TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference Meeting
March 23, 2009

Committee members present:
Maria Friedman
Candace Sorrell
Gregg O'Neal
Stanley Tong
Jack Herbert
Richard Swartz
Michael Klein
Ken Eichelmann
Jane Wilson (program administrator)

Associate members present:
Shawn Kassner
Mike Miller
Steve Eckard

Invited Guests present:
Dan Tholen
Jeff Burnette

1) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on March 16, 2009

Motion to accept minutes as written was made by Richard Swartz/second by Gregg O'Neal – all were in favor.

2) Action items recap/discussion

The voting procedure and timeline was reviewed. May 1 is the target to get the Voting Draft Standards (VDSs) completed so the SSAS committee can vote to release them for official TNI voting.

Oversight of stationary source program and the SSAS table is still under discussion. TNI management must decide whether it will be managed by the PT Board or another entity such as the SSAS Expert Committee. There is some efficiency if oversight is provided through the SSAS committee, since it has the members who are experts on the objectives of the program. SSAS EC is also more balanced than it has been with new members applying. TNI is also considering how the SSAS documents fit into the overall TNI standards structure.

Jack Herbert suggested representation is needed from the environmental sector which has an interest in how audit sample programs are implemented. Stan noted that these groups don't participate in existing program now. The group discussed what would be gained by their inclusion. Jack will make some inquiries as to whether there is interest in participation.

3) Resume review of Provider Accreditor WDS – start at line 16 of the WDS public comments spreadsheet

Line 15 – Only 2 comments were received. Maria will add to the spreadsheet.

Line 16 – 5.2.1 Volume and module numbers will be added when known.

Line 17 – 5.3 The suggested change will be incorporated.

Line 18 – 5.4 – Suggestion is to remove reference to PA database since oversight of the program is still under consideration. This was included since the WDS was derived from the TNI PT standards, but the SSAS situation is different than TNI PT program. A requirement for a database will increase costs for the program. Oversight could be done from other existing databases – TNI's or the providers' databases. TNI needs to determine what kind of oversight is needed for this program. The purpose of the TNI central SSAS database is not program oversight, just to have controlled access to data relevant to lab and tester performance. There is still some confusion about what the different databases represent and their purpose.

Providers are required to keep this information individually. This database would summarize the information at the PA facility from multiple providers. TNI does this for PT, but do they want this for SSAS? If it is included in the standard, the PA would have to develop it.

Steve Eckard suggested resolving discussion about the central database, but that section could potentially be deleted. The group will reconsider once more is known about program oversight.

Line 19 – 5.4.1 Will be considered as part of follow up on section 5.4.

Line 20 – 6.1 b) Volume and module numbers will be added when known.

Line 21 – 6.1 e) The comment suggests removing this item since more than 20 labs being involved will probably be rare. Dan Tholen noted this as his comment and said he will withdraw it.

Line 22 – 25 – Volume and module numbers will be added when known.

Line 26 – 6.3.1a) The comments notes that a provider may not get sample requests for the full range of concentrations in the SSAS Table. The Provider only sends out the samples in ranges that are requested. If the provider supplies samples that go outside the range, there may not be homogeneity and stability testing along with it.

The group discussed having a review process similar to the process for FoPT. Maria will contact the PT Board to see how they want to handle this.

Jack had additional questions on the issue of out of range samples. Each state will have to determine how to handle this. A sample may be offered outside of the range or for new analytes not on the table, but the reasons for this shall be documented. The provider should not alter the sample without a documented reason. This information should be collected in the central database too. Maria proposed that the committee review some language via email and add to the provider and participant documents as well. She requested the committee submit suggestions to Maria and Jane by end of tomorrow (Tuesday March 24th).

Line 28 – 6.3.1 b) The comment questions whether this section is relevant. In 6.3.3 of the provider document, there is a requirement for "analytes of interest" and the provider shall spike all of them. It was noted that some analytes can't be done together – like dioxins. It should be clear to the sample recipient what they have to analyze for. There may be other analytes present and some could present interferences.
Dan is not sure this section is needed in the accreditor document. The committee agreed to hold a decision on this until oversight issues are addressed. The provider standard should also be reviewed for this issue.

Next conference call is March 30th, at 2:00 pm EDT. Review will start with Line 29.