

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

OCTOBER 10, 2014

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, October 10, 2014, at 2:00 pm EDT. 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
Dan Dickinson, NYSDOH (Accreditation Body)	Present
Mandi Edwards, Envirochem (Lab)	Present
Tim Fitzpatrick, Florida DEP (Lab)	Present
JD Gentry, ESC (Lab)	Present
Nancy Grams, Advanced Earth Technologists, Inc. (Other)	Present
Anand Mudambi, USEPA (Other)	Present
John Phillips, Ford Motor Co., (Other)	Present
Scott Siders, IL DEP (AB)	Absent
Gary Ward, OR DPH (AB)	Absent
Ken Jackson, Program Administrator	Present

Associate Committee members present: Arthur Denny; Reed Jeffrey; Dixie Marlin; Diana Shannon; Gale Warren

2 – Laboratory Accreditation System Executive Committee (LASEC) Comments on the Calibration Interim Standard

The committee worked through the LASEC comments, together with notes Ken had taken during the recent conference call with LASEC members, Richard, JD, Francoise and Gary in attendance.

General Comment

The LASEC suggested, since the VDS had undergone a lot of revision in response to persuasive comments, the committee start again with a Working Draft Standard. The committee disagreed and formulated a response explaining its rationale.

1.7.1 It was suggested the use of examples should be avoided. As discussed on the call the committee agreed to retain this example and modify it to be clear that it applies to all regression type calibrations. Richard modified the first sentence to make it “including but not limited to”.

1.7.1.1 and 1.7.2.f In response to LASEC’s concern that the standard was in conflict with the EPA drinking water requirements, the committee replied there is no conflict because the federal requirement would take precedence (note: subsequent to this meeting, the committee made an editorial change that should satisfy the LASEC concern).

1.7.1.1.c The committee was unable to address how old a calibration may be, because this was a request for a new requirement, and outside the scope of the interim standard review. The committee decided it will consider the request for the next update.

1.7.1.1.d The LASEC considered this section too prescriptive. Aaren Alger had suggested clearer language which the committee had decided to adopt. The committee made it clear it was unable to make the section less prescriptive, because the detail had been added in order to satisfy persuasive comments from several voters on the VDS.

1.7.1.1.e The committee concurred with this argument and was able to adopt the LASEC recommendation because it had already been raised during the VDS voting process and ruled persuasive. The committee was removing the degrees of freedom from the table. However, it was still stated in the text of the standard that at least three degrees of freedom are required for curve types not covered in the table. Anyone applying calibration types other than average, linear or quadratic needs to understand what a degree of freedom is. The committee also decided to add a definition for degrees of freedom.

1.7.1.1.j The committee did not agree with LASEC that Relative Error/Relative Standard Error should be removed, and would make it clear in their response that it is supplemental to current method requirements for correlation coefficient and RSD. Anand added that it is appearing in more methods. Regarding the suggestion that criteria should be added, the committee would point out that several commenters cautioned against putting specific criteria in the standard since different criteria are appropriate for different methods and data uses.

1.7.2 d. iv Richard had clarified this point in the standard by adding the LCS is not a replacement for a failing CCV.

1.7.2 f. i-iii As suggested, Richard had removed the words “obvious” and “potential” , and he described the places in the narrative where this had been done. Richard said he would make sure this section of the standard had received comments at the VDS stage, which would allow it to be further modified.

This concluded the committee’s discussion on the LASEC comments. It was moved by Anand and seconded by Nancy to finalize these changes and send to LASEC after ensuring every comment is based on a vote made at the VDS stage, or is editorial. All were in favor and the motion passed.

3 – Aaren Alger Comments on the Calibration Interim Standard

Richard had circulated the proposed response to Aaren, based on the committee’s discussion during the previous conference call. It was moved by Françoise and seconded by Mandi to approve this response. All were in favor and the motion passed. The committee had agreed to add definitions for degrees of freedom and threshold testing. The former had already been voted on by the committee, but it was discussed whether it was appropriate to include examples. Richard said he would work on the language and circulate it for committee vote. A definition for threshold testing was discussed and finalized. It was

moved by Anand and seconded by John to approve the definition. All were in favor and the motion passed.

One of Aaren's suggestions was to better explain Section 1.7.1.1.j (RSE/RE), and Francoise circulated a proposed revision. This was discussed and modified by the committee.

4 – Next Steps

Richard said he would make all the agreed changes to the standard and would then circulate it to the committee so it could be finalized at the next meeting.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 pm EDT, with the next meeting to be scheduled on October 24 at 2:00 pm.