

**SUMMARY OF THE
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#
April 15, 2009; 1:00 – 3:00 PM**

The Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB or Board) regular teleconference was held on April 15, 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

The Board discussed the policy regarding holding a meeting without the presence of Ms. Lara Autry, the ELAB Designated Federal Official. It was decided that the initial meeting items could be addressed while waiting for Ms. Autry to join the call. Dr. Jeff Flowers began with calling roll of ELAB members and guests.

2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MARCH MEETING MINUTES

Dr. Jeff Flowers asked for comments on the March meeting minutes. Mr. Jeff Lowry replied that he had sent a comment through Ms. Autry. The name “Dan Hickman” had been recorded as “Dave Hickman” in the minutes and needed to be changed. Mr. Gary Dechant made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved through a unanimous vote.

3. FOLLOW-UP ON KEY TOPICS

A. Preparation for Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery (ORCR) Meeting

Dr. Flowers stated that a Tiger Team meeting was held and Mr. David Speis completed a draft of the one-page white paper summary to be presented to EPA’s Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery (ORCR). He agreed with the title of the paper, “Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Potential Solution Strategies for Discussion: SW-846 Regulatory Status Uncertainty.” The white paper was approved by the Board and has been submitted to ORCR. A draft agenda for the meeting is ready and the following ELAB members: Dr. Flowers, Mr. Jack Farrell, Mr. Dave Speis, Dr. Skip Kingston, and Dr. Reza Karimi, who are scheduled to meet with EPA/ORCR.

Mr. Farrell informed the Board that he has forwarded the final agenda and white paper to the NELAC Institute (TNI) Board for distribution with a disclaimer that the paper

identifies preliminary discussion points, not final recommendations. Mr. Gary Dechant informed the Board that he has forwarded the white paper to the American Council of Independent Laboratories (ACIL). Dr. Flowers asked if there were any comments on the agenda or white paper from TNI. Mr. Farrell responded that Ms. Jerry Aker, a TNI Board member from Pennsylvania, offered to assist the Board either with the meeting or the process. Mr. Farrell offered the suggestion that Ms. Aker could be included in upcoming Tiger Team meetings, as well as the ELAB monthly meeting. Dr. Flowers stated that the upcoming ORCR meeting was a great opportunity for the Board to move forward with the issue and encouraged bringing others into the process to help find the best solution.

Dr. Flowers asked about a brief Tiger Team meeting to be held on Friday before the ORCR meeting to develop a review the meeting strategy and to review the meeting agenda. The Board discussed the schedule for the Monday meeting with ORCR. There is an initial one hour meeting scheduled with the ORCR deputy director. This is a key meeting because ELAB will review with top ORCR management what it would like to accomplish. Mr. Speis agreed that the Board participants should be thoroughly prepared before the meeting and agreed the Tiger Team should meet again on Friday so the Team will know exactly what the expectations are for the meeting. Mr. Dechant reminded the Board that the OW/TNI comparison meeting would be held at 11:30 am EST that day. Dr. Flowers asked if a Tiger Team meeting at 9:00 or 10:00 am would be acceptable. Mr. Farrell recommended 10:00 am EST. Dr. Flowers agreed and stated that he would send an announcement to remind the Tiger Team.

Mr. Jeff Lowry asked Mr. Farrell if the white paper on issues and potential solutions was forwarded to the NELAP Board. Mr. Farrell replied that some of the TNI Board members are NELAP Board members and he assumes that the paper would be passed on to the NELAP Board by those members.

Ms. Lara Autry spoke up, stating that she has been on the call for the entire meeting but was unable to speak. Mr. Lowry asked if the Board was allowed to proceed without her for meetings, to which she replied that she was required to be present during full Board meetings to meet FACA requirements.

Ms. Autry reminded the Board that everyone participating in the upcoming ORCR meeting, including the Office Director, Ms. Maria Vickers, has seen all of the available materials. She has been briefed on the issue, its origins, and the upcoming meeting. Ms. Autry was informed that ORCR Deputy Director Ms. Vickers and the Office Director Mr. Matt Hale intend to express their support for the Board's effort. Ms. Autry agreed that the ELAB Tiger Team should set the expectations for the day at the opening meeting. Ms. Autry added that she would not be able to join the Friday morning pre-meeting. Mr. Lowry replied that if there were any questions for her, she would be contacted after the meeting. Dr. Karimi added that he would not be able to participate in the call. Mr. Farrell offered to update Dr. Karimi after the meeting.

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

Mr. Dechant reviewed progress on this topic, stating that progress has been made in revising the TNI/OW Standard comparison document. It appears that the current revision strategy is working well. The workgroup has reviewed 15-20% of the draft comparison table and there has been good participation in the calls. Progress is expected to continue over the next couple of months.

Dr. Flowers stated the last call was better focused and the email communication has helped with the workgroup's productivity. He then commented that there has not been much email traffic for the topics in the upcoming April 17 meeting. Mr. Dechant replied that he had 15-20 items ready for discussion at this meeting. Mr. Farrell asked if Mr. Dechant has seen the need for a lot of clarification and changes. Mr. Dechant replied that while the initial document was well-written, there have been a few topics that have required more clarification. Dr. Flowers commented that this has been a learning activity for all involved as each workgroup member learns more about each standard.

Dr. Michael Wichman informed Mr. Dechant that Mr. Dan Hickman from Oregon would be participating in future workgroup meetings. Mr. Hickman is familiar with both the TNI standard and the OW standard.

C. Proficiency Test (PT) Frequency Update/Discussion

Mr. Lowry reviewed the progress of the TNI PT Frequency subcommittee on this subject. The PT Frequency subcommittee has sent a request to all PT providers to collect failure rate information. The subcommittee plans to acquire 2007-2008 failure rates for TNI analytes by location of the laboratory. The NELAC laboratories will be considered as a group in the data set and other non-NELAC accredited laboratories will be considered as a separate group. The TNI workgroup will use the data provided by Ms. Judy Morgan about particular States and their PT programs. TNI will compare the State data to new data on straight failure rate to determine what information trends or correlations can be pulled from this new data treatment. The TNI project is ongoing and should be completed by the end of June. The PT Frequency subcommittee will present the findings to the TNI expert committee in July. This July presentation is the final PT subcommittee task to be completed for its current charter on this topic.

Dr. Flowers asked for clarification on how the subcommittee will be using Ms. Morgan's data to compare to the new data on failure rates. Mr. Lowry replied that the workgroup will target States to extract information about their accreditation process and compare State accreditation and PT failure to the TNI accreditation and PT failure. Mr. Farrell asked how the group will factor in laboratories within a State that are NELAC accredited out of State because their State is not an accrediting body. Mr. Lowry replied that all NELAP accredited laboratories would be included in the NELAP data group. Mr. Farrell reiterated that the purpose of this study is to evaluate states certification programs and to determine how well state programs work. Dr. Flowers asked if Ms. Morgan had anything to add about the data treatment and she did not.

4. WORKGROUP UPDATES/ASSIGNMENTS (OLD AND NEW)

A. Monitoring Workgroup

Ms. Morgan stated that her workgroup met on 4/14/2009 (yesterday). The workgroup is looking at the relationship between the EPA green initiative and hazardous laboratory waste.

Ms. Morgan believes the green initiative will be a good project for the Monitoring Workgroup. Dr. Wichman has shared a couple of documents that have good information about hazardous waste in the laboratory and green methods that can be used in the laboratory. He referred to the EPA Green Chemistry page where there is information available for the general information for the public but no assistance for specific laboratories issues. The workgroup thinks the laboratory community could use additional information.

Mr. Orval Osborne drafted a good write-up of yesterday's workgroup discussion that covered topics like solvent reduction, identification of laboratory waste, and method preservation requirements. The workgroup's goals are to inform laboratories of what hazardous waste regulations apply to them, identify what types of waste can be eliminated or reduced, and identify wastes that are not being disposed of properly. Ms. Morgan added that laboratories are not as informed as they need to be and the workgroup would like to work with EPA to make suggestions that would help laboratories better manage their waste.

Dr. Flowers commented as a chemical laboratory director that there are a lot of waste practices that can be improved upon, thus making disposal cheaper, more efficient and less time consuming. He added that the arcane language in the hazardous waste laws makes it difficult for smaller laboratories to understand how to manage their waste. Ms. Morgan stated that within ELAB there is sufficient experience with laboratory waste to help identify common waste issues present in laboratories and reach out to small laboratories to inform them about proper disposal procedures. She believes it is important to have information available to help laboratories understand the Title 40 CFR waste regulations, which can be complicated for small laboratories to interpret since the waste regulations are geared for large waste generators.

Dr. Flowers agreed that the Board could help small laboratories with this issue since the regulations were written for laboratories making large quantities of chemicals, and Board members are familiar with applying the regulations to smaller laboratories that generate far smaller quantities of waste. Ms. Morgan stated that this topic fits nicely in the Green Initiative and its objective to reduce, reuse, and recycle.

Ms. Morgan also asked the workgroup review the FEM Web site Methods page to determine if there were additional links ELAB should recommend to the FEM in an effort to make the site more interactive and up to date. Ms. Morgan stated that as far as method

collections, the workgroup needs to reopen its ties to the Forum on Environmental Measurement (FEM). Dr. Flowers suggested that Ms. Lynn Bradley should participate in the workgroup calls to help the workgroup coordinate with the FEM. Ms. Bradley replied that she is not opposed to participating in ELAB workgroup calls; the FEM Communication action team is still working with Ms. Autry to improve the new FEM Web site. She has also been contacted about building a repository of questions and answers on the FEM Web site. The FEM action team has a Web page package to do this, but was ran into a funding issue. The EPA has not found a way to add the Q&A package so perhaps ELAB can help the process along from the outside. Ms. Morgan commented that there is also an effort within TNI to develop a Q&A section on their Web site. Ms. Bradley stated that she and Ms. Morgan will continue their discussion offline about how they can contribute to the workgroup on interaction with the FEM.

Dr. Flowers stated that the Q&A repository has been discussed in the past and he believes that unless the Board's questions and answers are "memorialized," the topics will return and have to be readdressed. Having a national repository for this type of information will be cost-effective because effort will not be spent repeating the same issues. Ms. Bradley cited the "mice-line" as an example of the common ORCR methods questions and answers. She also cited OW email question line that was published with the last major rule-making; the Agency is retaining answers from the line and building a database of these answers. Her point was that other EPA programs have had issues determining how to deal with archiving question and answer data bases and the programs have also dealt with the issue of answers that are dependant upon the focus or expertise of the expert who responds to them.

B. Measurement and Technology Workgroup

Mr. Lowry stated that Dr. Richard Burrows has written a draft white paper to present to the ELAB for an electronic vote. The white paper deals with the Board's interest to be involved with the FEM on its Calibration effort. The workgroup will complete the document and distribute it to the Board for comment so that Dr. Flowers can present the paper to the FEM. Dr. Flowers asked Dr. Burrows to distribute additional information he had on calibration approaches to the Board. Dr. Burrows agreed to supply the documents for the Board's review on the calibration topic.

Mr. Lowry added that the workgroup has evaluated the New Jersey TNI PT frequency study and will move forward with white papers and clarification papers for the next ELAB meeting. The workgroup is still waiting for the final TNI subcommittee report on this subject due in July.

C. Laboratory Management Workgroup

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

5. REVIEW ACTION ITEMS/ASSIGNMENTS

A. Action Items from March

Submission of Workgroup Information to the ELAB Website

Dr. Flowers reviewed the action items assigned during the March 17 meeting. Regarding the first issue from the March 17 meeting action items, he stated that the Tiger Team met and the White Paper has been produced on the SW-846 method identification issue that was discussed in March. Regarding the second issue from the last meeting, Dr. Flowers asked Ms. Morgan about the workgroup tracking table that she has been developing. Ms. Morgan stated that she was basically done and would distribute the tracking table to the Board. If all the members approve the table, then it can be posted to the ELAB Web site. Regarding the third action item from the last meeting, Dr. Flowers asked Mr. Dechant if he planned to submit workgroup summaries to the Board to be posted on the Web site. Mr. Dechant replied that he could submit the meeting minutes to be posted. Dr. Flowers stated that those members not on the Laboratory Management call reviewing the OW/TNI comparison table might appreciate having the minutes available so they can stay updated on the issue.

Ms. Autry asked the Board if she should use the information provided in Ms. Morgan's tracking table to populate the workgroup Web sites, or if the tracking table should be placed on the general ELAB Web site. Dr. Flowers replied that if information on a specific ELAB activity originates from a workgroup, then it should be posted to the workgroup page. Information that generally applies to the Board should be included on the newsroom page. Ms. Autry asked for clarification on how the Board wants her to publish Ms. Morgan's table and if she should use parts of it to populate individual workgroup sections. Dr. Flowers stated the whole table could be placed on Ms. Morgan's workgroup's Web site. Ms. Autry stated that the information on each workgroup Web page is not up to date or is completely irrelevant and needs to be populated with current information. She suggested that the Board consider not having individual workgroup pages, but would rather track workgroup activities through Ms. Morgan's tracking sheet. Otherwise, these old workgroup pages need to be updated and made relevant.

Mr. Dechant asked if minutes from the OW/TNI Standard Comparison meeting and the updated spreadsheet can be posted to the workgroup Web site. Ms. Autry replied that she could have those items uploaded to his workgroup page if the Board agreed. Mr. Lowry suggested uploading minutes, etc., from the workgroups to the individual pages and removing the "Example Activities" text as a way to update workgroup pages. Mr. Dechant then asked if a date has been established for submitting items to be posted on the Web pages. Ms. Autry replied that she has been sending Web site updates two weeks after the ELAB meeting. The additional time allows revisions to the minutes plus time for any additional pieces beyond the meeting minutes to be submitted for posting. Mr. Lowry clarified that ERG can be used for workgroup meeting minutes. Ms. Autry added that anything sent to her from workgroups will be characterized as such when it is posted and

posting will note that workgroup items have not been through the same approval process that Board final products have been through. Dr. Flowers summarized that the workgroup Web pages will be changed by removing information about example activities and adding minutes and other items the workgroups want to post.

Posting of Discussed/Submitted Documents

Dr. Flowers asked Ms. Autry if she was able to contact the FACA attorney regarding the disclaimer for posting white papers contributed by individual Board members. Ms. Autry replied that she had spoken with the attorney and distributed an email on the topic to the Board about a week after the last meeting. The Board needs to be aware that if an item is discussed during a meeting it has the option to attach it to the minutes. The Board needs to consider whether information should be posted and shared while keeping in mind that the Web site is not intended as a repository for information, but rather a tool to share items publicly.

Dr. Flowers summarized, stating that the Board has flexibility for posting items on the ELAB Web page, there is not much concern from the attorney on how ELAB handles the issue. He asked if the Board members will permit any relevant documents to be published to the Web site. If not, then there is no need for further discussion, but if so, then ELAB needs to discuss and publish a policy regarding posting documents to the ELAB Web site. Mr. Speis stated that if items are submitted to the Board for consideration, the public has the right to see items the Board is considering. If a document is discussed, then it should be included with the minutes. If it is not discussed during the meetings, then the document can be posted to the Web site with disclaimer that ELAB has not discussed the item and it is presented for general information.

Dr. Flowers reminded the Board of a time when the Board was asked to address the concern of light pollution in the night sky. This issue was never taken on by the Board, and the document was lost because it was not published. There is value in storing items that are not discussed so they are not lost. Documents that see the “Light of day” is a means to clarify any topic or argument brought to the Board and Dr. Flowers supports full disclosure and full vetting of ideas. Mr. Speis reminded the Board that everyone has the right to submit information on a topic for review and consideration by ELAB. This does not necessarily mean ELAB will discuss that information, but it should be available for anyone who might want to look at it.

Ms. Nan Thomey suggested that items submitted that were not within the Board’s charter should be stored in a different place than items not discussed by the Board. This way the public will know the reason the Board did not address the issue. Mr. Lowry replied that the meeting minutes capture the Board’s discussion of whether a topic is or is not deemed to be within the its charter. Ms. Thomey replied that it should not be necessary to make interest groups to read through the minutes to determine the Board’s decision on particular items.

Dr. Wichman added for the record that he did submit the light pollution document to the physics department at his university and did not receive a response. Dr. Flowers replied that the issue was something the Board agreed it would not work on because it is not an environmental pollutant issue within the Board's charter.

Dr. Flowers understands the Board's preference is to publish items submitted for discussion and that the Board needs to determine how these items will be published. Ms. Autry agreed with Ms. Thomey's suggestion to separate ideas that are not relevant to the Board's work or items that ELAB does not have the resources or time to deal with. Items that are taken on by the Board could be highlighted on the assigned workgroup pages. Ms. Thomey agreed with Mr. Speis's recommendation to place information not dealt with by the Board in a separate location. She reiterated that the Board needs to place items that are not within the charter in a separate location. She recommended that these out of charter submissions should be documented in such a way that it deters the public from presenting the same issues repeatedly. Dr. Flowers suggested that these items can be presented in a new table with a similar format to the one prepared by Ms. Morgan and the table could be posted in a holding area on the Web page.

Mr. Farrell stated that two needs have come out of the discussion: first, the Web site will include workgroup information such as minutes and other materials and second, there needs to be a holding area for items not addressed by ELAB for whatever reason. Items that are discussed and will be addressed should be placed in the appropriate workgroup Web page. Anything that is part of the open discussion in the Board meetings will be part of the minutes.

Mr. Farrell asked about the policy regarding posting documents that accompany topics that ELAB is working on that are not necessarily assigned to a workgroup. Mr. Dechant stated his concern about checking to make sure items that are posted have a scientific basis. Mr. Farrell suggested that if an issue is being worked on, the topic should be listed in the summary table, the discussion on the topic will be in the minutes, and a list of the documents discussed could be appended to those minutes and cited by reference for the discussion. These documents could then be requested by the public as needed. Ms. Thomey agreed with Mr. Farrell's idea of an appendix to the minutes that includes bibliographic-type references and formal record that the document exists.

Mr. Lowry stated his belief that all topics submitted to ELAB should be assigned to a workgroup. That way, documents and other submitted information can be included in the workgroup Web pages. Mr. Dechant reminded the Board that there have been several examples where ELAB would not deal with a particular issue brought to it by some stakeholder. Mr. Farrell repeated his concern about items that are handled by the Board as a whole and not assigned to a workgroup. Even though the item will be part of the minutes there needs to be a way to document additional information that was available during the Board's deliberations.

Ms. Thomey asked about having an ELAB Web "filing cabinet" for such documents. Dr. Flowers replied that the only type of filing system available on the Web site is posting a

PDF file. Regarding the bibliography idea, he asked who would be the public contact responsible for retrieving and distributing the information. Ms. Autry replied that the “Contact Us” button on the Web site is available if someone needs help finding documents they need on an ELAB topic. All “Contact Us” inquiries are routed to Ms. Autry.

Ms. Autry added that OGC was very clear that the Board should never alter a document in anyway so that the Board can claim it was a product supplied by a stakeholder and not an ELAB product. Although modifications to the Web site are not free, it is possible to restructure the Web site if necessary to accommodate different types of documents discussed in this meeting. The Board should formally decide and be clear on the changes it wants to make in the Web site before any changes are made. In addition, the system the Board is currently creating to classify and post documents needs to be written into a formal procedure so that the process is performed consistently over time. Mr. Speis agreed to create a formal policy on posting documents and added that these documents need to be available to the public so Ms. Autry does not have to act as administrative assistant distributing requested information.

Dr. Flowers reiterated his “light of day” policy as a clarifying option. The best policy is to be open and make all the information sent to ELAB available for public scrutiny. Mr. Speis stated that he would provide language for the policy to the Board about what type of information will go on to the Web site. Dr. Flowers cited the previously developed language that he drafted and suggested placing that language on the Web site. He agreed with a policy not to change posted documents in anyway; changes would indicate ELAB possessing ownership of a document and that is not what the Board wants to do. Mr. Speis replied that he would look at that information again, as well. Dr. Flowers summarized that the Board would place documents on the Web site based on the criteria in the posting policy. Documents would be cited in the minutes as a means of publishing them. Documents that are sent to ELAB, but are not dealt with by the Board, would be posted in holding areas such as: “Not Under Active Review” or “Not Within Charter” on the Web site. He added that there would be a disclaimer that preceded the areas used to post these documents.

ORCR Meeting Preparation

Mr. Speis completed edits to the document to be presented to ORCR, the workgroup reviewed the edited document, and Mr. Speis submitted it to ORCR. Ms. Autry has contacted the representatives from ORCR and scheduled the meeting in Washington.

B. Current Action Items

Dr. Flowers discussed the action items assigned during the current meeting. The Tiger Team is to meet on Friday to prepare for the Monday meeting with ORCR. Ms. Morgan and her workgroup will continue to work on the green initiative topic and develop an

information dialogue. Mr. Lowry and his workgroup will look further into the proficiency test frequency issue and follow the activities of the TNI PT Frequency subcommittee.

Mr. Dechant will continue to lead the OW/TNI comparison document effort. Dr. Flowers asked Mr. Dechant how hopeful he is to complete the comparison within the discussed timeframe. Mr. Dechant replied that he is not convinced at this point that the document will be complete by August, but a revised draft should be a presentable. Dr. Flowers suggested that Mr. Dechant invite more people from OW to join the effort. Mr. Dechant replied that there are three people from the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water involved in the calls that run the program. He stated that the effort is moving forward and has adequate representation. He hopes that the topic will begin to move faster now that the workgroup is familiar with the review process.

6. CLOSING REMARKS/ADJOURN

Dr. Flowers asked for guest comment at this time. Citing none, Ms. Autry provided the Board with an update from the FEM. The Forum continues to deal with the calibration issue through the MQL/MDL/Calibration action team. The group is developing a global glossary of environmental measurement terms to foster a more consistent use of these terms throughout the Agency. Eastern Research Group, Inc (ERG) is assisting the workgroup in creating a table that shows the different acceptable calculations and methods used by different program offices. The effort is still moving slowly but will get to a point where these documents will require some review; a resulting document may be ready within six months.

In addition, the FEM is moving forward with developing a policy for requiring use of accredited laboratories on EPA contracts. This is a policy that the FEM hopes to draft and vote on in time for its meeting in July so that it can be presented to the Science Policy Council (SPC) to be approved for the Agency's use.

The FEM is working with the Science Policy Council (SPC) to obtain approval for submission of a new Federal Register Notice (FRN) on Flexible Measurement Approaches. This is the FEM's way to close the loop between the group's previous September 1997 FRN and a revised policy for flexible approach to environmental measurements. In addition, the FEM is submitting a recommendation to the SPC on reviewing all monitoring programs across the Agency. Given the magnitude of the effort, its importance, and the possibility for other council involvement, the FEM plans to take a couple of months to develop the issue description further and identify different entities that could or should be involved. The FEM hopes to begin work on the issue in June.

The Environmental Technology action team within the FEM is currently working on the issue of sensor technology and developing a priority list of areas where the use of sensors would benefit EPA in the short term as well as the long term. The FEM is also preparing to release another document in a series of validation guideline documents that specifically addresses the topic of biological testing. As previously mentioned, the new FEM Web

site is now live with the help of Ms. Bradley and her action team. Ms. Autry encouraged Board members to visit the Web site and provide feedback as necessary.

The FEM is also working on communicating the flexible approach to environmental measurement changes. The action team is developing a communication and outreach strategy and starting to work on a presentation that can be used when there are opportunities for outreach. The group is also trying to put together a list of possible venues for outreach. Ms. Autry asked the ELAB members for their recommendations for additional venues to present the current flexible approach to measurements. Finally, the FEM is beginning to prepare for the National Environmental Monitoring Conference in August. FEM supports having the new EPA administrator giving the keynote address to discuss the transition of the EPA under the new administration. The FEM is currently working through the process of formally inviting the EPA Administrator.

Mr. Lowry asked for some insight on the FEM's policy on using accredited laboratories. Ms. Autry replied that the policy is a long-standing request and the FEM has sought ways to encourage accreditation. The next step for the Agency is to explore how the policy can be included into the contractual requirements so that when a proposal is issued any relevant accreditations or certifications would have greater weight during proposal evaluation. Two offices have successfully tested some language in their contracts and the FEM has received language already in place in Department of Energy procurements. The FEM is creating a similar policy for the Agency using these examples.

With Ms. Autry's update on FEM activity, all of the Board's agenda topics for this meeting were complete and Dr. Flowers adjourned the meeting.

DRAFT

Attachment A

AGENDA
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
Monthly Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#
April 15, 2009; 1:00 - 3:00 pm (ET)

Opening Remarks	DFO/Chair
Roll Call of ELAB Members and Identification of Guests	Chair
Review/Approval of March Minutes	Chair
Follow-up on Key Topics	All
- Preparation for ORCR Meeting	All
- TNI Standard Comparison with Drinking Water Pgm	Dechant/All
- Proficiency Test Frequency Update/Discussion	All
Workgroup Updates/Assignments (Old and New)	All
Review Action Items/Assignments	Chair
Closing Remarks/Adjourn	DFO/Chair

Attachment B

MEMBERSHIP LISTING AND GUESTS

ELAB MEETING

April 15, 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	US 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.
Y	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)

DRAFT

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y (Guest)	Ms. Jennifer Colby	Eastern Research Group
Y (Guest)	Ms. Lynn Bradley	EPA/OEI
Y (Guest)	Mr. Aaron Nevel	Inside EPA (Newsletter)
Y (Guest)	Mr. Peter Westlin	OAQPS

Attachment C

ACTION ITEMS

1. The Tiger Team is to meet and prepare for the Monday meeting with ORCR on Friday.
2. Ms. Morgan and her workgroup will continue to work on the green initiative topic and develop an information dialogue.
3. Mr. Lowry and his workgroup will look further into the proficiency test frequency issue and follow the activities of the TNI PT Frequency subcommittee.
4. Mr. Dechant will continue to lead charge on the OW/TNI comparison document effort and provide updates to the Board.

DRAFT

Attachment D

I hereby certify that these are the final version of minutes for the Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Meeting held on April 15, 2009.

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

Signature Chairman

Dr. Jeff Flowers

Print Name Chairman