

**SUMMARY OF THE
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#

March 18, 2009; 1:00 – 3:00 PM

The Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB or Board) regular teleconference was held on March 18, 2009 from 1:00 to 3:00 PM EDT. The agenda and attachments for this meeting are 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/ROLL CALL

Dr. Flowers began the teleconference with a roll call of ELAB Members and guests. Guests on the call included Dr. Ray Merrill and Ms. Jennifer Colby from Eastern Research Group, Inc. (ERG) and Mr. Peter Westlin from the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY MEETING MINUTES

Dr. Flowers asked if there were any comments on the February meeting minutes other than the small correction he had already addressed with Dr. Merrill. Mr. Jeff Lowry asked if the white paper written by Dr. Flowers and discussed during February's meeting should be attached to the meeting minutes. Ms. Lara Autry stated that she had the same question and could not remember clearly what was decided at that meeting in regards to how the Board should post the document. Mr. Gary Dechant asked about the guidelines and restrictions for posting a white paper on the Web. Dr. Flowers replied that he felt since none of the Board members voiced any dissention as recorded in the minutes from the last meeting, that it is appropriate to include the white paper in the meeting minutes, as well as post it on the ELAB Web site.

Mr. Lowry suggested that the document not be included with the minutes, but only posted on the Web site with a disclaimer. Ms. Autry suggested the Board add this as an agenda topic for discussion later the meeting. Dr. Flowers asked if the Board was proposing to remove the white paper from the minutes. Mr. Jack Farrell entertained a motion to approve the February meeting minutes with the appropriate changes and hold attachment of the white paper in abeyance until the Board develops and adopts a policy for documents posted to the ELAB Web site. Mr. Gary Dechant seconded the motion.

Dr. Flowers asked the group to look at page five of the February minutes, where the discussion about how to publish the white paper is detailed. A Board member stated his recollection that the decision was made to attach the white paper to the minutes because it was discussed during the meeting and that it would be subsequently posted on the Web site. Dr. Flowers read Ms. Thomey's comments from the previous meeting minutes. Mr.

Lowry expressed concern about setting the precedent that ELAB will post all the documents discussed during its meeting. He cited the fact that 12 documents were provided to ELAB for the discussion during the previous meeting about hexavalent chromium.

Dr. Flowers asked Ms. Autry if discussion documents were posted from previous meetings. Ms. Autry replied that there will be times that outside entities will share information with the Board that is not a public document. If the Board wishes to attach every document that is included in its meetings, then it will have to obtain permission from the authors of these documents prior to posting the minutes.

Dr. Flowers stated his concern about making a Board decision without Ms. Nan Thomey present, who suggested attaching the white paper to the February minutes. Ms. Autry replied that it is appropriate for the Board to revisit any issue at a later time if the Board is not comfortable with the way it was left. The Board can reconsider whether to post the white paper since neither the minutes nor the white paper have been posted publicly. A “no” vote on the motion means the minutes are accepted with editorial changes and with the white paper attached. A “yes” vote on the motion means the minutes are accepted with editorial changes without the white paper attached. Mr. Farrell agreed that the Board should move forward with approval of the minutes without the white paper and have a policy discussion latter in the meeting. If any Board members do not agree with the motion on the floor, then they should vote “no” to the motion and allow the minutes to be posted with the white paper attached. If a Board member agrees to approve the minutes with editorial changes without posting the white paper then the member should vote “yes” and pass the motion. Dr. Flowers replied that he wished to vote “no” to the motion based on the rationale used by Ms. Thomey described in the previous meeting minutes.

Mr. Lowry stated his primary concern with including the white paper with the February minutes is that the posting in the minutes does not include the disclaimer discussed during the February meeting. Mr. Speis agreed that the Board should not post anything publicly before it develops a policy for posting information. This does not preclude the Board from posting the white paper at a later date. Dr. Flowers stated that he felt he was making a distinction between posting the document on the Web site and posting it in context as attachment to the meeting minutes. Mr. Lowry replied that even if the white paper was only attached to the minutes, the document would still be posted and publicly available.

Ms. Autry stated that the Board cannot follow the practice it developed during February’s meeting because it is incomplete. The white paper should not be posted by itself or with the minutes because the Board does not have an official disclaimer policy or text to accompany the white paper. In response to the motion presented by Mr. Farrell, Dr. Flowers called for a voice vote. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

3. FOLLOW-UP ON KEY TOPICS

A. Method Identification Issue with SW-846

Dr. Flowers reminded the Board that the group that was previously the Office of Solid Waste (OSW) has been restructured and is now called the Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery (ORCR) and the specific group assigned to SW-846 is in the Materials and Waste Management Division. The office has physically moved and has new functions within the Agency. Because of the reorganization, interaction with the Board has been on hold. Dr. Flowers referred to a handout produced by the Board that contained a proactive list of items that need attention and that will be presented to ORCR. The list also includes items for the States to consider on this issue. He asked the Board for any additional review comments on the handout. A Board member asked Ms. Autry if the new restructuring has changed the mission in regards to the SW-846 method identification issue. Ms. Autry replied that the mission has not changed and only the office's physical location within the Agency has changed, but their general work assignment remains. The Division management commitment to seeing this issue through has not changed.

Mr. Dave Speis commented on the handout provided by Dr. Flowers. He mentioned that the "Statement of the Problem" should be strengthened and included. The current handout just refers to issues on implementation dates and minimizes the problems the Board has been working on. He also referred to a discussion within the Tiger Team about the next-to-last bullet's inclusion in the document. Since ORCR does not have control over implementing this bullet, he thought the group had decided to remove it from the document. Finally, Mr. Speis recommended the editorial comments in the last paragraph be removed. Dr. Flowers replied that he feels the Board should leave the second to last bullet in the handout to show ORCR that the Board acknowledges the group is not the only responsible party in the issue resolution.

Mr. Lowry indicated that the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP) represented by Dan Hickman (OR) would like to be involved in the method identification discussions with ELAB and ORCR. Mr. Lowry recommended that other non-NVLAP States be involved in the discussion.

Mr. Speis recommended the Board change the bulleted item to indicate to ORCR that it should reach out to the stakeholder community in an effort to resolve that particular issue. Ms. Autry agreed that the handout should be revised to encourage ORCR to follow up with all interested stakeholders. She also introduced Mr. Peter Westlin, who was present on the call and who gave a presentation on this subject at a recent stack tester's conference. She added that Mr. Westlin heard the same sorts of comments that the Board has heard from the laboratory and State stakeholder community.

Mr. Westlin stated that from a stack tester's perspective, the method identification issue does add costs and from the State's perspective, the issue causes permitting problems since the change in rules and methods can change what is needed for a tester to comply

with a given permit. He asked Dr. Merrill to provide comment, as he was also present at the SES conference. Dr. Merrill stated that he has heard comments from stakeholders at both the ELAB and SES meetings and all the comments bring up the same issues. Laboratory stakeholders at the SES meeting confirmed that multiple SW-846 methods add cost to maintain and report. He has also heard comments that each similar SW-846 method requires individual standard operating procedures (SOPs) and there is increased cost associated with maintaining accreditation for multiple similar methods. Stakeholders are sending a consistent message about the confusion and cost for multiple SW-846 method versions, not just within solid waste community, but also the stack testing community.

Dr. Flowers summarized the Board's direction for the tiger team to revisit the document, clean up and add text as discussed in today's meeting, and remove the editorial comment in the last paragraph. Dr. Flowers reiterated the Board's decision not to coordinate the interaction between OCRA and the various State stakeholders. Ms. Autry suggested the Board could invite stakeholders to bring representatives to the discussion and also encourage OCRA to get the other stakeholder representatives involved in the discussion.

Dr. Michael Wichman commented on the final bulleted item and suggested that the language include something about needing a new method number if a revision requires a significant change in QC.

Dr. Flowers asked if the Tiger Team members have clear direction. Mr. Farrell asked if the Washington meeting with OCRA is now becoming a larger meeting with additional stakeholders. Dr. Flowers recommended that ELAB stick with its original plan to have the Tiger Team meet in Washington with OCRA. A larger stakeholder meeting can be scheduled as a follow up to that meeting for implementation of the success strategies created at the Tiger Team meeting with OCRA. Mr. Ferrell expressed his concern that a meeting with OCRA, the Tiger Team, and additional stakeholders would lead to a repeat of much of what has already been discussed and not to suggested language for solutions. Dr. Richard Burroughs asked Mr. Speis if he would do the final edit of the memorandum. Mr. Speis agreed to take this task.

Mr. Farrell asked if the Board should set a date for the meeting with ORCR. Ms. Autry has been trading voice mail communication with Ms. Kim Kirkland at ORCR. Ms. Autry believes ORCR is working towards a meeting date in late May. Ms. Kirkland mentioned in a voice mail the desire for ORCR to have a conference call with the ELAB Tiger Team soon. ORCR still has the meeting on their agenda based on their commitment to honor the request in the original ELAB letter to OSW. ORCR wants to coordinate with Ms. Autry first, then conference with the Tiger Team. Ms. Autry will talk to Ms. Kirkland tomorrow (Thursday 3/19/2009). Mr. Speis stated that he could have the memo revised including a timeline for actions and submit it to the Tiger Team this week for final review. He asked if it was necessary to get the Board's approval before sending the memo to ORCR.

Dr. Flowers requested that the Tiger Team revise the memo. He recommended scheduling a Tiger Team telephone meeting with ORCR to discuss a schedule for the Washington face-to-face meeting with ORCR. If possible, he wants to schedule the meeting with ORCR before May. Ms. Autry replied that this may not be possible and that ORCR was reviewing the schedule to find a time when the Tiger Team would already be in Washington for other meetings.

Dr. Flowers replied that if the meeting could not take place before the end of May, then the Tiger Team has plenty of time to revise, review, and present the memo to the Board for final approval. Ms. Autry added that the memo must be approved by the Board if it is presented as a formal ELAB recommendation. Ms. Autry advised that if it was only a draft or summary of talking points and not an ELAB recommendation, then the memo should not have a title that says “ELAB Recommendations.” She advised not having a title on the draft until it was a formal ELAB recommendation.

Mr. Dechant asked if the full Board can approve the memo via email once it’s complete. Ms. Autry answered “yes,” the Board could approve the final version by email. Another Board member agreed with having the Board review and approve the memo. There was discussion on whether the Board needs to approve the memo since it contained only talking points and ORCR input was desired before the Board made its final recommendation. Dr. Flowers charged Mr. Speis with finishing the memo and recommended a Tiger Team meeting to review and pass the final memo on to the Board for it to approve it before forwarding the memo to ORCR. Dr. Reza Karimi asked if the Board could discuss the finished memo at the next Board meeting rather than doing an email approval. Dr. Flowers replied that the Tiger Team would like to get the effort moving without another month of delay on top of the delay due to the EPA OSW reorganization. Mr. Speis recommended that the Board should proceed with the current plan and if there was adverse response from the Board during the email approval process, then the memo could be added to the next meeting’s agenda. Dr. Karimi and Mr. Dechant agreed with this recommendation.

Dr. Flowers added if there were additional changes to the document, the Tiger Team should have before they finished the memo. Upon receiving no additional comment, it was decided that the Board would proceed with the plan to revise the memo and circulate it for email approval or comments. Dr. Flowers recommended that Mr. Speis finish the memo by the end of the week for distribution to the Tiger Team, which will review and provide final comments by the end of the following week.

B. TNI Standard Comparison with Office of Water (OW) Drinking Water Program

Mr. Dechant provided the update for the TNI/OW Standard comparison. The Laboratory Management workgroup met for its first discussion on Friday, February 20. Mr. Dechant believes the group now has a good path forward to make progress reviewing the comparison table/spreadsheet on this topic. He indicated there was good participation in the workgroup. Mr. Dechant will send minutes and a status report on the workgroup activities prior to the next ELAB conference call.

Dr. Flowers asked if the workgroup had anything to post to the ELAB Web site after the coming meeting on Friday, March 20. Mr. Dechant asked when Ms. Autry would need the information. Ms. Autry replied that he could provide her with a summary by April 3 to be posted on the Web site with her next submission.

Mr. Dechant stated that he plans to hold meetings on the Friday following the ELAB meeting with the intent of being able to provide the Board with an update before the following Board meeting. Dr. Wichman will provide Mr. Dechant with contact information for another representative from his subcommittee to participate in the calls. Mr. Dechant commented that this week's meeting will determine the success of the current spreadsheet revision strategy. Mr. Lowry added a comment from the Comparison meeting in February, stating that it was revealed that the original crosswalk did not include 40 CFR part 141 references that correlate with the OW Drinking Water standard. Mr. Dechant replied that the Federal Register references were added to the workgroup's review process. Dr. Merrill commented that a column with references has been inserted for those references on the revised table.

C. Proficiency Test Frequency Update/Discussion

Dr. Flowers reminded the Board members that the NELAC Institute's (TNI's) proficiency test (PT) committee is meeting this month. He asked if this was an appropriate time to discuss the issue of a disclaimer that would be added to white papers posted on the ELAB Web site. Dr. Flowers prepared a disclaimer based on the language from February's ELAB minutes and drafted three sentences the Board can use as a disclaimer for documents posted to the Hot Topic area on the ELAB Web site:

- White papers listed here represent the opinion of the author
- The information is intended to assist ELAB in discussion on the topic and the information is not an ELAB opinion or recommendation
- Public posting of the information is provided to give stakeholders an opportunity to comment on the white paper or the topic to help ELAB's review and recommendation process.

The disclaimer was written to be a disclaimer for the Web site. Mr. Farrell added that the disclaimer needs to appear on the white paper. Several members of the Board agreed with Mr. Farrell's recommendation. The Board discussed placing the disclaimer on the Web page and on each white paper. Mr. Dechant asked whether the paper needed a disclaimer at all if it were published with only the author's name and had no reference to ELAB. Ms. Autry replied that the disclaimer is necessary to clarify that the paper is not a product of ELAB and to state the purpose of the posting in the disclaimer. The Board discussed papers available from other Web sources that could be posted on the ELAB Web site. Ms. Autry clarified that it is appropriate to provide a link to reference white papers posted to Web sites outside of the Agency rather than posting the paper. There is a standard exit

disclaimer posted whenever a link provided that accesses a Web site outside of the Agency's domain.

Dr. Flowers asked if the Board plans to add a cover page on every posted white paper that includes the three disclaimer sentences. Ms. Autry added that white papers provided directly to ELAB for posting should include an agreement with the author that ELAB will add a disclaimer to ensure readers that the white paper is the opinion of the author and not a product of ELAB. Board members discussed the issue of including the disclaimer to avoid outside users promoting the authority of these white papers since they were downloaded from the ELAB Web site. Several members of the Board commented that the three sentence disclaimer prepared by Dr. Flowers was adequate and acceptable. Mr. Farrell replied that it was not necessary to add a whole page to the document. He has seen Web sites that included the disclaimer in a text box on the first page or cover page of posted documents.

The Board discussed the last sentence of the disclaimer that encouraged feedback on item posted under the Hot Topics portion of the Web site. Dr. Flowers stated the goal of promoting use of the Web site and getting more input from the stakeholder community. Mr. Lowry asked how ELAB plans to receive outside comments to posted documents. He suggested that responses could be made through a link on the Web site to email the Board's chairperson or Ms. Autry.

Ms. Autry shared the approach to posting information on EPA Web sites. Currently, the Agency typically publishes products of conferences and presentations that EPA produced or items where EPA has major involvement. She noted that some of these materials contain disclaimers to clarify that the posting is the opinion of the author and not the Agency. She then recited to the Board the language of the exit disclaimer mentioned above.

Mr. Dechant asked if ELAB's disclaimer must be approved by EPA. Ms. Autry replied that if the Board can wait until the next Board meeting, she can consult with the FACA attorney and the FACA Office for additions they recommend in the disclaimer for postings that are not products of the Board. Mr. Dechant agreed that posting items on the Web page and getting responses is a powerful tool for interaction with the stakeholder community. He recommended that ELAB should investigate the issue of disclaimers fully before adopting a policy. Mr. Farrell suggested three pieces of the issue that should be discussed with the attorney. First, should there be a disclaimer when the Web page is opened? Second, should there be a disclaimer on items that come from an outside source? Third, what are the implications of information provided to ELAB for the purpose of discussion when they are attached to ELAB's official minutes?

Ms. Autry replied that the ELAB Web site is under the EPA's domain, therefore, any link to an external Web site must include the EPA's disclaimer. The other two questions will need to go to Marilyn Curry the FACA attorney for more advice. The Board can complete this discussion at its next meeting.

Mr. Lowry provided an update on the PT subcommittee. The group will make a decision on Friday about asking PT providers for failure rates from each State. Dr. Flowers asked about the PT subcommittee State failure rate inquiry and if that information would be used to modify the ongoing report on PT failure rates. Mr. Lowry responded that this request was going to all providers and would be a separate study to evaluate failure rates for NELAC accredited laboratories to compare State-by-State failure rates to the average failure rate for all accredited laboratories. The other activity for the subcommittee is finishing their New Jersey PT study report. Mr. Orval Osborne commented that he was very impressed with the results from the New Jersey study.

4. WORKGROUP UPDATES/ASSIGNMENTS (OLD AND NEW)

A. Monitoring Workgroup

Ms. Judy Morgan stated that her primary focus has been developing the tracking spreadsheet for the workgroups to use to monitor progress. A final document is ready, but she would like to circulate it through the workgroup leaders one more time before posting it to the Board Web site on April 1. The monitoring workgroup plans to have a conference call in the week.

B. Measurement and Technology Workgroup

Mr. Lowry stated that his workgroup met this week and has started looking at the New Jersey PT frequency study. The workgroup will continue this activity in the next month.

Dr. Burroughs asked whether the workgroup should request that ELAB review concepts for evaluating calibration outside of the current use of correlation coefficient. Since EPA is already pursuing this topic, Dr. Burroughs indicated willingness to work with whatever guidance is provided on the matter; however, he feels strongly that the correlation coefficient is not the best way to evaluate calibration. Using only the correlation coefficient to evaluate calibration increases the likelihood of generating poor data.

Ms. Autry replied that the EPA's Forum on Environmental Measurement (FEM) would encourage ELAB review and input on the product FEM is producing on this subject. She recommended that the Board not come to a conclusion or express a final opinion how to evaluate calibration since FEM is making progress working through the issues involved with calibration and calibration verification. Dr. Flowers agreed with Ms. Autry's recommendation to wait for the FEM product(s) before developing a recommendation on this issue. Ms. Autry updated the Board on the FEM's current progress in the issue. Their action team is developing a table of multiple calibration procedures to be used under defined circumstances that are encountered in certain methods. Some calibration practices will end up being discarded. For others, the calibration verification approach is not clear and may require a disclaimer regarding the confidence in the calibration.

Dr. Burroughs stated the Board can send a memorandum to FEM expressing interest in the calibration issue and FEM's draft projects. Ms. Autry agreed that a memo could be

written or she could inform the FEM at their next meeting that ELAB would like to be part of the process underway to evaluate calibration techniques. The Board can concur in the minutes and she can discuss it with the FEM. The Board agreed with Ms. Autry's recommendation to verbally inform FEM of ELAB's interest. Mr. Lowry added that ELAB could form a workgroup if necessary to develop an opinion based on what they read in the FEM's product. Ms. Autry updated ELAB on FEM's progress and activity and stated the goal that the draft products would be reviewed throughout the agency and ELAB before the end of the year. She mentioned that the issues of MDLs, MQLs and calibration were all lumped into the same action team and provided an update of that action team. Mr. Lowry asked Dr. Burroughs if he agreed to wait for information provided by Ms. Autry on the FEM's progress and products. Dr. Burroughs agreed. Ms. Autry agreed to inform ELAB after the next FEM meeting in April if the FEM wanted a formal memorandum expressing interest in being involved. Thus, ELAB could draft the request in time for approval at the next Board meeting.

C. Laboratory Management Workgroup

Mr. Dechant covered this topic in his discussion of the TNI/OW Drinking Water Standard comparison update detailed above.

5. REVIEW ACTION ITEMS/ASSIGNMENTS

Dr. Flowers reviewed the action items presented to the Board during the course of the meeting.

- Dr. Flowers will convene a meeting of the Tiger Team to move forward with the SW-846 method identification issue.
- Ms. Morgan will complete her tracking table and submit it to Ms. Autry to be posted on the ELAB Web site.
- Mr. Dechant will hold a meeting on March 20 to discuss the OW/TNI drinking water comparison document and provide a summary of the group's progress to the Board.
- Ms. Autry will consult the EPA's FACA attorney regarding the disclaimer issue.
- Ms. Autry will contact ORCR about meeting with ELAB representatives on April 20 or sometime that week (see below).

Mr. Farrell added the Board's request for Ms. Autry to express interest to the FEM about ELAB involvement in the calibration issue. Dr. Flowers replied that the Board may need to write a letter of interest to the Forum. He added that Mr. Speis is responsible for finishing memo for ORCR and submitting it to the Tiger Team for review and ELAB approval through an email vote.

6. CLOSING REMARKS/ADJOURN

Ms. Autry stated that she has been in the process of redesigning the FEM Web site and currently has a selection of people within the Agency beta-testing the site for errors. The

final product could be launched as early as Friday, March 27, but she expects the Web site will be available no later than Wednesday, April 1.

Dr. Karimi asked if the Board should start adding the National Environmental Monitoring Conference (NEMC) in August to the Board's agenda. Ms. Autry replied that the Board is on the conference agenda for Monday, August 10 beginning at 9:00 am. The preliminary agenda is available on the NEMC Web site for further reference. Fifty-two (52) abstracts have been submitted.

Ms. Autry asked the Board to re-visit the SW-846 method identification issue before adjourning, as she has been in electronic communication with Ms. Kirkland. Ms. Kirkland is curious if any of the Board members will be present at the LTIG meeting, which could be a potential venue for a small discussion meeting. Otherwise, she is open to an earlier meeting date. Ms. Autry can follow up with Ms. Kirkland to get more information about the LTIG meeting if anyone is interested.

Dr. Burroughs recommended holding the meeting with ORCR in Washington as originally planned. Dr. Flowers agreed, adding that an April meeting date would be an ideal time to meet with senior ORCR managers to communicate the "headspace" topic needs. Mr. Speis added that a meeting on April 14 could be held in time to update the Board at its monthly meeting on the 15. Ms. Autry recommended planning the meeting for the week of April 27. She expressed concern that participation could be lost due to spring vacation plans if the Board scheduled the meeting for the middle of April. Dr. Burroughs, Mr. Speis, and Dr. Flowers each had conflicts that week. Ms. Autry then recommended April 20, which seemed to work better for the Board. Ms. Autry agreed to ask ORCR if they were available that week.

Mr. Lowry reminded the Tiger Team that it would need to have materials ready and finalized before the next ELAB teleconference to present to ORCR at their meeting. It would also be beneficial for the Tiger Team to plan a meeting before the ORCR meeting so they can be prepared and have a successful meeting.

Citing no additional comments, Dr. Flowers adjourned the ELAB meeting.

Attachment A

AGENDA
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
Monthly Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#
March 18, 2009; 1:00 - 3:00 pm (ET)

Opening Remarks	DFO/Chair
Roll Call of ELAB Members and Identification of Guests	Chair
Review/Approval of February Minutes	Chair
Follow up on Key Topics	All
- Method Identification Issue with SW-846 (see Handout from Jeff sent 3/13/09)	All
- TNI Standard Comparison with Drinking Water Pgm	Dechant/All
- Proficiency Test Frequency Update/Discussion	All
Workgroup Updates/Assignments (Old and New)	Morgan/All
Review Action Items/Assignments	Chair
Closing Remarks/Adjourn	DFO/Chair

MEMBERSHIP LISTING AND GUESTS**ELAB MEETING****March 18, 2009; 1:00 – 3:00 PM EDT**

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y	Dr. Jeff Flowers (Chair)	City of Maitland Florida Representing: Elected Officials of Local Government
Y	Mr. David (Dave) N. Speis (Vice Chair)	Accutest Laboratories Representing: American Council of Independent Laboratories (ACIL)
Y	Ms. Lara P. Autry, DFO	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Representing: EPA
Y	Dr. Richard Burrows	Test America Inc. Representing: Commercial Lab Industry
Y	Mr. Gerald (Gary) Dechant	Analytical Quality Associates, Inc. Representing: Data Users
Y	Mr. John (Jack) E. Farrell, III	Analytical Excellence, Inc. Representing: The NELAC Institute (TNI)
Y	Dr. Reza Karimi	Battelle Memorial Institute Representing: Non-profit Research and Development Organizations
N	Dr. H. M. (Skip) Kingston	Duquesne University Representing: Government Consortiums, Native Americans, and Academia
Y	Mr. Jeffrey (Jeff) C. Lowry	Environmental Resource Associates Representing: Proficiency Testing Providers
Y	Ms. Judith (Judy) R. Morgan	Environmental Science Corp. Representing: Commercial Env. Lab.
Y	Mr. Orval Osborne	Creek Environmental Laboratories, Inc. Representing: Small Laboratories/Native Americans
Y	Mr. Glenn (Joe) J. Pardue, Jr.	Pro2Serve Representing: Clients of QS Services
Y	Dr. Jim Pletl	Hampton Roads Sanitation District Representing: Municipal Env. Lab.
N	Ms. Nan Thomey	Environmental Chemistry, Inc. Representing: Owners Full Service Labs
Y	Mr. Rock Vitale	Environmental Standards, Inc. Representing: Third Party Assessors
Y	Dr. Michael D. Wichman	University of Iowa Hygienic Laboratory Representing: Association of Public Health Laboratories (APHL)
Y (Guest)	Dr. Ray Merrill	Eastern Research Group (ERG)

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y (Guest)	Ms. Jennifer Colby	Eastern Research Group
Y (Guest)	Mr. Peter Westlin	U.S. EPA

ACTION ITEMS

- Dr. Flowers will convene a meeting of the Tiger Team to move forward with the SW-846 method identification issue.
- Ms. Morgan will complete her tracking table and submit it to Ms. Autry to be posted on the ELAB Web site.
- Mr. Dechant will hold a meeting on March 20 to discuss the OW/TNI drinking water comparison document and provide a summary of the group's progress to the Board.
- Ms. Autry will consult the EPA's FACA attorney regarding the disclaimer issue.
- Mr. Speis is responsible for revising the memo for ORCR and submitting it to the Tiger Team for review.
- Ms. Autry will contact ORCR about meeting with ELAB representatives on April 20 or sometime that week.

Attachment D

I hereby certify that these are the final version of minutes for the Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Meeting held on March 18, 2009.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Dr. Jeff Flowers", written over a horizontal line.

Signature Chairman

Dr. Jeff Flowers

Print Name Chairman