

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample (SSAS) Expert Committee Nov. 16, 2015 Teleconference Minutes

Attendance:

Tom Widera – Chair ERA (Provider)	Committee member	Present
Charles Simon – Vice Chair VOC Reporting, Inc. (Laboratory)	Committee member	Present
Mike Hayes Linde (Provider)	Committee member	Absent
Paul Meeter, Weston Solutions (Stationary Source Tester)	Committee member	Present
Bob O’Brien Sigma-Aldrich (Provider)	Committee member	Present
Michael Schapira Enthalpy (Laboratory)	Committee member	Present
Katie Strickland Element One, Inc. (Laboratory)	Committee member	Absent
Ed MacKinnon – TRC Environmental Corp (Stationary Source Tester)	Committee member	Absent
Danny Wong New Jersey DEP (State Government)	Committee member	Absent
Andrew Chew EPA (Federal Government)	Committee member	Present
Nishant Bhatambrekar GE Power and Water (Stationary Source Tester)	Committee member	Absent
Maria Friedman – Test America (Laboratory)	Associate member	Absent
Michael Klein New Jersey DEP (State Government)	Associate member	Present
Gregg O’Neal North Carolina DAQ (State Government)	Associate member	Present
Jim Serne TRC Environmental Corp (Stationary Source Tester)	Associate member	Absent
Stanley Tong EPA Region 9 (Federal Government)	Associate member	Absent
Brandy Hughes (Alliance Source Testing)	Guest	Present
Tom Maza Michigan Dept of Environmental Quality (State Government)	Guest	Present

Lauren Smith (A2LA - Provider Accreditor)	(for Rob Knacke)	Present
Katie Shonk, AQS	Guest	Present

Call to Order

Tom Widera began discussions at approximately 1407 EDT. There was not a quorum present.

Review of minutes

Without a quorum the minutes were briefly discussed, but voting would be handled by e-mail. Michael Klein, Charles Simon, and Tom Widera had edits. Mike S. made the changes and resent the minutes for review.

Membership Update

Michael Klein and Gregg O’Neal have served their 1 year as associate members and are eligible for application to the committee. Tom asked both if they were still interested and they were. Tom will send a link to the application to each. Michael Klein will replace Danny Wong on the committee.

Draft TNI Documents

Tom sent the membership two documents from TNI regarding GLP Data Handling and QA Requirements for the revision of EPA’s document “*Handbook for Analytical Quality Control in Water and Wastewater Laboratories*”. Each TNI committee was asked to review sections of each document to ensure that the contents did not contradict anything in the SSAS standards. Tom asked if anyone had looked at the documents and had any feedback. There was no response. Tom asked if the documents can be reviewed and any comments sent via email by November 23.

SSAS Standards Update

Stan Tong had made a comment back in June about a line being removed from the approved V1M1 and V1M3 standards. Maria Friedman had corrected the issue. Since it was editorial, it did not need to go through another vote. The volumes were submitted to Candace Sorrell and Ray Merrill at EPA for their review and approval. Tom indicated that we are due to revise V1M2 and will do this beginning in 2016.

Mercury on Filter

The EPA has accepted the recommendations of the SSAS committee regarding the concentration ranges and acceptance limits for the mercury on filter audit samples. Candace Sorrell at EPA has indicated they will place the sample back onto the required list of analytes for SSAS with an effective date of December 16, 2015. Tom thanked the committee for their great work on this project.

Method 25 Audit Sample Discussion

Charles indicated that he has received two bids from gas suppliers for M25 cylinders. The bids were at \$89 and \$98 per cylinder, assuming that there will be 48 batches of samples made with 10 samples per batch for a total of 480 samples. If the cylinders are returned, replacements will be sent at \$60 or \$65 per

cylinder. The gas manufacturers will include analysis of the master cylinder and analysis of two cylinders per each batch of 10 diluent samples. The gas suppliers will guarantee 2% accuracy.

Charles asked if it was reasonable to assume that if the PT providers take into account the cost of the cylinders and add in equivalent costs as they do for aqueous and filter samples, they would consider that to be a reasonable consideration of profit. If so, then it would keep the cost of the cylinders reasonable for the participants. Tom replied that ERA would have to take into consideration the labor involved for their end of the process before ERA could commit to their cost.

Charles updated Lauren Smith from A2LA on our progress thus far on the M25 audits so she would be up to speed on what we are looking to accomplish. We are looking for input from Lauren as to the acceptability of the splitting of the responsibility of the M25 audits between the PT providers and gas suppliers. Lauren had asked exactly what we are looking for from A2LA. Tom indicated that the administration of these samples would be different from the aqueous and filter samples and also to PT samples in that the control of the process would not be in the hands of only one organization. We want to make sure that ultimately the process for administering this audit would be acceptable to the accreditors. If so, then the requirements can be made public to any provider who may want to administer these samples. Tom indicated that in case ERA or Sigma did not want to participate, that the audits would not die without having two accredited providers.

Lauren indicated that 17043 allows for sub contracting of the manufacturing of samples.

Tom asked what the analytical requirements would be, if any, for the providers if the gas suppliers were testing two samples of each batch. Would the provider need to do additional testing or would the testing from the supplier be adequate. Lauren indicated that the gas supplier can do all the analytical work as well as the manufacturing.

Gregg asked a question about the shipping of the samples. Charles indicated that the price of the bids from the gas suppliers included a bulk shipment of all samples to the providers who would then distribute the samples to the participants. Tom indicated that either the gas suppliers or the providers can ship samples. ERA currently does both in their PT program. Charles suggested against having the gas suppliers ship the individual samples to the participants as then the cost of the cylinders would increase from the amount submitted on the bid.

Charles said he would inquire what the cost of the samples would be if the gas suppliers did all the work.

Tom asked if A2LA would be OK if both providers got their samples from the same gas supplier or would that be a conflict of interest. Lauren said she was not sure, but will look into it. The point was made about conflict of interest if any gas supplier decided to become accredited.

Paul asked how long it takes to become accredited. Lauren indicated that it typically takes 4-6 months.

Paul indicated that a manifold system needs to be provided with the audit samples. Charles indicated that the manufacturer can supply a regulator with the samples as this was done in the pilot study. Gregg asked if the regulator would be supplied by the lab or the gas supplier. Charles replied that it should come from the lab as they can control the cleanliness of the regulators themselves and thus reduce the potential for contamination.

The concentrations of the samples were discussed. Tom indicated that we need to make the samples in the range listed on the table of 150-2500. Charles indicated that would be fine to begin with, then maybe we could re-evaluate the ranges after 6 months. Michael Klein mentioned that he had concerns about making sure we get the low range lower than 150. The program would be more meaningful if we get the

low range down to 100 or less. Charles indicated that the statistics for the pilot study began to blow up at about 120.

Tom did some calculations of the regression equation and it showed that at 150, the limits would be 49-155%. Charles said that we need to change this. We could use the data from the pilot study, but would need to make a submission to change the table. Gregg mentioned that we could expand the scope of the M8 sub-committee to include the task of submitting the M25 data. Charles replied that he was the chair of the M25 sub-committee and that he could file a report from the pilot study data to submit to EPA.

M8 Update

Mike S. indicated that he did not receive any more data from the labs since our last call. He said he will send yet another reminder to the labs, but that we may need to go forward with the data we already have. Tom noticed that Maxxam had not yet submitted data. Maxxam has run the most M8 audits of any lab and their data would be valuable to our investigation. AS Maxxam is an ERA client, Tom indicated he would also reach out to them to submit data.

Adjournment

Tom suggested our next meeting be on December 14, 2015 at 2 pm ET and that seemed to work with the membership. Tom Widera made a motion that we adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mike S. All agreed. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1520 hours EDT.