TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
January 20, 2010

Attendance:

Maria Friedman, Chair	Committee member	present
Jack Herbert	Committee member	present
Michael Klein	Committee member	present
Ray Merrill	Committee member	absent
Gregg O'Neal	Committee member	present
Michael Schapira	Committee member	present
Jim Serne	Committee member	absent
Candace Sorrell	Committee member	absent
Richard Swartz, Vice-chair	Committee member	present
Stanley Tong	Committee member	absent
Jane Wilson	Program Administrator	present
Shawn Kassner	Associate member	present
Mike Miller	Associate member	present
Chuck Wibby	Associate member	present
Jeff Lowry	Guest	present
William Daystrom	Guest	present

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

Maria confirmed the documents to be reviewed during today's teleconference from her email of 1/19/10.

2) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on January 11, 2010

Mike S. moved to accept the minutes as drafted/Gregg second. All were in favor of the motion. Maria added that Ray Merrill also voted to approve via email prior to the meeting.

3) Chair update

a) EPA Lab Code (info from EPA's Charles Feldmann)

Maria talked to Charles Feldmann following the last SSAS meeting. EPA cannot assign lab ID codes to SSAS testers. Lab codes are primarily for water testing not for air, soil, etc. Also, there are many incorrect lab codes in the system, e.g. codes haven't changed when a lab has changed ownership etc. EPA advised it would be better for TNI to assign the lab codes for testers that need one and use EPA lab codes where they exist. TNI would need to determine how they would be assigned, etc. The TNI code would just need to be unique from the EPA lab code. The committee discussed whether it could be an auto assign function in the database, or would the testers have to apply, etc. William added he would prefer a form to fill out to help catch duplicates, etc. The lab ID code is intended to identify a physical location. This will be a topic for future discussion.

b)   SSAS FAQ document on TNI website

After consultation with Jerry, Maria finished adding the document tracking information for the FAQs document. It has been posted to the TNI website in the same area as the SSAS standards.

c)   Cost to use SSAS Central Database

Maria also consulted with Jerry about potential cost of the central database. Access will be free up to June 2010 at which time funding will have been used up. EPA may finalize their new rules by end of April 2010, so the central database needs to be up and running by then. After that (when funding is exhausted) Jerry Parr will determine ongoing costs to database users.

4)   Resume discussion re. SSAS Central Database permission matrix

Maria added some development history to the spreadsheet, which now shows three progressive versions of the table as comments have been incorporated. Maria asked for input from the regulators regarding the permissions, since some were not on previous calls. Richard and Michael Klein thought regulatory access to summary data would meet their needs. Jack wanted a higher level of details, but not necessarily names, e.g., Lab 1 has done a method 3 times and Lab 2 has done a method 25 times. Different states have different approaches to the audit program.

Mike S noted that he suggested results under appeal should be suppressed from the data statistics. William could allow the regulator to change the status of the sample. An audit sample purpose is to help identify if a test is wrong, but doesn't identify exactly what went wrong. Labs vary in support for whether all regulators should be able to see all the data. For Maria's labs, it has to do with client confidentiality policies. If testing is being done for SSAS, it will become a public record, although not an easily accessible one. A member of the public could go through FOIA request from regulatory agency to TNI. FOIA doesn't require that an agency generate a record; they are required to provide it only if they already have it.

Shawn was asked to elaborate on his concerns. A regulatory agency pulling records to look at perform of labs, etc. over time. could potentially influence who uses what company to test, analyze, etc. The regulators on the call noted that states are limited to directing inquiries to lists of qualified labs or testers, rather than recommending individuals. Some states require labs to be accredited, but testers can just get on a list. Jim S is fine with access to summary data as a tester. The committee discussed whether to show the name of the facility, but not the tester or lab, or provide information based on the type of source. It was noted that the database right now has not been designed to collect the source type and facilities often have multiple source types. If the regulator can access everything for any facility (line 26), they would be able to see the tester, the lab, etc. Michael K would rather be able to see the data all for labs and testers rather than by facility.

William provided an update on database development since the last meeting. He has expanded the search capabilities for some of the screens and is working on

adding another screen for results details for the facility, lab, tester, etc. The ability to see these details will be function of the permissions matrix.

The committee had further discussion on the Suppression of data under appeal. There is the basic question of who is responsible for flagging it and/or releasing it. The Provider releases data from database, so should the Provider be responsible for pulling data that has been appealed? The database currently doesn't have a means for toggling the data on or off or a field to record this. These are details that are not in the standard, and it's not in the complaint system. The Provider Accreditor and Regulatory Agency have the responsibility to make decisions on appeals/complaints. Maria will talk to Dan Tholen about this as the SSAS Provider Accreditor.

Greg motioned to have the committee vote on 1/18/10 version of the permission matrix / Mike S seconded. Maria asked the committee to return votes by email to Maria and Jane by Friday this week (1/22).

Maria is working on the powerpoint for the Chicago meeting and will send it to those calling in. Jane will set up a call in for those participating remotely.

Next meeting is Tuesday January 26 1:30 pm CST during the Chicago TNI Forum.