

Summary of the TNI NELAP Board Meeting January 17, 2008

1. Roll call.

Dan Hickman called the TNI NELAP Board meeting to order on January 17, 2008, at 9:00 AM PST in Newport Beach, CA. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1.

2. Overview of NELAP Board Accomplishments and AB Evaluation Update.

Dan Hickman provided an overview of the NELAP Board's activities and accomplishments over the past year. He provided an update on the progress of renewing nine of the current AB recognitions. He presented a timeline, but pointed out that at their last meeting, the NELAP Board voted to extend the deadline for submitting renewal applications until March 1, 2008. This will make it very difficult to meet the July 2008 deadline for renewal of the NELAP recognitions and SDW program approvals. Art Clark, USEPA, developed an alternate timeline which incorporated the new deadline. The most optimistic date for completion is September 2008 and the worst case is February 2009. Dan indicated that it was the NELAP Board's intent to grant renewals as long as corrective action plans were in place to address any deficiencies observed. Audience comments on Dan's presentation included:

- The NELAP Board should monitor the actual time it takes to complete each specific task to see if the times allotted by the SOP are realistic. The SOP may need to be modified.
- The cost of doing the evaluations needs to be tracked so that the information is available for future ABs.
- The NELAP and EPA evaluators should focus on getting the onsite visits done and not overemphasize the paperwork.
- During previous evaluations, the onsite was scheduled while the team continued to work on technical completeness.

On behalf of the EPA evaluators, Kevin Kubik, EPA, indicated that there should be a feed back loop in the process if the NELAP Board does not accept the evaluation team's recommendation. Kevin proposed that the following language be inserted into the Evaluation SOP between the existing 7.12.1 and 7.12.2:

“If the NELAP Board disagrees with the recommendation of the ET, it will notify the ET prior to the notification of the AB.

The NELAP Board will provide the ET with the reason(s) for its disagreement and allow the ET to respond to those reasons with additional details.”

Additional questions regarding the NELAP Board's decision process included how the voting would be handled and if a Board member was on the evaluation team, would they

have to recuse themselves from the vote on recognition for that AB. Dan indicated that the voting process would need to be reviewed and special provisions for recusal added for the recognition process.

3. NELAC Standards

Dan indicated that a future project for the NELAP Board was to adopt the new TNI standards and set an implementation date. In the meantime, the NELAP Board needs to make a statement about the 2003 NELAC standards and how they are being implemented given the change in organizational structure. Comments on this issue included:

- The NELAP Board needs to make some kind of link between NELAC and TNI
- The standard could be shown with amplification or notation similar to the DoD manuals. Gray boxes could be interspersed in the standard indicating how particular items will be implemented. It should only impact Chapters 1 and 6. We should document what we are doing, but we need to be practical.
- The 2003 standards should not be changed. A separate document is needed, not changes to the original document.
- Some states didn't adopt Chapter 6, so the new standard could be implemented immediately in some cases.
- We need to be reasonable and not cause outside criticism.
- The NELAC Board needs to transfer the duties of the AARB to the NELAP Board.

4. SW846 4(b) implementation.

Dan indicated that he had heard concerns about inconsistent implementation of the new SW846 4 (b) among the ABs. Dan requested input on this item. Comments on this issue included:

- All state ABs need to offer this or there will be issues with secondary accreditations.
- Some states will have to wait for permit requirements to change (renewal or amendments)
- Has this method been officially promulgated? There will be problems if it is not official.
- This method is part of EPA's performance approach.

5. Update on dispute resolution SOP.

Jeff Flowers gave an update on the draft dispute resolution SOP. He indicated that this SOP will be discussed in detail at the LASC meeting. Jeff indicated that there was some concern about who would appoint the appeals panel. The draft SOP calls for the Nominating Committee to make these appointments. Because this might require a bylaws change to expand the role of the Nominating Committee, the SOP could be amended to allow the TNI Board to make these appointments.

Some general comments were received about the process of drafting and approving SOPs:

- Who owns the draft SOP?
- Alfredo Sotomayor, Chair, Policy Committee, stated that reviewers can suggest changes to the author, but cannot edit or redline. The draft must be returned to the author for changes.
- Committees should have liaisons to communicate to others about the meaning and purpose of the SOP, so that it is fully understood by the reviewing committee or Board.
- June Flowers, Chair, LASC, stated that subcommittees will be formed in LASC to get the standards interpretation policy and the dispute resolution policy completed.
- The key point is authorship, not ownership. Boards and committees should work in cooperation with each other.

6. Next meeting.

The next meeting will be February 4, 2008 at 12:30 CST. Potential agenda items include:

- Implementation of SW846 4(b)
- Revision of voting process to include AB recognition
- Revision of evaluation SOP to include items identified from classroom training
- Process and timeline to adopt TNI standard

Attachment 1

State	Representative	Present
CA	George Kulasingam T: (510) 620-3155 F: (510) 620-3165 E: gkulasin@dhs.ca.gov Alternate: Jane Jensen, jjensen@dhs.ca.gov	Yes
FL	Stephen Arms T: (904) 791-1502 F: (904) 791-1591 E: steve_arms@doh.state.fl.us	No

	Alternate: Carl Kircher, carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us	
IL	Scott Siders T: (217) 785-5163 F: (217) 524-6169 E: scott.siders@illinois.gov Alternate: TBA	Yes
KS	Jack McKenzie T: (785) 296-1639 F: (785) 296-1638 E: jmckenzi@kdhe.state.ks.us Alternate: Aurora Shields, ashields@kdhe.state.ks.us	Yes
LA DEQ	Paul Bergeron T: 225-219-9800 F: 225-219-9898 E: Paul.Bergeron@la.gov Alternate: Karen Varnado Karen.Varnado@la.gov	Yes
LA DHH	Louis Wales T: (225) 342-8491 F: (225) 342-7494 E: lwales@dhh.la.gov Alternate: Ginger Hutto, ghutto@dhh.la.gov	No
NH	Bill Hall T: (603) 271-2998 F: (603) 271-5171 E: whall@des.state.nh.us Alternante: Jeanne Chwasciak, jcchwasciak@des.state.nh.us	No
NJ	Michael Miller T: (609)292-3950 F: (609) 777-1774 E: michael.w.miller@dep.state.nj.us	

	Alternate: Joe Aiello, joseph.aiello@dep.state.nj.us	Yes
NY	Kenneth Jackson T: (518) 485-5570 F: (518) 485-5568 E: jackson@wadsworth.org Alternate: Dan Dickinson, dmd15@health.state.ny.us	Yes
OR	Dan Hickman T: (503) 229-5983 F: (503) 229-6924 E: hickman.dan@deq.state.or.us Alternate: RaeAnn Haynes, haynes.raeann@deq.state.or.us	Yes
PA	Aaren Alger T: (717) 346-8212 F: (717) 346-8590 E: aaalger@state.pa.us Alternate: Ronald Houck, rhouck@state.pa.us	Yes
TX	Stephen Stubbs T: (512) 239-3343 F: (512) 239-4760 E: sstubbs@tceq.state.tx.us Alternate: Steve Gibson, jgibson@tceq.state.tx.us	No
UT	David Mendenhall T: (801) 584-8470 F: (801) 584-8501 E: davidmendenhall@utah.gov Alternate: Paul Ellingson, pellings@utah.gov	Yes
	Program Administrator: Carol Batterton	Yes

	T: 830-990-1029 or 512-924-2102 E: carbat@beecreek.net	
	Evaluation Coordinator: Lynn Bradley T: 202-565-2575 E: Bradley.lynn@epa.gov	Yes