TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee
February 16, 2010

Attendance:

Maria Friedman, Chair	Committee member	present
Jack Herbert	Committee member	present
Michael Klein	Committee member	absent
Ray Merrill	Committee member	present
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	present
Jane Wilson	Program Administrator	present
Shawn Kassner	Associate member	present
Mike Miller	Associate member	absent
Chuck Wibby	Associate member	absent
Jeff Lowry	Guest	absent
William Daystrom	Guest	absent
Mike Hayes	Guest	absent
Jim Presley	Guest	absent
Ron McLeod	Guest	absent

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

Maria confirmed the documents for today's conference call were provided in her email of February 15th and Jane's email of February 16th for the minutes.

2) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on February 8, 2010

Mike Schapira moved to accept the minutes as drafted/seconded by Stan. The following yes votes were recorded: Michael Klein (via email before the meeting), Mike S., Maria, Richard, and Stan. Remaining members joining late will be asked to vote via email after the meeting.

3) Resume discussion re. SSAS Central Database permission matrix

Maria reported there has been some interest from potential new members, but they are still completing the TNI and committee application processes. Michael Hayes is interested in joining as a SSAS provider. Jim Presley may join as a stack tester.

Maria asked the committee to review the permissions spreadsheet provided for today's call. The details of Jack's proposal are indicated in the spreadsheet. The spreadsheet is organized according to the fields currently designated in the central database. Items in black are already in database. Items in red are fields that may need to be added. Sample entries are provided for the permissions. Some cells in the "example entries" would have formulas for calculation from other field entries, and William will have to determine if those can be included in the database.

The committee first discussed what fields should be available for viewing (reference row 1 in the matrix). Jack provided background on his suggestion to add a field for "level range". His intent is to address the variability in audit sample success in different ranges of audit samples, e.g., at the low range the failure rate goes up. This field could also substitute in part for access to the actual SSAS values if the committee decides not to allow general access to that field.

The committee discussed the criteria for determining the level range and how they could change during the SSAS program. Shawn suggested providing the TNI concentration range rather than breaking the range up into generic segments. SSAS providers will be monitoring the regulatory ranges of interest and lab capability at the low end of the range. Shawn questioned whether we have a clear idea right now where the break points should be – is this "cart before the horse"? Shawn had to leave the call but will review this suggestion further for discussion via email. One proposal is to add the range field but insert more detail, such as the values of the "low" range rather than just the "low" descriptor. The SSAS Table Subcommittee will provide data for use by William. Mike S. noted that there may be situations where tight grouping may occur when many values in a range have been previously tested.

Jack has suggested adding fields for "Bias" (with entries of "high" or "low") and "% Deviation (absolute)". This information could be used in cases where we don't want to provide the accepted value/reported value. Jack clarified these data should be in the SSAS report, and are not needed in the database. Ray noted that if the actual value will be available to lab, this isn't needed. That will depend on whether labs will be able to see each other's data. The committee agreed these fields are not needed in the database. This information can be generated from what's in the database.

For the "Evaluation" (pass/fail) field, it was noted that in the SSAS standards the criteria are referred to as "acceptable" and "not acceptable". The terms from standard will be used for consistency.

It was noted that for some of the fields, such as "testers" and "facilities", codes may be used rather than specific locations and names. The EPA region identifier does not need to be a field in the database as this can be derived from other entries. It was also asked whether a field for "container" had been approved for addition. Past deliberations will be reviewed to confirm whether that field was approved for addition.

The committee reviewed the "Example entry" row (reference row 2 in the matrix) and acknowledged the source of each type of entry, which may include the SSAS Table, data uploaded by the SSAS Provider, calculated/derived values, etc. It was noted that for some analytes such as dioxin, sample reporting may be different due to analysis for specific congeners, and a lab may report just certain ones (similar to metals in terms of reporting those that are required only). William may need some direction on how to structure this in the database.

The committee reviewed the proposed permissions for each type of participant per database field (reference rows 3-8 in the matrix), while considering the high level permissions matrix previously approved by the committee. Maria noted that EPA would have the same access privileges as state regulators. The committee again discussed if

the "level range" field is needed if the accepted values will be accessible. The committee will wait to consider further discussion from Shawn.

The committee proposed permissions for each field based on consideration for each participant and whether they should be able to access their own data for a field, but not for all participants (e.g., accepted value). For example, labs and testers should be able to see the accepted value for their own samples, but not those of other labs and testers.

The committee discussed whether unrestricted access to "reported value" is of any meaning in the absence of unrestricted access to the "accepted value". It was determined that this could be combined with other information to be used in potentially unacceptable ways. Mike S. asked whether we need a separate matrix for the summary data. This is not needed as participants will see themselves and everyone else in summary data and will have access to their individual data.

Maria will update the detailed matrix based on today's discussion and distribute. William can then start updating fields in the database. Maria asked if Richard's group is ready to provide an update on the FAQs details for next week's meeting. Richard will contact regulators this week for comments. Maria added the committee will also further discuss the field on "level ranges" for next week.

Applications have not yet started for A2LA accreditation of SSAS providers. Maria will follow up with A2LA on status. It was noted the EPA audit sample program has been extended through April 2010.

Next meeting is on Feb 22nd at 2:00 pm EST.