

## **Laboratory Accreditation System Executive Committee Meeting Minutes September 23, 2014**

### 1) Welcome and Roll Call

Judy Morgan welcomed everyone to the meeting. Those in attendance are recorded in Attachment A. In the absence of a quorum, approval of minutes from July 22 was postponed.

### 2) Updates

#### SIR Subcommittee and Clarifications (Formerly FAQs)

The subcommittee met immediately before this meeting, and approved two new interpretations for posting to the AC's voting site. Additionally, they addressed comments on four SIRs from ABs – three of which were to correct either citations or punctuation. The fourth interpretation seemed to contradict current practices and reasonable use of Lab Information Systems by creating an excessive volume of sample numbers, and thus was returned to the LAB Expert Committee for reconsideration. A number of SIRs are in the final stage of voting (2-week notice to ABs that have not voted, since they already have two-thirds approval) and unless a veto vote is cast, those will be complete and posted as completed interpretations. Once these approved SIRs are removed from the voting site, there will be only the five revised SIRs remaining – a record low number since TNI was formed!

Members of this subcommittee are Kristin Brown, Kirstin Daigle, Bill Hall, Carl Kircher, Judy Morgan/Chair and Gale Warren, with staff support provided by Lynn.

Judy noted that the existing clarifications will be reformatted with the new name and the disclaimer as required by the Guidance SOP 1-105, and circulated to the committee. There are three new SIR submissions that need to be developed as clarifications, and Judy will ask by email for a volunteer to draft each of those.

Judy will also contact the Policy Committee Chair about that groups' stated requirement that all clarifications undergo review by a member of the relevant Expert Committee to ensure no conflict with the standard. This seems likely to introduce an exceptionally long review cycle that contradicts the purpose of creating these clarifications and makes them as complicated as if they were valid SIRs in the first place.

We discussed how to display approved clarifications on the TNI website – whether within the TNI Standards button (associated with interpretations) or less prominently, under the Professional and Technical Resources button. Committee members expressed a strong preference for having them be co-located with approved interpretations, or accessible from that page (by referring to the precise section clarified.)

Members of this Ad Hoc group are Carl Kircher, Kristin Brown, Bill Hall, Barbara Escobar, Mitzi Miller and Judy Morgan/Chair.

### Assessment Forum and Mentor Session

Betsy was unable to attend, but sent by email a summary of the comments and ratings from the Mentor Session evaluation forms. That information is in Attachment C. Attendance was low, but this session was scheduled against the joint committee meeting to discuss the 2015 standard development, adoption and implementation, which we knew would impact attendance.

Barbara briefly reviewed the Assessment Forum sessions at conference (NOTE: if/when I find her email summarizing the evaluation forms, I will revise these minutes by including that as Attachment D.) Attendance was good at both morning and afternoon sessions, and participants felt that the presentations were excellent. Attendance was better than for the Mentor Session but still lower than sometimes; participants noted that there were too many competing sessions. Barbara is ready to begin planning for the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary conference at Crystal City now and especially, since she cannot be there, she would appreciate a volunteer to moderate the Forum sessions.

Topics suggested by attendees, and under consideration, are a conversation between labs and ABs about the “lack of harmonization” of current standard implementation. Another possibility offered is determination of the MRL (as different from MDL) and how this might usefully coincide with the new Method Update Rule. A third option, probably better for summer 2015, is about how to ensure that QC criteria are met and which ones must be followed for “**Standard Methods**” (both the publication and its individual methods.)

### Joint Committee Session about Standards at Conference

Judy noted that the summary of this session was circulated to committee members, both as draft and then final form. The LAS EC’s takeaway from this session is that our initial review needs to happen after the first comment period, or in other words, at the Voting Draft Standard stage. We discussed how the consensus standard gets implemented as if it were regulation, and needs to be worded so that regulatory enforcement is possible, but also that committee review is a lengthier process than an individual’s review, and the four-week voting period is not adequate for a thorough committee review to occur. Perhaps once, with extraordinary effort, but not with all the different modules appearing over the next year, that’s simply too much effort to ask of volunteers.

We discussed possible better ways to review future standards – breaking them into sections and assigning workgroups to each, holding extra teleconference meetings – and noted that the presently-required rapid turnaround time handicaps all of the possibilities identified thus far. The CSD EC’s Standards Development SOP 2-100 builds in ample time for committee writing processes but does not address committee review processes in any way.

We also noted that the PT standards are re-opened for vote, by decision of the Board, and considered whether or not LAS EC should now attempt a rapid review of V1M1 and V2M2 during the remainder of the voting period, but decided that it would be inappropriate.

A large part of the decision NOT TO REVIEW the PT modules now was that we learned, with the Calibration Interim Standard, there is no provision for addressing “committee

comments” so that even if LAS EC were to put forth extraordinary effort to complete such review in the remaining 3 weeks, we have no assurance that our comments would have any more weight than an individual’s comments. NOTE: this is another issue to discuss with CSD EC.

### 3) Next Meeting

The next meeting of the LAS EC will be on Tuesday, October 28, 2014, at 1:30 pm Eastern. Teleconference information and an agenda with any other materials will be sent the week before.

Action Items are included in Attachment B.

## Attachment A

**PARTICIPANTS --TNI LABORATORY ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE**

	<b>NAME</b>	<b>EMAIL</b>	<b>TERM, End Date</b>	<b>INTEREST</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>	<b>S/H CATEGORY</b>	<b>PRESENT</b>
1	Judy Morgan, Chair	<a href="mailto:JMorgan@esclabsciences.com">JMorgan@esclabsciences.com</a>	3 years, 12/15	Chair (all)	Environmental Science Corp.	Lab/FSMO	Yes
2	Ann Marie Allen	<a href="mailto:ann.marie.allen@state.ma.us">ann.marie.allen@state.ma.us</a>	2 years, 12/14	Assmt Forum, StdsRev	Massachusetts DEP	non-NELAP AB	Yes
3	JoAnn Boyd	<a href="mailto:jboyd@swri.org">jboyd@swri.org</a>	3 years, 12/16	StdsRev	Southwest Research Inst.	Lab/FSMO	No
4	Kristin Brown	<a href="mailto:kristinbrown@utah.gov">kristinbrown@utah.gov</a>	2 years, 2/14	SIRs/Assmt Forum/FAQ	UT Bur. of Lab Improvement	NELAP AB	Yes
5	David Caldwell	<a href="mailto:david.caldwell@deq.ok.gov">david.caldwell@deq.ok.gov</a>	2 years, 12/14	Assmt Forum	OK DEQ	Non-NELAP AB	Yes
6	Barbara Escobar	<a href="mailto:Barbara.Escobar@pima.gov">Barbara.Escobar@pima.gov</a>	3 years, 12/15	Mentor, AssmtFrm, FAQ	Pima County, AZ	Lab/FSMO	Yes
7	Jack Farrell	<a href="mailto:aex@ix.netcom.com">aex@ix.netcom.com</a>	3 years, 12/16	Assmt Forum, StdsRev	Analytical Excellence	Other	No
8	Carol Haines	<a href="mailto:haines.carol@epa.gov">haines.carol@epa.gov</a>	3 years, 12/15	Stds Rev, ad hocs	EPA Region 10	Other	No
9	Bill Hall	<a href="mailto:George.Hall@des.nh.gov">George.Hall@des.nh.gov</a>	3 years, 12/16	SIRs,FAQs	NH ELAP	NELAP AB	No
10	Betsy Kent	<a href="mailto:bkent@rcid.org">bkent@rcid.org</a>	3 years, 12/15	Mentor Sessions	Reedy Improv. District, FL	Lab/FSMO	No
11	Carl Kircher	<a href="mailto:carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us">carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us</a>	3 years, 12/15	SIRs, FAQs	FL DOH	NELAP AB	Yes
12	Mitzi Miller	<a href="mailto:mitzi.miller@moellerinc.com">mitzi.miller@moellerinc.com</a>	2 years, 12/14	FAQs	Dade Moeller, Inc	Other	No
13	William Ray	<a href="mailto:Bill_Ray@williamrayllc.com">Bill_Ray@williamrayllc.com</a>	2 years, 12/14		Wm Ray Consultants	Other	No
14	Kim Sandrock	<a href="mailto:Kim.Sandrock@state.mn.us">Kim.Sandrock@state.mn.us</a>	3 years, 12/15	Training	MN ELAP	NELAP AB	No
15	Carol Schrenkel	<a href="mailto:CSchrenkel@suburbantestinglabs.com">CSchrenkel@suburbantestinglabs.com</a>	3 years, 12/16	Mentor, Ass. Forum		Other	No
Ex Officio							
	Elizabeth Turner	<a href="mailto:eturner@ntmwd.com">eturner@ntmwd.com</a>		Ex Officio	Small Lab Issues	North TX Mun. Water District	No

Associate Members							
	Aaren Alger	<a href="mailto:aaalger@state.pa.us">aaalger@state.pa.us</a>			PA DEP	NELAP AB	No
	Carol Barrick	<a href="mailto:cabarrick@msn.com">cabarrick@msn.com</a> , <a href="mailto:Carol.Barrick@mosaicco.com">Carol.Barrick@mosaicco.com</a>			FCC Environmental	Lab/FSMO	No
	Kirstin Daigle	<a href="mailto:kirstin.daigle@testamericainc.com">kirstin.daigle@testamericainc.com</a>		SIRs	TestAmerica, Inc.	Lab/FSMO	No
	George Detsis	<a href="mailto:george.detsis@eh.doe.gov">george.detsis@eh.doe.gov</a>		Assmt Forum	US DOE	Other	No
	Myron Gunsalus	<a href="mailto:ngunsalus@kdheks.gov">ngunsalus@kdheks.gov</a>			KS Lab Accred.	NELAP AB	Yes
	Kitty Kong	<a href="mailto:Kitty.Kong@chevron.com">Kitty.Kong@chevron.com</a>			Chevron	Other	No
	Christelle Newsome	<a href="mailto:cnewsome@c2nassociates.com">cnewsome@c2nassociates.com</a>			C2N Associates, Inc.	Other	No
	Gale Warren	<a href="mailto:ggw01@health.state.ny.us">ggw01@health.state.ny.us</a>		SIRs	NY ELAP	NELAP AB	No
	Program Admin. Lynn Bradley	<a href="mailto:Lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org">Lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org</a>					Yes

**Attachment B**

**Action Items – LAS EC**

	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Expected Completion</b>	<b>Actual Completion / Comments</b>
24	Consolidate “clarifications” for approval and circulate to LAS members	Judy	September 2014	
25	Conduct email vote on SIR SOP 3-105	Lynn	July 2014	Completed, passed
26	Formally re-transmit SIR SOP 3-105 and Standards Review SOP 3-106 to Policy Committee for final approval	Lynn	August 2014	Both SIRs approved by Policy and are pending Board approval
27	Prepare, polish and print flyers about Assessment Forum for conference	Barbara/Judy	July 2014	OBE
28	Draft language to provide to Chemistry Committee about “remove and replace” for points in a calibration curve, in the Calibration IS.	Judy, with input from committee members	October 1 – draft circulated 10/25/14	
29	Talk with Policy Chair about process for approving Clarifications	Judy	Prior to October LAS meeting	
30	Talk with CSD EC Chair and Program Administrator about process revisions. Specific issues are: 1 -- permit adequate time for LAS EC to review upcoming standards revisions 2 – build in that time at a stage when changes can still be accomplished to address problematic language 3 – consider whether to handle TNI committee reviews of developing standards in some parallel process that may allow either additional time or additional weight for those comments, or both	Judy/Lynn	Prior to October LAS meeting , hopefully at Strategic Planning session	

## Attachment C

### Summary of the feedback for the Mentor Session: Ten (10) Evaluations Forms Received

#### Attendees

Laboratory Directors/Supervisors = 4

QAO = 3

Chemist = 1

Microbiologist = 1

Anonymous = 1

**Average Years' Experience** = 16 (Range = 5 – 25 years)

Scale for the following -1 to 5 with 1 being poor and 5 being excellent

#### About the Presenters (average response):

The Presenters were prepared – 4.6

The presenters demonstrated good working knowledge of the subject matter – 4.8

The presenters had good presentation skills – 4.7

The presenters were responsive to the attendee's questions – 4.7

Overall, the presenters did an effective job – 4.7

#### Content (average response)

The Mentor Session content was relevant to your professional needs – 4.7

The material was covered at an appropriate pace – 4.1

Comment: *Not enough time, lots of information*

Visual aids were helpful in understanding the material – 4.5

Overall, the Mentor Session met your needs and expectations – 4.7

#### General Comments and Suggestions

##### What Mentor Session Topics would you like to suggest for future sessions?

MDL and LOQ

Calibration and calibration records

Data review techniques

Specific method auditing/How to audit specific methods

##### What Training Topics would you suggest for on-line webinars?

Training records presented in Mentor Session was really good. Could do a Webinar.

SOP Writing and what should be in a SOP

Records keeping

Data Integrity Training

EPA Method Update information

Standard Methods Information

##### Have you participated in a TNI on-line webinar? If yes, please write in the topic and rate the webinar.

Several. Corrective action, Calibration Standard – 5

Done a couple on-line webinars (topics not specified) – 5

MDLs and LOQs, Data Integrity, 2012 Method Update Rule – 4  
Several (topics not specified) – 4  
Future of Accreditation – 3

**Preferred Training Format(s) ( select all formats preferred):**

In Person “Live” Training - 5  
Webinar - 5  
Webcast - 2  
Other

**Do you plan on participating in a TNI Training Session in the next 12 months:**

Yes – 8  
No – 0  
No response – 2

**Additional Comments:**

Assessment Forum and Mentor Session are the most valuable at the Lab Forums. Too bad other important sessions are scheduled at the same time.

Thanks!

No comment – 8