

Summary of the NELAP Accreditation Council Meeting
July 2, 2018 1:30 pm Eastern

1. Introductions

The NELAP Accreditation Council (AC) met at 1:30 pm on Monday, July 2, 2018. The minutes of June 4, 2018, were approved. Those present are listed in Attachment 1.

Ilona Taunton, another TNI Program Administrator, had requested a state AB volunteer for the evaluation team for IAS, a new Non-governmental AB applicant for recognition. Both Carl and Kristin indicated they would be willing to participate in another NGAB evaluation.

As of June 18, the NELAP AC vote on the motion to adopt the TNI ELS Volumes 1 and 2, with the understanding that the AC will not set an implementation date until all required documents are approved, passed with fourteen votes in favor and Minnesota not voting.

2. Election of NELAP AC Vice Chair

Paul Bergeron was the only nominee for Vice Chair of the Council. Carl moved and Paul Harrison seconded that Paul Bergeron be elected to the position. At the close of the meeting, fourteen votes were cast in favor of Paul's election, and the final, fifteenth vote in favor was received by email on July 5. Congratulations, Paul!

3. Renewal Recommendation for Pennsylvania DEP

In Paul Bergeron's absence, Aaren declined to lead this part of the meeting. This renewal recommendation will be addressed at the next teleconference of the NELAP AC. A temporary extension of PA's certificate of recognition was approved in September 2017.

4. Decoupling Policy POL 3-102

A revised version of the document was again provided, with appropriate definitions for both the NELAP AC and a NELAP AB. Additional revisions were requested, to make Section VI read as follows:

CONTINUED MEMBERSHIP IN NELAP AC -- As documented in SOP 3-102, the final step of an AB evaluation is the decision of the NELAP AC concerning whether to accept the recommendation of the evaluation team, for continued recognition, as presented by the LE. In the unexpected event that the evaluation is unsatisfactory, and the NELAP AC accepts a recommendation not to renew an AB's recognition, then the NELAP AC will determine a *suitable amount of time for laboratories to seek primary accreditation with a different AB* and, based on that determination, set an "end date" for the AB's then-currently-valid Certificate of Recognition. In this case, the Certificate issued to that NELAP AB would expire on the date determined by the NELAP AC, regardless of the "normal" annual expiration date on the Certificate when it was issued.

Cathy moved and Lynn Boysen seconded that the policy be approved with the change noted. At the close of the meeting, fourteen votes were cast, and the final, fifteenth vote in favor was received by email on July 5. The document will be submitted to Policy Committee for final approval, and then to the TNI Board for its endorsement.

5. Updates

Related to Florida's standard updating regulation – while the TNI Board was discussing FL's rule, and the fact that FL is retaining some language from the 2003 NELAC standard while moving to the 2009 TNI ELS Standard, Aaren had sent email about PA's regulation that specifies that individual analysts must perform Demonstrations of Competency but not, as FL, to the analyte level but only for methods.

Following up on the issue of states needing to include particular items in their regulations because they are necessary even though omitted from the standard, Aaren asked that AC members begin compiling lists of items they find necessary but are not in the standard, and sharing those with the group over the next few months. The goal will be to consolidate all those items into one list and send to CSDEC so that the various expert committees can consider how to include them in the next revision of the TNI standard. Also, please specify to which module each item applies. This may be a consensus memo or might list some items state-by-state, depending on the items identified.

FL regulation – there were no requests for public hearing but the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee (a FL group) submitted comments. The program is waiting to see whether the planned implementation date will stand or if they need to publish a notice of change for that date.

Quality System Checklists and Training Proposal – no update is available for either item.

6. PTRL Guidance

In addition to the comments noted in the June minutes, the following additional comments were made.

- Page numbers are needed on the guidance.
- On page 3, in the language about reporting below the LOQ, additional language is needed to recommend that the lab should note that fact in its report to the PT provider.
- In the “Evaluating and Reporting...” section, Example 2 Option 1 needs additional explanation about why the lab is not allowed to qualify PT samples, beyond just “not required.” Also, for Example 4 in this section, the lab should only report <7.0 ug/l or 5.2 ug/l, not “<5.2 ug/l” as suggested.
- One participant submitted an email comment that requests adding an additional example, under "The Derivation of PTRLs" section, a third example should be added that reads as follows:

Example #3 - Endrin in Solid and Chemical Materials (Study Mean and regressed Standard Deviation Limits)

Matrix: Solids

Analyte: Endrin

Concentration Range: 50-500 ug/kg

Acceptance Criteria: Study Mean, $c = 0.1435$, $d = 7.1706$

PTRL: 5.0 ug/kg

In this example, the PTRL is derived based on Footnote 4 of the FoPT Table, which reads: "If the lower acceptance limit generated using the criteria contained in this table is less than 10% of the assigned value or the PTRL, the

lower acceptance limits are set at 10% of the assigned value or the PTRL whichever is higher."

In all cases, the laboratory should examine the footnotes on the FoPT Tables. For the SCM Table, Footnote 7 says in relation to PTRL's: "NELAC Proficiency Testing Reporting Limits (PTRLs) are provided as guidance to laboratories analyzing NELAC PT samples. At a minimum, the laboratory should use a method that is sensitive enough to generate quantitative results at the PTRLs shown. NELAC PTRLs are also provided as guidance to PT Providers. At a minimum for all analytes with an assigned value equal to <PTRL, the PT Provider should verify that the PT sample does not contain the analyte at a concentration greater than or equal to the PTRL."

The AC's comments will be combined with LASEC's comments and returned to the PT Expert Committee after the next LASEC meeting (July 24.)

7. Lessons Learned Document from LASEC with CSDEC Response

After a brief discussion of the purpose of this document, Aaren recommended that the Council provide specific responses to the items where it has a role, in the same manner as CSDEC's comments. She asked for a volunteer to draft those responses, and Cathy offered to do so after some discussion at the informal meeting in New Orleans, provided that she doesn't have to commit to a specific deadline.

Once the Council's feedback is approved, the final version (including comments) will be provided to TNI's Board of Directors for its consideration.

8. The 2017 Revision of ISO 17025

There will be an entire afternoon session devoted to the next revision of the TNI Environmental Lab Sector Standard, at conference in New Orleans, on Wednesday. Aaren and Lynn previewed the big concern identified thus far, that while a quality manual will no longer be required, the focus of the ISO document will be on managing risks to the lab and its data quality as identified through a risk assessment process. Several documents and a video URL were provided so that the AB representatives can be well informed before participating in the discussion at conference.

NOTE: Since the AC meeting, the Advocacy Committee also discussed this session, and the fact that the new revision also includes sampling was discussed, with the suggestion presented that it might no longer make sense to have the field activities accreditation separate from the laboratory, since sampling will be an integral part of the ELS standard anyway. Please be alert for this issue when reviewing the comparison documents and the video!

9. New Business

MUR Implementation – Florida noted that some labs having secondary accreditation there are asking for their primary accreditations for the updated MUR methods to be accepted in Florida, as well, and asked what other states are doing. Responses from the various states present for the discussion were consistent with the MUR implementation table in the January 24, 2018, minutes.

The Chemistry Committee's guidance documents became available on Friday, June 29, and have been distributed to the NELAP AC for discussion at a future meeting. Lynn noted that the Assessment Forum on Monday morning at conference in New Orleans will devote a block of time to these two documents.

Aaren has been asked to give a presentation for NEMC (Monday afternoon at 3:30) about which NELAP ABs can and cannot recognize Non-governmental ABs. She asked that other states please send her the legislative or regulatory citation, or the policy statement, that governs this ability to recognize them, or not.

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Council will be at conference in New Orleans, 10:30 am CDT in Thursday, August 9, 2018. Teleconference capability will be available, and the information will be sent out before conference.

The September meeting date is not decided yet, but will probably be either Tuesday, September 4, or Monday, September 10.

Attachment 1

STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	PRESENT
FL	Carl Kircher E: carl.kircher@flhealth.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Vanessa Soto E: Vanessa.sotocontreras@flhealth.gov	Yes
IL	Celeste Crowley T: 217-557-0274 F: 217-524-6169 E: celeste.crowley@illinois.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Becky Hambelton Rebecca.Hambelton@Illinois.gov	No
	For information purposes: Kathy Marshall Kathy.Marshall@Illinois.gov	No
	For information purposes: John South John.South@illinois.gov	No
KS	Paul Harrison paul.harrison@ks.gov	Yes
	Alternate: N. Myron Gunsalus 785-291-3162 E: ngunsalus@ks.gov	No
LA DEQ	Paul Bergeron T: 225-219-3247 E: Paul.Bergeron@la.gov	No
	Altérnate: Elizabeth West elizabeth.west@la.gov	Yes
LA DOH	Grant Aucoin Grant.aucoin@la.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Scott Miles Scott.Miles@la.gov	No
MN	Lynn Boysen E: lynn.boysen@state.mn.us	Yes
	Alternate: Stephanie Drier 651-201-5326 E: stephanie.drier@state.mn.us	No

NH	Bill Hall T: (603) 271-2998 F: (603) 271-5171 E: george.hall@des.nh.gov	No
NJ	Michele Potter T: (609) 984-3870 F: (609) 777-1774 E: michele.potter@dep.nj.gov	Yes
	Alternate : Rachel Ellis E: rachel.ellis@dep.nj.gov	No
NY	Victoria Pretti 518-485-5570 E: victoria.pretti@health.ny.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Lynn McNaughton E: lynn.mcnaughton@health.ny.gov	No
OK	David Caldwell (405) 702-1000 E: David.Caldwell@deq.ok.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Chris Armstrong (405) 702-1000 E: chris.armstrong@deq.ok.gov	No
OR	Lizbeth Garcia (971) 865-0443 E: Lizbeth.garcia@dhsoha.state.or.us	Yes
	Alternate: Scott Hoatson Agency Quality Assurance Officer Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (503) 693-5786 E: hoatson.scott@deq.state.or.us	No
	Included for information purposes: Stephanie Ringsage, Manager, Laboratory Compliance Section 503-693-4126 stephanie.b.ringsage@state.or.us	No
PA	Aaren Alger T: (717) 346-8212 F: (717) 346-8590 E: aalger@pa.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Yumi Creason E: ycreason@pa.gov	No
TX	Ken Lancaster T: (512) 239-1990 E: Ken.Lancaster@tceq.texas.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Kristy Deaver T: (512) 239-6816 Kristy.deaver@tceq.texas.gov	Yes

UT	Kristin Brown T: (801) 965-2540 F: (801) 965-2544 E: kristinbrown@utah.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Alia Rauf T: 801-965-2511 E: arauf@utah.gov	Yes
VA	Cathy Westerman T: 804-648-4480 ext.391 E: cathy.westerman@dgs.virginia.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Ed Shaw T: 804-648-4480 ext.152 E: ed.shaw@dgs.virginia.gov	No
NELAP AC PA and EC	Lynn Bradley T: 540-885-5736 E: lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org	Yes
EPA Liaison	Donna Ringel T: 732-321-4383 E: Ringel.Donna@epa.gov	Yes
California	Christine Sotelo Christine.Sotelo@waterboards.ca.gov	No
Guests:	none	