

## Summary of the NELAP Accreditation Council Meeting

January 9, 2017 1:30 pm Eastern

### 1. Roll Call and Approval of Minutes

The NELAP Accreditation Council (AC) met at 1:30 pm on Monday, January 9, 2017. This meeting was rescheduled due to January 2 being the official New Year's holiday. Those present are listed in Attachment 1. Minutes of December 12, 2016, were approved with the edit that Stephanie Drier was present.

### 2. Action Items Pending

None

### 3. Review and Acceptance of Revised NPW and SCM FoPT Tables

The Chair of the PT Program Executive Committee, Maria Friedman, had sent revised Field of Proficiency Testing (FoPT) tables for both Non-potable Water (NPW) and Solid & Chemical Materials (SCM) to the AC for its approval shortly after the second December meeting. The changes proposed are as follows:

#### NPW FoPT Table

- 1) Under Base/Neutrals, removed 3,3-Dichlorobenzidine (Analyte Request Application sponsored by NYDOH)
- 2) Under Petroleum Hydrocarbons, corrected TNI Analyte Code for non-Polar Extractable Material (TPH) from 1935 to 1853 (NHDES request)

#### SCM FoPT Table

- 1) Under Volatile Halocarbons and Medium Level Volatile Halocarbons, added cis- and trans-1,3-Dichloropropene in low- and medium-level concentration ranges (Analyte Request Application sponsored by FLDOH)
- 2) Under Misc Analytes, corrected TNI Analyte Code for Cyanide, total from 1635 to 1645 (NHDES and PT Provider request)
- 3) Under PCBs in Oil, added Aroclors 1221, 1232, and 1248 (Analyte Request Application sponsored by FLDOH)
- 4) Updated concentrations and acceptance criteria for numerous analytes as a result of routine FoPT review of the entire SCM FoPT Table

Carl moved and Scott seconded that both tables be accepted as presented. One AB inquired about whether other ABs would track the additional aroclors individually, and the discussion points were that at least one AB expects labs to run either aroclors in oil OR in soil, but not in both, and if labs do choose to do both, they must pass both in order to pass aroclors. The issue of low and medium concentrations for 1,3-dichloropropene is intended to be two separate PTs, and scored independently. Once again, participants noted that some ABs track PTs by method/matrix/analyte and others by matrix/technology.

Voting was by roll call, with all present voting yes, except that NY asked to vote by email and LA DHH will be invited to vote by email due to being absent (12 yes votes recorded at the close of the meeting.)

#### **4. LASEC Recommendation to Accept Revised PT Module (V1M1) with Technical Clarifications**

After the discussion of, and agreement upon, proposed edits to V1M1 at the November 7, 2016, AC meeting, LASEC prepared, approved and proposed to the AC a formal recommendation to accept V1M1 as revised (see Attachment 2.)

Carl moved and Scott seconded that this recommendation be accepted and approved by the AC. A brief discussion took place about the meaning of the added “note”, with one AB expressing continued frustration about the inconsistency of how different ABs track and accept PT results.

Voting was by roll call, with all present voting yes, except that NH asked to vote by email and LA DHH will be invited to vote by email due to being absent (12 yes votes recorded at the close of the meeting.)

#### **5. Recommendation from NJ Evaluation Team to Restore Full Recognition**

The final report from NJ, in December, was found acceptable by the ET, and a recommendation to remove NJ from provisional status and restore full recognition was delivered to the AC. The materials were distributed by email before the meeting, although Aaren neither received any of those messages nor did she get notice that they were not delivered. Between the Lead Evaluator and Lynn, three emails were sent with only one “rejection” message returned. For this reason, Aaren asked that Paul summarize the recommendation for participants.

Paul moved and Carl seconded to accept the recommendation from the team to restore full recognition to NJ. Voting was by roll call, with all present voting (NJ abstained, so 12 yes votes) and the absent LA DHH representative asked to vote by email.

#### **6. Planning for Conference**

All ABs except the two from Louisiana will be represented at conference, but NY will have an “information only” person present. Teleconference capability will be provided, and the session will take place at 8 am local time on Wednesday, January 25.

Aaren summarized her expectation for the meeting agenda:

Update on evaluations

Update on implementation of the standard, including the transition to the next revision

Discussion of the Volume 2 update

#### **7. Follow-Up about the Chemistry Module**

Aaren also noted that the Chemistry Expert Committee wants to resolve all needed technical clarification edits to the Chemistry module (V1M4) prior to reopening the module for revision, so that the revision can be limited to only those sections with unresolved issues (small portions of the standard.) This should ensure that the revision proceeds rapidly and without

controversy. She encouraged all ABs to communicate with the Chemistry Chair, Val Slaven, and the Program Administrator, Ken Jackson, to clarify their outstanding objections and what solution they wish to see implemented, including specific wording if possible.

Aaren also clarified that the AC will not vote on adoption of a new Volume 1 until the issues with V1M4 are fully resolved.

## 8. **Next Meeting**

The next teleconference meeting of the Council will be on Monday, February 6, 2017, at 1:30 pm Eastern time. Teleconference information and meeting materials will be distributed with the meeting reminder.

**Teleconference capability will be available for two meetings involving the AC, at conference -- the full NELAP AC session on Wednesday morning, January 25, 8-10 am Central time and a special meeting with EPA drinking water program officials on Wednesday, January 25, at 12:30 pm Central time (this meeting will be invitation only, with all AB representatives invited – please eat your buffet lunch in the main room and move to the meeting room as quickly as possible after eating.) For both meetings, the teleconference number will be 1-218-339-7800, and the passcode 155258# and the lunchtime meeting will be in the same room as the AC morning session (Regency C.)**

An additional sidebar meeting will take place among Advocacy Committee, the NELAP AC and the LAB Expert Committee on Tuesday, January 24 at noon, local time. Teleconference capability will not be available for this meeting. For this meeting, participants should collect their food from the buffet line and bring it to the room designated on the ticket in your registration packet.

NELAP Evaluator Training will begin at 4 pm on Wednesday, January 25 and conclude about noon on Thursday, January 26. A webinar version of the training will be provided, no later than March 2017 for those unable to participate in person.

**Attachment 1**

STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	PRESENT
FL	Carl Kircher E: <a href="mailto:carl.kircher@flhealth.gov">carl.kircher@flhealth.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate: Vanessa Soto E: <a href="mailto:Vanessa.sotocontreras@flhealth.gov">Vanessa.sotocontreras@flhealth.gov</a>	No
IL	Celeste Crowley T: 217-557-0274 F: 217-524-6169 E: <a href="mailto:celeste.crowley@illinois.gov">celeste.crowley@illinois.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate: Becky Hambelton Rebecca.Hambelton@Illinois.gov	Yes
	For information purposes: Kathy Marshall Kathy.Marshall@Illinois.gov	
	For information purposes: John South John.South@illinois.gov	
KS	N. Myron Gunsalus <a href="tel:785-291-3162">785-291-3162</a> E: <a href="mailto:ngunsalus@ks.gov">ngunsalus@ks.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate: Sara Hoffman <a href="mailto:shoffman@ks.gov">shoffman@ks.gov</a>	Yes
LA DEQ	Paul Bergeron T: 225-219-3247 E: <a href="mailto:Paul.Bergeron@la.gov">Paul.Bergeron@la.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate: TBD	
LA DHH	Steve Martin, <a href="mailto:stephen.martin@la.gov">stephen.martin@la.gov</a> 225-219-5235	No
	Alternate: TBD	
MN	Lynn Boysen E: <a href="mailto:lynn.boysen@state.mn.us">lynn.boysen@state.mn.us</a>	Yes
	Alternate: Stephanie Drier 651-201-5326 E: <a href="mailto:stephanie.drier@state.mn.us">stephanie.drier@state.mn.us</a>	Yes

NH	Bill Hall T: (603) 271-2998 F: (603) 271-5171 E: <a href="mailto:george.hall@des.nh.gov">george.hall@des.nh.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate: Tyler Croteau <a href="mailto:Tyler.Croteau@des.nh.gov">Tyler.Croteau@des.nh.gov</a>	No
NJ	Michele Potter T: (609) 984-3870 F: (609) 777-1774 E: <a href="mailto:michele.potter@dep.nj.gov">michele.potter@dep.nj.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate : Rachel Ellis E: <a href="mailto:rachel.ellis@dep.nj.gov">rachel.ellis@dep.nj.gov</a>	No
NY	Mike Ryan T: (518) 473-3424 F: (518) 485-5568 E: <a href="mailto:michael.ryan@health.ny.gov">michael.ryan@health.ny.gov</a>	No
	Alternate: Victoria Pretti <a href="mailto:victoria.pretti@health.ny.gov">victoria.pretti@health.ny.gov</a>	Yes
	Included for information purposes: Lynn McNaughton <a href="mailto:lynn.mcnaughton@health.ny.gov">lynn.mcnaughton@health.ny.gov</a>	No
OR	Scott Hoatson Agency Quality Assurance Officer Oregon Department of Environmental Quality 503-693-5786 E: <a href="mailto:hoatson.scott@deq.state.or.us">hoatson.scott@deq.state.or.us</a>	Yes
	Lizbeth Garcia <a href="mailto:Lizbeth.garcia@dhsosha.state.or.us">Lizbeth.garcia@dhsosha.state.or.us</a>	No
	Included for information purposes: Stephanie Ringsage, Manager, Laboratory Compliance Section 503-693-4126 <a href="mailto:stephanie.b.ringsage@state.or.us">stephanie.b.ringsage@state.or.us</a>	No
PA	Aaren Alger T: (717) 346-8212 F: (717) 346-8590 E: <a href="mailto:aaalger@pa.gov">aaalger@pa.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate: Yumi Creason E: <a href="mailto:ycreason@pa.gov">ycreason@pa.gov</a>	No
TX	Ken Lancaster T: (512) 239-1990 E: <a href="mailto:Ken.Lancaster@tceq.texas.gov">Ken.Lancaster@tceq.texas.gov</a>	Yes
	Julie Eldredge E: <a href="mailto:Julie.Eldredge@tceq.texas.gov">Julie.Eldredge@tceq.texas.gov</a>	Yes

UT	Kristin Brown T: <a href="tel:(801)965-2540">(801) 965-2540</a> F: <a href="tel:(801)965-2544">(801) 965-2544</a> E: <a href="mailto:kristinbrown@utah.gov">kristinbrown@utah.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate: Jill Jones T: (801) 965-3899 E: <a href="mailto:jilljones@utah.gov">jilljones@utah.gov</a>	No
VA	Cathy Westerman T: 804-648-4480 ext.391 E: <a href="mailto:cathy.westerman@dgs.virginia.gov">cathy.westerman@dgs.virginia.gov</a>	Yes
	Alternate: Ed Shaw T: 804-648-4480 ext.152 E: <a href="mailto:ed.shaw@dgs.virginia.gov">ed.shaw@dgs.virginia.gov</a>	No
NELAP AC PA and EC	Lynn Bradley T: 540-885-5736 E: <a href="mailto:lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org">lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org</a>	Yes
EPA Liaison	Donna Ringel T: 732-321-4383 E: <a href="mailto:Ringel.Donna@epa.gov">Ringel.Donna@epa.gov</a>	Yes
California	Christine Sotelo <a href="mailto:Christine.Sotelo@waterboards.ca.gov">Christine.Sotelo@waterboards.ca.gov</a>	No
Oklahoma	David Caldwell E: <a href="mailto:David.Caldwell@deq.ok.gov">David.Caldwell@deq.ok.gov</a>	Yes
Guests:	none	

## Attachment 2

### Recommendation of LASEC to NELAP AC

**TNI Standard V1M1, Proficiency Testing, revised technical clarifications to final version approved April 2016, as agreed upon with NELAP AC on November 7, 2016, and approved by PT Expert Committee at its November meeting, then submitted to LASEC on November 22, 2016, for review and formulation of revised recommendation to the NELAP AC.**

### APPROVED BY LASEC December 13, 2016

The LASEC has reviewed the re-edited Proficiency Testing Module V1M1 as revised and approved by the PT Expert Committee at its November, 2016, meeting and recommends that the NELAP AC find the revised edits in the accompanying version (approved by PT Expert Committee following the November 7 NELAP AC meeting) to be acceptable for addressing the objections identified during its August 2016 vote on LASEC's earlier recommendation, and addressing additional comments from the NELAP AC at its November 7, 2016, meeting.

The problems with the 2016 final version of this module, the further revisions requested by the NELAP AC on November 7, and the PT Expert Committee's revised proposed resolutions follow:

#### AB definition

The problem called "show-stopper" by at least two Accreditation Bodies is the definition of an Accreditation Body (AB) in the PT module of Volume 1. At least two modules of Volume 2 use a different definition, which would seem to override the V1 definition, since V2 is the module that applies to ABs. Simply deleting the V1M1 definition would resolve this issue.

*The definition of Accreditation Body has been deleted.*

#### SOPs relating to performing PTs

From §4.2.2, it seems that a lab could prepare and use an SOP that directs "different" treatment of PT samples, that would qualify as acceptable under this new language. For instance, a corporate QA/QC SOP might qualify as an "established" SOP rather than an SOP that actually meets the TNI standard requirements. Apparently, this change was made in an effort to condense the wording, and when later language was pointed out ("as used for analysis of routine samples"), concerns were eased, but the possible need for a Standards Interpretation Request (SIR) was raised. LASEC believes that approving standard language when we already recognize the need for clarification through submission of a SIR is not acceptable.

*The term "established" is replaced by the phrase "routine" in order to avoid the potential for a SIR in the future.*

#### Reporting PTs by technology instead of method

This is an area where ABs are not consistent, and the PT module of Volume 2 is silent about scoring of PTs. We recognize that the expert committee could not address this because the current scoring by

PT providers does not allow distinctions between method and technology. For instance, if there are 3 methods for one analyte, but only one technology (used in all three), there is no requirement to perform the PT analysis by all 3 methods, but if all 3 methods are run and one fails, the entire technology fails. The lab has to choose, currently, and balance the risks of failure by running only 1 analysis per technology.

Consensus is that the language is clear for what labs may do (run PTs by method or by technology) and is silent about how ABs must score the PTs. However, §4.3.4 requires clarification about what happens if a lab chooses to report PTs by method – this clarification could instead be made in the PT module of Volume 2 (V2M2) but needs to be addressed prior to adoption of the revised V1M1.

*A “note” was added to point out the risks of running PTs by technology rather than by method.*

### Successful PT

In §5.1.1(a), the expert committee needs to clarify what constitutes a “successful (acceptable scores) PT.”

*The “note” from V2M2 about this issue, copied directly into §5.1 and 5.2 of V1M1, used the phrase “real environmental samples.” The note was copied as requested, but the AC asked that “real” be replaced with “routine” in order to be consistent with other language in this module (i.e., “routine environmental samples.” The revised note reads:*

*“Note: “Acceptable” PT study scores from a PT Provider do not automatically result in a successful evaluation of a PT study by an AB. For example, failure to report an analytical method or reporting of an incorrect method, failure to provide the PT Provider with a release of results to the AB before the close of the study, failure to report results to the PT Provider before the closing date, failure to handle PT study samples in the same manner as **routine** environmental samples, etc. may be cause for an unsuccessful evaluation by an AB.”*