# Summary of the NELAP Accreditation Council Meeting Monday, February 5, 2024 1:30 pm Eastern

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

Kristin welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendance is recorded in Attachment 1. The minutes of December 4, 2023, and January 23, 2024, were approved by unanimous vote following a motion by Cathy, seconded by Annmarie.

#### 2. Vote on ORELAP Recommendation

Carl moved to accept the recommendation of the evaluation team to renew the recognition of Oregon as a NELAP AB, and Brian seconded the motion. Twelve votes were cast during the meeting, with OR abstaining, and the remaining vote was cast by email the following day, February 6. The vote tally is presented in the table below.

State AB	Vote	State AB	Vote
FL	Yes	NY	Yes
IL	Yes	OK	Yes
KS	Yes	OR	Abstain
LS	Yes	PA	Yes
MN	Yes	TX	Yes
NH	Yes	UT	Yes
NJ	Yes	VA	Yes

# 3. Discussion of Cleaning Up Method and Analyte Codes

In November of 2023, a Council member had asked if Paul Junio still intended to "clean up" these codes, and when Lynn contacted Paul, he asked to discuss the process with the Council. This was the first meeting where schedules matched, so that he could participate. Kristin invited Paul to lead the discussion.

Paul explained the origin of the request for clean-up, agreeing on the need to do so, but shared his concern about how to accomplish the task without disrupting the accreditations, and asked about the best way to do it without creating disastrous results. One participant suggested a small workgroup, another noted that in times past, Dan would propose a list of removals and seek feedback on whether deletion would be acceptable.

When asked, Paul indicated that clean-up could be just removing unused or obsolete codes, or it could extend to consolidating multiple analytes into one code (e.g., identical compounds with different common names or Colilert products). He noted that cleaning up the analyte codes will be considerably simpler than the method codes. For analytes, a simple sort by CAS Number and name should be the easiest starting place, then proposing removal for unused chemicals and consolidation of those with a single CAS# but varying names.

One participant noted that some regulatory citations need to be corrected, but that is beyond TNI's capabilities. Another noted that some analytes have different codes depending on which FoPT table they are listed in (e.g., PCB 1262 and 1262 in oil have different codes for PT purposes).

Paul asked if prep method need analyte codes, or should those be method codes, and apparently in NJ, the different analyte codes are needed to identify the analyte being extracted in the prep method.

One suggestion was to initially identify a list of questions to be addressed, and start with analyte codes (~4,000 codes). Paul pondered whether it is necessary to retain a history of actions taken with the codes, probably not in the database itself but available to ABs. CA noted that they have undertaken a similar effort, and suggested that the information should reside in the code database if possible. Paul will check with TNI's IT Administrator to see how complicated or easy that might be.

Paul will begin with creation of a list of duplicate or redundant analyte codes, which he will distribute to Council members for review. After that, he will proceed with method codes, which will be a much more complex task. There are ~5,000 method codes, and not all of them refer to reference methods but rather to lab-developed SOPs. Paul gave his wish list of method code clean-up, recognizing that not all ideals are attainable and that for the most part, there are valid reasons for the seeming inconsistencies that are now in the method code database, He also provided his email and personal phone number (see Attachment 1 below) for later thoughts or questions.

# 4. Discussion of New Drinking Water FoPT Table

NH initially sent an Analyte Request Application (ARA) for PFAS PTs, which prompted this update. NH indicated that it has no plans to comment on the new FoPT table, and there was no discussion about the table itself.

Michella noted that EPA has a rulemaking underway that will likely have different acceptance limits than what is now in the FoPT table, due to additional information gained from the certified laboratories participating in the Fifth Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR) testing. The UCMR showed that labs can readily attain ±30% of target value, while this FoPT table permits ±40%, and thus the ±30% value will be used in the regulation. Unfortunately, EPA could not disclose this information to the FoPT Subcommittee while the new table was being developed (that began in calendar 2020). The final date of this regulation is not known but once it is promulgated, all ABs and state certification bodies will be required to recalculate all PFAS PTs manually. There are six (6) PFAS chemicals affected by this, but every lab's PT results would need to be recalculated. The PT Providers are required to adhere to the FoPT table, but the regulation and its limits supersede the FoPT table. Only the six PFAS substances are affected by this conflict. One participant asked that, at minimum, a note be added to the FoPT table that a different regulatory acceptance limit is anticipated and that those limits will supersede the table.

Michella's preference would be to delay the FoPT table's effectiveness until after the regulation is published, when the acceptance limits could be changed to match the regulation. Otherwise, she will submit an ARA for the change, once the regulation is promulgated. In that case, the recalculation of PT results would only need to be done until the FoPT table is changed to match the regulation, but sometimes those updates do not happen quickly.

Michella explained that the data on which the FoPT table acceptance limits are based come from analyses done with lab SOPs, while the UCMR analyses were required to be done by the method "as written", and thus are considered more consistent and more reliable by the Agency.

Kristin will call Stacie Crandall, Chair of PTPEC, to share these concerns and discuss possible solutions. NJ noted that Rachel Ellis (also an evaluator) is on PTPEC.

## 5. Discussion of SIR 427

The discussion request for this SIR pointed out that the requirement to document the details of how a lab determines the mid-point of a calibration is not in the Standard and thus should not be part of the response. The Standard does not define how the mid-point is to be determined. Once this issue was identified, everyone present agreed. The Council will ask LASEC to return this SIR to the Chemistry Expert Committee and suggest that the last sentence of the response be replaced with "Since the Standard does not define how the mid-point is to be determined, either interpretation would be acceptable."

Time was expired after this discussion. Two items, discussion of issues from conference and a new item, the proposed update to the evaluation schedule, are postponed until the March meeting.

## 6. Next Meeting

The next teleconference meeting of the NELAP AC is scheduled for <u>Monday</u>, <u>March 4</u>, <u>2024</u>, <u>at 1:30 pm Eastern</u>. An agenda and documents will be provided in advance.

Attachment 1 – Remote participation was not available for this conference session

STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	PRESENT
FL	Carl Kircher E: carl.kircher@flhealth.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Vanessa Soto  E: Vanessa.sotocontreras@flhealth.gov	No
IL	Millie Rose T: 217-557-0220 E: mildred.rose@illinois.gov	No
KS	Carissa Robertson Carissa.Robertson@ks.gov (785) 291-3162	Yes
	Alternate: Paul Harrison  paul.harrison@ks.gov  (785) 296-1656	No
	For information purposes: Amy Suggitt Amy.Suggitt@ks.gov	No
LA DEQ	Tramecha Rankins E: tramecha.rankins@la.gov 225-219-3247	Yes
	Paul Bergeron E: paul.bergeron@la.gov	Yes
MN	Lynn Boysen E: lynn.boysen@state.mn.us	No
	Alternate: Stephanie Drier T: 651-201-5326 E: stephanie.drier@state.mn.us	Yes
	For Information only: Windsor Molnar Windsor.Molnar@state.mn.us	Yes
NH	Brian Lamarsh (603) 271-2998 F: (603) 271-5171 Brian.M.Lamarsh@des.nh.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Bill Hall T: (603) 271-2998 E: george.hall@des.nh.gov	No
NJ	Michele Potter T: (609) 984-3870 F: (609) 777-1774 E: michele.potter@dep.nj.gov	Yes

	Alternate : Rachel Ellis E: rachel.ellis@dep.nj.gov	No
NY	Amy Steuerwald 518-473-0748 E: amy.steuerwald@health.ny.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Gretchen Welfinger Gretchen.Welfinger@health.ny.gov	Yes
	For Information only: Derek Symula derek.symula@health.ny.gov	No
OK	Taryn Hurley Taryn.hurley@deq.ok.gov (405) 702-1006	Yes
	Alternate: Ryan Lerch Ryan.Lerch@deq.ok.gov (405) 702-1020	No
OR	Steve Jetter T: 503-505-2672 E: steven.jetter@oha.oregon.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Lizbeth Garcia 971 865 0443 E: Lizbeth.garcia@dhsoha.state.or.us	No
	Included for information purposes: Ryan Pangelinan E: Ryan.pangelinan@dhsoha.state.or.us	No
PA	Annmarie Beach E: anbeach@pa.gov T: 717-346-8212	Yes
TX	Jody Koehler (512) 239-1990 <u>Jody.Koehler@tceq.texas.gov</u>	Yes
	Steve Gibson (512) 239-1316 Steve.Gibson@tceq.texas.gov	Yes
UT	Kristin Brown T: (801) 965-2540 F: (801) 965-2544 E: kristinbrown@utah.gov	Yes
VA	Cathy Westerman T: 804-648-4480 ext.391 E: cathy.westerman@dgs.virginia.gov	Yes
	Alternate: Shane Wyatt shane.wyatt@dgs.virginia.gov	No

	C Lynn Bradley C T: 540-885-5736 E: lynn.bradley@nelac-institute.org	Yes
EPA Liaison	Michella Karapondo Karapondo.michella@epa.gov	Yes
CA	Christine Sotelo Christine.Sotelo@waterboards.ca.gov	No
	Christopher Hand Christopher.Hand@Waterboards.ca.gov	Yes
NV	Michael Antoine mantoine@ndep.nv.gov	No
Guest	Paul Junio Paul.junio@nelac-institute.org 262-200-1180	Yes