SUMMARY OF THE
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Face-to-Face Meeting/Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#
Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill, Washington, D.C.
August 4, 2014; 1:00 – 5:00 p.m. EDT

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB or Board) face-to-face meeting was held on August 4, 2014, from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. EDT. The meeting was held as a session at the Forum on Laboratory Accreditation. The agenda for this meeting is provided as Attachment A, a list of meeting participants is provided as Attachment B, and action items are included as Attachment C. The official signature of the Chair or Vice-Chair is included as Attachment D.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. OPENING REMARKS AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Lara Phelps, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Board, and Ms. Patsy Root, Chair of ELAB, welcomed the members and guests to the meeting. Following an overview of the agenda by Ms. Root, the Board members introduced themselves.

2. APPROVAL OF JULY MINUTES

Ms. Root asked whether there were any comments regarding the July 2104 Board meeting minutes; there were none. Mr. Jack Farrell moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Dave Speis seconded the motion. The meeting minutes for July 2014 were approved unanimously with no discussion and two abstentions.

3. ELAB CHARTER/HIGHLIGHTS OF ACTIVITIES SINCE JANUARY 2014

Ms. Root explained that ELAB's mission is to provide consensus advice, information and recommendations on issues related to enhancing EPA's measurement programs and facilitating the operation and expansion of a national environmental accreditation program. ELAB provides this advice, information and/or recommendations to the EPA Administrator, EPA Science Advisor and/or Forum on Environmental Measurements (FEM).

Ms. Root described the highlights of the Board's 2014 accomplishments thus far, which included sending three separate letters to EPA regarding: (1) method detection limits (MDLs), (2) Board engagement during the development of the next Method Update Rule (MUR), and (3) opportunities to harmonize methods. The Board will meet with Agency representatives regarding the MUR during the Forum on Laboratory Accreditation and had met with Agency representatives regarding method harmonization just prior to this meeting.

Mr. Farrell asked whether formal responses to the letters had been received. Ms. Root said that MDL work occurring within the Agency is addressing ELAB's comments. Dr. Richard Burrows added that this was being accomplished as part of the MUR in regard to the wastewater rule.

4. NEWS/UPDATES FROM THE DFO

Ms. Phelps explained that a new Board term begins on October 15, 2014. Board members serve 2-year terms for up to three terms, which can be nonconsecutive. Several current ELAB members have met their term limits: Dr. Burrows, Mr. Farrell, Mr. Speis, and Dr. Michael Wichman. Ms. Phelps expects the new Board package to be signed shortly, and she can provide further updates during ELAB's September meeting.

Ms. Phelps explained that EPA is moving to Drupal for its website, and the ELAB website will be prominently located on the top right-hand side of the front page of the new Agency website devoted to methods, monitoring and data analysis. Because of the migration to the new platform, the current ELAB website is not being updated as frequently as in the past.

5. TASK GROUP UPDATES

Ms. Root stated that the Board possesses broad expertise and works on a variety of topics identified by ELAB members, the Agency or the environmental laboratory community, each assigned to a temporary Task Group to address the issues related to each topic. The Task Group leaders or their representatives provided a report of current activities.

Interagency Data Quality Task Force (IDQTF)/Data Quality Objective (DQO) Process

Ms. Silky Labie explained that this effort began when a former Task Group began investigating the DQO process and which entities within the Agency implement the process. The DQO process is elegant and provides an organized matrix for approaching environmental projects, including planning, assessing, reassessing and adjusting as necessary. After project and technical objectives are articulated, all parties must be involved, but laboratories are not considered a critical party. As a result, methods are introduced that are not feasible or do not have available technology. At that point, the process must be re-initiated. If laboratories are involved from the beginning, technical issues will be addressed before it is too late. Therefore, it is necessary to facilitate laboratory involvement in the DQO process.

One Agency organization that can facilitate this integration is the IDQTF, which uses the DQO process very actively. The group has developed guidelines, practices, quality assurance project plans (QAPPs) and other documents on this topic, so the Task Group has decided to approach the group, and the Board sent a letter to the IDQTF chair asking to meet and discuss the issue of laboratory involvement.

Ms. Root asked what the Task Group envisions as the result of this effort. Ms. Labie said that she would like EPA to acknowledge that there is a need to involve laboratories in the DQO process to provide technical advice. Laboratories can provide a great deal of advice on what limits are and are not achievable, method validation procedures, and a variety of other crucial topics.

In response to a question from Ms. Root regarding gaps in the process, Ms. Labie responded that often a list of compounds needing remediation is provided, but methods are not always available or limits amenable to making decisions. Essentially, engineers examine potentially contaminated sites without understanding the methods or limits that can be applied. Regulators expect laboratories to meet limits that are not practical or possible. Mr. John Phillips added that laboratory input is needed at the appropriate point in the process. Many times the stated detection limit is not achievable, so the laboratory must be involved in the preliminary work to ensure that limits can be met. Mr. Farrell commented that the Superfund and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act arenas have begun to improve their use of the DQO process and involve the relevant parties. The question is how to encourage other organizations and agencies to use and apply the improved process. ELAB could involve the FEM as it has been successful in releasing sampling policies.

Mr. Speis said that the engineering community needs to be educated and involved in the effort to increase laboratory input. The DQO process has been in place for a long time but still is not being implemented effectively. Mr. Farrell commented that it is difficult to target access to engineering groups and agreed that it is necessary to increase engineers' awareness of this issue.

Mr. James Burden (TechLaw, Inc) commented that EPA has contact with the engineering community via the regions, which have contracts with engineers. Ms. Phelps added that she works "down the hall" from Agency engineers and is grappling with the fact that this community has not been reached via this issue yet.

Mr. Farrell noted that the process flows from engineers to the laboratory back to engineers and permit writers, and then environmental consultants perform the cleanup.

Ms. Marlene Moore (Advanced Systems, Inc.) stated that IDQTF's purpose is to increase laboratory and user community involvement in what is now being called the systematic planning process. The DQO process is one type of systematic planning process, and laboratories are increasingly involved in the process. Ms. Charlotte Bertrand (EPA) is the new contact. Another agency significantly involved in this effort is the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). Ms. Moore can provide ELAB with contacts within each agency. There still is difficulty getting the "right people to do the right things." The various groups need to understand the current keywords to move all groups forward. Although there has been improvement, gaps still exist because a long-held institution is being changed. It is necessary to continue to find mechanisms to move the effort forward. The systematic planning process moves the old DQO process forward by changing the terminology. Finally, accreditation is difficult to obtain, so it is critical to promote the use of accredited field sampling and field sampling and measurement organizations (FSMOs).

Mr. David Friedman (Friedman Consulting, LLC) commented that the regulatory system evolved with a focus on actions rather than on the questions that need to be answered and the quality of the answers. To succeed, there must be a paradigm shift.

Mr. William Ray (William Ray Consulting, LLC) noted that engineers' views of measurements must be considered; engineers do not measure zero and have no concept of "nothing" and the

attempt to reach nothing. It will be helpful to understand how engineers think and determine how to change the way that they think to improve the DQO process.

Dr. Shen-Yi Yang (EPA) said that data are collected to make decisions as a project team. The most important questions within the DQO process are: Who is the data user? What decisions need to be made? The project team needs to include the assessor and laboratory director so that the appropriate methods are selected.

In response to a question from Ms. Root regarding next steps for the effort, Ms. Labie explained that there are lessons to be learned from IDQTF regarding laboratory engagement and training. The task force also can help expand communication to other programs among the agencies so that there is active dialogue with the "real world" (i.e., laboratories). Facilitating the conversation between the analytical and environmental regulatory communities will provide information useful to regulators, ultimately helping the laboratory community, which is frustrated with the limits set by those lacking expertise.

Mr. Scott Siders (Illinois EPA) asked whether the Board had contacted the laboratory community about its work with environmental consultants and what gaps may exist between laboratories and these companies; he thought that this was a critical conversation. Ms. Labie said that this would be the focus of the discussion with IDQTF about lessons learned, and then ELAB could determine the following steps.

Ms. Linda Bohannon (EcoChem, Inc.) commented that her company had been tasked with developing an analytical quality assurance plan, which is different than a QAPP, for its work with the deep water oil spill cleanup. The company set performance-based methods, contracted with four laboratory networks, and provided forums for communication with all relevant parties. ELAB should consider consulting with firms that perform this type of work as they have experience bringing the laboratory and engineering communities together and translating their work.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Lem Walker (EPA) commented that he has been asked about using inline/online continuous monitoring methods for compliance and wondered whether ELAB had discussed this issue in the past. Ms. Root responded that the Board had not discussed it as a group. Mr. Scott Hoatson (Oregon Department of Environmental Quality) added that inline monitoring commonly is used in process control (e.g., for total organic carbon analysis), and there is an interest in using it for wastewater and drinking water compliance. Mr. Phillips noted that laboratories are not very involved in the inline process, but it might be beneficial for them to be involved in calibration. Ms. Barbara Escobar (Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department) added that her laboratory is attempting to add sulfite inline measurement to permit requirements so that this may be used instead of total residential chlorine analysis.

Mr. Dan Hautman (EPA) noted that there are some approved methods for online monitoring for disinfecting residuals, which are limited in scope.

Mr. Ray said that all waste dischargers in California that discharge to a water body have inline chlorine monitoring. State law requires that this be performed by certified laboratories, so these laboratories use a variety of methods to perform the analysis in the laboratory. He provided a local example in which laboratories were running drinking water and wastewater analyses with different chlorine requirements.

Mr. Farrell summarized that the issue is that most inline monitoring is used for process control but in some cases already is being used for compliance. As the desire to use inline monitoring for compliance increases, the question becomes how it is accredited or certified (e.g., FSMOs).

Ms. Zonetta English (Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District) said that the lack of validation for these tests is becoming an issue, particularly for larger municipalities.

Ms. Moore noted that ASTM International methods exist regarding how to calibrate and monitor inline data for compliance, but the question of proficiency testing arises. It is cumbersome to develop a process. The appropriate data quality for compliance work should be documented from accredited field sampling. A participant noted that technology improves at a rapid rate, causing a gap in accreditation.

Ms. Sharon Mertens (Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District) said that there is a key need for real-time data to monitor waterways. Her community has been using real-time monitoring in critical areas of streams, and the measurements are validated to ensure that the quality of the data is comparable to that of laboratory data. Although it is a cumbersome process, the client has confidence in the data. There is a need for more validation of real-time data.

Ms. Naomi Goodman (Electric Power Research Institute) commented that in regard to air sampling, the quality assurance (QA) requirements for data entered into the database are minimal. EPA is attempting to incorporate quality measurements into the database, but the current process makes this difficult. The laboratory community should have input. All entities involved with air testing data should be concerned.

Mr. Farrell moved that an ELAB Task Group be formed to examine inline and online monitoring for compliance, determine any relevant issues, and provide EPA with recommendations in response to the identified issues. Ms. Susan Mazur seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Robin Cook (City of Daytona Beach Environmental Monitoring Laboratory) noted that operators are trained, tested and licensed to operate, not serve as scientists. Inline/online monitoring goes beyond the accreditation issue to examining all of the pieces of the system; operators deal with enough that learning about these other pieces is not of high priority. Mr. Farrell noted that operators perform well with set guidelines and requirements. Ms. Cook agreed but stated that those operators who have been performing their jobs for many years will not understand new requirements. There must be a shift so that operators understand the "why" as well. Separate standards for inline monitoring are needed because the data must be of high quality and legally defensible. Mr. Farrell noted that FSMOs are a part of determining next steps.

Ms. Jeri Rossi (de maximis Data Management Solutions, Inc.) commented that Methods 8260 and 8270 do not address selected ion monitoring (SIM) or the accompanying QA. Dr. Burrows

agreed that there could be more specificity in this area. Ms. Rossi added that laboratories are not examining primary and secondary ion ratios, and there is nothing in the regulations that require this. Dr. Burrows, Mr. Phillips and Dr. Wait agreed that the Board might want to make recommendations to the Agency regarding better control of SIM analysis. Dr. Burrows noted that the previous MUR included SIM analysis for wastewater. Mr. Speis said that some states are accrediting SIM analysis as a separate process, implying that there will be standard operating procedures (SOPs) with quality control (QC) criteria, but these SOPs may not be standardized.

Dr. Burrows moved that the Board develop reasonable criteria for the control of SIM and recommend that EPA begin integrating them into its methods. Mr. Speis made a friendly amendment that ELAB work with the Agency collaboratively to develop criteria for SIM analysis that can be incorporated into commonly used methods or standards. Dr. Burrows agreed to the amendment. Mr. Farrell seconded the motion with the amendment, which passed unanimously.

A participant noted that the EPA Contract Laboratory Program Superfund Organic Methods (CLP SOMs) include SIM and associated criteria. Mr. Farrell noted that this might be a good place to start. Mr. Henry Leibovitz (Computer Science Corporation) noted that, in regard to method harmonization, the group had just identified methods (i.e., CLP SOMs) that provide specifics regarding SIM, and the list of semivolatile compounds is the same as in Methods 8260 and 8270. Utilizing existing information would be helpful for method harmonization.

Ms. Cindy Gagnon (Prairieville, Louisiana) commented that SIM analysis does not result in the true identification of a compound because only three major ions are examined. It is important to identify the ion.

Ms. Moore commented that state agencies are not renewing certifications in a timely manner, which is costly to laboratories that cannot bid because their drinking water and wastewater certifications are expiring. She asked whether ELAB had considered how to help laboratories obtain timely certification. Ms. Phelps responded that the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program was created to mitigate this issue, and this is an issue for The NELAC Institute (TNI). Data from the states will be shared during sessions at the end of the week.

A participant commented that third-party accreditation may be able to provide more expedient certification. In Rhode Island, the laboratory certification program trained wastewater treatment facility inspectors, who previously were operators, using the short form of the laboratory checklist. The inspectors perform two visits annually, speaking directory to operators regarding why the tests are being performed and the importance of the tests. This is a beneficial collaboration between laboratory certification programs and inspectors, who educate and check in with operators.

Mr. Siders asked why EPA has not enforced accreditation for wastewater. Ms. Phelps responded that EPA has statutory authority only for drinking water, lead and asbestos. Mr. Farrell added that the Agency supports a national accreditation program, but this is not always recognized.

Ms. Jessica Jensen (A&E Analytical Laboratory) commented that although third-party accreditation may be an option, it can be cost-prohibitive for small laboratories. In her case, her

laboratory would need to pay five to six times the amount that she is paying for accreditation currently. If third-party accreditation included bidding, it would be helpful. In Kansas, accreditation firms are assigned to laboratories by the state. Mr. N. Myron Gunsalus, Jr. (Kansas Department of Health and Environment) responded that in Kansas, third-party accreditation applies only to out-of-state laboratories. The problem with the bidding process is that there is a financial incentive to underbid. The state is attempting to identify methods to provide laboratories with flexibility at the best price without financial disincentives or inappropriate financial pressures for assessment firms.

7. TASK GROUP UPDATES (CONTINUED)

Methods Harmony

Dr. Dallas Wait, via teleconference, explained that the Task Group is focused on exploring and suggesting opportunities for harmonization of test method practices throughout the Agency. The Task Group met with EPA staff via teleconference in January 2014 and earlier that day. EPA is cognizant that methods harmonization is sensible, particularly in terms of consistency in the number of points on calibration curves, retention times, QA/QC approaches and so forth. There are EPA efforts in this area, with a group of representatives from several programs and offices discussing harmonization as the opportunity arises. The Agency will consider method harmonization when a new method is promulgated or old methods are updated. The Task Group will continue its efforts and welcomes input from the larger community.

Mr. Siders asked whether the Task Group had considered the more basic issues, such as method nomenclature and numbering. Ms. Root explained that the Board considered a great number of variables. The goal is to address these issues when new methods are promulgated or old methods are updated. A global change would stymie the process.

Mr. Hoatson asked about regulatory harmony and incorporating wastewater and drinking water methods that are similar. Mr. Farrell responded that ELAB's previous activities have addressed this to some extent, such as Board input regarding Methods 624 and 625 and SW-846, and ELAB continues to address these issues when opportunities present themselves. It is difficult for Clean Water Act programs to change because of the need for data validation studies. Dr. Wait added that EPA had requested the Board's input regarding Methods 603, 608, 624 and 625, and ELAB's comments included remarks about harmonization opportunities.

Mr. Siders asked about the specific goal of this effort in terms of harmonizing the Agency's programs. Mr. Speis said that the effort would not move forward unless there is a reasonable chance that EPA will attempt to harmonize its programs when the opportunities arise.

Ms. Root explained that the Board provides advice to EPA during the rule-making process, but because this process is infrequent, ELAB maintains a list so that when opportunities for method harmonization present themselves, the Board is ready to comment. Because the rule-making process includes public comment, the environmental laboratory community can provide input as well.

Mr. Siders suggested that the Board ask all participants for their "top five lists" for method harmonization.

Acrolein and Acrylonitrile Methods

Dr. Burrows said that Method 624 had been approved during the previous MUR for acrolein and acrylonitrile, but the MUR states that Method 603 is the preferred method. The Board wrote a letter to EPA recommending the preference of Method 624 versus Method 603 for acrolein and acrylonitrile as well as the removal of the pH 4–5 preservation requirement. This preservation requirement has been removed from Chapter 4 of SW-846, but Dr. Burrows was unsure whether acrolein and acrylonitrile would be part of the upcoming MUR or not. The preference for Method 624 results from the considerable potential for false positives and negatives.

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Mr. Speis explained that in reviewing Method 608, it became apparent that PCBs are being reported as aroclors, but there are other sources of PCBs that may not be reported. Therefore, the Task Group is exploring alternatives to reporting PCBs as aroclors with a sensitivity somewhere between that of Method 1668 and the current version. Mr. Phillips added that moving toward congeners is helpful, but the regulations need to be made current as congeners must be extrapolated to aroclors to meet the regulations.

Ms. Goodman explained that a report regarding Method 1668 was available in the public docket and should be used as a resource in this effort.

Mr. Ray noted the need to understand the regulatory system because the stakes are high; when rules change, individuals begin to question whether the old rules were flawed. Ms. Root understood the rationale for keeping legacy methods, but as technology improves over time, sensitivities and how data are viewed may change. This does not mean that the old methods were flawed but rather that sensitivities and quantitation have improved. There needs to be some mechanism in place to improve the regulations based on the available technology. Mr. Ray noted that water quality standards for congeners will be needed because they are not yet included in the regulations; there are considerations other than technology. Ms. Root commented that it is necessary to understand how new methods compare to legacy methods, which should drive any review or change in limits. Mr. Ray added that attorneys become involved, so the legal aspects of enforcement and compliance must be considered as well.

Ms. Mertens said that cost must be considered as a practical matter. The cost for switching methods for major projects could be prohibitive.

Dr. Wait wondered about resolving the heated purge and trap method that is in Method 603 but not in Method 624. Dr. Burrows responded that acceptable detection limits are possible even without a heated purge and trap. Dr. Wait asked about recovery, and Dr. Burrows replied that analytical standards are the same.

Mr. Farrell commented that legacy methods should not prevent industry from pursuing new avenues to move forward.

MUR

Ms. Root explained that 40 CFR 136 is undergoing an update, the last of which was in 2012. During the Board's February meeting, Agency staff presented information about the update to ELAB members. The Board followed up with a letter to the Agency requesting engagement on MUR development. Several ELAB members will be meeting with EPA staff regarding this issue this week during the Forum. Ms. Root invited the participants to bring forth any issues related to the MUR that they would like the Board to present to the Agency.

Mr. Hoatson suggested that the Board include in its comments that the MUR adopt SW-846 methods into 40 CFR 136. Generally, QC criteria are better in SW-846 compared to wastewater methods.

Mr. Ray suggested that EPA examine 40 CFR 136.7 (QA section) and address the problems contained within that section. The list of 12 QC criteria do not always apply. Ms. Root noted that the paragraph above the list indicates that it applies to chemistry. Mr. Ray said that the problem is that the QC from the method compendium must be used in certain cases, but there are several print editions of the compendium, and the QC often differs among editions. Following the compendium as a single source is not working, and therefore, the Agency should re-examine this. Ms. Root noted that on Tuesday afternoon during the Forum she is presenting about 40 CFR 136.7 regarding microbiology and cross-referencing chemistry. Mr. Hoatson stated that he appreciated 40 CFR 136.7 from a regulatory standpoint for small wastewater plants because it emphasizes the importance of QA/QC to these operations. Even older versions of the compendium have better QC than nothing. The current 40 CFR 136.7 is a step in the right direction but may need revision. The requirements for SOPs are not clear, so this could be a focus during the update. Mr. Farrell added that TNI will be reviewing comments regarding 40 CFR 136.7. He agreed that 40 CFR 136.7 could be clarified and more detailed added, but it is a good start.

8. OPEN DISCUSSION/NEW ITEMS

Ms. Root reported that TNI's Proficiency Testing Program Executive Committee's Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing FoPT Table Subcommittee has requested that ELAB review how whole effluent toxicity proficiency testing is performed.

Mr. Leibovitz asked whether personal air sensors, which are worn by individuals, should be considered by ELAB because laboratories may be involved in analyzing the resulting data. The other question is whether data generated from these sensors would be considered field testing. Ms. Phelps explained that this topic would be addressed during sessions taking place later in the week. There are several topics to be discussed during the forum that may be given to the Board for consideration. New technology is allowing collection of exposure data that could not be collected in the past (e.g., data collected by unmanned aerial vehicles [UAVs]). ELAB may want to investigate some of these technologies.

In response to a question from Ms. Root, Ms. Phelps explained that the question is how to begin to use and manage the data collected by nonprofessionals (i.e., citizen science). Dr. Wait thought

that the largest source of data quality errors would be whether the results obtained are reflective of what is being measured.

Ms. Kim Watson (Stone Environmental, Inc.) noted that a national accreditation program does not exist for mobile laboratories. TNI's National Environmental Field Activities Program (NEFAP) Executive Committee is trying to develop a national program, but states and the DoD have issued limitations. Additionally, there is no reciprocity, and laboratories accredit to ISO Standard 17025. Assessment and accreditation of mobile units is an issue that must be explored.

Mr. Leibovitz stated that responsible use of cutting-edge technology must be accompanied by collaboration with engineers to develop DQOs. He would like ELAB to promote engineering/ laboratory partnerships and ensure that misinformation is not being disseminated. Ms. Phelps will consider whether the engineering field should be represented on the Board.

Ms. Gagnon said that the question is how to define a mobile laboratory, and she did not think that inline analyzers should be considered mobile laboratories. As such, she did not think that inline analysis would be covered within NEFAP. Ms. Root responded that Mr. Walker's question was in regard to using inline monitoring data for compliance. Mr. Farrell explained that NEFAP, which is flexible, is based on ISO Standard 17025 for any field work that is performed and can be applied to mobile laboratories and field branches of laboratories that are performing field measurements versus fixed laboratory processes.

Ms. Labie commented that equipment ownership and maintenance must be considered; laboratories sometimes are responsible for maintenance.

Mr. Hoatson stated that Oregon requires the use of EPA-approved methods. SOPs can be instituted for inline monitoring that address the same issues (e.g., operator training), and accreditation can be instituted in those states that require it. SOPs and appropriate QC can help laboratories obtain accreditation, but whether it is useful is determined by the regulatory framework.

Ms. Phelps noted that an enormous amount of data will be generated by mobile monitors, and ELAB members may want to attend the upcoming session regarding this topic during the Forum. Mr. Siders agreed that UAVs and personal sensors will collect vast amounts of data regarding primary pollutants. This will result in many changes in the future regarding data monitoring, measurement and quality.

Mr. Leibovitz commented that wastewater treatment facility laboratories in his state must be certified. Many chemical plants have built-in inline analyzers for chemicals that require EPA-approved methods. Calibration data cannot be provided, however, and data to inform the public are based on data that are not calibrated daily. Therefore, the question is whether these plants truly are following the methods. How can required missing information be provided to ensure calibration and that the analysis is in control? Ms. Labie added that Florida also requires wastewater laboratory certification to provide data for compliance purposes, but some analytes (e.g., pH, dissolved oxygen, residual chlorine) are exempt because Florida developed SOPs related to the methods that focus on field rather than laboratory testing. The SOPs, which must be followed by laboratories opting to not obtain certification for the exempted analytes, include

information about calibration, calibration checks, calibration verification and so forth. There are extensive training programs for operators or field measurement personnel to ensure that accurate results are obtained. The question is whether the field or the laboratory must be certified. In response to a question from Mr. Leibovitz, Ms. Labie clarified that the Florida data of which she spoke was inline data. Mr. Leibovitz remarked that technicians in Florida possibly could inform Mr. Walker's original question. Mr. Farrell commented that Florida's system may be a good model when considering the issues, because perhaps accreditation may not be the ultimate issue.

9. REVIEW ACTION ITEMS/CLOSING REMARKS/ADJOURN

Ms. Kristen LeBaron reviewed the action items identified during the meeting, which can be found in Attachment C.

Citing no additional comments or issues, Ms. Root asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Farrell made the motion, which Mr. Speis seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Attachment A

AGENDA
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
Face-to-Face Meeting/Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#
Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill, Washington, D.C.
August 4, 2014; 1:00 – 5:00 p.m. EDT

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.	Opening Remarks and Roll Call
	Approval of July Minutes
	ELAB Charter/Highlights of Activities Since January 2014
	News/Updates From the Designated Federal Officer
	Task Group Updates
	Public Comment
3:00 – 3:30 p.m.	BREAK
3:30 – 5:00 p.m.	Task Group Updates (Continued)
	Open Discussion/New Items
	Review Action Items/Closing Remarks/Adjourn

Attachment B

MEMBERSHIP LISTING AND GUESTS

ELAB MEETING
August 4, 2014; 1:00 – 5:00 p.m. EDT

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y	Ms. Patsy Root (Chair)	IDEXX Laboratories, Inc. Representing: Laboratory Product Developers
N	Ms. Michelle L. Wade (Vice-Chair)	Kansas Department of Health and the Environment Representing: Laboratory Accreditation Bodies
Y	Ms. Lara P. Phelps, DFO	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Representing: EPA
Y	Dr. Richard Burrows	TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc. Representing: Commercial Laboratory Industry
Y	Ms. Patricia M. Carvajal	San Antonio River Authority Representing: Watershed/Restoration
Y	Mr. John (Jack) E. Farrell, III	Analytical Excellence, Inc. Representing: The NELAC Institute (TNI)
Y (via teleconference)	Ms. Ruth L. Forman	Environmental Standards, Inc. Representing: Large Third-Party Assessors
Y	Ms. Sylvia (Silky) S. Labie	Environmental Laboratory Consulting & Technology, LLC Representing: Third Party Assessors
Y	Ms. Susan L. Mazur	Florida Power and Light Representing: Utility Water Act Group
Y	Mr. John H. Phillips	Ford Motor Company Representing: Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
N	Dr. Mahesh P. Pujari	City of Los Angeles Representing: National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA)
N	Dr. James N. Seiber	University of California, Davis Representing: Academic and Research Communities
Y (via teleconference)	Ms. Aurora Shields	City of Lawrence, Kansas Representing: Wastewater Laboratories
Y	Mr. David (Dave) N. Speis	QC Laboratories Representing: American Council of Independent Laboratories (ACIL)
Y	Dr. A. Dallas Wait	Gradient Representing: Consumer Products Industry
Y (via teleconference)	Dr. Michael D. Wichman	State Hygienic Laboratory at the University of Iowa Representing: Association of Public Health Laboratories (APHL)

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y	Ms. Kristen LeBaron (Contractor)	The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc. (SCG)
Y	Ms. Linda Bohannon (Guest)	EcoChem, Inc.
Y	Mr. James Burden (Guest)	TechLaw, Inc.
Y	Ms. Robin Cook (Guest)	City of Daytona Beach Environmental Monitoring Laboratory
Y	Ms. Zonetta English (Guest)	Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District
Y	Ms. Barbara Escobar (Guest)	Pima County Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department
Y	Mr. David Friedman (Guest)	Friedman Consulting, LLC
Y	Ms. Cindy Gagnon (Guest)	Prairieville, Louisiana
Y	Ms. Naomi Goodman (Guest)	Electric Power Research Institute
Y	Mr. N. Myron Gunsalus, Jr. (Guest)	Kansas Department of Health and Environment
Y	Mr. Dan Hautman (Guest)	EPA
Y	Mr. Scott Hoatson (Guest)	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Y	Ms. Jessica Jensen (Guest)	A&E Analytical Laboratory
Y	Mr. Henry Leibovitz (Guest)	Computer Science Corporation
Y	Ms. Sharon Mertens (Guest)	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District
Y	Ms. Marlene Moore (Guest)	Advanced Systems, Inc.
Y	Mr. William Ray (Guest)	William Ray Consulting, LLC
Y	Ms. Jeri Rossi (Guest)	de maximis Data Management Solutions, Inc.
Y	Mr. Scott Siders (Guest)	Illinois EPA
Y	Dr. Shen-Yi Yang (Guest)	EPA
Y	Mr. Lem Walker (Guest)	EPA
Y	Ms. Kim Watson (Guest)	Stone Environmental, Inc.

Attachment C

ACTION ITEMS

1. Ms. LeBaron will finalize the July 2014 teleconference minutes and send them via email to Ms. Phelps.

2. The IDQTF/DQO Task Group will update the terminology involved with the effort (e.g., replace DQO with "systematic planning process") and follow up with additional experts, including Ms. Bertrand.

3. ELAB will form a new Task Group to examine inline and online monitoring for compliance, determine any relevant issues, and provide EPA with recommendations in response to the identified issues.

4. ELAB will form a new Task Group to develop criteria, in collaboration with the Agency, regarding SIM analysis.

5. The PCB Task Group will follow up with Ms. Goodman regarding the Method 1668 report on the public docket.

Attachment D

I hereby certify that this is the final version of minutes for the Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Meeting held on August 4, 2014.

Signature Chair

Ms. Patsy Root

Print Name Chair