Meeting Minutes
National Work Group on Leak Detection
June 4-5, 1993, Kansas City

See attached sheet for attenders.

Ground rules established during the course of the meeting:

* Minutes will be taken at each meeting, with responsibility rotating from meeting to meeting.
* Decisions will be made by a majority of a quorum of at least 7 members.
* The group check to identify any efforts by any vendors and evaluators to unduly influence the actions of the work group.
* A substitute member attending can vote if the substitute is from the state UST agency.
* The position of Vice Chair, is established to fill in if Chair cannot attend or participate.
* Both Chair and Vice Chair are elected annually, with changeover scheduled for January 1.
* Tie votes are broken by having the acting Chair abstain.
* Chair will fill vacancy according to established procedures. Until these procedures are completed, Chair will nominate replacements, the Group will vote on confirmation.

The group discussed a couple of questions: the extent to which the Chair (or Backup) speaks for his or her agency, and whether or not EPA employees should serve as Chair or backup. Baylson and Wiley will look into further and report at next meeting.

Group Purpose

There was a lot of discussion on the purpose of the group and the problems that the group should tackle. A proposed purpose was to identify and recommend needed changes or additions to the set of EPA protocols. In the end, the group unanimously adopted this mission:

> The mission of the work group is to review release detection equipment/procedures evaluations to determine if each evaluation was performed in accordance with an acceptable protocol, to ensure that the equipment/procedures meet EPA performance standards.
>
> To make the results of such reviews available to interested parties.

Highlights

Mike Kadri volunteered to be Vice Chair and the Group accepted.

Region 10 list will continue to be maintained independently until such time as Region 10 decides to do something different. If Region 10 decides to phase out its list, it will notify vendors

in writing.

Legal concerns, and ways to avoid problems, were discussed. On a case by case basis, a group member must recuse himself or herself from direct involvement in the review of any evaluation in which he or she has a conflict of interest. Group members should also make sure their work stays within their scope of employment, to avoid potential individual liability.

Group will work on developing a List of "acceptable" evaluations, which will be draft initially, and will indicate a deadline for submittals for new or changed information for the final. Each version of list will be dated. The List should have a disclaimer statement to the effect that additions or deletions may happen if: new information becomes available; if EPA performance standards change; or if there are changes in the EPA protocols. The list will contain equipment/procedures for which protocols now exist, and will not exclude those whose protocols will potentially be changed.

Initial mailout will include cover letter from Chair, where to send 4 copies of any new evaluations (and new protocols, if applicable), mission statement, Region 10 list or variant to serve as a starting place.

Teams will use criteria derived from information obtained from states. The review of a new protocol will be done at same time as review of the associated new evaluation. For now, new **protocols will be reviewed on an individual basis.**

Wiley will discuss with EPA's Edison lab what assistance they could provide in the review of new protocols, particularly

"Existing" evaluations are those in existence before 6/5/93. Those on or after this date are "New."

Scott volunteers to receive evaluations and documentation and also serve as a repository. A need to log receipt of documents was identified.

A team of Nelson (lead), Farahnak, and Ritcherson will take input from Group members and States and draft a review checklist to be used to ensure that reviews are consistent.

The format of information provided should be similar to California's, with 1 page per evaluation and also a summary list broken down by technology. This has proven helpful to inspectors.

If communication is of a formal nature, it will be through Chair. Clarifications and requests for information can be between individual members and vendors or evaluators, preferably by fax.

Communication of findings will be by a copy to each State, each EPA Region, and EPA HQ. EPA can place in UST Hotline or Docket so that requestors could receive a copy.

Group is still looking for a better name. Suggestions for a better one should be forwarded to Johnson by 6/30/93.

Next meeting will be in Washington, D.C. area, November 5-6

Teams for reviewing evaluations:

Team	Lead	Members
1. Volumetric	DeHaas	Brauksieck, Scott
2. Non-Volumetric	Farahnak	Nelson, Brauksieck, Scott
3. ATGS	Martinets	Johnson/Ritcherson, Bradley
4. SIR	Bradley	Nelson, Martinets, Johnson/Ritcherson
5. Vapor	Kadri	Wiley
6. Liquid	Wiley	Kadri
7. Pipeline	Johnson/ Ritcherson	DeHaas, Farahnak
8. Other	Nelson	Kadri, Wiley
A. Cable		
B. Contin. ATG		Farahnak
C. Pt. sensor		

Schedule:

Activity	Responsibility	Date
Mail package out	Johnson	7/6
Deadline for input	Commenters	8/5
Draft review checklist	Nelson, Farahnak, Ritcherson	9/3
Review, using criteria, and send out draft	Each team	10/4
Next meeting		11/5 - 11/6
Feedback on EPAers as Chairs	Wiley/Baylson	"
Explore Edison assistance	Wiley	"
Draft procedures on filling vacancies	Johnson	not spec.

Minutes respectfully submitted 6/21/93 by David Wiley.

Attachment