

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
June 8, 2009

Committee members present:

Mike Schapira
Maria Friedman
Richard Swartz
Michael Klein
Jim Serne
Jack Herbert
Candace Sorrell
Jane Wilson (program administrator)

Associate members present:

Shawn Kassner
Yves Tondeur
Frank Jarke

- 1) Double-check of spreadsheet/document to be referenced in this teleconference

Maria reviewed the documents to be used in today's discussion that were emailed prior to the call.

- 2) Brief announcement re. membership

Maria noted that Ken Eichelmann had to resign the committee due to a change in employment. If anyone would like to contact him, Shawn Kassner has his contact information. Maria also indicated that some contacts who have not confirmed their ongoing interest in joining the committee as full or associate members – Joe Aldina and Craig Mackenzie – would be dropped from distribution. Jim Serne and Jack Herbert may contact them to determine their continued interest.

Jane reminded committee members that they need to vote on the voting draft standards by June 30. Comments must be submitted through the TNI website – click on the “News” item for voting on the VDS standards to locate the information, or the following link:

<http://www.nelac-institute.org/cms/posts/1242419357.php>

- 3) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on May 11, 2009

Maria asked for comments on the meeting summary. Jack asked about the “performance based evaluation” referenced in the section on review of the SSAS table, explaining that it is not a term with which he is familiar. Yves briefly explained an approach to performance based evaluation.

Jack motioned to amend the fifth sentence, and delete the last sentence. Jim seconded – motion carried.

Maria added that she does not have permission yet to distribute the referenced document from the PT subcommittee.

Mike Schapira motioned to accept the minutes as amended –Jack seconded. All were in favor.

4) Review of internal comments to VDS

Candace Sorrell announced the proposal package to restructure the EPA audit sample program has been signed and should be published in the Federal Register soon. The proposal establishes the utilization of accredited audit sample providers. She added that the proposal should be posted on EPA web soon.

Maria initiated comment review with the Participants/Internal comments:

Lines 2-3-4: Section 1.2a

Line 2 Maria motioned to accept the proposed change/Jack second – all in favor of adopting changes.

Line 3 – Mike motioned to accept the proposed change /Jim second – all in favor.

Line 4 – Jack motioned to accept the proposed change /Jim second – all in favor.

Line 5-6, section 3.2

Line 5 – The committee discussed the proposed change to the “facility” definition. It was noted that the second suggestion (line 6) seemed to help address the issue as a whole. Looking at the two comments together should address the concern. It was proposed not to accept Line 5, and to accept Line 6.

Jim Serne motioned to reject line 5 and accept line 6/Jack second – all in favor.

Line 7 – section 3.3 The committee agreed to accept the recommendation to delete the 3 words (end of first sentence). All in favor of change

Line 8-9 section 3.5

Line 8 – Should the committee make the “stationary source” definition broader to potentially include other pollutants such as wastewater? The committee decided it was outside of the current scope of activity and decided to reject line 8. All in favor.

Line 9 – The definition is already is consistent with the EPA definition in part 60.2. It was suggested that a note could be added indicating the test is of a piece of equipment or units of the building, etc. There was a motion to not accept the comment. All were in favor.

Line 10 section 3.7

Yves suggested using “programmatic samples”. The committee decided to refer to standardized “audit” samples. Jack motioned to accept/Jim seconded. All in favor.

Line 11 section 3.8 – delete reference to SSAS program and refer to audit samples instead. Jack/Jim all in favor.

Line 12 section 3.9 – add reference to other standards is appropriate. Jim/Jack – all in favor.

Line 13 14 sections 3.10 and 3.11
Will retain “atmospheric” for consistency with line 8.

Line 15 -16 -17 Figure 1

Line 15

The committee agreed to label the arrows as follows in the legend:

Red arrows – pretest communication

Black arrows – post-test communication

Jack motioned to accept/Jim seconded. All in favor. Ray will have to update the figure since he did the initial design.

Line 16

The group considered the comment. Sometimes the data do flow as indicated, so the arrows will be retained as proposed. Mike motioned to retain as is/Jack seconded. All in favor.

Line 17

The comment suggested the need for a black arrow pointing to source provider and other participants and an arrow pointing to the provider. The committee decided to add 2 way arrows to all black arrows, but won't add additional arrows beyond what are already indicated. Candace motioned to accept/Mike S seconded. All in favor.

Review will start with Line 18 for next meeting.

Next meeting is June 15, 2:00 pm EDT.