

**TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
March 9, 2009**

Committee members present:

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

Associate members present:

Shawn Kassner
Mike Miller
Yves Tondeur
Jim Serne
Michael Schapira

Invited Guests present:

Joe Aldina

- 1) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on March 2, 2009

Gregg O'Neal motioned to accept as written/Richard Swartz seconded – all were in favor.

Maria asked Joe Aldina from Covanta Energy to summarize his interest in the committee. Joe was present at SES meeting and wanted to find out more about the standards. His company is in the energy from waste business.

- 2) Reminder re. number of meetings/teleconferences left prior to posting of VDS

Maria reviewed the timeline for the development of the voting draft standard documents. Internal comments can be accepted until sometime in April (Maria will confirm date to committee). No more external comments can be accepted, but SES members will be allowed to funnel comments to the committee via SSAS members. Maria will email the deadline for internal comments.

- 3) Email voting this week to approve applicant for full committee membership

Maria noted that the committee will be asked to vote on a membership application via email this week.

- 4) Continue review of SSAS Provider WDS, start at line 60 of the WDS public comments spreadsheet

Line 60 – Will look at the individual comments to section 10 in the following lines.

Line 61 – The committee agrees that quarterly review is probably not appropriate for SSAS program, but discussed whether it should be a specific period or after a certain number of samples have been reported. SSAS PA will also make sure that the provider does the report, but the time period could vary by provider. It could be a rolling report updated on a periodic basis. How will these data be used? They are used by the provider to assess sample design/manufacturing and could also be used by the SSAS program to look at limits in SSAS tables.

The committee decided to ask for input from Dan Tholen of A2LA. All comments on section 10 will be sent to Dan (Lines 60-70).

Line 71- 11.1.2 Comment suggests that “relevant parties” referenced in the standard needs to be defined. This was not defined in the participant’s document. Need to look at the other documents to make sure the same terminology is being used rather than introducing additional terms. The Facility owns the data, so they can authorize it going to other participants. The Provider should not have burden to disseminate it unless asked by the facility. Facility can ask that it is released to lab as well, for example. Timing of the release of data was discussed – would the lab get the report in time to rerun the samples if needed? The timeframe could be reduced to 7 days from 15 days to address holding times issue.

The committee agreed that "relevant parties" will be replaced with "other parties requested by the facility". Move discussion re. timing to line 72 (11.1.2 Note) and that timing to submit results in 11.1.1 will be reduced from 15 to 7 calendar days.

Line 72 – 11.1.2 NOTE Suggestion to remove the portion of the note about rapid reporting of data. This was added to accommodate the need for reporting of results in the field. Is this a business practice that should be in the standard? Can the provider be audited on this? The service is available, it can be arranged with the provider, but doesn’t need to be in the standard. it could go in the guidance document for ordering samples rather than in the standard.

Line 73 – 11.2.1 f) Delete accreditation body number for lab since labs may not be TNI accredited for SSAS program. Committee suggested addition of phone number and contact information.

Line 74 – 11.2.1 i) The comment suggests the deletion of reference to discussion of not-acceptable test results. The provider won’t be providing comments on why someone failed.

Line 75 – 11.2.2 a) This section will refer back to SSAS number as previously revise/defined.

Line 76/77 – 11.2.2 i) Numbering will be corrected (2 i's). Since the provider reports the matrix, "As reported" is irrelevant and will be deleted.

Line 78 – 11.3.1 Could any of the participants request this information? Yes, change it to all participants.

Line 79 – 11.3.2 Should release of information come from the facility rather than the laboratory? Will the lab be identified in the central database? Lab should be changed to participants? Any participant can request the failure report. This item is related to identification of specific labs that failed. Who can that be released to and who has to authorize? This issue has implications for the central database, if we have to have release of information for it. The central database will not be public access. Do all the impacted participants have to sign off? Providers should not be in the position to have to decide this.

Email comments on this topic to Maria and Jane by 3:00 pm EDT Weds. March 11.

Updated spreadsheet and deadlines for internal comments will be emailed by Maria.

Next meeting will be March 16th 2:00 pm EDT. The committee will begin reviewing comments to the Provider Accreditor document.