

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference  
June 22, 2009

Participants:

Committee members:

Maria Friedman  
Richard Swartz  
Candace Sorrell  
Gregg O'Neal  
Jack Herbert  
Jim Serne  
Mike Schapira  
Jane Wilson (program administrator)

Associate members:

Mike Miller  
Shawn Kassner  
Frank Jarke

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

Maria confirmed the Voting Draft Comment spreadsheet dated 6/19/2009 would be used for this call. The Voting Draft Standards emailed by Maria on 6/8/2009 will be the reference versions of the standards.

- 2) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on June 15, 2009

The group discussed the item related to appeals in the Participants document (Line 30). Shawn reviewed what is being done for the PT committee, since they have run into the same issue of a TNI appeals process not having been developed yet. The PT committee had to develop a tentative interim amendment (TIA) for this issue. Shawn suggested checking with the Policy committee to get the status of the development of the TNI process (Maria will follow up with the Policy committee). Mike Schapira moved to accept the minutes/Richard Swartz seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

NOTE: Approval of the minutes of the June 8<sup>th</sup> conference call was completed via email.

- 3) Resume review of internal comments to VDS; go back to Lines 21 to 25 of the Participants Int tab, then jump to Provider Int tab.

Participants Int tab:

Lines 21-25, sections 4.1.3 – 4.2.5

Jack explained his reasoning for inclusion of the term “measurements” in these sections. It is to address the need for measurements of indices such as mass, volume, pressure, etc. that are not analyses related to the processing of samples for this program. Jack suggests changing the text to “...audit sample analyses and measurements...”, or getting rid of “analyses” and “measurements” and just using “results” is fine too.

Mike Schapira noted that some of the language in these sections may need to be re-arranged to reflect the appropriate order of data flow and data reporting (per his email of June 15). This comment was tabled for this discussion.

Richard Swartz motioned to incorporate “results” as a replacement for “measurements” and “analyses”/ Jim Serne seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Provider Int tab:

Line 2, section 3.12

This comment is to the definition for audit sample number. Each sample will have its own unique number assigned by the provider. Mike Schapira suggested adding the word “each” to the audit sample number definition. Richard Swartz moved to accept the change with Mike’s addition/Jack seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Line 4, section 5.2d)

Richard moved to accept the proposed change/Jack seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Line 5, section 5.5

Jack noted a grammar correction to this section to delete a split infinitive. Jack moved to accept the proposed change/Richard seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Line 6, section 7.5

This section needs to make reference to the audit sample number definition, which will be added to the end of the sentence. The committee discussed whether there any benefit to having a consistent TNI numbering system across providers – Shawn noted each provider has a slightly different system. Candace added that other organizations in addition to TNI may offer audit sample programs as well. Jack motioned to accept the proposed change. All were in favor.

Line 7, section 8.2e

Jack motioned to reject the comment as non-persuasive/Richard seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Line 9, section 11.1.1

This section is referring to the full evaluation report, not just the provider's short-term confirmation of whether the audit sample result is in the ballpark or not. The group discussed several issues, including whether this section needs to refer to the "quick response" option offered by providers, and whether the evaluation report should include both sets of results if the lab reran the sample. These issues have been addressed historically on a state-by-state basis. Providers usually report both sets of data as of specific dates of the reports.

Shawn is not sure the providers can always meet a 1 business day limit on the audit sample report. He suggested 3 business days or 5 calendar days. Gregg moved to amend the requirement to 5 calendar days/Richard seconded. All were in favor of the motion. After further discussion, the limit was proposed to be further lowered to 3 business days. Gregg made the motion for a 3 business day limit/Mike S seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

The next meeting is June 29, 2009 at 2:00 pm EDT.