SUMMARY OF THE
TNI CHEMISTRY EXPERT COMMITTEE MEETING
AUGUST 6, 2018

The Committee held a public meeting at the Environmental Measurement Symposium, New Orleans, on Monday August 6, 2018 at 1:30 pm Central Time. Chair Valerie Slaven led the meeting.

1 – Roll call

Jay Armstrong, VA DGS (AB)	Absent
Paula Blaze, NJ DEP (AB)	Absent
Eric Davis, Austin Water Utility (Lab)	Present
Deb Gaynor, Independent Consultant (Other)	Present
Shawn Kassner, Neptune (Other)	Absent
Charles Neslund, Eurofins (Lab)	Present
Max Patterson, UT DOH (AB)	Absent
Valerie Slaven, Consulting Services (Other)	Present
Colin Wright, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

2 – Introduction

Val explained the purpose of the meeting was to present the draft guidance documents on the 2016 standard, and to seek further input prior to their finalization.

3 – Review of Guidance on Detection and Quantitation

The document was presented to the audience and the committee worked through it section by section. Many questions were asked, but only those sections where further clarification may be merited are discussed below.

1.0 Flow Charts

Val cautioned, during on-going verification, a decent amount of space should be allowed between detection limit (DL) and limit of quantitation (LOQ), to ensure the LOQ remained greater than the DL. In response to a question from the audience, Val explained if the DL goes up or down, there may be no need to go back to scratch if the LOQ was set high enough to be well above the DL. However, if the LOQ changes the spike must be changed and hence the procedure would have to be repeated. It was suggested adding this clarification to the guidance.

It was stressed that MDL and LOQ verification can be included in the same procedure if appropriate spiking levels are chosen. Eric suggested making it clear that existing data can be used for a new MDL study.

2.6.1 Calculation of a DL_b and DL_s

In the sentence “This calculation is the same as the current EPA MDL procedure, but note that the requirement that the calculated DL be less than ten times lower than the spiking level does NOT apply”, a language change was suggested to provide clarification by replacing “current”.

3.3 Corrective Action

This section generated quite a few questions, and it was discussed whether to incorporate some of the information from FAQs on that section directly into the guidance document or whether to publish FAQs separately.

4 – Review of Guidance on Calibration

Val commented that this section of the standard is easier to follow compared with detection and quantitation. The guidance was presented section by section, and again only those sections that may need further clarification are discussed below.

2.2 Removal of Calibration Levels

Pertaining to Section 1.7.1.1 e) ii of the standard, Val asked if examples should be added to better explain “not properly introduced”. This generated a long discussion, including the statistical likelihood of a sporadic marginal excedance, and how that should be handled.

2.5 Replacement of Calibration Levels

There was discussion of the following sentence in the guidance: “The replacement standard must be re-run within 24-hours and inserted into the original calibration before any samples are analyzed.” It was stressed that elsewhere in the standard it states the laboratory must have a valid calibration prior to sample analysis. Therefore, if you replace a standard you have to re-run the samples.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm CDT.