To: Anna. Kelley (Anna.Kelley@hamilton-co.org)[Anna.Kelley@hamilton-co.org]
From: McGrath, Jesse
Sent: Thur 11/6/2014 4:56:26 PM
Subject: FW: Precision and Bias Checks

Looks like Mike takes the strict interpretation.

I'll have to talk to him on the phone later. I've been suddenly asked to present this concept.

From: Papp, Michael
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2014 5:53 AM
To: McGrath, Jesse
Subject: Precision and Bias Checks

From the validation template

Observations that do not meet each and every criterion on the ***Critical Criteria Table*** *should be invalidated unless there are compelling reason and justification for not doing so. The sample or group of samples for which one or more of these criteria are not met is invalid until proven otherwise. The cause of not operating in the acceptable range for each of the violated criteria must be investigated and minimized to reduce the likelihood that additional samples will be invalidated.*

Any check listed as critical should be invalidated back to the last acceptable check. We may allow one check that just over the acceptance limit in but that's up to you.

The requirements are pretty clear. Some have abused this and now are paying the price.

Now there are other precision check (Like PM2.5 collocation) that represent a grander scale of precision for the PQAO that is not critical but operational. In this case you have more leeway to trouble shoot to determine issues.

A failure of an NPAP audit by itself would not be cause for invalidation but further follow-up.
Hope this helps.

Mike Papp

EPA

Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards

Ambient Air Monitoring Group

Research Triangle Park, NC

919-541-2408