ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD (ELAB)
Face-to-Face Meeting/Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#
Hyatt Regency Chicago, Chicago, IL
July 13, 2015; 1:00 – 5:00 p.m. CDT

MEETING SUMMARY

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB or Board) face-to-face meeting was held on July 13, 2015, from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. CDT. 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 certification of the minutes by the Chair or Vice-Chair is included as Attachment D.

OPENING REMARKS, ROLL CALL, MISSION STATEMENT, OVERVIEW OF BOARD GOALS AND HIGHLIGHTS OF ELAB OUTPUTS

Ms. Lara Phelps, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Board, and Ms. Patty Carvajal, Chair of ELAB, welcomed the members and guests to the meeting. Following an overview of the agenda by Ms. Carvajal, the Board members introduced themselves. Ms. Carvajal explained that the Board operates under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. 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).

Since the previous face-to-face meeting in February 2015, important Board products have included comments sent to EPA in May 2015 on the Method Update Rule (MUR) and a letter to the FEM in June 2015 regarding the qualification of water quality data.

APPROVAL OF JUNE MINUTES

Ms. Carvajal asked whether there were any comments regarding the June Board meeting; there were none. Dr. Henry Leibovitz moved to approve the minutes, and Ms. Silky Labie seconded the motion. The meeting minutes for June were approved unanimously.

UPDATES FROM THE DFO

Ms. Phelps explained that EPA is in the process of transforming its website, moving it to a Drupal platform and creating a topically based system. This will allow members of the public to navigate the site more easily. As a result of the reorganization, the ELAB website is now a part of EPA's environmental measurement website at www2.epa.gov/measurements. The four primary topics on the front page of the environmental measurement website are methods, monitoring, competency and ELAB. The goal is to have the full EPA website redesign completed by October 1, 2015.

TASK GROUP UPDATES

Ms. Carvajal 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. The Board addresses these topics through temporary Task Groups. The Task Group leaders provided a report of current topics/activities.

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

Dr. Leibovitz explained that this Task Group focuses on the concern that laboratories are not involved in the DQO process early enough. He provided background on the IDQTF from information he had received through a meeting with Dr. Jordan Adelson (U.S. Navy), who sits on the task force. The Department of Defense (DoD), Department of Energy (DOE) and EPA work collaboratively to, among other goals, promote consistent and transparent intergovernmental quality systems at federal facilities for planning, collecting and using environmental data of appropriate quality. The task force is an initiative of the DoD's Environmental Data Quality Workgroup (EDQW), which is responsible for developing and recommending policy and overseeing the DoD's Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program.[1] The IDQTF promotes the use of the Uniform Federal Policy (UFP) for Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs), which encourages a team-based approach to planning project objectives, schedules, resources and requirements.

The DoD Procurement Policy, another initiative of the EDQW, is important to this issue because it requires DoD quality assurance surveillance and chemist involvement in the DQO/QAPP processes. Another important EDQW initiative is the DoD/DOE Quality Systems Manual (QSM). DoD prime contractors ("primes") usually are environmental engineering firms that contract laboratories through Requests for Proposals (RFPs), and laboratories were concerned that chemists were not involved in the DQO process; however, per the Procurement Policy, chemists actually are required to be included. During the RFP process, the IDQTF sets guidelines for laboratory qualification[2]. The IDQTF has recommended that: (1) primes and contract laboratories must work to improve communication and interaction among them, (2) laboratories should become aware of how primes hire laboratory services and how to better market their services to them, and (3) primes should not hire laboratory services if they do not meet the requirements[3].

A mechanism must be put in place so that laboratories communicate with primes earlier in the process because, ultimately, improved communication and interactions with primes may provide more time for laboratories to learn the project and technical objectives that guide the DQO process. Laboratory marketing departments should develop relationships with companies that are likely to become primes, allowing laboratories to more quickly respond to opportunities.

[1] Although described during the meeting as an EDQW initative, the IDQTF is an EPA/DoD/DOE initiative.

[2] Although described as such during the meeting, the IDQTF is not involved with the RFP process.

[3] Although these recommendations were described as coming from the IDQTF, this cannot be confirmed.

Laboratories should not agree to provide analytical services until the project and technical objectives are understood.

Mr. Dave Speis (Eurofins QC, Inc.) found the recommendations to be somewhat naïve. Unless the IDQTF understands the realities of the situation, change will not occur. Dr. Leibovitz responded that these recommendations are the limit of the IDQTF's power, as the task force is unable to develop and implement policy; higher level policy makers must make the changes.

Ms. Labie noted that it is necessary to make changes on all laboratory projects, not just those related to the DoD, DOE or EPA. In many cases, laboratories are not told the DQOs, and as a result may be unable to meet them. Mr. Michael Flournoy commented that better communication is key and necessary to make appropriate DQO decisions and develop proper policies.

Dr. Leibovitz stated that the engineering groups are responsible for including chemists sooner in the process. The Federal Acquisition Regulations' Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (FAR DFARS), which dictates how primes and laboratories are hired, must be changed. Ms. Labie asked how to effect these changes so that laboratory inclusion in the DQO process is realized. Dr. Leibovitz said that it would not be through the IDQTF, which does not control the primes and is charged only with setting the specifications for laboratories[4]. He was not sure how to build this into the FAR DFARS. Dr. Kitty Kong thought that including laboratory quality requirements in the RFPs would effect change by ensuring that the laboratory can achieve these requirements. Laboratories (chemists) should be part of the project team to ensure that requirements can be met and the project is successful.

Mr. Bob Wyeth (Independent Consultant) said that it is necessary to understand the highly competitive nature of the environmental commercial testing market. Marketing departments are charged with finding jobs and bringing in work under short timelines, and the opportunities for communication is minimal. The recommendation that laboratories refuse work is oxymoronic, as laboratories need the work to survive. The answer lies in the EDQW. He agreed that communication is key, but it must occur at a much higher level. He would like ELAB to recommend that communication must be included in the planning process rather than the procurement process. Although former chemists may work at environmental engineering firms to provide a laboratory perspective, the commercial analytical testing business changes frequently; therefore, active laboratories must participate in the planning process prior to procurement.

Ms. Catherine Katsikis (Laboratory Data Consultants FL, Inc.) suggested that the environmental laboratory community speak to engineering firms at the conferences that they attend to encourage the firms to include laboratories earlier in the process. This topic is not generally covered at environmental engineering meetings.

Mr. Scott Siders (Illinois EPA) commented that the Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) employed a good approach in the 1980s. Multiple meetings were held to develop statements of work (SOWs) and ensure that they were reasonable. Dr. Dallas Wait agreed that the CLP process was informative, with laboratories agreeing that the resulting DQOs were reasonable.
Mr. Charlie Appleby (EPA) commented that the CLP still asks for input to develop SOWs,

[4] Although stated as such, the IDQTF is not involved with setting or developing laboratory specifications.

although it occurs via email discussion rather than during face-to-face meetings because of the current budget. Dealing with specific projects and matrices and obtaining analysis results through standard methods creates a particular challenge that requires upfront involvement by planners on how to obtain analytical results. Dr. Leibovitz noted that challenges arise not from following the UFP QAPP but from special circumstances; all projects are different, but they are not always special.

Ms. Marlene Moore (Advanced Systems, Inc.) indicated that the IDQTF has developed two major documents that indicate that laboratories must be involved in the planning process, the UFP QAPP and the UFP for Implementing Environmental Quality Systems. These documents provide a framework for and stress the importance of ensuring that everyone involved in a project discusses the project requirements, which is accomplished with a cross-section of experts and sciences familiar with the issues of the specific project. The procurement process is where the issue lies. This process is a vicious cycle because primes cannot hire the laboratories for their expertise until after they have procured them, they cannot procure them until after they know what the project is, and they cannot know what the project is until after they have completed the planning, which requires laboratory expertise. Engineering firms must build in time and understand upfront that each project is different. A “cookie cutter” approach will not work to develop project DQOs; thought must be given to each project. Regulators, data users, engineering firms, laboratories, sample collectors and others must be included in the process.

Ms. Dorothy Love (Eurofins Lancaster Laboratories Environmental) agreed that laboratories need to be involved early on but cautioned about their level of involvement. More than one laboratory needs to provide input so that DQOs can be determined scientifically by site needs, data type, risks and other pertinent factors rather than by one laboratory reporting its specific capabilities. Dr. Leibovitz noted that laboratories might invest time in developing DQOs and QAPPs and then be underbid and not receive the work.

Mr. David Friedman (American Council of Independent Laboratories [ACIL]) said that an approach for consideration may be similar to the two-phase process that the DoD uses for purchasing weapons systems. The first phase involves a procurement process to hire expert services to design the QAPP for the operation. The resulting team, which includes the various types of needed expertise, is charged with developing a plan. The implementation of the plan requires a second procurement. This approach might address the issue, allowing laboratories to be involved in the planning process without providing their time freely.

Mr. Jack Farrell (Analytical Excellence, Inc.) commented that the IDQTF and DoD are doing a good job on a limited scope, but a much wider scope needs to be addressed. This topic has been under discussion for at least 30 years, with no significant changes. A different process is needed. He encouraged ELAB to consider an entirely different process that might be implemented that would involve laboratories in the process much earlier.

Dr. George Detsis (DOE) stated that the client needs to clearly define the purpose of the data and how the data will be used, defining DQOs before laboratories bid. He cited a DOE example of how analysis of uranium versus plutonium causes issues.

A participant from the state of Oregon commented that project managers increasingly are being hired more for their marketing skills than their technical abilities. Laboratories must retain their technical abilities to be involved in the process.

Mr. Speis agreed with Mr. Farrell and suggested that ELAB help the Agency design a new system. He thought that this approach had the best chance of effecting change. Mr. Flournoy concurred that a different process is key, and increasing laboratory and engineering firm communication is a good starting point. He did not know if the QSM was the answer, but perhaps a national community of practice could be beneficial.

Mr. Mike Shepherd (Shepherd Technical Services) commented that focusing on the EDQW or QSM misses the larger picture, as this problem is much larger than just DoD or DOE projects. Expecting the QSM to solve the issue is inadequate because the problem encompasses more than the sector covered by the QSM.

Mr. Paul Junio (Northern Lake Service, Inc.) noted that sometimes laboratories complete a project and only then are given the DQOs.

Ms. Labie said that the laboratory community mostly is concerned about smaller projects. Attempting to meet impossible DQOs affects regulatory laboratories as well and is cross-cutting to a variety of areas. She agreed that communication must occur much earlier in the process.

A participant agreed that a new system is needed, as the current one is not working for laboratories or primes. He thanked ELAB for addressing this serious problem.

In response to Ms. Carvajal's question regarding how the Task Group will move forward, Dr. Leibovitz said that EDQW should be contacted because it sets the policy. It would be ideal if laboratories could be awarded projects before developing DQOs so that their efforts are not wasted if another laboratory is awarded a project.

Methods Harmony

Dr. Wait explained that the Task Group's goal is to provide recommendations to EPA regarding test methods that may be amenable to harmonization among program offices. The Task Group met with representatives from the Agency, who asked ELAB to identify three to five test methods that could be harmonized. Method harmonization can improve efficiencies and costs for commercial and EPA laboratories as well as enhance comparability among different laboratory results. Promulgated regulatory requirements, matrix issues and differing DQOs, however, may be reasons for differences in similar test methods. The Task Group is examining and will make recommendations in six different areas: (1) pharmaceuticals and other liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) methods, (2) herbicides, (3) ion chromatography, (4) total organic carbon, (5) metals by inductively coupled plasma, and (6) metals by inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry. Dr. Wait highlighted the Task Group's process using the three methods within the herbicide area as an example. The Task Group is identifying differences in parameters among the three herbicide methods and determining whether there is a good reason they are different. If no reason can be found, the Task Group is recommending harmonization of the parameters. The goal is to make recommendations to EPA soon.

Dr. Mahesh Pujari thought that there was no significant reason that parameters among the herbicide methods should differ and these methods should be unified. Ms. Carvajal thanked the Task Group for performing the challenging work of identifying the differences and potential for harmonization among the methods in the six areas.

Mr. Eric Davis (City of Austin Water Utility) asked whether the Agency had considered establishing a single set of methods given the presidential directive to federal agencies to harmonize. Ms. Phelps replied that EPA offices and program work under different, specific statutory authorities, which sometimes prevents harmonization. Mr. Dan Hautman (EPA) added that technological advances also must be considered, but it can be costly to withdraw old methods. If the intent is to be able to use methods on all matrices, drinking water has much stricter criteria that would then have to be applied to wastewater and other matrices. Dr. Wait added that the goal of this project is not the wholesale harmonization of all methods but to examine which parameters of certain methods can be harmonized. Ms. Michelle Wade agreed with Mr. Hautman, noting that it is difficult to withdraw a method once it has been regulated.

Ms. Moore stated that drinking water and wastewater frequently are becoming the same matrix, but they must be tested separately. Matrices are evolving, and technological advances must be considered when creating new or updating older methods. There is a great deal of complexity. She asked whether the Agency is examining streamlining or simplifying the drinking water and wastewater matrices. Mr. Hautman responded that such considerations are occurring, and his office communicates with Mr. Lem Walker's (EPA) office about this issue; there is a good deal of crosstalk.

Mr. Wyeth applauded the harmonization effort but questioned whether the different methods for the different matrices utilize the best science. He did not think that the best science was being applied to the herbicide methods. The political reality is that certain offices have developed different methods for specific reasons. Is this an appropriate use of ELAB's efforts since harmonization is unlikely? Mr. Hautman replied that many of the parameters that Dr. Wait had highlighted in his presentation could be harmonized; others have a solid rationale for their differences. Dr. Wait reiterated that ELAB's effort was not to pursue comprehensive method harmonization but rather to suggest pieces of methods that can be harmonized. The Task Group is not being naïve and understands that there are certain barriers, but it is important for ELAB to bring issues to the attention of the scientific and regulatory communities. Dr. Richard Burrows (TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc.) added that this was absolutely an appropriate use of ELAB. Several areas already have been harmonized as a result of past ELAB efforts. Harmonization of parameters whose differences truly do not make a difference will increase simplicity and laboratory compliance. Mr. Farrell agreed that this was a beneficial exercise for the Board, noting that the Task Group should identify parameters that must be method-specific and those that could use a performance-based approach. The focus should be on those methods being revised or new methods being developed.

Mr. Sider suggested that ELAB speak directly with the EPA staff member with the power to make method harmonization occur and asked who that person might be. Ms. Carvajal reiterated that the Agency requested that the Task Group investigate methods that could be harmonized; this effort is not being undertaken without EPA input. Mr. Hautman said that Mr. Mike Shapiro (EPA) would be the person with the power within the Office of Water (OW). Ms. Phelps noted

that ELAB is working with multiple program offices, not just OW, so there is more than one "person of power." EPA formed a group at the request of Mr. Shapiro to discuss harmonization; the group asked the Board for cross-media examples of how the Agency could best achieve method harmonization and be more transparent.

Mr. Hautman explained that EPA now is sharing methods across offices to obtain buy-in on future methods rather than focusing on old methods.

Mr. Dan Hickman (The NELAC Institute [TNI]) recommended that the drinking water and Clean Water Act groups reference standard methods by the same name.

A participant noted that regulatory methods are moving to LC-MS/MS and suggested that upgrades be investigated in addition to harmonization.

Mr. Andy Valkenburg (Energy Laboratories, Inc.) commented that this was a great opportunity to have OW staff present to listen to the discussion so that new methods can be harmonized as they are created.

Acrolein and Acrylonitrile Methods

Dr. Pujari explained that ELAB had decided to explore the analysis and pH preservation requirements for acrolein and acrylonitrile methods, ultimately recommending a preference of Method 624 over Method 603 and removal of the pH 4–5 preservation requirement in a letter to the Agency. EPA's recently proposed MUR provides direction on the pH adjustment but did not remove this pH requirement. ELAB will continue to work with the Agency on this issue.

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)

Dr. Pujari explained that the Task Group was created to recommend modifications to current PCB congener analysis in wastewater. The group provided and initial review of Method 1668C, with a particular focus on the quality control (QC) requirements of the method. The Task Group asked Mr. Adrian Hanley (EPA) for direction on this issue and was advised to wait until funding and direction to work on this topic could be determined. EPA announced funding of this project in May 2015, with Mr. Hanley serving as project lead. The project focuses on developing new gas chromatography (GC) and GC-MS methods to analyze PCB congeners. The project kick-off meeting was held on June 4, 2015, and Dr. Pujari was invited to attend. The Task Group will provide support to EPA in evaluating new methods and support the method development.

Mr. Speis asked for context regarding how the developed method will be applied. Dr. Pujari responded that the method would be an additional method rather than a substitute method. Mr. Hanley added that the main objective is to develop a method that can be widely implemented and focuses on PCB congeners. The project is in its infancy.

MUR

Ms. Patsy Root explained that ELAB, after providing feedback and proposed changes to several EPA methods (e.g., Methods 608, 624, 625), requested engagement during the MUR development process, which included a constructive face-to-face meeting between EPA and

ELAB personnel in August 2014. EPA published the proposed MUR (docket EPA-HQ-OW-2014-0797 at www.regulations.gov) in February 2015. The Board provided comments to the docket on May 20, 2015, focusing on additional 600 series method edits, method detection limits, and corrections to various tables and footnotes. Additionally, the Board took a different approach with these comments, adding its concurrence with comments submitted by other organizations (TNI, TestAmerica, Eurofins and the Association of Public Health Laboratories) as the Agency said that this would be helpful in reviewing submitted comments.

In-Line/On-Line Monitoring

Mr. Flournoy explained that industry would like to use in- and on-line data to demonstrate compliance, but there is a broad, accompanying concern because monitors cross several different matrices and technologies. The Task Group is determining the possibility of recommending minimum requirements for quality determination and utilizing existing methods and guidance. Currently available methods and guidance include 40 CFR 136.7, EPA Method 150.2, the ISO 17025 DoD Handbook, state of Florida field testing and measurement documents, and manufacturer information.

The state of Florida guidance indicates that calibration is done prior to installation, and verification is performed daily. Recalibration is done if verification fails, following corrective action, or if the instrument is returning to service. The criteria may change depending on each program's objectives, and the actual criteria may need to be developed based on permit expectations. The 40 CFR 136.7 guidance includes 12-step calibration requirements for chemical testing. EPA Method 150.2 calls for daily calibration and much lower calibration requirements than the Florida methods. The DoD handbook specifies calibration on electronic temperature loggers on installation and once per quarter.

Generally, it is important to follow manufacturer recommendations for routine preventative maintenance and corrective action procedures. If the manufacturer's calibration criteria is outside regulatory method criteria or limits needed by program (e.g., field instrument is rugged but not sufficiently sensitive), then manufacturers may need to develop/update the field instrument to meet requirements or select an appropriate manufacturer. Another question is whether EPA could consider allowing flexibility for field measurements in lieu of more real-time data.

The Task Group recommends that EPA determine the frequency of QC elements and work with manufacturers of on-line/in-line monitors to be more consistent, utilizing and leveraging as many of the QC elements in 40 CFR 136.7 as possible. If continuous data are favorable, it may be necessary to determine whether higher permit levels are appropriate. Manufacturers should continue to push for better technology. The Task Group has additional work to perform in this area, but it would like Agency input before moving forward.

A participant suggested that the Task Group speak to the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards for insight regarding this topic. The office has been using on-line monitoring for years and could provide useful information. This also could help with harmonization. Mr. Flournoy responded that different office have different requirements, but the Task Group is trying to find ways to harmonize processes and determine whether in-line and on-line monitoring can be used

for compliance. Dr. Leibovitz noted that the philosophy differs, as well; on-line monitors are process instruments versus laboratory instruments.

Mr. Farrell asked about the Task Group's focus. He recommended that ELAB provide specific recommendations and guidance to EPA rather than simply asking the Agency to take action. Ms. Root noted that if manufacturers are interested in their monitors being used for compliance, they can undergo the Alternate Test Procedure process; much of the responsibility should fall on manufacturers rather than the Agency. Mr. Farrell thought that the best approach would be for ELAB to develop common guidelines with manufacturer input rather than for EPA to begin the process with nothing. He posed the following questions to guide the process: What makes sense? What can be done? What should be done? What is practical? Dr. Leibovitz added that including an internal QC check in the system while it is online would be helpful.

A participant noted that comparing the on-line methods with the already-approved 40 Part 136 or Part 141 methods would be beneficial to determine how the validation studies were done. He asked what happens when something is out of spec. The participants discussed current strategies versus what might happen with on-line monitoring. If one 10-second interval measurement is out of spec, does that mean the whole day is out of spec?

Mr. Hautman said that the Agency was incredibly supportive of in-line and on-line monitoring, recognizing that challenges exist that must be overcome. EPA already has approved some solutions in the on-line monitoring methods. He cautioned that there may be some industry pressure against use of these methods. Additionally, states must accept the use this type of monitoring for drinking water, which may increase the need for additional state resources.

Mr. Flournoy explained that the Task Group initially had asked whether this issue was too broad to address and determined that the QC requirements were a reasonable focus. Once the Task Group has gathered more information, it can provide more feedback. He asked anyone with pertinent information to contact him at michaelflournoy@eurofinsus.com.

Qualification of Drinking Water Data

Ms. Carvajal explained that ACIL and the Pennsylvania Association of Accredited Environmental Laboratories brought to ELAB concerns about the implementation of a policy that prohibits the reporting of qualified drinking water data into the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's (PaDEP) Drinking Water Electronic Lab Reporting database, essentially requiring that all drinking water data be qualification free. This issue is not isolated to drinking water programs.

In accepting qualified data, the Agency is concerned that laboratories may not properly address repeated failures. How would the public view qualified data? Would the public understand qualifiers or view the data as "bad"? Also, there are potential conflicts for laboratories because many of the data are submitted directly by the laboratories, and the laboratories are evaluating their own data. Ultimately, the concern is the protection of public health and production of defensible data. If laboratories have concerns, EPA's preference is that they discuss this issue with the states, which should then bring it to the regions. The Task Group will continue a dialogue with OW regarding this issue.

Ms. Aaren Alger (PaDEP) explained that PaDEP implemented a process in January 2015 for requests to report qualified drinking water sample results, including specific examples for situations in which data cannot be reported. She was hopeful that the current direction was toward a system in which laboratories could evaluate their own data. As laboratories use the implemented process, their understanding of it increases. Initially, PaDEP rejected a significant number of requests, but now the majority of requests are approved as laboratories learn the system. Dr. Leibovitz asked whether there was a short list of methods cited in the requests. Ms. Alger responded that the majority of requests were Methods 505 and 548.1.

Mr. Speis thought that the situation had improved, and he was sensitive to the Agency's concerns. His concern was a situation in which all cases were treated in the same, broad manner. He suggested including real-world performance into the methods rather than placing QC criteria into the methodology.

Mr. Hautman said that his concern was a situation in which laboratories attempt to qualify everything. Pennsylvania is doing a good job in evaluating data for quality, but he wondered whether the data should be flagged if that determination can be made. If the QC fails, the data are not of known quality. Data of known quality are important when reporting for compliance purposes. He does not want to see a situation in which a laboratory uses an allowance as a sidestep.

Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM)

Ms. Carvajal explained that a letter requesting a dialogue with the Agency on the topic of SIM was sent to the FEM in October 2014. The letter requested that the Board be able to provide input on potential issues that have been identified, such as a lack of appropriate QC measures for some methods that employ this technique because ELAB supports the objective of producing data of known and documented quality. A favorable response to this request was received from the FEM in February 2015. A Task Group will be assembled to begin discussions with the Agency on this topic.

Ms. Jeri Rossi (ddms, inc.) volunteered to help with this topic when the Board forms the Task Group.

OPEN DISCUSSION/NEW ITEMS

No new items were introduced by the Board members nor the participants.

Ms. Carvajal stated that if participants wished to introduce topics for ELAB's consideration in the future, they could contact her via email at pmcarvajal@sara-tx.org.

REVIEW ACTION ITEMS/CLOSING REMARKS/ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Kristen LeBaron (The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc.) and Ms. Phelps reviewed the action items identified during the meeting, which can be found in Attachment C.

Citing no additional comments or issues, Ms. Carvajal asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Wade made the motion, which Ms. Labie seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

Attachment A

ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD (ELAB)
Face-to-Face Meeting/Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#
Hyatt Regency Chicago, Chicago, IL
July 13, 2015; 1:00 – 5:00 p.m. CDT

AGENDA

1:00 – 5:00 p.m.	Opening Remarks, Roll Call, Mission Statement, Overview of Board Goals and Highlights of ELAB Outputs
	Approval of June Minutes
	Updates From the Designated Federal Officer
	Current Task Group Updates
	Open Discussion/New Items
	Review Action Items/Closing Remarks/Adjournment

Attachment B

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Board Members

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y	Ms. Patricia (Patty) M. Carvajal (Chair)	San Antonio River Authority Representing: Watershed/Restoration
Y (via teleconference)	Dr. A. Dallas Wait (Vice-Chair)	Gradient Corporation Representing: Consumer Products Industry
Y	Ms. Lara P. Phelps, DFO	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Representing: EPA
Y	Dr. Michael (Mike) Delaney	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority Representing: Massachusetts Water Resources Authority
Y	Mr. Michael Flournoy	Eurofins Environment Testing USA Representing: American Council of Independent Laboratories
Y	Mr. Keith Greenaway	ANSI-ASQ National Accreditation Board Representing: The NELAC Institute
Y	Dr. Deyuan (Kitty) Kong	Chevron Energy Technology Company Representing: Chevron
Y	Ms. Sylvia (Silky) S. Labie	Environmental Laboratory Consulting & Technology, LLC Representing: Third-Party Assessors
Y	Dr. Henry Leibovitz	Rhode Island State Health Laboratories Representing: Association of Public Health Laboratories
Y (via teleconference)	Dr. Mahesh P. Pujari	City of Los Angeles Representing: National Association of Clean Water Agencies
Y	Ms. Patsy Root	IDEXX Laboratories, Inc. Representing: Laboratory Product Developers
Y (via teleconference)	Ms. Aurora Shields	City of Lawrence, Kansas Representing: Wastewater Laboratories
Y	Ms. Michelle L. Wade	Kansas Department of Health and the Environment Representing: Laboratory Accreditation Bodies

PARTICIPANTS LIST (CONT)

Contractors and Guests

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y	Ms. Kristen LeBaron (Contractor)	The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc. (SCG)
Y	Ms. Rachel McIntosh-Kastrinsky (EPA ASPPH Fellow)	EPA
Y	Ms. Aaren Alger (Guest)	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Y	Mr. Charlie Appleby (Guest)	EPA
Y	Dr. Richard Burrows (Guest)	TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc.
Y	Mr. Eric Davis (Guest)	City of Austin (Texas) Water Utility
Y	Dr. George Detsis (Guest)	U.S. Department of Energy
Y	Mr. Jack Farrell (Guest)	Analytical Excellence, Inc.
Y	Mr. David Friedman (Guest)	American Council of Independent Laboratories
Y	Mr. Adrian Hanley (Guest)	EPA
Y	Mr. Dan Hautman (Guest)	EPA
	Mr. Dan Hickman (Guest)	The NELAC Institute
Y	Mr. Paul Junio (Guest)	Northern Lake Service, Inc.
Y	Ms. Catherine Katsikis (Guest)	Laboratory Data Consultants FL, Inc.
Y	Ms. Dorothy Love (Guest)	Eurofins Lancaster Laboratories Environmental
Y	Ms. Marlene Moore (Guest)	Advanced Systems, Inc.
Y	Ms. Jeri Rossi (Guest)	ddms, inc.
Y	Mr. Mike Shepherd (Guest)	Shepherd Technical Services
Y	Mr. Scott Siders (Guest)	Illinois EPA
Y	Mr. Dave Speis (Guest)	Eurofins QC, Inc.
Y	Mr. Andy Valkenburg (Guest)	Energy Laboratories, Inc.
Y	Mr. Bob Wyeth (Guest)	Independent Consultant

Attachment C

ACTION ITEMS

1. Ms. LeBaron will finalize the June 2015 teleconference minutes and send them via email to Ms. Lara Phelps.

2. Ms. Phelps will provide Ms. LeBaron with clarifying information about the IDQTF discussion, which will be added as a footnote to the meeting minutes.

Attachment D

I hereby certify that this is the final version of minutes for the Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Meeting held on July 13, 2015.

Signature Chair

Ms. Patricia Carvajal

Print Name Chair