

**STACK TESTING ACCREDITATION COUNCIL (STAC)**  
**SPECIAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**  
**Minutes of January 27, 2011**

---

A special Board of Directors of the Stack Testing Accreditation Council (STAC) conference call was held Thursday, January 27, 2011. The primary goal for the call was to finalize the Quality Manual and discuss/vote on FSMO Vol. 2.

**Present:** Angela Hansen, Scott Swiggard, Steve Szambaris, Scott Evans, Jim Serne, Bob Platt, and Maggie Cangro.

Scott Swiggard called the meeting to order at 2pm.

Scott S.: I would like more time to thoroughly review Vol. 2, but let's move forward. Page 5, Paragraph 6.1.1 – "must complete action within 9 months". That's a huge milestone that we would have difficulty meeting.

Scott E: I believe that excludes field assessment.

Steve: Disagree – it excludes FSMO delays.

Scott E: We need clarification from TNI. If we cannot get a site to agree to entry, that's an FSMO delay.

Steve: Those who have had interim accreditation for a while will be at an advantage. It will take time for the Quality System to work/show development. Those starting from scratch will have issue with the 9 month time frame.

Scott E: We can go back to TNI for revision if necessary.

Scott S: Any other comments?

Next issue: The individual managing will be an employee of the accrediting body.

Scott E: Easy remedy - \$1/year salary.

Scott S: We need someone full time to manage. It will cause us to act differently.

Angie: Must have someone – there are issues that will come up (law suits, etc.). Perhaps start part time and work into full time.

Steve: Add "designated agent" language.

Scott E: TNI may not like that – the intent is to exclude sub-contracting of operations.

Scott S: Paragraph 6.2.5.2 Item A: assessor shall have no interest in play other than that of accreditation. Does that mean they work full time and are not an employee of another testing company?

Scott E: TNI is having a meeting next week. Perhaps I can get some clarifications while there.

Scott S: If we adopt this today, we need to know what we're adopting.

Angie: Is there anyone else doing this? Using this standard?

Scott E: Water sampling organizations are, but no air groups. I'll try to get contact info on some of the water groups.

Jim: Does EPA have any plan to name TNI in the standard?

Scott E: No.

Scott S: - Section ii: Any method you plan on accrediting, you need to be able to do so fairly.

- 6.2.5.2 (a)(v): "cannot hold financial interest" – once again, assessors may need to be full time employees of STAC.
- 7.1.3 – accreditation applicability "may be by matrix" – may also be granted by field assessment.

Scott E: Scope is limited to stack testing. Not method-specific. We would accredit by "point source" matrix.

Scott S: - 7.6 Pre-assessment document. Same as what we've done so far with interim review; in alignment with 7036.

- 7.7.2.1 – Assessor should not sign any waiver of responsibility for FSMO. Insurance will ask for a waiver of subrogation.

Angie: Wouldn't STAC carry insurance?

Scott E: Notes are not controlling – we would need to change the language from "shall not".

Scott S: - 7.7.5 – this section is substantially different.

Scott E: I don't see divergence.

Scott S: "observe field sampling and measurement practice"

Scott E: ASTM is not an accreditation standard. ASTM simply a stack testing implementation of ISO 17025. They are intended to be the same. To have credibility to the outside world, we must use FSMO or ISO as criteria for the accrediting body.

Scott S: If we use ISO 17011, would we need an ISO audit?

Scott E: No – it's about recognition as an accrediting body to outside organizations (like Texas and Louisiana).

Jim: - 7.6.1(b) – requirement to do audits every 2 years.

Scott E: We need to request interpretation on this topic. Language “typically” – therefore not a requirement. It was the intention of STAC to have a 5 year accreditation period with 2 audits – an initial audit and one follow-up. TNI is trying to form a stack testers expert committee. I think this is a good idea.

Jim: We don’t want that to be mostly regulatory personnel, like audit program committee.

Scott E: Any other issues?

Scott S: We can’t vote to approve until language issues resolved. Now is the time to review these so Scott can present our ideas next week. We’ll adjourn and continue this discussion in 2 weeks.