

Attendance:

Tom Widera – Chair ERA (Provider)	Committee member	Present
Vacant – Vice Chair		
Andrew Chew EPA (Federal Government)	Committee member	Present
Bob O'Brien Sigma-Aldrich (Provider)	Committee member	absent
Ed MacKinnon TRC Env. Corp. (Stationary Source Tester)	Committee member	Present
Gregg O'Neal North Carolina DAQ (State Gov.)	Committee member	Present
Katie Strickland Element One, Inc. (Laboratory)	Committee member	Present
Michael Klein New Jersey DEP (State Government)	Committee member	Present
Mike Hayes Linde (Provider)	Committee member	absent
Nishant Bhatambrekar GE Power & Water (Stationary Source Tester)	Committee member	absent
Paul Meeter Weston Solutions (Stationary Source Tester)	Committee member	Present
Michael Schapira Enthalpy Analytical, Inc. (Laboratory)	Committee member	Present

Jim Serne TRC Env. Corp. (Stationary Source Tester)	Associate member	Present
Stanley Tong EPA Region 9 (Federal Government)	Associate member	Present
Jeff Ogle ALS Environmental (Laboratory)	Guest	Present
Tom Maza MI - DEQ (State Government)	Guest	Present
Marge Heffernen Alliance Source Testing (Laboratory)	Guest	Present

Call to Order

The February meeting had been cancelled. This meeting was rescheduled from 3/13/17 to 3/20/17, due to confusion with the Conference Call website and the recent change to DST. Tom Widera (Tom hereafter) began the meeting at 2:05 EDT. A quorum was not initially present, but became so.

Membership

Mike Schapira was confirmed to receive enough positive votes and is accepted back as a Committee member (making the quorum). Tom will forward this info to Ilona Taunton, and check on Katie Shonk's status (last check her application was not yet in).

Monthly Meetings

Minutes from the January 17 Meeting were made available. After giving people a few extra minutes to reread and comment on them, Tom proposed accepting the minutes. Mike Schapira seconded the motion. There were no nay's, and 1 abstention (Gregg - who had been absent), so the minutes were accepted by voice vote.

SSAS Charter for 2017 Discussion

Tom submitted the charter, the last version slightly restructured to fall in line with the new TNI Charter format (to help unify the assorted versions). One step was to remove the member names, as that is now a separate form reported to TNI. Jim Serne noted that we still have no members from the actual facility portion of the community. Tom reiterated that we are open to anyone who might be interested, and asked without reply for any recommendations/suggestions.

Stan Tong mentioned that Method 25Z was confusing to folks at EPA. Discussion followed about whether it was an alternate method or a replacement draft with additional QC. Most recalled it being more of a replacement, to try and improve and standardize it; rather than being an optional alternative. Stan also noted that in their meetings, it seems clear that methods with requirements to be updated (etc.) have the priority for the present, and it may be some time before 25Z would be considered. A best practices document would have a shorter turn around time, and Gregg noted that this might be a way to get it made part of the current method.

Paul moved for acceptance. Michael Klein seconded - and there was a unanimous vote to accept. Tom will inform Ilona of this as well.

2017 Officers

Tom asked about officer positions.

Paul reminded us that a couple meetings ago, we had nominated Tom to continue as Chair (Michael Klein agreed and seconded it again). No other nominations or volunteers were forthcoming. Tom was unanimously voted in for another term as the Chair.

Tom asked about the Vice Chair position. There were no volunteers or nominations made. Tom will pursue that by e-mail.

Absent Committee Members are also going to be contacted to confirm if they want to remain on the committee or not, but that they need to reply to e-mails so we can conduct business. Tom mentioned that we are also allowed to grow to 15 members, and so let the recurring guests know that they were also welcome to submit applications to join officially. Also that if we know others who might be interested, please pursue them.

Central Data Base Update

Good success rates on most methods, though not too much change overall in pass rates. Method 8 is now up to 83%, so improving. Unsure of whether testers are sending those to more successful labs, or less successful labs have improved. In any event it has moved from about 77 to 83%, so that is good.

Hydrogen fluoride and silver have slightly low pass rates. Neither concern Tom as they are 'bad actors'. No one voiced any real concern about other analytes.

New Topic - An Issue

Jeff Ogle joined the call, with a significant figure issue. Systems currently say 3 sig figs is required format, based on PT systems. The only place in the SSAS standard that speaks of sigfigs, is V1M1 6.4.2b - assigned values shall be presented to 3 significant figures.

ERA currently uses 3 for everything, but we have never really gone into this in detail. Someone presented to 5 figures and got a 'fail' because the value was lower than the acceptance limit. But if rounded

their value would have passed. Tom wanted opinions and advice about significant figures for the SSAS program.

Mike Schapira said 3 should be plenty of figures and we should add phrasing to make sure labs only report to 3 figures to avoid failures like the example. Michael Klein and Stan Tong agreed.

Tom asked if we wanted to modify Module 1 or 3. Or if Providers be made to round any excess figures before evaluating. Someone (voice unrecognized, around 34 minutes into the call) asked if the providers wanted to do the rounding, which Tom said of course they would rather not have to do this. And whatever course we take, it should be spelled out how it will play out. So if we say 3 figures and someone enters 5 - it needs to say the value presented will be evaluated as is. Provider rounding of the values would be serious reprogramming. Instructions do say to report to 3 figures.

Adding it to the module would force any newcomer provider would also have to put in their instructions that reporting is to be to 3 figures. There was an agreement we should fix the modules, especially since TIAs are no longer part of the program. To make changes - would have to make the modification, get recommendations, voting, and the whole public process for revision.

Tom will check with his staff about changing their paperwork to try and get that in process ASAP. And Tom will let Bob know about this issue and what hopefully can be done until a standard can be modified.

Truncating was also brought up briefly and not supported over rounding.

Tom will also look at where these changes should be made in the Modules.

Setting Lower Concentrations and Acceptance Ranges for EPA Method 26/26A halides and Method 29 metals in impinger solution

Tom has e-mailed the labs doing the bulk of the work and got some information about reporting limits and calibration ranges, for Methods 26/26A and 29. Tom would like to throw ERA data in as well, and Sigma if Bob gets back in touch with him.

A question was raised about if we should even be bothering seeking lower levels. Some requestors want audits at detection levels, others want them at regulatory levels.

Candace cannot attend a meeting as it could appear to be inappropriate. Stan noted that it is up to the states about whether audits should be at stack or regulatory levels. No one is making a rule one way or the other to control everyone else. For example it seems that lots of low level requests for M26/26A

Mike S. asked if we were just moving the lower level down and going to be in the same place of all the requests being at the new low level. This would cause the same problem where their number of batches goes up beyond what they feel is economically feasible. Tom will see if someone can check into the request levels to get a better idea of this aspect.

Marge Heffernen asked that since we have 96% pass rate, if perhaps we do not need audits with every project. Michael Klein reminded everyone that the goal is to get the audits to test the tester, not just the laboratory, and that the audit is supposed to be a project-specific item.

Marge also mentioned that M26/26A might be a good goal for first method to find a way to test the testers - based on large # of test samples, and the seeming repetitiveness of audits for labs when lots of projects go through them.

A short discussion followed about field spiking aqueous spikes, or using spiked tubes with collocated trains like in Method 18 - but the best would be gaseous... that is just the trickiest. Tricky to get manufacturers to make, but also for testers to use in a uniform manner. Tom's also noted the concern from gas providers wanting to sell large #s of cylinders and not getting stuck with unused ones.

Next: April 10, 2 pm Eastern
Meeting Adjourned 3:10 pm

Next Minutes Authors

April 17 Tom Widera

May 8 Ed MacKinnon