

# MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the National Work Group  
For Leak Detection Evaluations

FROM: Mike Kadri

SUBJECT: Minutes of the Meeting Held in Portland Maine on September 21 & 22, 1995

The meeting was called to order at about 9:00 a.m. by Curt Johnson who asked David Wiley to update the group about the status of the printing and distribution of the final list.

Mr. Wiley reported that he was able to expedite the printing of the list on good quality paper, two sided and three-hole punched and wrapped, using the text that was mailed out to the members of the work group. This list was placed on the Clu-In network and to the best of his knowledge the distribution of this list is already underway.

Ellen and Shahla expressed some dissatisfaction with the text which they have received and indicated that they did not send corrections because the number of corrections would have been excessive and they were discouraged about making these corrections and sending them on time.

Lamar stated that Tony must have been overwhelmed with all the changes which were sent to him by all the group members, while he was trying to reformat the electronic text from Word Perfect into Microsoft Word and introducing what he perceived to be enhancements to the listing format itself.

Beth indicated that she was under the impression that it would be difficult to get the list out so expeditiously.

David agreed in principle and stated that he would check during the break on the status of the mailing out.

Shahla inquired about the corrections she had sent on disk and hard copy to Tony. Curt replied that Tony had indicated to him that he was unable to read the disk which arrived somewhat late and did not mention anything about the hard copy.

Russ suggested that the group may be able to send an addendum with the changes especially if the list is already mailed out.

David indicated that he would be in favor of doing that rather than stopping the mailing process.

Lamar asked about the format of the updating process and Curt replied that the minutes indicate that the group decided to send only replacement and additional pages and not the whole document.

Beth expressed some concern about the fact that the changes and instructions she has worked on for a major part of a day and forwarded to Tony were misunderstood.

Shahla was not aware that the group wanted to split some of the categories and add new ones. This, in Shahla's opinion has added to Tony's work and caused some mix-ups.

Curt suggested that changes be made in the meeting and finalized and all changes that are not completed during the meeting will be forwarded directly to Curt who will forward a copy to Tony and check that the changes are made properly. Group consensus.

David reported that the list is already printed but has not been mailed yet. A discussion ensued about what to do next and the group decided that a replacement mailout of an estimated 30-40 sheets will be necessary once the group completes all the corrections and changes to the present list. Shahla offered to make the changes and reprint the whole list for hard copy distribution and send David and Curt copies and also a copy for the Clu-In network. David was not sure that he wanted to accept Shahla's offer yet. He indicated that he will stop the mailing of the present copies and he will withdraw the Clu-In current copy, and see if can expedite the printing of the revised copy for distribution.

Flow chart on how to update the list was considered next. It was suggested by Curt that Team leaders send the revisions and additions to Curt, Curt will make a copy for Toni to process and check to make sure the changes and additions are properly made, then Curt will forward a copy to David and David will forward a copy to Clu-In.

It was suggested that a hard copy of the changed portions should be mailed back to the team leaders to check and make sure that the changes are made properly. The team leader will have no more than ten working days to respond before Curt considers the changes to be acceptable. Group consensus.

Flow chart will be as follows: Team leaders will send the revisions or additions to Curt, Curt will forward a copy to Tony, Tony will make the changes or additions and return to Curt for his review, Curt will send a hard copy to the team leader for review and comment within ten working days, Curt will forward the changed or added pages to David, David will put on Clu-In.

David shared some information about the tentative plan for the upcoming EPA annual conference planned for March 11, 12, and 13 in Chicago. Curt asked David to arrange for a meeting room for the work group for the afternoon of the March 13, and the morning of March 14.

Ellen suggested a development of a questionnaire to be sent to state program directors about the utilization of the list by inspectors in the field. The group decided that Ellen should prepare the questionnaire.

Randy volunteered to prepare a brief summary of each of the Non-EPA protocols reviewed to be included in the list.

Beth suggested that the group should purge the under-review methods after sending a registered letter to the vendors giving them a deadline for providing the requested information before deleting their products from the under review list. Group consensus.

Concern was raised by Randy regarding the review of evaluations of products and systems which were evaluated under the new protocols which were found acceptable to the work group. This prompted a review of the assignments of the work group members. Curt accepted to stay as the chairperson, Tom accepted to be the secretary for the next meeting, and the following changes were made in the New-Protocols Teams: David withdrew from the Continuous ATG, Large Tank ATG, Large Tank Volumetric, and Maintaining Pressure or Vacuum on Doublewalled Tanks. Russ joined the Large Tank ATG, Beth joined the Large Tank Volumetric, Mike joined the Maintaining Pressure or Vacuum on Doublewalled Tanks and a new team was formed for Large Pipelines consisting of Tom and Mike.

Ellen suggested that the group should get involved in the marketing of the list. Shahla indicated that California provides training on the utilization of the list during their annual conference. It was suggested that David and Curt prepare an article for publishing in UST related magazines.

David reminded the work group members that he would like the Cost & Benefit questionnaire back as soon as possible.

The work group broke into teams to work on making changes to the latest list and give the red marked pages to Curt.

The meeting came to order at 9:00 a.m. on September 22, 1995.

Randy provided the group with a summary of the Large Pipeline Protocol which was recently reviewed and found to be acceptable by the team.

Shahla provided the group with a summary of the progress made on the Continuous ATG protocol and proposed addendums and alternates. She encouraged group members to provide their comments and reviews to Randy and who will finalize the group's acceptance with MRI by November first. She also would like to receive comments on the addendum's by November first.

Randy provided an update on the Large Tank Protocol and the practical limitations involved such as the temperature changes during the third party evaluation. Russ provided some comments regarding the accounting for the groundwater table elevation, trying for a minimum detectable leak rate and providing a chart or graph which correlated the systems detection capability with tank size, diameter or depth with leak rate (ratio), testing at different times of the day or other naturally occurring temperature changes and monitoring the effects of the temperature change. Allow only the standard protocol for up to 75,000 gallon capacity tanks, one sided temperature changes under the standard protocol for tanks up to 100,000 gallons in capacity and allow the proposed protocol for tanks with capacities greater than 100,000 gallons. Discussion followed mostly in agreement with these comments.

Lamar updated the group on the latest SIR effort, an EPA project to compile a database for SIR evaluations and ultimately rewrite the protocol. Ken Wilcox has an EPA grant to head this project and will work with a small group convened to review his work. This group had just finished meeting in Las Vegas. Environmental Canada has also been developing a protocol and is involved in the data collection effort. Randy indicated that SIR vendors would probably want to be evaluated under the new protocol once it is developed.

David indicated that he observed that the indication is that there was no interest among the large petroleum marketers in new leak detection methods.