

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
February 14, 2011

Attendance:

Maria Friedman, Chair	Committee member	present
Michael Klein	Committee member	present
Gregg O'Neal	Committee member	present
Michael Schapira	Committee member	present
Jim Serne	Committee member	absent
Richard Swartz, Vice-chair	Committee member	present
Stanley Tong	Committee member	absent
Mike Hayes	Committee member	present
Jane Wilson	Program Administrator	present
Shawn Kassner	Associate member	present
Mike Miller	Associate member	absent
Ty Garber	Associate member	absent
William Mills	Associate member	present
William Daystrom	Guest	present

- 1) Double-check receipt of documents to be referenced in this teleconference

Maria asked the committee to confirm receipt of the documents emailed February 11, 2011 and the minutes emailed by Jane on February 14, 2011. All confirmed receipt.

- 2) Review and approve minutes from teleconference on February 2, 2011

Stan emailed an editorial correction to the minutes prior to the meeting. Richard/Michael motioned to accept the minutes with Stan's correction. All were in favor of the motion.

- 3) Continue discussion re. EPA comments to TNI SSAS Standard

Maria reviewed her follow up on the EPA comments since the Savannah meeting. She has requested permission from TNI to get feedback from EPA first before developing TIAs for any revisions that may be needed to the SSAS standards.

Shawn and Maria discussed how to document the SSAS table information and the process used to develop the values. Shawn explained that the subcommittee followed the TNI SOP on FoPT tables and the subcommittee will complete the spreadsheet that Maria and Richard created. He noted the subcommittee didn't anticipate having to do this when the table was first developed, since EPA was part of the subcommittee.

Maria has also talked to Randy Query of A2LA. He didn't think the PAs (A2LA and ACLASS) would necessarily create mutual recognition between their organizations. She is waiting to get the final response on that topic.

The expert committee continued with review of the responses and proposed actions for the EPA comments. Discussion of the comment summary spreadsheet provided by Maria followed.

Row 2 – EPA comment is to amend the definition of “audit sample”. The committee has agreed to reword it to the following:

Gregg/Mike Hayes motioned to accept. All present were in agreement (voice vote).

Row 3 – This comment relates to the mutual recognition issue between provider accreditors. It was noted that Jim S may not have realized there would be two provider accreditors when he made his comments as recorded in the spreadsheet. William Mills asked if this issue is really mutual recognition as traceability of signatories back to ILAC. If both provider accreditors (PAs) are traceable to ILAC, do they need any further recognition of this through TNI? The committee also discussed whether the mutual recognition is supposed to be between the two PAs or between all the other accrediting bodies with that traceability. It was confirmed that TNI does its own evaluation for the TNI PA qualification.

The committee discussed Stan’s suggested changes to section 5.1.5 – it may need some additional word-smithing for clarity. It was also commented that any re-assessments that are performed (reassessment is optional) should be justified by the PA.

Maria asked that the committee continue to consider the issue and think about a rewording that takes into account the committee discussion. William Mills suggested having a single checklist being used by the PAs to enhance consistency. It was discussed whether PAs consider these checklists to be proprietary or if the checklists could be reviewed by the Expert committee and accepted. Mike Schapira asked how much of PT provider accreditation can be used for audit sample provider accreditation. Maria thinks they will have a different checklist and this is one reason they haven’t done the accreditation of providers yet.

Row 4 – In reviewing the EPA comment about the consistency of the statements, the committee acknowledges the different wording, but doesn’t think the statements conflict. This item will be addressed as an editorial change using Richard’s suggested language (see cell G4). Richard/Mike Schapira motioned to accept Richard’s language. All present were in favor (voice vote).

Row 5 – EPA has not added interferences to audit samples before and they were not included or referenced in the final rule. Maria also asked A2LA about how they would assess this for equivalence. Maria suggests waiting for the A2LA response prior to voting. Gregg thinks it is technically challenging to achieve. Mike Schapira suggested addressing this issue when we decide how to address new compounds. The committee discussed that if an interferent is added, should it be noted to the SSAS Table. Michael Klein thinks this would be most useful for a unique industry and perhaps should be dropped for the time being if it can’t be resolved. Maria suggested leaving it for now and taking it up again after hearing from A2LA.

Row 6 – Similar to Row 3 above for mutual recognition – committee will take same action.

Row 7 – This comment relates to the prohibition of laboratories from analyzing an audit sample intended for another facility/laboratory. It was concluded this can be dropped since the action is prohibited by other clauses. Gregg discussed whether this was a

situation where someone wants to split an audit sample to two labs. Usually shared audits go to one laboratory, or if two labs are used they would obtain two separate audit samples. Splitting the sample could cause problems itself.

Richard/Mike Hayes motioned to delete the clause 5.1.b. This will require a TIA to delete the clause. All present were in favor of the motion (voice vote).

Maria will follow up with contacts outside the committee on comments in Rows 3, 5, and 6. The committee should continue to consider the mutual recognition issue.

Next meeting will be Feb 28th, 2:00 pm EST.