

**SUMMARY OF THE
TNI ENVIRONMENTAL MEASUREMENT METHODS EXPERT COMMITTEE
MEETING**

JUNE 22, 2012

The Committee held a conference call on Friday, June 22, 2012, 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)	Absent
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, TNI administrative support staff	Present

Associate Committee member present: Arthur Denny

2 – Minutes from June 1

The draft minutes were amended to show Arthur Denny present. It was moved by Lee and seconded by Anand to approve the minutes as so amended. All were in favor.

3 – Powerpoint presentation for the August Environmental Measurement Symposium

Each slide in the draft presentation was discussed. Changes were agreed on those listed below.

Slide 3. Remove the sentence beginning “There has been inconsistent enforcement...”. In the last sentence “restated” was changed to “emphasized”.

Slides 6 and 7. These were OK, but prompted an editorial change in the Working Draft Standard (WDS); i.e., in 1.7.1.1 h) Ken would label the options as (i) and (ii).

Slide 8. Richard explained that, based on r, linear unenforced would be chosen, yet the lower point is 218.38% off and the RSE is 99.36%. He will add some graphs to show visually the error at each point.

Slide 9. On Dan's suggestion, "necessarily associated with" would be changed to "limited to". "h" and "i" should be changed to "j" and "k". Ken was tasked to change the WDS appropriately.

Slide 11. Richard said there may be questions on what is an analytical batch. Francoise pointed out that Module 2, Section 3.1 defines analytical batch, but there is nothing about the time and number to end the batch. Richard said it is outside the committee's ability to change that definition at this time, but if needed, the definition could be qualified here by adding "not to exceed 24 h".

Slide 12. Item (iii) on the slide should really be with each calibration and not analytical batch. Ken was tasked with changing the WDS to reflect this. In the explanation at the bottom of the slide it was agreed to add "Note: applies only to single-point calibration methods."

Slide 14. This slide was OK, but it will be preceded by an additional slide that provides the wording of the standard Section 1.7.1.1 m).

Slide 23. It was again discussed whether a time limit should be added to the definition of analytical batch, and it was decided to identify this as a point of discussion.

Slide 26. Anand said this should be re-worded to include multi-analyte method considerations.

Slide 28. It was suggested to add to the 4th bullet "(e.g., Arochlors)", and add another bullet: "Special considerations for methods with many analytes". Under "Special topics" it should be added to the 2nd bullet "(calibration standards proceed through the entire method)".

4 - Proposed Agenda for the Washington DC meeting

In the 3:30 – 5:00 time slot, it was discussed whether the committee would be receiving input, since the committee has not yet had an initial discussion. It was agreed the committee should start with the FAC report recommendations on "What we need a procedure to do". Richard volunteered to send this out to the committee members.

5 – Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 pm EST. The next meeting will be July 20, 2012 at 2:00 pm EDT.

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)	Ongoing
6	2/17/12	Review Volume 1 Module 4 of the 2009 standard to identify any inconsistencies with the new language	All Committee Members	Not determined
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	6/18/12
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	6/18/12