TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
February 22, 2010

Attendance:

Maria Friedman, Chair	Committee member	present
Jack Herbert	Committee member	present
Michael Klein	Committee member	present
Ray Merrill	Committee member	present
Gregg O'Neal	Committee member	present
Michael Schapira	Committee member	present
Jim Serne	Committee member	present
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	present
Chuck Wibby	Associate member	present
Mike Hayes	Guest	present
William Daystrom	Guest	present

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

Maria noted that all documents for this call were sent via email on 2-19-2010. All confirmed receipt of the email.

2) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on February 16, 2010

Prior to approval of 2-16-2010 minutes, Maria announced that Jack retracted his comments to amend the 2-8-2010 minutes. Gregg requested to see the proposed amendment and the reason for the retraction. Maria will send Gregg copy of Jack's email announcing his retraction; Jack's proposed amendment was included in the documents emailed on 2-19-2010 (see item 1 above).

Minutes from 2-16-2010 - Ray motioned to accept minutes as written; Gregg seconded.

3) Chair Update

Maria explained the need to complete the basic elements of the TNI SSAS program in order to have a viable program in time for the end of the EPA program. Jack has expressed a desire to establish specifications for audit samples matrices, but the committee needs to first focus on items like completing the updated SSAS table, etc. While it is an important topic, the committee can't take on other work at the moment that involves the input from many other participants such as EPA. Jack will talk to Gary McAlister about this. Things will keep evolving as the SSAS program matures.

Gregg noted the desire for innovation in audit samples from the multiple providers, but the regulatory community also doesn't want samples that are so radically different as to

not be comparable. Mike Miller added that part of this will be addressed by the Provider Accreditor role.

Ray added that when ERG first started working on audit samples in 1996, EPA had a one page of matrix instructions at that time. ERG has added to it over time. Mike S. noted the committee could prepare the foundation to expand on the sample matrices, and the Provider Accreditor could help ensure the Providers are providing appropriate samples. It wouldn't be in the SSAS table to begin with, but the committee could note the expectation that samples will expand in the future.

What will drive Providers to produce these new samples – it could be driven by regulatory request, etc. It might depend on how the EPA regulation is written. Stan noted that comments on the EPA regulation can't be submitted now if it wasn't made during the original comment period. Members agreed they are not sure what the vehicle is, but the SSAS committee could be the hub for fostering development of these new samples. It was noted this should be a future goal of the committee. Some of this is policy driven rather than technically driven, so the Subcommittee for the SSAS table can't address it. Mike S. noted the need for Provider direction on how to use the samples that are intended to be treated as field samples. This is needed for giving appropriate control ranges for samples treated as field and lab audit samples. Historical issues with Method 18 were noted. This will be addressed at least at first by the Subcommittee on audit samples. Jack thought the program should be providing the instructions rather than the provider. This function is currently being done by the providers.

4) Resume discussion re. SSAS Central Database permission matrix

Maria noted the changes made to the detailed matrix based on last week's discussion. Some items incorporated for discussion from Maria and Shawn were also noted. Some high level matrix permissions may need to be adjusted. The committee discussed the suggestions in Shawn's email.

Maria changed the order of columns based on Shawn's suggestion.

Shawn explained his suggestion to refer to % recovery rather than % deviation. This is a better indicator of lab performance across many variables and is a more recognizable metric for most people (rather than deviation). Shawn suggested deleting the acceptance criteria since it will be in the SSAS table. Concentration ranges would be good to have for reference and the high-med-low ranges may mean different things to different users.

Jack noted the current program is based on % deviation (inverse of % recovery). If more users are familiar with % recovery, should we use that instead? Gregg noted this may be easier to understand at all experience levels. It was also discussed whether the acceptance limits should be expressed as percentages rather than actual limits. Sometimes the acceptance range may not be symmetrical around 100% so % recovery may be easier to understand. Acceptance limits will still be based on concentration.

With respect to using the high-med-low ranges, the committee would need to establish criteria for how to determine this. Users would get more information from looking at the actual concentration range. It could also be informative to look at how it changes over time. By providing the range, the user can quickly tell where the result value falls in the

concentration range. William can also add a query for concentration range. Jack was trying to capture that providers should have samples in a variety of sub-ranges. The committee agreed to add the concentration ranges instead of level range. William will determine if there is a way for it show a history of how the range has changed over time.

Maria reviewed what was agreed on the detailed permissions matrix during last call. Regulatory users can see all data, and labs/testers/facilities will see their own data. Maria noted which columns are shown that will not be included in summary statistics.

Gregg asked if samples from different matrices will be separated out and the committee agreed they will.

In the review of the high level matrix, right now the tester will not see audit sample results in the database, but will get this from the provider. The tester should be able to see their own data on acceptance criteria in database, but not others. This would need to be adjusted the high level permission matrix. It will be changed so testers can see data for their own samples in the database.

The Lab will not see facility data based on the high level matrix. The Tester may not tell the lab where the sample is from, although it's rare. Is the tester always in between the lab and facility? There are not many occasions where the lab doesn't know where the sample is coming from as there is not a need for confidentiality. The committee agrees the lab should be able to see their own data related to facilities and testers. Again, this will change the high level matrix. But an entity could choose not to report the ID of the facility and then it wouldn't show up in database.

Providers should be able to see the facilities and tester data for the audit samples they provide as this will be coming to the provider anyway.

The committee discussed whether participants should see regulator data for their own samples. For example, testers that work in multiple states could track their samples in one place. This would be the same for providers, etc. The regulators on the call agree with it too. Stan asked if it's being approached too simply, as there may be multiple agencies involved at the state level. It was also discussed whether it will be tracked at the contact level – for example, at the level of "Jack" or "Oregon". It could be a look up table, etc. in the database. Two fields – agency name and contact – are already in the database. That information was going to be provided by the provider. Some projects may have multiple contacts for one participant involved.

Maria noted she will change all blanks to say "own data" and add another row for regulators. Maria will amend the spreadsheet and send to everyone via email for voting.

Next meeting is Monday March 1, 2:00 EST.