

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

Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#

May 16, 2012; 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. EDT

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB or Board) teleconference was held on May 16, 2012, from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. EDT. The agenda for this meeting is provided as Attachment A, a list of the participants is provided as Attachment B, and action items from the teleconference are included as Attachment C. The official certification of the minutes by the Chair or Vice-Chair is included as Attachment D.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Aurora Shields, Chair of ELAB, and Ms. Lara (Autry) Phelps, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) of ELAB, welcomed participants to the teleconference and called an official roll of the Board members and guests.

2. APPROVAL OF APRIL MINUTES

Ms. Shields noted that Mr. John Phillips had sent suggested comments regarding the April 2012 minutes and asked for any additional comments. Mr. Dave Speis said that his affiliation needs to be changed to "QC Laboratories." Mr. Speis moved to accept the minutes with these changes, and Ms. Patsy Root seconded the motion. The Board unanimously approved the April minutes with the discussed changes.

3. DISCUSSION ABOUT WORKGROUPS

Mr. Speis noted that the Board has used an *ad hoc* approach to various tasks outside of the Workgroups. He liked this approach because only interested parties worked on the tasks. Under this type of system, there is a great deal of enthusiasm, discussion and report-outs. With the hard-wired Workgroups, often there is nothing to report because some members may not be interested in the current Workgroup activities, and it is difficult to get participation to move items forward. Therefore, he thought that the *ad hoc* approach was more effective. Mr. Phillips said that it was difficult choosing a Workgroup when he first joined ELAB because he had interests in more than one Workgroup. He thought that the *ad hoc* approach would increase participation and allow Board members to work on the issues about which they are most interested. Ms. Judy Morgan agreed.

Ms. Phelps stated that it was necessary to find a balance to ensure that the Workgroups are effective. She emphasized that an *ad hoc* Workgroup cannot be comprised of more than one-half of the ELAB members, or all meetings would need to follow the rules of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), including 15-day meeting notices in the *Federal Register*. Three Workgroups were established to avoid this. Another problem is that the same members continually "step up to the plate" and perform the majority of the work; not every member has

been involved outside of regular Board participation. The current structure of assigning new Board members to a Workgroup was designed to decrease this problem. Ms. Phelps asked the ELAB members to consider these issues when determining Workgroup structure.

Mr. Jack Farrell asked whether the issue was the establishment of standing Workgroups or the focus of the current Workgroups; perhaps the current Workgroups do not have the correct focus. Mr. Farrell clarified for Ms. Silky Labie that each of the three Workgroups has a defined focus, and perhaps they need to be modified. Ms. Shields agreed with Mr. Phillips that as a new member it is difficult to choose one, but it is clear that each of the Workgroups has completed a great deal of work since their inception. She does not want to see the current Workgroups disbanded because any task can be assigned to any subgroup of the Board at any time. ELAB is not limited to the three Workgroups. Dr. Jeff Flowers agreed with the point that Mr. Speis had made about interest, noting that pre-assigned Workgroups may provide a “voice” to those members who may not have participated otherwise.

Mr. Speis said that the current structure could be modified to allow the “best of both worlds.” The current Workgroup structure could be maintained, but any interested Board members could participate in any Workgroup activity in which they are interested as long as the number of Workgroup members remains under the level of quorum. Dr. Flowers agreed with this suggestion, stating that there has been diverse involvement in the various Workgroup projects, which has been beneficial in developing the Workgroup products. Ms. Shields said that the value of having standing Workgroups is that each has an assigned Chair. Mr. Speis said that the current structure could be described on the ELAB website with additional language explaining that Board members interested in current Workgroup activities are free to participate as long as the number of participants is under a quorum level. Mr. Eddie Clemons commented that members’ expertise may be applicable to multiple Workgroups, and the ELAB members should use their expertise and experience in a beneficial manner.

Mr. Farrell said that in certain cases an ad hoc group could be set up as needed. Mr. Speis suggested that the Workgroups be reviewed at certain intervals to ensure that their focus is reflective of the current issues that the Board is undertaking. Ms. Phelps said that she does not intend to increase the number of Board members above 16. She suggested that each Workgroup review the wording of their committee on the website and ensure that they are accurate and reflective.

Mr. Farrell asked whether there was a standard operating procedure (SOP) for each Workgroup and, if not, whether they should be implemented. Ms. Phelps said that the Board is welcome to develop any SOPs that it would like; currently, there only is a one-pager about the rotation of the Chair and Vice-Chair. Mr. Farrell wondered whether guidelines should be established if Workgroups are going to be opened to all Board members. Dr. Flowers said that when he holds a meeting he determines how many regular members are going to be present and then invites additional Board members who have shown interest, ensuring that the number is below quorum. Leaving this decision to the Workgroup Chairs allows some flexibility without violating FACA rules.

4. EPA'S RESPONSE TO ELAB'S COMMENTS ON THE METHODS UPDATE RULE (MUR)

Ms. Shields said that the Board needed to discuss the recently published MUR, particularly in regard to the lack of an EPA response to ELAB's extensive comments on the rule on a variety of issues (e.g., quality assurance, detection limits). Mr. Farrell thanked Mr. Jerry Parr (The NELAC Institute [TNI]) for his assistance. He noted that there needs to be more clarification and detail regarding TNI standards, but he did not see this addressed in the standards. He also thought that ELAB should have been consulted more by the EPA during the process. When the Board provides recommendations to the agency, they should be considered seriously. He did not observe this occur nor did he observe an EPA response to the recommendations. Is it reasonable for ELAB to request a discussion with the EPA to determine the status of the Board's recommendations? He would appreciate Ms. Phelps' input about such a discussion. There are many stakeholders in addition to ELAB that submitted comments, and they are questioning the status of their comments as well. Ms. Labie thought that every comment needed to be addressed in the *Federal Register* when a document was finalized by the agency.

Ms. Phelps said that ELAB could extend an invitation to the Office of Water (OW) staff responsible for the MUR to discuss this issue further, providing examples of the types of questions that the Board would like answered. She agreed that ELAB deserved a response to the feedback that it had provided, and sending a follow-up letter to OW would be very appropriate. ELAB can invite OW staff to its monthly conference call, set up a face-to-face meeting or table the discussion until the next face-to-face meeting in August 2012. Ms. Phelps thought that a document detailing how comments were mitigated and why some were or were not accepted must accompany a finalized document. It may be published separate from the docket, so she could determine the status of this document. Mr. Parr said that typically this response is present, and the agency provides a weblink to <http://www.regulations.gov> for the responses to comments; this announcement did not have such a link. There was a brief, general response to some comments included in the docket, but he has not found a comprehensive response. Mr. Farrell wondered whether these responses did not have to be filed until a final rule was released. Mr. Parr agreed that this could be the case.

Mr. Farrell thought that the issue needed to be addressed by the Board because it impacts ELAB's effectiveness. Ms. Shields agreed, noting that the members spend a good deal of time and effort to develop recommendations, and ELAB must address this issue if the recommendations are not being taken seriously. Perhaps a problem is that the recommendations are not being disseminated to the appropriate individuals within the agency. Ms. Phelps said that this FACA committee operates differently than most other agency FACA committees because it is stake-holder driven; ELAB's charter could be modified to address this, but this would change the work of the Board. Many of the issues raised by ELAB and its constituents focus on OW, which may indicate that ELAB should be an OW FACA committee. OW receives many ELAB comments about a variety of its issues.

In response to a question from Ms. Shields, Ms. Phelps explained that this FACA committee has been established as a "two-way street," but there is nothing that is written in the charter that would dictate that it must remain as such. Mr. Clemons did not think that that the Board should be limited to being an OW FACA as its constituency operates across other media. Mr. Farrell agreed that it was necessary to listen to all of the stakeholders' issues, and he did not think that

ELAB was intentionally focusing on OW. The charter focuses on national accreditation, and the current focus on OW is coincidental and not intentional. Mr. Speis agreed with this assessment and that ELAB should not be limited to OW, noting that issues from other program offices may arise on which ELAB should act. Ms. Phelps agreed that national accreditation should be more global than OW, although current stakeholder questions dominate the water community. She thought that it was important to ensure that all programs in all media use their data quality objectives (DQOs) properly.

Dr. Skip Kingston asked whether there was a policy in place regarding national accreditation about which ELAB should be aware. Is that why the Board did not receive a response to its recommendations? Mr. Farrell wondered whether the Board provided its comments to the wrong audience, as Ms. Shields had previously suggested. Ms. Phelps said that the comments were to the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water about the differences between the Drinking Water Certification Manual and the TNI standards, in addition to the topic of proficiency testing. She was not aware of any broader ELAB recommendations to other offices regarding national accreditation. Dr. Kingston said that the Board had provided specific examples so that the recommendations would be taken seriously. Ms. Phelps commented that the recommendations regarding national accreditation solely focused on the laboratory and not on sampling and measurement organizations. The discussions have focused on the TNI standards, which have standards for sampling organizations, but those organizations have not been covered. The Board needs to be aware of its focus to date. Dr. Kingston agreed and noted the need to help EPA staff understand that the Board is trying to look more broadly than water issues. Perhaps ELAB needs to address its own methods of making recommendations to ensure that the agency provides a response. The Board can address a broader audience by making its comments appropriate for a broader audience. Ms. Morgan added that OW is the only office that has a federally mandated certification program, which contributes to ELAB's focus on that office. The original goal was to change the one mandated program and then go broader within the agency. It is difficult to focus on several offices when the Board does not receive a response from the one office with which it is trying to communicate.

Ms. Shields thought that the Board was discussing two separate issues. The first is the national accreditation issue, and she agreed with Ms. Phelps' assessment that the ELAB focus has been on laboratories. Perhaps the Board does not possess the appropriate individuals to address this issue. The second issue is that ELAB's specific, targeted comments regarding the proposed regulation that did not receive a response; and accreditation was not addressed in the Board's recommendations. The Board did not receive a response regarding very targeted comments, so the questions are: How effective is the Board? What can it do to ensure that its comments receive a response and are taken seriously? ELAB does not know when regulations will be published because the Board is not notified prior to their release that the agency is developing regulations. One consequence of this is that the Board then struggles under tight deadlines to provide recommendations within the public comment period. ELAB attempted to address this issue with its letter of introduction asking the agency to use the Board's expertise during regulatory development. Ms. Phelps agreed and said that there may be a process that could be instituted to receive comments and allow followup on issues. She suggested writing a letter to OW indicating that the Board has yet to receive a response to its comments and that there was no response to comments published in the docket; ELAB should request to meet with OW staff to discuss these matters further. The letter should be addressed to the EPA staff member listed on the docket with management copied to ensure that the Board communicates with the appropriate staff members.

Mr. Farrell wondered whether to address the letter to the OW Assistant Administrator. He agreed that ELAB needs to broaden its focus outside of OW, but OW has been releasing regulations to which the Board must respond. He wondered about the weight a FACA comment carries that would allow ELAB to receive the attention that the Board desires.

Ms. Labie noted the Board's efforts regarding the agency's Recreational Water Quality Criteria development. Ms. Root had sent a letter offering ELAB's input and noting the desire to work with the agency during criteria development, and the EPA's response was that the Board should wait to provide comments during the public comment period following publications of the guidelines in the *Federal Register*. Ms. Root agreed that there had been a lack of enthusiasm on the agency's part to receive the professional opinions of ELAB; she noted, however, that the issue was somewhat different than the MUR because it dealt with implementation of a method and is a guideline rather than a rule.

In response to a comment by Ms. Shields, Ms. Phelps explained that most FACA committees provide reports to the agency regarding the issues on which they focus; these reports can be filed at the Library of Congress as an official record of the FACA committees' work. ELAB has never written a report, and most of the Board's products have been letters to the agency with recommendations or requests to engage in discussion about various issues. She provided the example of a specific charge from the agency to the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology, which formed a specific task force with the required expertise, including experts outside of the FACA committee, and provided the agency with formal recommendations in the form of a report. Mr. Farrell asked how ELAB's comments about MUR differed. Ms. Phelps said that the Board's recommendations were submitted in response to a docket and became a part of the docket; ELAB was one of many groups that provided comments in response to an invitation to comment. She agreed that the Board's comments should be valued with some weight. The difference is that the Board was not chosen specifically by the agency to provide expert comments to the rule. ELAB has functioned as a stakeholder-to-agency-driven FACA committee rather than an agency-to-board-driven committee. This has arisen from the manner in which ELAB was established. It is possible for the Board to be involved with the agency in a two-way manner, and there are many examples of ELAB success in bringing stakeholder issues to the agency (e.g., SW-846, the Forum on Environmental Measurements [FEM] method and detection issue). The Board must create a better system to elicit responses from the agency; as the DFO, Ms. Phelps also can follow up with the agency as needed. She can serve in this role to ensure that the Board receives a timely response to its comments, requests and recommendations. The ELAB members also must recognize that some issues will be of more urgency to the stakeholder community than to the agency. Every topic that the Board raises may not be successful, particularly because of timing. She applauded ELAB for ensuring that stakeholder issues stay at the forefront so that they are not forgotten.

Ms. Shields thought that the Board should write a letter in an attempt to receive a response regarding its comments on the MUR. Dr. Richard Burrows said that the letter needed to include recognition that there has been limited EPA response on specific issues and note that this limited response is inadequate. Mr. Farrell said that the letter could ask about the response process because 20 other groups made similar comments to ELAB's, and it does not appear that these comments have been addressed adequately. Dr. Burrows agreed. In response to a comment from Ms. Shields, Dr. Burrows thought that perhaps the Board should wait until there is a response-to-comments document provided with the final rule. Ms. Shields questioned the effectiveness of

this approach because if comments are not addressed prior to the finalization of the MUR, then ELAB only can express frustration that its comments were ignored. What would be the outcome in that case? Dr. Burrows said that the Board could ask for specific clarification that would decrease frustration. Ms. Shields said that there needed to be a goal for a desired outcome that the letter will address rather than merely expressing ELAB's frustration.

Dr. Jim Pletl noted that this was not the Board's first discussion on this subject. He would like to have a discussion with the EPA about the process of having regulations reviewed and the transparency in how the agency deals with comments. He did not believe that there was a federal requirement that the EPA post responses to comments, but to avoid frustration within the agency's stakeholders, the recommendation to the EPA should encourage a well-defined, transparent process. The current perception among stakeholders is that they provide comments and nothing happens. The agency should be concerned about this perception and needs to know that the stakeholders are not happy about the manner in which this issue has been addressed by the EPA. ELAB can make recommendations on how the agency can improve this process. Ms. Shields said that most dockets include a response to comments. Dr. Pletl said that this may occur, but he did not think that it was required.

Mr. Parr said that the agency had released a 1-page general response to comments, but it was not detailed, and many comments had been ignored. Mr. Farrell wondered whether ELAB should include in its letter information about stakeholders who have expressed concern about needing clarification regarding the MUR, which appears to be subject to interpretation. ELAB could ask for the EPA's help in clarifying these issues.

Ms. Shields asked whether the Board wanted to draft the letter immediately or wait until a final rule is released. Mr. Farrell thought that perhaps some of the stakeholders who had provided comments on the MUR could be involved with drafting the letter. Dr. Michael Wichman volunteered to lead the group to write the letter using some of the language that Mr. Farrell had provided.

5. GENERAL WORKGROUP ACTIVITY

Monitoring Workgroup

Ms. Root did not have anything to report regarding the Recreational Water Quality Criteria development because the EPA had not responded to the letter. Ms. Phelps will follow up with Ms. Denise Hawkins (EPA) to determine the status of the letter. Dr. Flowers said that the State of Florida is not using the expensive procedure and instead is using total coliform technology; the agency needs to be aware of budget constraints in choosing the method. In response to a question from Ms. Root, Dr. Flowers explained that the State of Florida is cutting back its beach testing dramatically, and using the less expensive method because of funding reductions.

Measurement and Technology Workgroup

Mr. Phillips reported that the Workgroup had scheduled a conference call prior to ELAB meeting with Dr. Maria Gomez-Taylor (OW) and Ms. Jan Matuszko (OW) to discuss the Federal Advisory Committee on Detection and Quantitation process, but it will need to be rescheduled for the first week of June 2012. The Workgroup had sent the OW staff members its list of

questions via email, which Mr. Phillips also provided to the Board members. Ms. Phelps reported that only one statistician works with the office, and Mr. Phillips should contact Ms. Janet Goodwin (EPA) once Ms. Phelps provides him with her contact information.

During the Workgroup's analysis of the DQO process, it determined that OW was not effectively applying the process. Mr. Phillips had forwarded the Workgroup members Appendix C of a quality systems document, which discusses measurement quality indicators (MQIs) that currently are required under the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program. The Workgroup will continue to discuss typical MQIs needed for those organizations applying the DQO process. The Workgroup would like to obtain feedback from organizations that heavily utilize the DQO process to determine whether laboratories are able to provide needed information readily. This will provide some feedback to the Workgroup to ensure that the necessary MQIs are included. The Workgroup discussion about this issue has been primarily via email because of the difficulty of scheduling conference calls. Ms. Shields asked whether any other Board members would like to participate in these activities. Those who are interested should contact Mr. Phillips so that they can be included. Ms. Labie and Dr. Pletl volunteered to be involved with both issues on which the Workgroup is working. In response to a question from Ms. Shields, Mr. Phillips explained that the Workgroup would be providing reports to the full Board on these issues following its discussions with the EPA.

Laboratory Management Workgroup

The Laboratory Management Workgroup's main focus is the health of national accreditation, which the Board discussed as a current action needing update/review.

Ad Hoc Website Workgroup

Ms. Root has not moved forward because the *ad hoc* Workgroup has not met since the prior Board meeting. Ms. Shields said that the appropriate next steps must be determined.

6. CURRENT ACTIONS NEEDING UPDATE/REVIEW

Mr. Speis explained that Ms. Morgan had prepared an introduction to the 12-page summary document on the state of national accreditation. A statement explaining that all of the parties did not respond to all of the issues needs to be included. Ms. Shields will incorporate the comments that she received from the members during the teleconference the previous day into the introduction. Ms. Morgan asked what the Board intends to do with the entire document once the introduction is approved. Ms. Shields said that it would be published on the ELAB website. Ms. Morgan moved to vote on approval of the introduction via email; Mr. Speis seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Mr. Speis reported that the Laboratory Management Workgroup has been meeting weekly via teleconference to discuss the 12-page summary document and determine whether any issues are worthy of making recommendations to the agency. The Workgroup has evaluated approximately one-half of the comments, and approximately 40 percent of these comments are considered "a comment appropriate to the EPA." The remainder of the issues are those that should be handled by TNI. Ms. Shields said that it has been difficult extracting issues from the larger document that will serve the Board in advising the EPA directly. Mr. Speis reported that eventually the

Workgroup will develop a letter for Board review regarding the issues on which the Workgroup determines that the Board can make recommendations to the EPA.

Ms. Morgan asked whether the summary document would be submitted with the letter. Ms. Shields said that this could be determined by the Board once the final product has been developed, depending on whether the final product is a letter or a report. Mr. Farrell asked whether the objective is to write a report; if so, will ELAB include information about the TNI-related issues or focus only on what can be recommended to the agency? Ms. Shields said that it could be a report with a finalized recommendation to the EPA. It could be published on the ELAB website so that other groups can utilize it. Ms. Phelps stated that although she had given the example of other FACA committees that write reports, she did not intend to imply that the Board must write reports. If ELAB chooses to write a report, it must have the mindset that the report is written to the agency. Although other organizations may benefit from such a report, they cannot be the focus.

Mr. Speis reiterated that the original intent of this effort was to make recommendations to the agency. A report was not the intended outcome, but if the Board determines that a report-like format with recommendations to the agency would be useful, the intent will need to be modified. Ms. Phelps cautioned that this has been an intense topic in the past, so every member of the Board must be comfortable with a report as a final product. Ms. Shields thought that the audience would determine the format. Mr. Speis said that the Board had not determined to whom the final product would be sent to affect change within the EPA. Ms. Phelps said that if ELAB would like to speak to the agency about accreditation and the state of accreditation programs currently available, the letter should go to the Science Advisor with a copy sent to the FEM, which is the actionable group within the agency on this topic. If the Board chooses to focus on OW, then Ms. Nancy Stoner, Acting Assistant Administrator for Water, is the appropriate staff member. Mr. Speis thought that it was an all-program-encompassing recommendation, so the Science Advisor would be the most appropriate. Ms. Phelps said that Dr. Glenn Paulson (EPA) recently had been named as the Science Advisor, so the recommendations should be addressed to him in this case. In response to a question from Mr. Farrell, Ms. Shields noted that the Board could discuss the format of the final product during a future ELAB teleconference; Mr. Speis agreed. Dr. Wichman suggested that the Board present the final product to the stakeholders as well.

7. UPDATES FROM THE DFO

Ms. Phelps noted that the membership process has begun, and most of the paperwork has been completed. She expects senior management to review and approve the packages in approximately 1 week.

8. OTHER ITEMS

The Board members did not introduce any additional items for discussion.

9. WRAP-UP/REVIEW ACTION ITEMS

Ms. Kristen LeBaron reviewed the action items from the meeting, which are included in Attachment C.

10. CLOSING REMARKS/ADJOURNMENT

Determining that there were no more issues to discuss, Ms. Shields asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Farrell made the motion, which Ms. Root seconded. The members voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 3:01 p.m.

Attachment A

AGENDA ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD

Monthly Teleconference: 866-299-3188/9195415544#

May 16, 2012; 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. (EDT)

Opening Remarks	Phelps/Shields
Approval of April Minutes	Shields
Discussion about Workgroups	Shields
EPA's response to ELAB's comments on MUR	Shields
General Workgroup Activity	
Monitoring Workgroup	Root
Measurement/Technology Workgroup	Phillips
Laboratory Management Workgroup	Flowers
Ad Hock – Website Workgroup	Shields/Root
Current Actions Needing Update/Review	
- State of National Accreditation	Morgan/Speis
Updates from DFO	Phelps
Other Items	All
Wrap-up/Review Action Items	Shields
Closing Remarks/Adjourn	Phelps/Shields

Attachment B**MEMBERSHIP LISTING AND GUESTS**

ELAB TELECONFERENCE
May 16, 2012; 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. EDT

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y	Ms. Aurora Shields (Chair)	City of Lawrence, Kansas Representing: Wastewater Laboratories
Y	Ms. Patsy Root (Vice-Chair)	IDEXX Laboratories, Inc. Representing: Laboratory Product Developers
Y	Ms. Lara P. Autry, DFO	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Representing: EPA
Y	Dr. Richard Burrows	TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc. Representing: Commercial Laboratory Industry
Y	Mr. Eddie Clemons, II	Practical Quality Consulting Services Representing: Clients of QS Services
Y	Mr. John (Jack) E. Farrell, III	Analytical Excellence, Inc. Representing: The NELAC Institute (TNI)
Y	Dr. Jeff Flowers	City of Maitland, Florida Representing: Elected Officials of Local Government
N	Dr. Reza Karimi	Battelle Memorial Institute Representing: Nonprofit Research and Development Organizations
Y	Dr. H. M. (Skip) Kingston	Duquesne University Representing: Government Consortiums, Native Americans and Academia
Y	Ms. Sylvia (Silky) S. Labie	Environmental Laboratory Consulting & Technology, LLC Representing: Third Party Assessors
Y	Ms. Judith (Judy) R. Morgan	Environmental Science Corp. Representing: Commercial Environmental Laboratories
Y	Mr. John H. Phillips	Ford Motor Company Representing: Alliance of Auto Manufacturers
Y	Dr. James (Jim) Pletl	Hampton Roads Sanitation District Representing: Municipal Environmental Laboratories
Y	Mr. David (Dave) N. Speis	QC Laboratories Representing: American Council of Independent Laboratories (ACIL)
Y	Ms. Michelle L. Wade	Kansas Department of Health and the Environment Representing: Laboratory Accreditation Bodies
Y	Dr. Michael D. Wichman	University of Iowa Hygienic Laboratory Representing: Association of Public Health Laboratories (APHL)

Attendance (Y/N)	Name	Affiliation
Y	Ms. Kristen LeBaron (Contractor)	The Scientific Consulting Group, Inc. (SCG)
Y	Ms. Lynn Bradley (Guest)	TNI
Y	Mr. David Friedman (Guest)	Friedman Consulting, LLC
Y	Ms. Paula Hogg (Guest)	Hampton Roads Sanitation District
Y	Mr. Jerry Parr (Guest)	TNI

Attachment C

ACTION ITEMS

1. Ms. Kristen LeBaron will finalize the April 2012 meeting minutes with the discussed changes and send them to Ms. Phelps via email.
2. Ms. Phelps will determine whether there is a formal requirement for the agency to respond to comments and what process currently is in place.
3. Dr. Wichman will draft a letter to the agency regarding its lack of response to MUR comments.
4. Ms. Phelps will follow up with Ms. Hawkings on the status of the letter that the Board sent regarding Recreational Water Quality Criteria development.
5. Ms. Phelps will provide Ms. Goodwin's contact information to Mr. Phillips.
6. Ms. Shields will update the introduction to the summary document on the state of national accreditation with the comments that she has received from ELAB members, and the Board will approve the introduction via email.

Attachment D

I hereby certify that this is the final version of the minutes for the Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Meeting held on May 16, 2012.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "P. Root", is centered on a light gray rectangular background.

Signature Vice-Chair

Ms. Patsy Root

Print Name Vice-Chair