actual standard wording for consistency with the other sections. Colin had put in a short paragraph defining degrees of freedom and explaining how the number of degrees of freedom had been used to determine the minimum number of standards. This concept, originally in the draft standard, had been removed at the request of some voters. However, it had been suggested during the public discussion at the recent meeting in Tulsa that some mention would be useful in the guidance document. Colin also said he would add that the lowest calibration standard needs to be below the lowest sample quantitation level, and the highest standard needs to be above the highest quantitation level.

4 – Next Steps

Brooke would collate and combine the PowerPoint slides, and Eric would similarly handle the written documentation. Eric had yet to provide his section. Richard asked all authors to send to him any further changes within a week, and he would then send them to Brooke and Eric. The next meeting would be April 29, when Brooke and Eric would present progress.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 pm EST.