

TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
Summary for July 13, 2009

Committee members present:

Maria Friedman
Gregg O'Neal
Jack Herbert
Richard Swartz
Michael Klein
Mike Schapira

Associate members present:

Mike Miller
Shawn Kassner

Agenda Discussions – Meeting was called to order at 2:04 PM EDT:

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

For today's call, Maria emailed to all members the agenda, the minutes from the July 6th call, and the updated VDS comments spreadsheet, on July 10th. The VDS drafts to be referenced remain the same; emailed to all on June 8th and are the same ones currently posted in the TNI website.

Richard volunteered to help take minutes; Jane is out today.

M. Klein reported that he inquired from Jane whether members may participate in the SSAS meeting on August 11th in San Antonio, via teleconference. Jane will check.

- 2) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on July 6, 2009

Minutes approved as written. M. Schapira motioned; Jack seconded. Motion carried.

- 3) Resume review of internal comments to VDS; start with Line 2 of the Provider tab

Prior to discussion, Maria notified the committee that instead of simply writing a summary of EPA's proposed changes to the Federal Register, she will summarize the differences between the proposed changes and the SSAS VDS.

Line 2, Section 1.0 – M. Miller commented that revision to the section is not needed; section looks fine as it is. M. Klein indicated it will not hurt to add

clarification and proposed to amend Section 1.1 to clarify that the audit samples are for "stationary source air emissions testing results."

Jack motioned to add clarification; M. Schapira seconded. Motion carried.

Line 8, Section 2.0 – M. Miller indicated that since we mentioned the ISO/IEC 17011 reference in the VDS, then this should be referenced, as was stated in the public comment received. Jack and Gregg agreed. Shawn mentioned that this does not need to be referenced at all. Note that ISO/IEC 17011 does not pertain to Providers; it relates to Accreditors.

M. Schapira asked if the definitions in ISO/IEC 17011 are the same as those in ISO/IEC 17025. If so, then the current reference to 17025 (already in Section 2.0) may be sufficient. Jack thought it would be better to reference both for consistency.

Shawn suggested that Maria consult with Dan Tholen. Comment was tabled for now.

Lines 16 and 17, Sections 4.1 and 4.2 – Jack noted that the requirement should not be assumed. There was no explanation from the commenter why Section 4.1 is unenforceable. The committee agreed that combining the two sections is simpler but not necessary. Comment was voted down.

Richard motioned to consider comment as Non-persuasive; Gregg seconded. Motion carried.

Lines 18 and 19, Sections 4.4 and 4.4.1 – Shawn thought that comment was good; simpler and more concise to combine these two sections.

Richard motioned to combine two sections; M. Schapira seconded. Motion carried.

Line 20, Section 4.4.2 – The question arose as to why Provider Accreditor would need to see who are the Participants; shouldn't these info be confidential? Shawn agreed with commenter; it is ok to delete this section.

Richard motioned to delete section; Gregg seconded. Motion carried.

Line 21, Section 5.1 – There was general agreement to change heading, per commenter's proposal.

Gregg motioned to change section heading; Jack seconded. Motion carried.

Line 22, Section 5.1.1 – Maria was requested to discuss comment with Dan. Comment was tabled for now.

Line 25, Section 5.1.5 – Jack did not agree that the two sections (5.1.5 in the Provider VDS and 5.3.3 with Note in the Provider Accreditor VDS) conflict with each other because it is permission-granted, per the Note. He suggested either to add the Note to 5.1.5 or to replace 5.1.5 with the Note. To avoid the confusion, Shawn proposed to delete Section 5.1.5 and replace with the contents of Section 5.3.3 together with the Note. The committee agreed that this is a requirement for the Provider Accreditor but won't hurt for Providers to know the requirement, hence add to the Provider document as well.

Gregg motioned to accept Shawn's proposal; Jack seconded. Motion carried.

Line 31, Section 5.3 – Gregg noted that since the TNI SSAS Program is new, Facilities paying for the audit samples may want to know what they are paying for. Richard added that access to G13 and 17043 may be difficult or requires another fee. All agreed that redundancy, in this case, may be useful. Comment voted down.

Jack motioned to consider comment as Non-persuasive; Richard seconded. Motion carried.

Lines 32 and 33, Sections 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 – Same discussion and rationale as Line 31 above.

Gregg motioned to consider comment as Non-persuasive; M. Schapira seconded. Motion carried.

Lines 35 and 37, Sections 6.3.1 and 6.4.1 – Suggestion makes sense from an organizational stand point in the document.

Richard motioned to accept change; Jack seconded. Motion carried.

Line 36, Section 6.3.5 – This is an assignment to all; discuss via email.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:31 PM EDT. Next meeting is on July 20th, 2:00 PM EDT.