TNI Stationary Source Audit Sample Expert Committee Teleconference
March 1, 2010

Attendance:

Maria Friedman, Chair	Committee member	present
Jack Herbert	Committee member	present
Michael Klein	Committee member	absent
Ray Merrill	Committee member	absent
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	absent
Stanley Tong	Committee member	present
Jane Wilson	Program Administrator	present
Shawn Kassner	Associate member	present
Mike Miller	Associate member	present
Ty Garber	Associate member	present
Mike Hayes	Guest	present
William Daystrom	Guest	present

Maria welcomed Ty Garber of Wibby Environmental to the group as an Associate Member. Ty provided details about his responsibilities at Wibby and his interest in the work of the SSAS committee.

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

Maria noted that all documents for this call were sent via email on 2-26-2010. All confirmed receipt of the email.

2) Review and approval of minutes from teleconference on February 22, 2010

Stan commented on Item 4 regarding the Method 18 discussion. The minutes were amended to delete details about the reasons Method 18 audit samples had historical problems.

Gregg motioned to accept the minutes as amended/Stan seconded. All were in favor.

3) Resume discussion re. SSAS Central Database permission matrix

Maria began with a Chair update. A2LA can now move forward with SSAS provider accreditations. The current SSAS table is now posted on the TNI website in same area as the SSAS standards and FAQs. Information hasn't been posted on the A2LA site as of yet. Interested parties should contact Randy Querry for more information or see this link: http://www.a2la.org/.

Maria added that the committee should contact Dan Tholen when we are ready to update the SSAS table so A2LA can reassess providers. EPA samples should be

available thru June, but no more samples are being made in an effort to use what's already been produced. Availability will depend on requests that are made during that period. Some concentration ranges have been depleted already.

Maria updated the permission matrices based on last week's discussion. Anything shown in red is new material. Regulatory agency ID and contact is a new row and participants will see this information for their own data. The committee discussed whether the database should accommodate multiple regulatory contacts. This information would have to be provided to the SSAS provider for entry into the database. The committee discussed whether the contact need to be listed as primary or secondary but it was decided we didn't need that level of detail or hierarchy, just multiple fields to list more than one contact.

The detailed permissions matrix was reviewed and Maria provided a recap of what was decided by the committee last week. It was noted that separate fields for state and federal regulatory agencies will be needed in order to do searches, etc. Questions about including the EPA region were discussed, such as whether a given EPA region will always have the same contact – the committee doesn't know if this is consistent across EPA regions. Is it enough to know what region is, or does the user need the actual contact. William doesn't have a table in the database with contacts for regulators yet. Shawn suggested that it can be a field in the EDD. It would be beneficial to have accepted values to address variations in names, such as "Stan Tong" vs "Stanley Tong". It is not desirable to have to set up a list of valid contact names in the database. Naming individuals at an agency might be going a level too far in detail. Jim Serne had an example based on an ICR – information collection request – in which state and federal contacts were involved. The federal contact could be other than an EPA region, and it could be another part of EPA program or office. It was noted that 2 columns would be needed if we want to see two separate sets of regulatory agency information. Mike M suggested the most important regulatory contact is the one that confirms the specifics of the audit sample to the provider. It is most important to know who approved the audit sample. Is this for tracking legal responsibility for the audit sample, as that would probably not be TNI's intent. The committee decided not to add another column.

There were no other questions on the red unhighlighted cells.

Maria noted the addition of the audit sample ID as an open text field. The only issue is whether two providers might somehow assign the same ID to different samples. Jack suggested maybe Provider Accreditor should specify the system across providers but that's not something the committee can dictate the Accreditor to do. Providers on the call suggested specifying a minimum and/or maximum length of the ID, and it should allow for alphanumeric characters. There was general agreement that a 30 character maximum will work. Mike S asked how allowing access to the audit sample ID will ensure that a lab doesn't get the same concentration for testing twice or isn't able to make some reasonable guesses about the concentration of a particular sample. Shawn will look into how they control for this as a provider but IDs are typically unique to each audit sample event. Users won't see the audit sample ID being used more than once. Those controls are already in place by providers.

Maria asked those on the call to vote on the two matrices and others will vote by email.

High level permission matrix dated 2/25/2010:

Stan /Mike S motioned to approve the matrix.
Yes votes received from Stan, Mike S, Maria, Jack and Jim (Gregg exited call early).

Detailed permission matrix dated 2/25/2010:
Jack/Stan motioned to approve the matrix.
Yes votes received from Stan, Mike S, Maria, Jack and Jim (Gregg exited call early).

Maria will forward to those not on the call for voting. Once accepted by email, Maria will provide the matrices to William for incorporation into the database development.

Maria asked for an update on the FAQ document revision. Regulators are still working on it. There are some disagreements about what should go in and some answers may depend on how the EPA rule is finalized.

Next meeting will be on March 15th, 2:00 pm EST and will include another regulator update.