TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
July 27, 2009

Participants:

Committee members:
Maria Friedman
Gregg O'Neal
Stan Tong
Jack Herbert
Mike Schapira
Jane Wilson, program administrator

Associate members:
Mike Miller
Shawn Kassner

It was noted that a quorum is not present on the teleconference; all motions/decisions will be confirmed by email vote of absent members.

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

Maria confirmed the documents to be used for this teleconference. The updated comment spreadsheet was provided by email by Maria on Thursday 7/23 and the draft summary by Jane on Friday 7/24.

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

Jack suggested an amendment to Line 39 discussion to note that "packaging event" definition is being deleted since the once instance of the term in the standard is being deleted.

Stan motioned to approve the minutes as amended/Mike S seconded. All were in support of the motion.

3)   Brief announcement

The SSAS database committee plans a meeting this Thursday 7/30 (12:30 pm) and the SSAS expert committee is invited to participate. Maria requests that participants submit comments by email to Gregg (copy to others optional) to confirm the primary purpose for the central database. Details about which fields to include, etc., are not requested at this time. The focus is on gaining consensus around the overall mission and purpose of the database. Details of the database design will be discussed in San Antonio.

Comments for the proposed EPA rule are due August 3rd. Committee members wishing to include group comments should send to Jack by email.

4) Resume review of internal comments to VDS; start with Line 6, Section 1.2e of the Provider tab

Line 6, 1.2e

Stan motioned to accept Maria's suggested resolution/Jack seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Line 8,

The comment notes that ISO 17011 and ISO 17043 are both referenced in the text and should be added to the reference section. Mike S motioned to accept/Gregg seconded. All were in favor of the motion. Reference section in Provider Accreditor document will also be updated.

Line 26 (and 25), 5.1.5 and Provider Accreditor 5.3.3

The committee discussed whether to make the proposed change or keep what was already revised in Line 25 (use language in 5.3.3 of V1M2). It was agreed the Provider Accreditor should have flexibility to look at other accreditations if there is a reason to do so or at their discretion. The committee decided to revise 5.3.3 by deleting the note and adding the following: "The PA is not required to reassess these activities, although they may choose to do so."

Stan motioned to accept the proposed language/Gregg second. All were in favor of the motion.

Line 53, 11.1.2

The suggestion is to specifically add the testers and labs to the distribution of the evaluation report.

The committee discussed potential conflict with Mike Schapira's issue regarding the ability to redo the analysis of an audit sample if it has been indicated by the provider that the reported value is not acceptable. Shawn suggests Mike's concern is more part of corrective action and wouldn't be part of the standard. All participants should get the evaluation report at the same time, but does this impact whether re-analysis can be done on a blind basis. Corrective action system will be situation dependent and even state dependent. There is no formal preliminary report in this system.

Jack motioned to accept the comment/Gregg seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Line 55/56, Annex A 2g

The comment suggests a correction to Annex A homogeneity testing requirements to correct an equation. Dan Tholen's comments to the proposal are noted in spreadsheet. Shawn explained there is an economy of scale in homogeneity testing, so providers will want to maximize the benefit. The "make 3, test 2" approach is not inexpensive. Dan also suggests adding a clarifying paragraph explaining that sample batch of less than 20 don't give good statistics. Other protocols should be used for the validation of smaller batches as approved by the Provider Accreditor.

Jack motioned to accept the proposal/Gregg seconded. All were in favor of the motion. (Stan not on the call as of this point).

Provider Accreditor doc
Line 5, 6

The comment suggests updating the reference section to include all referenced documents. Gregg motioned to accept the comment/ Mike S. seconded. All were in favor of the motion.

Line 13, 4.0

Maria explained that this item needs follow up at the level of the TNI Board. The comment is not accepted – the committee agreed to accept Maria's rationale as proposed.

All were in favor with Maria's rationale.

Next Meeting:
8/3, 2:00 pm for 2 hours
Also SSAS database call on 7/30 at 12:30 pm.