

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
Summary for April 27, 2009

Committee members present:

Maria Friedman
Gregg O'Neal
Jim Serne
Jack Herbert
Richard Swartz
Michael Klein
Ken Eichelmann
Stanley Tong
Mike Schapira
Jane Wilson (program administrator)

Associate members present:

Mike Miller

Guest:

Frank Jarke

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

Maria emailed the materials on April 26th for today's conference call. She also asked the committee to refer to the VDS drafts dated April 7.

- 2) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on April 20, 2009

Mike Klein proposed changing the minutes to reflect acceptance of the simpler terms instead of using the "SSAS" acronyms. All were in favor of the change. No other comments were provided. Stan motioned to accept, Ken seconded. All were in favor.

- 3) Chair Update

Maria noted that TNI has not yet finalized which sector the audit sample standards will go into but will be organized as Volume 1 and Modules 1, 2, and 3 for the voting draft standards. The Expert Committee will oversee the audit sample table for the time being, but the TNI PT Board will oversee Provider accreditation.

Today is the last day to address external comments. Following this meeting, Jane and Maria will work on preparation of the VDS drafts. The committee will not meet on May 4th. That week the committee will vote on posting the VDS documents for voting.

- 4) Resume spreadsheet review as follows:

a) Provider tab – lines 4, 15, 23, and 67

Line 4 – General comment from Dan Tholen regarding the redundancies in the standards (Shawn was not on the call to comment on whether this was resolved). The comment acknowledged the other TNI standards contain redundancies as well. Redundancy between the modules might be useful if users only read one or two modules of the modules. Jack motioned to table the comment and consider it in the future as needed. Gregg seconded. Motion carried.

Line 15 – Section 3: The comment suggested a definition for “analyte of interest” is needed. The committee discussed the fact that interferences may be present – should they be considered analytes of interest? What if the regulatory agency adds more analytes and the lab was not properly calibrated for an analyte? It was noted that facilities are not going to pay to analyze for compounds they do not have to report.

The committee agreed to the following definition: “Target analytes that are spiked into the audit sample, as requested by the participants.”

Mike Schapira motioned to accept. Jack seconded. All were in favor.

Line 23 – Section 6.3.3: Comment about adding assigned values for non-spiked compounds to the audit sample tables. This issue is also being dealt with in the TNI PT standards. Given time constraints, Maria motioned the proposed wording change to 6.3.3 be accepted and the larger issue of non-spiked analytes will be dealt with down the road. Gregg seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Line 67 – Section 10.2.2: Comment was received suggesting deletion of this section. Previous discussion had referred review to Dan Tholen, who agreed with the comments and recommended deleting much of Section 10. This committee chose to retain the section pending additional discussion. Maria suggested the results should represent the same sig figs as the made to concentration of the audit sample. Mike Schapira noted that measurement to 3 sig figs is getting harder – trending toward 2 sig figs. Richard motioned to remove 10.2.2. Mike S. seconded. All were in favor of removal.

b) Provider Int tab – lines 20-22, 24, and 26

Line 20 – Section 8.1.2e: Comment suggested rewording to reference analysis in addition to collection. This item is for samples collected in the field. The committee formerly agreed to remove “in between test runs” in another section. Jack stated this item is for a specific

circumstance and analysis has no place in this item. Jack motioned to reject comment. Richard seconded. All were in favor.

Line 21 – Section 8.1.3c: Mike Schapira comment related to the “excessive volume” terminology. Mike stated it is not unusual to do analysis on ½ volume of the sample to allow for a redo if a tech drops the sample, etc. Most labs don’t risk everything on one run. Mike does not consider this to be “non-routine”. This is the same practice for client samples. The intent is to not do multiple analyses on the audit sample (or more analyses than the routine samples). Removing the word “multiple” would address the concern. Jim Serne motioned to remove “multiple”. Gregg seconded. All were in favor.

Line 24 – Section 11.1.1: Suggestion to change “reports” to “evaluation reports”. Jack motioned to accept change. Richard seconded. All were in favor.

c) Internal Comments after 4-3-2009 tab (time permitting)

Insufficient time was available to review internal comments. They will be reviewed during the process of reviewing comments to the VDS documents after balloting.

May 11th 2:00 pm EDT is next meeting – the committee will review audit sample table.