

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
May 16, 2011

Attendance:

Maria Friedman, Chair	Committee member	present
Mike Hayes	Committee member	absent
Michael Klein	Committee member	present
Gregg O'Neal	Committee member	present
Michael Schapira	Committee member	absent
Jim Serne	Committee member	present
Richard Swartz, Vice-chair	Committee member	present
Stanley Tong	Committee member	present
Ken Jackson	Program Administrator	present
Ty Garber	Associate member	absent
Shawn Kassner	Associate member	present
Mike Miller	Associate member	present
William Mills	Associate member	absent
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 e-mailed May 13, 2011. All confirmed receipt.

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

Gregg moved to accept the minutes, as amended by Maria on May 13, 2011 to reflect comments by Michael Klein. Stan seconded the motion, and all 6 Committee members present voted in favor.

Maria reported that the latest TIA Section 5.1b of V1M3 had been approved by e-mail voting (6 Committee members were in favor). Consequently, Maria had sent the duly amended standard to EPA for approval.

- 3) Continue discussions re. SSAS Table

There was some discussion on the voting procedure to be followed on the table, and Maria solicited suggestions from the committee. Rather than delaying voting until all methods have been reviewed, Gregg proposed having a preliminary vote on each method as it is discussed, and then approving the table as a whole at the end. The Committee Members decided to follow this approach. Maria pointed out that each vote would require a two-thirds majority of Committee Members to pass; hence all 6 members on this call must be in favor.

The latest version of the table was examined; found on the website at <http://nelac-institute.org/ssas/table/prop2011.php>. This was listed as "Proposed SSAS Table" and with an effective date of August 1, 2011.

Methods 6 & 8.

Gregg moved and Jim seconded to accept the values as listed in the table for methods 6 & 8 with NELAC analyte codes 4010 and 4020. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Method 7.

It was noted that the method is not used much anymore, and Maria questioned why the criteria are being changed since there are not much data. Nevertheless, it was proposed by Gregg and seconded by Jim to accept the values as listed in the table for Method 7. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Methods 13A and 13B.

There was no change, so no vote was needed.

Methods 26 and 26A.

It was proposed by Jim and seconded by Richard to accept the values as listed in the table for Methods 26 & 26A. All were in favor and the motion passed.

Method 25.

Reference was made to an e-mail message to the Committee from Jeff Lowry on May 13, showing that 38-41% of laboratories fail this audit. It was suggested the subcommittee should revisit this method. Mike Miller suggested the method should be split into a high and a low audit level. The high level is OK, but for the low level it should be found out what is wrong with the method so the statistics can be improved. Gregg suggested that perhaps the lack of a standard procedure on how to get the audit sample from the cylinder to the sample train is introducing errors. Shawn suggested, although the method is stated to go down to 50 ppm, maybe it is not good down to lower levels. Maria reminded everyone that there are concentrations down to 50 ppm happening in the field. Jim suggested contacting EPA to get their input, and to mention the concerns shared by Wayne Stollings with the subcommittee.

Jim asked if it was not true that the Expert Committee was bound by the EPA requirement that 90% of well qualified labs have acceptable results at 95% confidence level, regardless of how wide that would require the acceptance limits to be. It was pointed out that the Expert Committee had yet to resolve the issue of defining well qualified labs, and that we are also limited by the available historical data. Gregg said that another limiting factor could be the availability of audit samples at low levels: there may not be audit samples commercially available at the kind of low levels being discussed for Method 25. Maria added that from the historical data for Method 25 analyzed by the subcommittee, the lowest concentration was 72.4 ppm, for which there were 40 data points.

Action Item: Shawn will draft an e-mail to Candace at EPA, asking EPA for more information about Method 25 (specifically its performance from 150 ppm down to 50 ppm), and seeking their position on having audit samples for Method 25 only going down to 150 ppm. He will circulate the e-mail to the Committee for comment before sending it to EPA, and will copy Maria.

Method 29 (Metals on Glass Fiber Filters).

The Committee proceeded down the list metal-by-metal. There were no comments on Sb, As, Ba, Be or Cd. For Cr it was noted the acceptance limits have been tightened based on the statistical information, and this was acceptable to everyone. There were no changes for Co or Cu. The upper acceptance limit for Pb had been changed from 500 to 350 mg/dscm, and this was acceptable to all Committee members. For Mn, it was noted there was a typographical error in the 04-28-2010 subcommittee minutes, where it was identified as Mg. Shawn said he would correct it immediately and send it to Maria for posting on the website. Otherwise there were no comments. There were no comments on Ni, Se, Ag, Tl or Zn. For Hg, Maria questioned how 1.0 ug was arrived at for the lower level, since historical data were available down to 0.2 ug. Shawn said the graph did not support that low level, and that it is also necessary to look at how the data at the low level affect the overall acceptance criteria. After further discussion and reviewing the subcommittee minutes, the Committee members were OK with 1.0 ug.

Method 29 (Metals in Impinger Solutions).

A preliminary discussion was made, referring to Richard's comments in "SSAS Table Notes". On Be, he had questioned why the criteria had been relaxed for lower concentrations, since all the data fall within the current acceptance criteria of 25%. However, it was noted the charts do show flaring at the lower concentration end, so Richard declared he is OK with this. Richard had said the notes from the 5-12-2010 conference call indicate the upper concentration limit voted on for Pb was 30 ppm, but the table indicates 20 ppm. Shawn will check whether this is a typographical error.

Since there was no time to continue further, Maria asked all committee participants to look at the rest of the method 29 metals in impinger solutions before the next conference call, which was scheduled for 5-23-2011, 2:00 – 3:30 pm EDT.

4) Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned 3:25 pm EDT

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference Agenda for May 16, 2011:

- 5) Double-check receipt of documents to be referenced in this teleconference
- 6) Review and approve minutes from teleconference on May 2, 2011
- 7) Continue discussions re. SSAS Table