QA Strategy Workgroup Conference Call Notes

Thursday 03/21/02

Attendees

Kuenja Chung	Patricia Maliro
Tom Parsons	Don Gourley
Donovan Rafferty	Jerry Sheehan
Richard Heffern	Michael Papp
Mike Miguel	Mark Shanis
Keith Duncan	Dennis Mikel
	Rachael Townsend

An Observation----

The discussion on yearly data certifications brings home the "diverseness" of our monitoring organizations and how important and enlightening these conference calls can be. As we revise CFR and our guidance we need to keep in mind how different State/local/Tribal monitoring programs can be and be able to develop the flexibility we need without sacrificing data quality.

Progress- (action items in bold italic)

MQO Tables

Three conference call were held last week (311-15) on O_3, CO and NO_2/SO_2, Two conference calls have been set for the week of March 25:

NO_2/SO_2	O3
Monday 3/25	Wednesday 3/27
3:00 4:00 Eastern	12:00 - 1:00 Eastern
919-541-4154	360-357-2913

CO Workgroup has gone through their MQO table and made necessary revisions - ***CO group needs to review Validation Template to see if it reflects the discussions.*** Mike will then send the Validation Template to the full Workgroup for review.

Mike is on travel the week of April 1 right up to the Phoenix meeting. ***If any MQO Workgroups needs to have a conference call the week of April 1 please contact Mike the week before if you need to set up a call line. In addition, if a call is set up, please e-mail Mike with changes to the MQOs.***

Mike has developed validation template style tables of O_3 and NO_2/SO_2 and will revise the validation template based on conference call discussions.

Tom Parsons thought it might be good to have a comments section on the validation template. We'll see how we can accommodate this.

Mike Miguel made a point about the amount of time it took to get through some of the parameters (i.e., shelter temperature). On one hand, these discussions are good because it allows for a full discussion on the ramifications of a change and the other areas of regulation or guidance the change might effect. ***On the other hand, in order to effect the more time critical changes needed for CFR it might be more efficient to identify what QC criteria need to be in CFR which would be the items that would end up on the critical criteria table of the validation template***. Using the shelter temperature example, it might be important to say in CFR "shelter temperature is important as it relates to the operating ranges of your monitoring instrumentation. Monitoring organization are required to record and document (hourly?) temperature reading, and identify the acceptable temperature ranges in their QAPP"; leaving the suggested temperature ranges in guidance.

So as a good QA manager, ask yourself, "for any method, what QC criteria would I want to make sure was in place to ensure I had quality data?". In some cases it may be important to actually include the acceptance criteria in regulation, in other cases it may not. This process will allow us to complete the validation templates. In later conference calls we can go back and discuss what revisions we need in our guidance documents.

National meeting- Phoenix - April 8-11 Ambient Air Day April 10th

8- 9:30 2 Presentations from Dennis Mikel other good talks also at this time
9:30- 12:00QA Strategy meeting - progress- and review
1:00 -5:00 QA Workshop -DQO/DQA/AIRS

QA Strategy Meeting Activities -

Validation template reviews - During the National Meeting, the MQO pollutant leads or their seconds in command (see the 3/6/02 notes, leads go from left to right) will provide a review of the validation templates, hitting the highlights of the changes/revisions. ***Mike will have revised templates available electronically (laptop/projector) for any changes discussed at the meeting. Validation Templates will be distributed to full Workgroup members on Friday 4/29. Workgroup members are requested to review the tables prior to the meeting***.

CFR Part 50 review - ***For validation template pollutant groups and any others, please read you method in CFR part 50. Identify other potential changes or revisions.***

CFR Part 58 App A and B review - ***All Workgroup member should attempt to review 40 CFR Parts A and B. Identify other potential changes or revisions***. Workgroup members

will be asked to identify at least one item they thinks needs to be revised in Part 58 App A.

Part 50, 53 and 58 can be found on AMTIC (http://www.epa.gov/ttn/amtic/)

AIRS Issues- We'll discuss issues related to getting P & A data into AIRS, as well as any other AIRS related problems. Mark Schmidt will be in attendance and we can hope to have Jake Summers on the conference line.

Other discussions during the morning will include (as time permits):

Identifying the role of the QA manager in CFR. ***Mike will try to pull togther basic attributes, roles and responsibilities of the QA manager***. Keith Duncan has agreed to help in this regard. ***Any others who would like to contribute, send Mike an email listing what you might conceive the attributes, roles and responsibilities of the QA manager.***

Graded Approach - Mike and Melinda Ronca-Batista may have some concepts developed on the graded approach.

Other Action Items for National Meeting

< A conference line will be secured line from 9:30 to 12:00. The phone number is (919) 541-4328
< Mike will try to find out the room names for our meetings. At present the rooms are not listed on national meeting site. (http://www.atlintl.com/epa-conference-2002/agenda.htm)

Other Call Discussions

The CFR related items on the Action/Recommendation Table were reviewed. In general, the revision of the MQO tables will address an number of action items on the table.

One issue that has been identified in the QA Workgroup that is also being discussed in the Regulatory Workgroup is whether to move towards quarterly certifications and what the ramifications for this might be. Some interesting discussion ensued on how monitoring organizations actually perform certifications; from a manual review of 100% of data values in AIRS, to random checks of a certain percentage of data, to a simple paper exercise of certifying that data (which has been verified and validated through normal QA/QC processes) is "good to go" The Redbook does not cover this topic but it sounds like additional guidance on this subject might be in order.