NEFAP Executive Committee
Meeting Summary
August 8, 2013

1. Roll call:

   Chair Kim Watson called the NEFAP Executive Committee meeting to order on August 8, 2013 at 1:30 CT in San Antonio, TX. Attendance is included in Attachment A. There were 13 committee members present.

2. Scope of Accreditation

   Kim shared the comments she got back when she sent out her e-mail question about Scope.

   A guidance document regarding Scope was finalized more than a year ago – "Guidance for ABs on the Suggested Content for the Scope of Accreditation". The observation was that these were really analysis technologies and not sampling.

   Kim will send the updated document with possible sampling additions. She will also consider the comments received by e-mail when doing this.

   Carl asked if the FAC is planning to put together technical modules like NELAP. Justin responded that this is not being planned at this time.

   Kim will distribute this information for further comment.

3. Recognition Committee

   The Recognition Committee sent a letter of recommendation to the EC for changes moving forward. The Evaluation SOP is in the process of an update due to some of these changes. Marlene Moore is heading up the re-write of the Evaluation SOP.

   Action item: Ilona send copy of Aug 12, 2012 Evaluation SOP to William to post on the Document part of the NEFAP website.

   All documents are ready for the Recognition Committee; they just need the final report.

4. Mobile Lab Subcommittee

   See Presentation Slides in Attachment D.

David Speis: Asked if the methods were differentiated between methods that would be accredited under the lab standard and what would be accredited under NEFAP.

Marlene suggested sending the survey results to Lara and FEM and getting some input.

The subcommittee would like to expand the list of people to send the survey to. They will take care of this in the subcommittee and ask for Ilona's help to get it out. Justin has a mailing list that he will be forwarding to Ilona.

The emphasis of this group is Mobile lab at this time.

5. Advocacy

During the FAC meeting a subcommittee was formed to update the NEFAP brochure by the end of the month.

The Advocacy summary is now in Attachment B of the FAC minutes.

6. Standard Process

The NEFAP EC comment period on the Interim Standard has been closed. No comments or recommended changes needed to be submitted. It will now go to the standards review committee as part of the CSDP. They will be looking for conflicts with other TNI standards and policies, etc. Justin expects the process to be complete by Fall and then there will be a new NEFAP Standard.

Mitzi asked when it will become effective and should people working on accreditation wait for the new standard. The response was no. The effective date will be determined by the NEFAP EC.

Once the standard is approved through CSDP – the standard needs to be voted in by the NEFAP EC.

Jack suggested dedicating part of a NEFAP EC meeting to developing an implementation plan.

7. Charter

Kim and Ilona will be working on this for completion by 10/31/13.

8. New Business

- None.

9. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the NEFAP Executive Committee will be planned by e-mail.

Action Items are included in Attachment B and Attachment C includes a listing of reminders.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm CT. (Motion: Calista Second: Justin Unanimously approved.)

Attachment A

Participants
TNI NEFAP Executive Committee

Members	Affiliation	Balance	Contact Information	
Kim Watson (Chair) **Present**	Stone Environmental Inc	FSMO	(802)229-2196	kwatson@stone-env.com
Keith Greenaway (Vice-Chair) **Present**	ACLASS	AB	(703)836-0025	keith.greenaway@aclasscorp.com
Dane Wren **Absent**	Wren Engineering, P.A.	FSMO	(407)833-0061	dwren47@aol.com
Calista Daigle **Present**	Dade Moeller	FSMO	(225)485-2007	calista.daigle@gmail.com calista.daigle@moellerinc.com
Scott Evans **Absent**	Clean Air Engineering	AB	847-654-4569	sevans@cleanair.com
John Moorman **Present-Phone**	Water Quality Monitoring Division, South Florida Water Mang District	FSMO	(561)753-2400 x4654	jmoorma@sfwmd.gov
Cheryl Morton **Present**	AIHA	AB	703-846-0789	cmorton@aiha.org
Doug Leonard **Present**	LAB	AB	260-637-2705	dleonard@l-a-b.com
Nilda Cox **Present**	Eurofins Eaton Analytical Inc	Other	626-318-8517	nildacox@eurofinsus.com
Doug Berg **Tracy - Present**	PJ Laboratory Accreditation, Inc.	AB	(248)709-0096	dberg@pjlabs.com douglaslberg@gmail.com
Paul Bergeron **Present**	LELAP	AB	225-219-3247	Paul.bergeron@la.gov
Carl Kircher **Present**	Florida DOH	AB	904-791-1574	Carl_kircher@doh.state.fl.us
Lauren Smith **Present**	A2LA	AB	(301)644 3216	lsmith@a2la.org
Seb Gillette **Absent**	DOD	Other	(210) 395-8434	john.gillette.1@us.af.mil
Justin B. Brown **Present**	EMT	FSMO	(847)324 3350	jbrown@emt.com
Jack Farrell **Present**	AEX	Other	(407)331-5040	aex@ix.netcom.com
Ilona Taunton	The NELAC Institute		(828)712-9242	tauntoni@msn.com

Members	Affiliation	Balance	Contact Information	
(Program Administrator) **Present**				

Attachment B

Action Items – NEFAP Executive Committee

	Action Item	Who	Expected Completion	Actual Completion
27	Forward FSMO names to Ilona.	Justin	3-15-13	
39	Give Alternate name to Ilona.	All	9/30/10	Ongoing
81	Prepare NEFAP Timeline Agenda next moth	Doug L.	4/22/13	4/22/13: It has been distributed and needs to be put on agenda for review.
106	Mobile Lab Issue – Subcommittee to begin work. From Backburner: Evaluate overlap issue with NELAP and DoD ELAP regarding mobile labs. (Originally brought up 8-6-12 meeting.)	Kim, Scott, Doug Berg, John and Marlene. Mike to help through 3/13. 3/28/13: Paul has been added.	TBD	3/28/13: Subcommittee will begin work in April. Questionnaire will go out first. 6/12/13: Survey will go out this week.
110	Complete DRAFT Training SOP for EC review.	Scott, Lauren, Ilona	3/31/13	
115	Review old charter vs. new format and provide any needed changes to the committee via e-mail.	Kim Ilona	10/31/13	
116	Update Evaluation SOP and distribute to committee.	Marlene Carl Justin	5/2/13	6/12/13: Still in progress. 7/15/13: Still in progress.
119	Update "Guidance for ABs on the Suggested Content for the Scope of Accreditation" by adding comments received by e-mail to Scope inquiry. Distribute to committee.	Kim	Next meeting	
120	Post August 12, 2012 Evaluation SOP in Document section of NEFAP website.	Ilona	Next Meeting	
121	Forward mailing list for survey to Ilona for further distribution of the survey.	Justin	10/1/13	

Attachment C

Backburner / Reminders – NEFAP Executive Committee

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
4	Review Charter.	October 2013	
6	Evaluate how to handle adding additional ABs. Impact on committee size.	8-6-12	Next meeting
7	Evaluate overlap issue with NELAP and DoD ELAP regarding mobile labs.	8-6-12	Part of Mobile Lab Subcommittee work. Delete
8	Nomination SOP needs to be updated.	3-28-13	6-12-13: Comments have been received from the Policy Committee that need to be addressed.
9	Determine need for a policy or statement regarding the assessment of sampling.	4-22-13	

Attachment D

PPT Presentations and Handouts from Meeting

NEFAB EC Meeting

- Agenda
- Introductions
- NEFAP CHARTER_472013.doc
- Scope of Accreditation Discussion
- Status of AB Evaluation: Report from Recognition Committee
- Mobile Lab Subcommittee: Report of Survey

NEFAB EC Meeting

- Advocacy Update-Brochure
  - FSMO and AB Training
- Standard Update
- Committee Charter
- Other

Scope of Accreditation

- **Question**
- **-Review of Comments**
- **summary of comments.xlsx**

Scope of Accreditation (con't)

- **Scopes of Accreditation**
- **Additions**
- **Proposed Scope of AccreditationSept292010rev2.pdf**
- **Question put forth to EC**

Status of AB Evaluation

- **Report from Recognition Subcommittee**
- **Committee – name change**
- **SOP update**
- **Competence/Complete**

NEFAP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHARTER

1. Organization Name: NEFAP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	2. Version: Revision 2013	3. Date: April 10, 2013

4. Mission Statement: The mission of the NEFAP Executive Committee is to ensure the implementation of a national program for FSMO accreditation is consistent with the TNI FSMO Standard requirements. The Executive Committee will support the field accreditation program with appropriate guidance, procedures, and policies to facilitate implementation of these accreditation standards on a national level. The Executive Committee is committed to establishing and maintaining a program in support of the TNI FSMO standards that will assure continual improvement of FSMO accreditation processes and which incorporate practical, effective, and clear standards of performance that are consistent with the needs of the environmental community as well as regulatory and industry specific requirements. The NEFAP accreditation assures data of known and documented quality that meet the needs of the client.

5. Committee Sponsor: TNI Board of Directors

6. Committee Members: *(indicate Chairperson, insert rows as necessary for additional members)*	7. Interest Category & Stakeholder Group:
Calista Daigle	FSMO (Dade Moeller Inc.)
Cheryl Morton	Accreditation Body (AIHA Laboratory Accreditation Programs, LLC)
Dane C. Wren	Other (Wren Engineering)
Doug Berg	Accreditation Body (Perry Johnson Laboratory Accreditation)
Doug Leonard	Accreditation Body (L-A-B)
John (Seb) Gillette	Other (DoD)
John, Moorman	FSMO (South Florida Water Management District)
Justin B. Brown	FSMO (EMT)
Keith Greenaway (Vice Chair)	Accreditation Body (ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board)
Kim Watson (Chair)	FSMO (Stone Environmental)
Lauren Hedrick	Accreditation Body (A2LA)
Scott Evans	Accreditation Body (STAC)
Paul Bergeron	Other (Louisiana DEQ)
Nilda Cox	FSMO (Eurofins Eaton Analytical)
Carl Kircher	Accreditation Body (Florida DOH)

8. Objectives/Approach:

- ✓ Implement a national accreditation program that is consistent with the TNI FSMO standards.
- ✓ Establish adoption and formal acceptance of the program through an advocacy program including supportive contracts, communications, and direction to the stakeholders as well as input to the Field Activities Expert Committee regarding additional standards needs.
- ✓ Ensure consistent implementation by the ABs as an integral part of the recognition process, including the implementation of AB evaluation protocols, peer review processes, and an open input policy to ensure an effective forum and corrective action processes in support of all stakeholders.
- ✓ Develop field accreditation program guidance, procedures, and policies that meet the needs of the environmental community as well as regulatory and industry specific requirements and are consistent with other national and international standards, avoiding unnecessary duplication and non-value added requirements.
- ✓ Collaborate with affected stakeholders to develop a national program that accounts for the needs and interests of all stakeholders while balancing considerations of cost; practical concerns, and the quality and consistency of environmental data.
- ✓ Continually evaluate and establish success measures to target opportunities for improvement.
- ✓ Develop and maintain the tools (e.g., guidance documents, templates, training materials, etc.) necessary for consistent standards implementation and AB recognition.
- ✓ Utilize existing and future stakeholder organizational infrastructure and resources to accomplish mission.

9. Success Measures:

- Implementation of an accreditation program that is acknowledged by EPA, government agencies and organizations through contractual requirements for field sampling and measurement organizations.
- Increasing support and input from stakeholders including ABs, FSMOs, Industry, Regulators and Standards Setting Organizations.
- Field accreditation standards are adopted by those performing environmental sampling and field measurements, including those not under a regulatory mandate to do so.
- The field accreditation standards are adopted by accrediting bodies (3rd Party or government agencies) on a voluntary basis or written into regulation where applicable or through contractual arrangements.
- Decision uncertainty reduced over time with the production of higher quality, more consistent environmental data.

10. Key Milestones: *(significant events and corresponding dates)*

- Revise implementation support documents including the required approvals during 2012.
- Implement recognition program for accreditation bodies starting July 2010 with full operation by January 2013.

11. Considerations: *(assumptions/constraints/obstacles/risks)*

- Volunteer member organization with significant time constraints
- New organization with limited resources and developing infrastructure
- Ability to communicate updates and progress to the community at large in a timely fashion.
- Ability to implement an effective consensus-based accreditation program that both meets the standard requirements and ensures comparable execution of the accreditation process by all accreditation bodies
- Substantial learning curve for those organizations which have not previously been subjected to rigorous quality requirements and/or accreditation
- Ability to develop and conduct training programs
- Authority of government agencies to require FSMO accreditation
- Stakeholder "buy-in" and acceptance within the industry
- Industry "politics"

12. Available Resources:

- Volunteer committee members
- Existing national and international consensus-based standards
- EPA Cooperative Agreement
- TNI Website
- TNI Advocacy Committee
- TNI PT Executive Committee
- Dedicated TNI support resources
- Field Activities Expert Committee
- Other TNI Committees (Expert and Support)
- Participating organizations

13. Additional Resources Required:

- Industry experts
- Writers and technical editor support
- Web-based teleconferencing services
- Outreach assistance from Advocacy Committee
- Effective and accessible member database

14. Anticipated Meeting Schedule: *(specify meeting format and frequency)*

- Where Practical - Monthly Executive Committee Teleconferences (schedule to be posted in advance of actual meetings)
- Additional teleconferences as needed
- Executive Committee meetings (face-to-face) during semiannual TNI Forums (Winter and Summer)

Guidance for ABs on the suggested content for the scope of accreditation

Organizations (See TNI FSMO Standard for Definition)

A. Multiple Facility Organization
B. Single Facility Organization

General Categories - Media

I. Air
II. Solids
III. Water
IV. Biological
V. Chemical Wastes
VI. Other (not otherwise categorized)

General Categories - Technologies

a. X-Ray Fluorescence
b. Immunoassay
c. Gas Chromatography – Volatile Organics
d. Gas Chromatography – Semi-Volatile Organics
e. Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry – Volatile Organics
f. Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry– Semi-Volatile Organics
g. Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPL) Detection Techniques
h. Colorimetric In Situ Probes
i. Electrochemical Methods
j. Ion-Specific Electrodes
k. Open-Light Path Techniques
l. Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy
m. Tunable Dye Lasers
n. Direct Sensors
o. Colorimetric Tests (includes kits)
p. Titrametric Tests (includes kits)
q. Spectrophotometric Tests
r. Analyze Immediately Parameters – Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Temperature, Residual Chlorine, Sulfite.
   Note: Analyze immediately parameters may be accredited under a laboratory accreditation program that is mandated by a state regulatory requirement to be performed by a NELAP AB or State certification program.
s. Geophysical Test Parameters (Real Time)
t. Geological Techniques
u. Other (not otherwise identified)

Categories – Methods/Programs

i. ASTM
ii. USGS
iii. NIOSH
iv. AOAC
v. EPA
vi. State Specific Sampling methods or requirements(e.g.; New Jersey, Florida, etc.)
vii. Other (to be named specifically as part of the accreditation, such as LQSR for NLLAP)

Question	
	Question: Please give your thoughts to this so I can gather feedback. We represent the stakeholders is this program so we should try to help make the process smoother and in accordance with the standards by having options. I guess what we should look at is providing a set of guidelines for the users of the program. How would you complete the table below? Or should the table look different…? Please give me your thoughts, needs and ideas.
1	format from the standard "Accreditation shall be granted for Field Sampling by Matrix/Technology, and/or for Field Measurements by Matrix/Technology." with a supporting note stating "Accreditation may also be granted for Field Sampling/Measurement Methods, or analyte as specific to regulatory programs.". Therefore, my intent is only to take the recommendation from all that responded and update the guidance document for approval by the EC.
	I think the entire purpose of NEFAP is to do exactly that. One accreditation. If we have to get both a NEFAP and a NELAC accreditation, then the entire reason for the creation of NEFAP is void. We seem to be spinning a bit out of control here. We are moving into territory that I thought was settled when NEFAP was first formed. We cannot allow ourselves to be sucked back into the laboratory accreditation scheme after fighting for years for the establishment of a separate system. I think we need to possible get Jerry Parr involved to provide some guidance as to the fundamental purpose of NEFAP and our mission to develop an accreditation program independent of the lab side. I think we are losing sight of this. Having been assessed and also been an evaluator on AB assessments it is clear that it would be in our best interest to provide some guidance and work with the ABs and FSMOs to focus and have consistency on how the field sampling scopes are written and presented. As reminded by Lauren Smith, this is what the standard reads:
2	
2	7.1.3.2 Scope of Accreditation
	7.1.3.2.1 Accreditation shall be granted for Field Sampling by Matrix/Technology, and/or for Field Measurements by Matrix/Technology.
	NOTE: Accreditation may also be granted for Field Sampling/Measurement Methods, or analyte as specific to regulatory programs.
	-What I would like to see for consistency is a list of matrices to choose from and a technology. However, in most cases would be the specification, method or technique as described in the standard operating procedures provided by the FSMO.
	Should we assist by giving a field of sampling list like: 1. Water-Groundwater, surface, other water sampling, 2. Soil sampling-grab, composite, other solid sampling, Air – passive, ambient, stack? The procedure would then be listed as described in an SOP (stack, passive, ambient).
	Quality Management Requirements per ISO 17025 General Field Decontamination requirements General Field Documentation requirements General Field QC requirements DW/NPW SAMPLING Grab Sampling Composite Sampling (OR, organize by Surface Water, Groundwater, Drinking Water, Wastewater) SCM SAMPLING Grab Sampling Drum Sampling Core Sampling (OR, organize by Soils, Sediments, Wastes) BT SAMPLING Tissue Sampling Biological Communities and Habitat Assessment AE SAMPLING Source Air / Stack Gas Sampling (activities to include Pitot Tube calibrations, stack traverses, VOST trains, impinger trains, filters & cartridges, Performance Audit Samples (see the TNI SSAS Stds.), flowmeter calibrations, humidity & moisture corrections) Continuous Emission Monitor Validations (activities to include Performance Specifications, Zero & Relative Accuracy tests, data completeness and representativeness evaluations) (OR, organize by NOx, TSP, O3, SO2, Pb, meteorological parameters, etc.) Industrial Hygiene Sampling (activities to include hi-flow & lo-flow sampling pumps, filters, cartridges, passive dosimeters) Canister Sampling
4	FIELD TESTING

Currently LELAP will recognize scopes which list the matrix “Air Emissions”; reference methods (title and revision or edition number, and/or date of approval) for sampling, preparation (extraction, filtration, digestion etc), and analysis; standard operating procedures (title and revision number and/or date); and for analytical methods, the analytes, analyte groups or parameters being measured. LELAP is not requiring the listing of analytes, analyte groups or parameters associated with sampling or sample preparation at this time. Other matrix descriptions such as those listed on the 2010 document and those you, Carl, and Mike submitted are acceptable; each accreditation body should allow the applicant sampler and/or
5 tester to submit a request a clearly defined scope of accreditation that is useful to all stakeholders.

My apology for not being able to get back with you sooner, but I am sure you saw my ‘out of office’ response to your message and unexpectedly also ended-up not being in the office yesterday. Thank you for your participation in the webinar and for your question. If a sampler pursued accreditation/certification, a competency demonstration would be expected for the matrix, method and/or technology, analytes for which they were being awarded the assistance agreement.

6

Not sure I understanding your response, as I have done a lot of sampling (stack, wastewater-grab and composite, drinking water, groundwater, and soil) and always felt I needed to control my sampling devices. Including such things as heat tracing lines on an ISCO composite sampler when sampling in sub-zero temperatures, monitoring flow rates on a dry gas meter and ensuring the correct orifice was selected in stack sampling, or making sure a coring device was properly cleaned between each sample for collecting soils. In each case, I knew the device, the matrix and analyte. For example OK to use methylene chloride to clean a particulate filter, but would not be OK for a SASS train for collecting organics.

7

Please everyone - keep an open mind and realize that we have focused too long on the analyte as the outcome and we have NOT focused on the process which is needed to be sure every step in the data generation is performed by competent personnel within organizations that have demonstrated this competency through accreditation.

The need for analyte is totally inappropriate for sampling and field measurements. Many field measurements (stack sampling, groundwater measurements such as MIP, etc.) do not and cannot be evaluated on an analye basis. Even field testing is technology based since the environmental conditions for each method is highly variable.

8

Here is the one of many problems with PTs and analyte specific field testing rather than technology. PTs are performed by the wastewater lab for DMR report reporting (NPDES program). The pH measurement that is reported on the DMR comes from automated inline continuous monitoring equipment. How is this PT relevant to demonstrate the organization can perform a proper pH? In fact the personnel in the instrument shop responsible for the automated pH are never evaluated. But we have a lab doing measurements that has no oversight or input to the pH performance of the inline meters. Why are we looking at the competency of the performance of the analyte in the lab and not the competency of using in-line continuous monitoring equipment? There is no way you can directly measure a PT with the inline meter. The measurement of the analyte is not as critical as the maintenance, calibration and monitoring performance of the technology. (There are many examples which the stack testing community and ground water monitoring and even direct push techniques that measure an analyte using a variety of processes, but most can never measure a PT since the media is different.) The technology (entire measurement system) is important, not the specific analyte.

9

Also use of a technique can be demonstrated in a management system with competency demonstrated and monitored by the organization. The qualifications, training, oversight and monitoring of this is the responsible for the organizations management. The accreditation process ensures this is taking place and that the data generated is appropriate for the customer.

Many of the TNI community have never managed and worked in field operations. Many only see the analyte and do not realize how we have never required the field sampling design and procedure to be equally performed by competent organizations. This occurs because we continue to focus on the analyte and do not ensure the competency of the entire process for generating the measurement (technology).

I have been doing training for DOD for over twenty years for field QC and before that managed, performed and monitored a variety of field operations. Within the last 8 years I have been focusing on the design of sampling and testing operations for project management. The accreditation of the field activities is one more step in the process to ensure competency, We will not have data of known and documented quality for the intended use until all aspects of the data generation process is performed by competent organizations.

10

Please let me apologize for any confusion that my response to Paul on Tuesday caused in creating this situation. I had just returned from vacation and was catching-up with a great deal of email. As you will see from what I am pasting below, I used Paul’s word choice from his emailed question to me without pausing to think about the difference in accreditation
11 combination between NELAC and NEFAP, which does not include analyte. I did not mean to suggest that it suddenly be added from what decisions were made previously.

Mobile Lab Subcommittee

- Report from Committee
- Survey Results

Advocacy Update

- Brochure
- Status of FSMO Applications and Actions for Committee to Communicate

Standard Update

- Status

Training and Education

- Status

Standard Update

- Status

Committee Charter

- New

NEFAP Mobile Field Lab Questionnaire RPT 7-30-13 Revision 8/5/13
Mike Miller reviewed by Paul Bergeron

The committee thanks the 15 organizations that responded to the Mobile Lab Questionnaire up to this date. Mike Miller and Paul Bergeron summarized the results in this report.

The committee did not receive responses from FSMOs that work at potable and waste water, or at hazardous waste sites.

The committee did not receive a response from the third party accreditors for the TNI-FSMO Standard.

Some of the NELAP and non NELAP states continue to use the definitions from the 2003 NELAC Standard. The TNI 2009 standard does not include a mobile laboratory definition. More States require separate accreditations or approvals for each mobile laboratory. NELAP States use the NELAC Standard, the TNI standard, and/or their regulations. Non NELAP States have their own regulations. The TNI-FSMO 2007 Standard is not used by the FSMOs. The stack testers use ASTM D7036 accreditation or obtain Louisiana accreditation. EPA regional laboratories are accredited to the NELAC Standard or TNI standard by a NELAP State.

One State Certification Program (in the state health department) does not certify Air Quality analysis or mobile laboratories. The state Contaminated Sites Program requires the use of specified analytical (SW846 and State method) and sampling methods (State specified UST manual). Mobile and remote are approved by the State Laboratory approval program based on the State Administrative Code.

Another State Environmental Protection Program accredits mobile laboratories under the TNI Standard. That State operates a mobile laboratory for Volatile Organics Analysis (EPA 524.2, 624, 8260); the mobile laboratory is accredited by NJDEP-OQA under TNI. The state operates a mobile laboratory for ambient and indoor air testing (TO-16) within its laboratory group. The state also operates a mobile laboratory for soil and waste water. Both laboratories are accredited by NJDEP-OQA under TNI.

One federal program responded that operates a mobile lab for ambient air sampling and measurement and a mobile lab for the immediate analysis of water parameters, performance of emergency microbiology, and determination of mercury (EPA 30B & and metals contamination by XRF). The main laboratory is accredited under the NELAC 2003 Standard. Mobile labs were not addressed as part of the accreditation.

The three commercial FSMO mobile labs which perform the sampling and measuring of ambient and indoor air confirm 5-10% of the measurements taken through analysis at a fixed laboratory. One state Laboratory Accreditation program offers air accreditation (not NELAC Standard). Summa canisters and Tedlar bags are sent to certified fix base laboratories.

Note: Unless the measurement/analytical method contains the field sampling procedures, the NELAP AB usually does not include the sampling procedures in the accreditation.

The methods identified for stack testing and air sampling and measurements were EPA- Air. For water and soil, EPA and some state specific methods were listed. Except for one state, no sampling methods were given.

Respondent Self Identification	Accredit Sampling Only	Accredit Measurement Only	Accredit Sampling & Measurement	Total Number of AB Respondents
NELAP States	0	0	6	6
Non-NELAP States	0	0	1	3
FSMO AB's	0	0	0	0
Respondent	Perform Sampling Only	Perform Measurement Only	Perform Measurement & Sampling	Total Number of FMSO Respondents
FSMO Air	0	0	2	1
FSMO STAC	0	0	3	3
EPA Regions,	0	0	1	1
FSMO (other media)	0	0	0	1
Total	0	1	14	16

Respondent Identification of Methods/Parameters	Sampling Methods Accredited	Measurement Methods/ Parameters Accredited	Combined Sampling/Measurement Methods/Parameters Accredited	Total Number of Lab Methods
NELAP States	0	0	0	0
Non-NELAP States	2	9	0	11
FSMO AB's	0	0	0	0
Respondent Identification of Methods				Total Number of Lab Methods
FSMO Air	0	0	4	4
FSMO STAC	1	2	16	19
EPA Regions	0	0	6	6
FSMO (other media)	0	0	2	2
Total	3	11	28	42

NEFAP Mobile Field Lab Questionnaire RPT

Michael Miller & Paul Bergeron
mwmillernviron@yahoo.com

Questionnaire sent by e-mail

- To NEFAP EC, FAC and NELAC auditor's form members
- 15 organizations responded
- NELAP State ABs, State ABs, STAC Testers, Air FSMOs
- NELAP States Accredit to NELAC 2003 and/or TNI_NELAC 2009
- Some NELAP States also have State accreditations
- State AB accreditations based on rules/ regulations
- Most State ABs Accredit Mobile Labs individually
- Majority used or preferred the following definitions:

Mobile Lab Definitions

- 2) NELAC 2003 Standard: A portable enclosed structure with necessary and appropriate accommodations and environmental conditions as described in Chapter 5, with which testing is performed by analysts.

Definitions

- 3) TNI-FSMO 2007 rev 0.1: Defines Field Sampling and Measurement Organization, which includes mobile activities , following from standard.

  NOTE 1: FSMO activities, whether from a fixed or mobile base, that encompass multiple field sampling and measurement locations, do not require separate accreditations.
  NOTE 2: A mobile sampling and measurement unit, operating under the FSMO management system, does not require a separate accreditation

T

Respondent Self Identification	Accredit Sampling Only	Accredit Measurement Only	Accredit Sampling & Measurement	Total Number of AB Respondents
NELAP States	0	6	0	6
Non-NELAP States	0	0	1	3
FSMO AB's	0	0	0	0
Respondent	Perform Sampling Only	Perform Measurement Only	Perform Measurement & Sampling	Total Number of FMSO Respondents
FSMO Air	2	0	0	2
FSMO STAC	0	0	3	3
EPA Regions,	0	0	1	1
FSMO (other media)	0	1	0	1
Total	2	7	4	16

Respondent Identification of Methods/Parameters	Sampling Methods Accredited	Measurement Methods/ Parameters Accredited	Combined Sampling/Measurement Methods/Parameters Accredited	Total Number of Lab Methods
NELAP States	0	(same as Labs)	0	
Non-NELAP States	2	9	0	11
FSMO AB's	0	0	0	0
Respondent Identification of Methods				Total Number of Lab Methods
FSMO Air	0	0	4	4
FSMO STAC	1	2	16	19
EPA Regions	0	0	6	6
FSMO (other media)	0	0	2	2
Total	3	11	28	42

Conclusions

- The Participation in questionnaire was limited.
- The committee would appreciate more participation.
- Questionnaire available from:

Ilona Tonton

Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.com

FSMO Questions

- Do You Operate a Mobile Lab?
- What Measurements/ analysis (methods) at Sample source, in mobile lab, fix base Lab
- What Sampling Methods
- What type of vehicle
- Are Measurements/ Analysis accredited?
- Are sampling Methods accredited?
- What Accreditation Standard, NELAC, TNI-FSMO, ASTM D7036, State Rule

FSMO AB Questions

- Do you offer Mobile Lab Accreditation
- Do you accredit for Field Sampling
- Do you accredit for measurements/ analysis methods
- How do you define Scope
- What Accreditation Standard, NELAC, TNI-FSMO, ASTM D7036

FSMO-STAC

- Do You Operate a Mobile Lab?
- What Measurements/ analysis (methods) at Sample source, in mobile lab, fix base Lab
- What Sampling Methods
- What type of vehicle
- Are Measurements/ Analysis accredited?
- Are sampling Methods accredited?
- What Accreditation Standard, NELAC, TNI-FSMO, ASTM D7036, State Rule

Ambient/ Indoor Air

- Same Questions as other FSMOs

Other Business

- Open

Contact Information

- Ilona Taunton, TNI-Nelac Institute
- FAC Committee Chair Justin Brown
- EC Committee Chair Kim Watson

NEFAP Mobile Field Lab Questionnaire RPT

Michael Miller & Paul Bergeron
mwmillernviron@yahoo.com

Questionnaire sent by e-mail

- To NEFAP EC, FAC and NELAC auditor's form members
- 15 organizations responded
- NELAP State ABs, State ABs, STAC Testers, Air FSMOs
- NELAP States Accredit to NELAC 2003 and/or TNI_NELAC 2009
- Some NELAP States also have State accreditations
- State AB accreditations based on rules/ regulations
- Most State ABs Accredit Mobile Labs individually
- Majority used or preferred the following definitions:

Mobile Lab Definitions

- 2) NELAC 2003 Standard: A portable enclosed structure with necessary and appropriate accommodations and environmental conditions as described in Chapter 5, with which testing is performed by analysts.

Definitions

- 3) TNI-FSMO 2007 rev 0.1: Defines Field Sampling and Measurement Organization, which includes mobile activities , following from standard.

  NOTE 1: FSMO activities, whether from a fixed or mobile base, that encompass multiple field sampling and measurement locations, do not require separate accreditations.
  NOTE 2: A mobile sampling and measurement unit, operating under the FSMO management system, does not require a separate accreditation

Respondent Self Identification	Accredit Sampling Only	Accredit Measurement Only	Accredit Sampling & Measurement	Total Number of AB Respondents
NELAP States	0	6	0	6
Non-NELAP States	0	0	1	3
FSMO AB's	0	0	0	0
Respondent	Perform Sampling Only	Perform Measurement Only	Perform Measurement & Sampling	Total Number of FMSO Respondents
FSMO Air	2	0	0	2
FSMO STAC	0	0	3	3
EPA Regions,	0	0	1	1
FSMO (other media)	0	1	0	1
Total	2	7	4	16

Respondent Identification of Methods/ Parameters	Sampling Methods Accredited	Measurement Methods/ Parameters Accredited	Combined Sampling/ Measurement Methods/ Parameters Accredited	Total Number of Lab Methods
NELAP States	0	(same as Labs)	0	
Non-NELAP States	2	9	0	11
FSMO AB's	0	0	0	0
Respondent Identification of Methods				Total Number of Lab Methods
FSMO Air	0	0	4	4
FSMO STAC	1	2	16	19
EPA Regions	0	0	6	6
FSMO (other media)	0	0	2	2
Total	3	11	28	42

Conclusions

- The Participation in questionnaire was limited.
- The committee would appreciate more participation.
- Questionnaire available from:

Ilona Tonton
Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.com

FSMO Questions

- Do You Operate a Mobile Lab?
- What Measurements/ analysis (methods) at Sample source, in mobile lab, fix base Lab
- What Sampling Methods
- What type of vehicle
- Are Measurements/ Analysis accredited?
- Are sampling Methods accredited?
- What Accreditation Standard, NELAC, TNI-FSMO, ASTM D7036, State Rule

FSMO AB Questions

- Do you offer Mobile Lab Accreditation
- Do you accredit for Field Sampling
- Do you accredit for measurements/ analysis methods
- How do you define Scope
- What Accreditation Standard, NELAC, TNI-FSMO, ASTM D7036

FSMO-STAC

- Do You Operate a Mobile Lab?
- What Measurements/ analysis (methods) at Sample source, in mobile lab, fix base Lab
- What Sampling Methods
- What type of vehicle
- Are Measurements/ Analysis accredited?
- Are sampling Methods accredited?
- What Accreditation Standard, NELAC, TNI-FSMO, ASTM D7036, State Rule

Ambient/ Indoor Air

- Same Questions as other FSMOs