

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference  
June 13, 2011

Attendance:

Maria Friedman – Chair TestAmerica (Laboratory)	Committee member	present
Mike Hayes Linde (Provider)	Committee member	present
Michael Klein New Jersey DEP (State government)	Committee member	present
Gregg O’Neal, North Carolina DAQ (State government)	Committee member	present
Michael Schapira Enthalpy (Laboratory)	Committee member	present
Jim Serne TRC Solutions (Stationary Source Tester)	Committee member	present
Richard Swartz, Vice-chair Missouri DNR (State government)	Committee member	present
Stanley Tong EPA Region 9 (Federal government)	Committee member	absent
Ken Jackson TNI (Program Administrator)	Program Administrator	present
Ty Garber Wibby (Provider)	Associate member	absent
Shawn Kassner ERA (Provider)	Associate member	present
Mike Miller (Member at large)	Associate member	present
William Mills Mills Consulting (NELAC Assessor)	Associate member	absent
William Daystrom TNI (Webmaster)	Guest	present
Jeff Lowry ERA (Provider)	Guest	present

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

All present confirmed receipt of the documents e-mailed June 10, 2011.

- 2) Review and approve minutes from teleconference on June 6, 2011

The following corrections were proposed:

in item #4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> sentence, methods 25A and 18 do not have blanks, so the words “unlike Methods 25A and 18” should be deleted;

in item #4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, line 7, “ppmc” should be changed to “ppmC”;

in item #4, 11<sup>th</sup> paragraph, line 10, "There were also issues with flow regulators" should be replaced with "There were also issues with Regulators".

In the attendance list it should be noted that Ken Jackson was absent.

Michael Klein moved for approval of the minutes as amended, and Richard seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor.

3) Continue discussions re. SSAS Table – Method 23

Shawn had not yet checked Method 23 discrepancies between the subcommittee minutes and what was presented on the proposed SSAS Table (Action item from May 23 minutes). Shawn explained the process followed by the subcommittee. Statistical analysis was performed on available congeners. It was made sure all were looked at in a consistent manner, and then it was decided which analytes are truly necessary and regulated; i.e., only those with TEQ levels from WHO. Some regulators are also interested in total furans and total dioxins. A lot of differences were noted in the concentration ranges compared with the previous table. Jeff said it was confirmed that only 17 analytes with TEQs were necessary for audit samples. Most newer EPA regulations only require Total PCDD/Fs, Total PCDDs and Total PCDFs. However, states may require more.

Maria noted there were no graphs for some of the congeners, and Shawn responded this was because all were not needed. This had been confirmed with the regulators on the sub-committee call. Maria asked about spiking with fly ash, and it was replied that is not appropriate since a concentrate is needed that laboratories can spike into their normal cartridges that hold their own resins. This will be in the provider instructions. Maria also asked why both WHO 1998 and WHO 2005 are cited. Jeff replied some EPA regulations reference one and some reference the other.

The Committee members voted for acceptance of the Method 23 section of the table. All present voted in favor.

4) Continue discussions re. Method 25

Gregg moved to accept the proposed change in the method 25 table, as worked out by the subcommittee. The motion was presented for vote and failed. There was some further discussion on Method 25, but this was inconclusive.

Gregg asked if the providers can do anything to make this work at low concentrations. Jeff and Shawn suggested providing two cylinders. There was disagreement on whether to accept the poor acceptance criteria at low levels. Attorneys may object to not using the historical data to set the criteria. A dual audit would provide data over time, but meanwhile it was suggested the rule of using currently available historical data must be followed. It was suggested that by changing the audit (e.g., adding carbon dioxide etc.), it will then be a new audit so historical data will not be available. It was questioned if sample design were to change, how many data points would be needed to be statistically valid.

Maria wanted Method 25 to be finalized by the next conference call, and it was decided to hold a separate meeting of the Committee Members to move this along. The following motion from Michael Klein will be considered.

“Method 25 audits shall be defined as follows:

1. For each sampling location (e.g., inlet and outlet), two audit samples (or cylinders) will be provided; one audit sample shall be collected in the field and then analyzed, and the second audit sample shall be analyzed without field collection.
2. Audit samples that are collected in the field shall be analyzed prior to audit samples that were not collected in the field.
3. Audit concentrations shall be 50 - 2500 ppmC.
4. The diluent gas for the audit sample shall include CO, CH<sub>4</sub>, and CO<sub>2</sub>.
5. Acceptance criteria shall be +/- 30% for audit samples collected in the field, and +/- 20% for audit samples not collected in the field.”

5) Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm EDT.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 27, 2:00 - 3:30 pm EDT.

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference Agenda  
for June 13, 2011:

- 1) Double-check receipt of documents to be referenced in this teleconference
- 2) Review and approve minutes from teleconference on June 6, 2011
- 3) Continue discussions re. SSAS Table – Method 23