California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program

The Path from Worst to First



The Expert Review Panel is Correct

- The process was thorough
 - Intense information gathering process
 - Self examination on our part
- Year 1 Report was critical and in-depth
 - Much more than a simple summary
 - Detailed analysis of ELAP
- Findings are accurate and precise
 - We agree with their assessment

How do you fix a program with so many flaws?

On the To-Do List:

- 1. <u>Select and implement an internal management</u> <u>system</u>
- 2. Update the methods we offer for certification
- 3. Improve the quality of our staff
- 4. Improve communications with clients and laboratories
- 5. Adopt new laboratory accreditation standards

3

• Foundation for our program

Select and Implement an Internal Management System

The choice was easy

• TNI Volume 2

Implementation is difficult

- We need to develop and implement 50+ Standard Operating Procedures
 - We've written 20
 - Currently test driving

How do you fix a program with so many flaws?

On the To-Do List:

- 1. Select and implement an internal management system
- 2. Update the methods we offer for certification
- 3. Improve the quality of our staff
- 4. Improve communications with clients and laboratories
- 5. Adopt new laboratory accreditation standards

5

• We view this as the foundation for our program

Update our methods

 Cleaning up our certification offerings list with the most up-to-date methods

 Verifying the list with our California regulatory agencies / end users to meet their needs

How do you fix a program with so many flaws?

On the To-Do List:

- 1. Select and implement an internal management system
- 2. Update the methods we offer for certification
- 3. Improve the quality of our staff
- 4. Improve communications with clients and laboratories
- 5. Adopt new laboratory accreditation standards
 - We view this as the foundation for our program

Improve the Quality of Staff

Personnel Management

Training our Staff

Personnel Management

- This has been a difficult task
 - We encountered bureaucratic hurdles
 - There has been emotional resistance to cultural change

9

- TNI Volume 2 process is a great road map
 - Clear, concise
 - Establishes a standard for ELAP

The Results

- Major changes in last year
 - 35% staff turnover
 - 6 staff left the program
 - Opportunity for new staff
- Comprehensive Assessor Training Program
 - Foundation for training right people for the right job
 - Truly improve quality of our staff

Assessor Training Program

- We are investing in creating the top assessor training program in the country
- Three-year contract with multiple elements
 - Classroom training on assessment skills and analytical methods
 - Compliance Assessments for Drinking Water Laboratories
 - ELAP staff will shadow experienced assessors

11

- Train the trainer model
 - ELAP staff will be trained to maintain the program after the contract ends

How do you fix a program with so many flaws?

On the To-Do List:

- 1. Select and implement an internal management system
- 2. Update the methods we offer for certification
- 3. Improve the quality of our staff
- 4. <u>Improve communications with clients and</u> <u>laboratories</u>
- 5. Adopt new laboratory accreditation standards
 - We view this as the foundation for our program

Communications

- Expert Review Panel accurately assessed that ELAP was siloed
 - No communication existed with regulatory agency clients
 - Strained communication existed with ELTAC
 - Very little communication existed with the laboratory community at large

13

 We developed and are implementing a communications plan to address this deficiency

State Agency Partners Committee

- We created a solid partnership
 - The relationship between ELAP and the agencies had never existed
- Made up of representatives from California regulatory agencies
 - Members are decision-makers

State Agency Partners Committee

- CA Department of Toxic Substances Control
- CA State Water Resources Control Board
- CA Department of Public Health
- CA Department of Pesticide Regulation
- CA Department of Fish and Wildlife
- CA Regional Water Quality Control Boards



State Agency Partners Committee

Committee is meeting regularly

- Considering key issues in the Expert Review Panel report
- Responding to ELTAC requests
- Serve as an advisory body to ELAP
 - Their first task was to define their collective regulatory needs
 - Their needs are the driving force behind ELAP accreditation services

State Agency Partner Needs

Accurate Data

Consistency of results

Robust quality assurance program

Legally defensible documentation

Environmental Laboratory Technical Advisory Committee

- We rebuilt ELTAC
- We took steps to ensure the committee would be representative
 - Worked with the lab community to rewrite their By-Laws
 - Instituted a formal interview process for candidates
 - We've defined a clear set of charges
 - We are committed to providing a written response if we do not take ELTAC's advice

The Result

- We have 14 well-qualified, diverse members representing the laboratory community:
 - Municipal, Commercial, Academia
 - Large, Medium, Small
 - Northern and Southern
 - Organizational
 - Specialty laboratories
 - State Agency Partners

ELTAC Members

- Mindy Boele CWEA
- Jill Brodt small, Northern commercial
- Stephen Clark Bioassay, Aquatic toxicity
- Ronald Coss CWEA
- Huy Do CASA
- <u>Andy Eaton</u> Chairperson, Large, interstate commercial
- Miriam Ghabour Large municipal
- Bruce Godfrey ACIL

- Anthony Gonzalez- Public health labs
- Rich Gossett Commercial and academia
- David Kimbrough small, Southern municipal
- Mark Koekemoer small, Northern municipal
- Allison Mackenzie California commercial
- Guilda Neshvad Hazardous Waste
- Four non-voting, regulatory agency representatives

ELTAC Current Tasks

Fee Structure

• Fields of Testing lists

Proficiency Testing scoring system

Laboratory Accreditation Standard

ELTAC Accomplishments

- Created a process for agency and laboratory coordination when new regulatory needs emerge
 - Accepted by the CA Division of Drinking Water

- Created a new Field of Testing list structure
 - Changed accreditation from method to analyte based
 - We have accepted their recommendation

Communication with Laboratory Community

- We developed a communications plan
 - Aimed at transparency, consistency, and creating access for the community

- We are implementing that plan
 - Electronic communication, Email, Redesigned Web Site, Electronic newsletter, Web meetings, ELTAC meetings

How do you fix a program with so many flaws?

On the To-Do List:

- 1. Select and implement an internal management system
- 2. Update the methods we offer for certification
- 3. Improve the quality of our staff
- 4. Improve communications with clients and laboratories
- 5. Adopt new laboratory accreditation standards
 - We view this as the foundation for our program

Elements of an Accreditation Standard

- We tasked both of our advisory committees with recommending a standard
- Separated laboratory accreditation standards into three elements
 - 1. Technical Standards
 - 2. Monitoring Requirements
 - 3. Quality Management Systems
- They have been deliberating on these three elements
 - We have some resolution

Technical Standard

- State Agency Partners Committee recognize the analytical method as the technical standard for laboratories
- ELTAC agrees
- We have accepted this recommendation

Monitoring Requirements

• State Agency Partners Committee recommend one Proficiency Testing sample per year

• ELTAC recommends one sample per year

• We have accepted this recommendation

State Agency Partner Concerns

Why it's a bad system

- Simple matrix, unrepresentative matrix
- Samples not truly blind
- Laboratories already know the answer
- Everyone games the system
 - Best analyst
 - Reruns analysis until they get the right answer

Not about the frequency of PT samples

Low opinion

Quality Management System

 State Agency Partners Committee recommends including a quality management system as a condition for accreditation

• ELTAC agrees

• ELAP agrees

Which one?

- State Agency Partners Committee recommends using The NELAC Institute (TNI) Quality Management System
 - Dissention expressed by 1 agency partner

Why Agency Partners want TNI

- Ready for adoption
- Sustainable
- Consensus-based
- Clear, consistent standard for ELAP
 assessment staff
- Training and implementation resources are available for ELAP and for laboratories

31

Why Agency Partners want TNI

- State Agency Partners Committee recognize this may be a big change for some laboratories
 - Open to a phased Implementation
- Would like to work with ELTAC to prioritize elements and create an implementation schedule
- Not recommending laboratories be TNI-Accredited, only meet TNI requirements

ELTAC is Deliberating

- Difficult decision to make
 - They represent a large diverse community

- Some members are hesitant about TNI
 - Concerned about the effects of adoption into regulations

Diverse Laboratory Community

- Accredit 700+ laboratories
 - Largest in the nation

• 80% are small laboratories

Approximately 350 are municipal laboratories

Why is ELTAC hesitant?

- Unnecessary paperwork
 - Documentation of non-critical elements
- Doesn't equate to improved data quality
 - No evidence, anecdotal
- Not relevant to two-person laboratories
- Time is money
 - Additional resources/staff to comply

Process to New Laboratory Accreditation Standards

- Anticipate ELTAC's recommendation end of August
- Decision in September 2016
- State Water Board Members workshop with the community October 2016
- Formal rulemaking process early 2017

Worst to First: Harnessing the Challenges

Comprehensive Assessor Training

Improve monitoring of laboratories

Expanding certification offerings

Improve Monitoring of Laboratories

Make samples truly blind

Increase complexity of sample matrix

Conduct laboratory intercalibration exercises

Expanding Certification Offerings for State Agency Partners

- California is uniquely primed
- Harness how to accredit new methods/method developers

1. Emerging contaminants - State Water Board dischargers are monitoring

Close to requiring bio-analytical screen techniques – cell line assays

2. qPCR - 14 labs routinely use it, USEPA approved for beach monitoring

 We have good communications: Partners & ELTAC

