Central Valley Clean Water Association

Representing Over Fifty Wastewater Agencies

October 20, 2016

Via Electronic Mail Only

Felicia Marcus, Chair
State Water Resources Control Board
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov

RE: **Comment Letter on ELAP Regulations Development/Laboratory Standard**

Dear Chair Marcus:

The Central Valley Clean Water Association (CVCWA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the California Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program's (ELAP) recommendation to adopt Volume 1 of The NELAC Institute's (TNI) 2016 Standard as the basis for the quality management system (QMS) for California laboratory accreditation.[1] CVCWA is a non-profit association of public agencies located within the Central Valley region that provide wastewater collection, treatment, and water recycling services to millions of Central Valley residents and businesses. We approach these matters with the perspective of balancing environmental and economic interests consistent with state and federal law. Many of our members operate environmental laboratories to provide compliance monitoring and ensure proper operation of their wastewater treatment plants in a manner that is protective of public health and the environment. Others rely on small local laboratories to perform basic testing. In this letter, we provide further comments regarding ELAP's proposal to base forthcoming regulations on the 2016 TNI Standard, and its potential impact on publically-owned treatment works (POTWs) in the Central Valley. This letter is not intended to provide an exhaustive list of

[1] CVCWA appreciates that ELAP's recommendation includes a single annual Performance Test and the maintenance of currently approved analytical methods for the technical requirement part of ELAP's regulation, as ELTAC and the State Agency Partners have supported.

provisions within the 2016 TNI Standards that we believe are problematic, but rather provide a few examples of some of the problems that specific provisions will create for municipal laboratories, especially small laboratories.

As a preliminary matter, we would like to thank you for extending the written comment deadline and providing a means to review the 2016 TNI Standard, which has enabled CVCWA and other stakeholders to have some time to review portions of the standard and provide meaningful feedback to ELAP and the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board). The comments provided here are in addition to comments submitted in writing on September 16, 2016 and by testimony provided at the October 6, 2016 informational hearing on this topic. CVCWA also appreciates ELAP's creation of an ongoing opportunity to provide additional comments directly to ELAP regarding specific revisions to the 2016 TNI Standard that stakeholders would like to see in the draft regulations governing laboratory accreditation. CVCWA hopes that this is the beginning of a closer relationship between ELAP and the broader stakeholder community as these regulations are developed. CVCWA highly encourages the State Board to make this process more collaborative by bringing the different stakeholder groups it is working with (i.e., Agency Partner, ELTAC and other stakeholders) together to work on priority issues and needs rather than trying for a wholesale edit from each of the individual groups ELAP is working with. This will allow for a more inclusive and streamlined edit of the 2016 TNI Standard.

As you heard on October 6, adopting 2016 TNI without customization to the needs of California environmental laboratories and state agencies using laboratory data would result in regulations that are at the same time overly burdensome and fail to meet the needs of state agencies. This letter will address some of the most critical issues with Module 2 of the 2016 TNI Standard, as viewed by small municipal laboratories, and will suggest possible alternatives or modifications to these provisions. The following is not an exhaustive list, but rather an example of some of the problems that specific provisions will create for small and municipal laboratories.

1. Small and Municipal Laboratories Play an Important Role in Protecting Public Health and the Environment, and in Ensuring Proper Wastewater Treatment Plant Operation

As mentioned at the October 6 hearing and in CVCWA's September 16, 2016 comment letter, municipal laboratories are important to ensuring that public health and the environment are protected and that wastewater treatment plants are operating optimally. Because these laboratories are "in-house," they can quickly monitor and process data and report results. These laboratories see results in context, and can re-sample quickly if unusual testing results arise or if an analytical problem occurs. If the analyses done by these laboratories, including small laboratories, are sent to outside laboratories, "out of trend" results will not be detected and questioned in a timely manner. Small municipal laboratories and regional laboratories serving remote treatment plants play an essential role in ensuring that wastewater plants are operating in a way that not only meets permit requirements, but also ensures the protection of human health and the environment.

Some municipal laboratories, or small regional laboratories serving only POTWs, are the only environmental laboratories within many miles of more remote communities. Commercial laboratories are clustered in urban areas including Sacramento, the Bay Area, Fresno, and Los Angeles. This leaves many areas with only one nearby commercial laboratory or none at all. Municipal laboratories located in rural communities, such as the Weaverville Sanitary District and Mammoth Community Water District, are several hours from the nearest commercial laboratory. This makes coliform analysis difficult since testing must begin within eight hours of sample collection. During inclement weather, testing with short holding times, such as BOD and nitrate, may be out of compliance if shipping delays prevent testing with 48 hours of sample collection. Another concern with shipping samples to remote laboratories for testing is that by the time the treatment plant receives the Analysis Report, which takes about three weeks, and notices the anomaly, it may be too late to ask for a retest (i.e., past hold time) and could also be too late to resample (i.e., past the compliance period). Most importantly, if the sample sent out is to test for an analyte that is acutely critical to public health—such as detection of *E. coli* in drinking water—this could lead to serious consequences and will in fact affect public health and environment. Thus, small municipal laboratories and small regional laboratories in rural areas are of critical importance to ensuring proper testing is performed and public health is adequately protected.

Because of the importance of municipal laboratories to POTWs specifically, it is important that ELAP's draft regulations acknowledge the utility of these laboratories and do not so burden them with documentation of every detail not directly related to an analytical test or sample such that their response times to environmental or health concerns are critically delayed.

2. Some 2016 TNI Requirements Are Outside of Laboratory Management Authority to Implement, Particularly for Municipal Laboratories

Several requirements present in the 2016 TNI Standard, specifically in Module 2, section 4.4, involving tenders and contracts, and in section 4.5, involving the subcontracting of environmental tests, are outside of a municipal laboratory's authority to implement. Municipal laboratories, as a part of a city, county, or special district, must follow their parent agency's procedures and statutory obligations governing contracting, including approval by the municipality's legislative body. (See, e.g., City of Davis Municipal Code, §§ 29.01.100, 15.02.040.) The provisions governing subcontracting in section 4.5 are particularly important to municipal laboratories, which often subcontract out specialized tests to be performed by commercial laboratories. Similarly, 2016 TNI contains requirements for how laboratories must go about purchasing supplies. (2016 TNI, Module 2, § 4.6.) Municipal laboratories also generally do not have the power to make decisions regarding the purchasing of laboratory materials, as other departments are in charge of this process. Records related to these contracting and purchasing procedures are maintained by other branches within the local agency as well, and not by the laboratory. Accordingly, ELAP's regulations should exempt municipal laboratories from complying with these and similar TNI provisions if following their agencies' procedures, and not

require that municipal laboratories to create or maintain records of such purchasing policies and procedures.

In addition, because many of these contracting and purchasing procedures are already standardized for local agencies and municipalities, there is no benefit to be gained through requiring municipal laboratories to re-write or cross-refer their operating procedures with their parent agency's ordinances or policies. The draft regulations should expressly include an exemption for municipal laboratories or a provision that acknowledges that municipal laboratories already operate under legally enforceable contracting and personnel policies, such that they will not be required to have separately documented procedures on-site in order to receive ELAP accreditation.

3. Municipal Laboratories Have Limited Authority Over Creating New Positions and Terminating Laboratory Employees

The 2016 TNI Standards also require changes to a laboratory's hiring and termination of laboratory staff. (See 2016 TNI, Module 2, §§ 4.1.5.i, 4.1.7.1, 5.2.7.) These provisions require a laboratory to have a "quality manager," which may result in the creation of an additional staff position because, although section 4.1.7.1 states that the technical manager and the quality manager may be the same person, section 4.1.7.1(b) provides that the quality manager must "have functions independent from laboratory operations for which they have QA oversight." This is of particular concern for small laboratories because limited staffing would require such laboratories to hire additional staff to perform this role if independence is necessary. Municipal laboratories generally do not have the authority to create new positions or hire new employees. This power is vested in the governing body of the local agency that owns the laboratory, such as a city council. Accordingly, this section should be revised to allow additional flexibility for municipal laboratories to ensure that these laboratories can operate within their authority and retain ELAP certification. For example, removing the requirement that the quality manager have functions independent from laboratory operations when the quality manager and the technical manager are the same person would alleviate concerns that laboratories with limited staff would be unable to comply with ELAP accreditation standards.

Additionally, section 4.1.7.2(b) provides that each physically separate laboratory must have a different technical manager. This provision would require municipalities that have separate, yet close by, small laboratories to hire additional staff to fill these positions, when having a single technical manager to serve all such locations would be a more efficient use of resources. Again, the draft regulations should provide that, at least for municipal laboratories, a single technical manager may serve multiple physically separate laboratories when those labs are owned by the same agency and are within a close proximity of each other.

Similarly, section 5.2.7 states that "Employees are required to understand that any infractions of the laboratory data integrity procedures shall result in a detailed investigation that could lead to very serious consequences including immediate termination." Again, municipal

laboratories do not have the authority to immediately terminate employees. This is an authority that remains with the laboratory's parent agency, and at times requires engagement with bargaining units or unions. Therefore, revising this provision to allow for investigations and possible termination by a body with appropriate authority would ensure that ELAP accreditation regulations would not require municipal laboratories to take actions that they cannot legally take. These modifications could be made globally, or they could be made for only non-commercial laboratories in a two-tier system.

4. Technical Manager Qualifications Should Be Amended to Include CWEA and/or AWWA Certifications

As mentioned at the October 6, 2016 hearing, the current ELAP regulations include a very important provision regarding laboratory management qualifications: "Laboratory Directors of utility-owned water or wastewater treatment plant laboratories . . . may fulfill the requirements for Laboratory Director by possession of a Laboratory Analyst/Water Quality Analyst Certificate from the California Water Pollution Control Association (CWPCA) [now called the California Water Environment Association (CWEA)] or the California-Nevada Section of the American Water Works Association (CA-NV/AWWA)."[2] (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 22, § 64817(b).) The 2016 TNI Standard does not allow for laboratory technical managers (the equivalent of a Laboratory Director in current regulations) to satisfy degree- and experience- based qualifications with the certifications offered by CWEA and AWWA. (2016 TNI, § 5.2.6.1.)

The certifications offered by CWEA and AWWA are critical for smaller municipal laboratories that run simple tests,[3] because it can be difficult for such a laboratory to hire and retain staff with the requisite degrees. Additionally, the CWEA and AWWA certifications require continuing education to maintain an individual's certification, which ensures that professionals certified through these programs stay up to date with laboratory issues and technology. The draft regulations should include language substantially similar to that in the current regulations to recognize that CWEA and AWWA certifications are an equivalent alternative to degree-based qualifications for technical managers, particularly for municipal laboratories.

5. 2016 TNI Standards Should Be Modified to Reflect the Interactions with NPDES Permits and Other Regulatory Programs

ELAP's draft regulations should take into account that some 2016 TNI requirements may already be achieved through other regulatory programs, such as National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting. For example, in Module 2, section 5.7, titled *Collection of Samples*, 2016 TNI requires that laboratories have a sampling plan and procedures for documenting data and operations related to sampling. The 2016 TNI Standard also contains provisions governing environmental methods and method validation, and imposes upon the

[2] Approximately 20 years ago, CWPCA renamed itself the California Water Environment Association (CWEA).
[3] Examples of simple tests are pH, temperature, conductivity, coliforms, residue, biochemical oxygen demand, titrimetric analyses, gravimetric analyses, and basic colorimetry.

laboratory the requirement to select appropriate testing methods. (2016 TNI, Module 2, §§ 5.4.1–5.4.5.) For those municipal laboratories that perform testing only for wastewater treatment plants operating under an NPDES permit, these provisions are redundant as compared to requirements set in the NPDES permit by state and federal law.

For those dischargers operating under an NPDES permit, this information is largely prescribed by permit terms and conditions themselves, as codified in federal U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) regulations. (40 C.F.R. § 136 et seq.) For those laboratories associated with wastewater treatment plants operating under NPDES permits, federal regulations prescribe 12 elements of quality assurance and quality control, create procedures through which alternative testing methods can be approved, and establish analytical requirements. (40 C.F.R. §§ 136.4–136.7.) Additionally, the Standard Provisions (based on U.S. EPA regulations) and Monitoring and Reporting Programs contained in NPDES permits require recordkeeping, sampling collection procedures, and calibration documentation, which are largely similar to that required in 2016 TNI. (See, e.g., Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Order R5-2014-0051, NPDES No. CA0084573, Attachments D, E.)

Therefore, it would be redundant and unnecessarily burdensome for such laboratories to have to generate a separate sampling plan in order to become accredited by ELAP. These laboratories have already been operating under a separate system that ensures high-quality data and that provides sufficient legal defensibility. Also, to the extent that provisions in 2016 TNI conflict with permit requirements based on federal regulations, the more specific and stringent federal regulations will preempt ELAP regulations. (*Hillsborough County v. Automated Medical Laboratories, Inc.* (1985) 471 U.S. 707, 713.) For these reasons, the draft regulations should provide that certain regulatory programs, such as NPDES permitting, would satisfy these requirements for ELAP accreditation in municipal laboratories without any additional documentation needed.

Similarly, the 2016 TNI Standard's method validation section also fails to refer to the Clean Water Act's or the Safe Drinking Water Act's Alternative Test Procedures. (2016 TNI, Module 2, § 25.4.5.) Following the method validation procedure described in the 2016 TNI Standard in order to modify standard methods could result in a conflict with federal and state regulations. Therefore, the draft regulations should add language indicating that Alternative Test Procedures required by federal laws and regulations may also be used to validate non-standard methods. This will ensure that ELAP's accreditation requirements will not create difficulties for laboratories that must also comply with federal regulations and NPDES permits.

6. Burdens of Individual Provisions Should Not Be Evaluated in Isolation, Particularly in Regard to Their Effects on Small and Municipal Laboratories

Additionally, the total burden of the 2016 TNI Standard will result in staff reorganization or the hiring of additional staff members to conduct all necessary steps to bring a small municipal laboratory, or small laboratory generally, into compliance, especially if the duplicative

provisions in 2016 TNI are not addressed sufficiently. For example, in the short term, municipal laboratories will have to hire consultants to guide implementation and allocate staff time toward drafting the additional policies and procedures required by 2016 TNI, as well as training activities conducted by consultants. Even after the transition has occurred, the additional documentation maintenance activities will require staff time that would otherwise be spent on performing sample analyses. The amount of time so spent could account for one-third of a staff member's time, or enough time that an additional full-time staff member would need to be hired. The costs associated with the foregoing could range from $100,000 to $200,000.

These burdens are felt even more profoundly on small municipal laboratories with one to five staff members, due to limited staffing and limited budget flexibility. To keep the level of service and scope of work that these small laboratories provide would require additional staff and tools in the $100,000 to $200,000 range to meet 2016 TNI requirements, which can be a significant increase in a laboratory's operating budget. Alternatively, the small municipal laboratory may maintain the same level of staff, but reduce the level of services the laboratory provides and the scope of work it can perform. This would result in a greater volume of sampling work being done through contracts with commercial laboratories, which can increase the costs of analytical testing while requiring more staff time in the municipal laboratory to be dedicated to handling sample shipments and reporting rather than running analytical tests. Either way, as the municipal laboratory is coming into compliance, small laboratories may be required to send nearly all samples out for outside analysis, as staff time could be completely consumed with generating the additional operating procedures required in the 2016 TNI Standard.

Ultimately, it is the compounding of all such burdensome requirements that is of concern to small and municipal laboratories. CVCWA urges that the State Board and ELAP consider the 2016 TNI Standards, and modifications thereto, as a whole rather than purely provision-by-provision. Although any one provision discussed above may appear to have no significant impact upon a laboratory's operations, even just the ten provisions discussed above would collectively have a huge impact on laboratory staff and budgets. Again, while the 2016 TNI Standard as a quality management system has some value for improving data quality and the legal defensibility of the data, the technical requirements contained in test methods and performance testing requirements have a much more direct connection to ensuring that laboratories are operating well and producing high-quality data. Thus, the level of specificity in document management and recordkeeping required to comply with such quality management systems do not need to be so high that the goals of ELAP's regulations fall to the wayside. The suggested modifications stated above are ways to achieve these goals.

7. Reciprocity With Other States Is Not Necessary For Municipal Laboratories and a Dual System Approach Would Allow for Reciprocity Only Where It Is Valuable

One of the benefits that ELAP has argued for adopting 2016 TNI Standards with minor modifications is in an effort to ensure that laboratories certified in California will more easily be

able to market their services across state lines. While CVCWA and the laboratory community recognizes that this goal has merit for medium to large private laboratories, it is important to acknowledge that many small private laboratories in California, and essentially all municipal laboratories in California, do not perform work in other states. For these laboratories, the benefit to be obtained from ELAP's accreditation standards closely mirroring 2016 TNI Standards is minimal.

Other states that have adopted TNI-based standards have realized the inherent differences between commercial and non-commercial (i.e., municipal, educational/research, and non-profit) laboratories. Virginia, for example, created a dual system where "commercial" laboratories must meet a standard that closely follows the 2003 NELAC Standard (and later, the 2009 TNI Standard), but the standard that "non-commercial" laboratories must meet is a more modified 2003 TNI standard that is tailored to the needs and realities of municipal laboratories, without sacrificing quality and legal defensibility of the data. A dual or two-tier system like this would suit California and its diverse laboratory community better than a one-size-fits-all approach. Such a two-tier system would also allow ELAP to require that out-of-state laboratories meet TNI standards, for ease of certification, and still allow the regulations to be adequately tailored to in-state municipal laboratories' needs and limitations.

CVCWA would also like to clarify a statement made during the October 6 hearing, regarding TNI as a "national standard." TNI is not quite a "national standard," as only 13 states have TNI-based regulations and are registered TNI accrediting bodies.[4] This number also includes five states that have dual accreditation systems, such as Virginia. In fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency considered adopting TNI as its quality management system, but opted to create its own system for laboratory certification. TNI notes that its "vision is a true national accreditation program," but TNI is not yet that national standard. (*TNI Mission*, The NELAC Institute, *available at* http://www.nelac-institute.org/content/aboutus.php [accessed Oct. 13, 2016].)

Additionally, modifying the 2016 TNI Standard to better fit California's laboratory community, or using a two-tier system, would not prevent those laboratories wishing to be fully TNI-compliant from doing so. In fact, only approximately 36 laboratories in California are already TNI accredited, without any part of the regulations requiring TNI compliance.[5] Therefore, a modified standard would still allow laboratories to become fully TNI-accredited, should they so desire. In fact, a two-tier system would adequately allow commercial laboratories, which have more to gain from potential reciprocity, to be fully TNI compliant, while allowing non-commercial municipal laboratories to become accredited according to a standard that fits their specific organizational structure and legal limits, as described further herein.

[4] It is worth noting that all 13 states with TNI-based laboratory accreditation standards use the 2003 or 2009 TNI standards, not the 2016 TNI Standard California's ELAP is proposing.

[5] There are approximately 700 environmental laboratories in California presently, so this number is only five percent of the total laboratories in California.

8. Municipal Laboratories Generally Have Only One Customer—Their Parent Agency

A key difference between municipal laboratories and commercial laboratories is their customer base. Municipal laboratories are part and parcel of their sole customer, the city, county, or special district.[6] Therefore, provisions in 2016 TNI that pertain to customer accountability and transparency, and other customer relations issues, are not a good fit for municipal laboratories. (See 2016 TNI, Module 2, §§ 4.1–4.2.) Given that municipal laboratories have only one customer, which also happens to be the owner of the laboratory, the laboratory is constantly in contact with its customer and are able to respond in real-time to their customer's concerns. The requirements in the 2016 TNI Standard would impose additional documentation burdens on municipal laboratories for customer relations purposes that are not necessary, given the close relationship between these laboratories and their customers (i.e., parent agencies). Accordingly, the draft regulations can reduce burdens on municipal laboratories, especially small ones, by exempting them from these and other similar provisions.

9. Many Provisions in the 2016 TNI Standard Are Unattainable For Very Small Laboratories

Several provisions in the 2016 TNI Standard, as described above, are virtually unattainable for laboratories with one to three staff members due to their limited budgets and required fees for compliance with this standard. The following are two examples of this situation, and CVCWA will provide additional comment and specific examples to ELAP during the rulemaking process.

First, even with the acceptance of CWEA and AWWA certifications to meet qualifications for laboratory technical manager positions, the additional requirement that technical managers have at least two years of laboratory experience will be particularly burdensome for small municipal and regional laboratories. It is also unrealistic for a technical manager to be required to have two years of laboratory experience when a small or municipal laboratory performs only simple tests, as described in footnote 3 above. Although these tests are critical to the operation of a POTW and to the protection of public health and the environment, this requirement is unrealistic from a hiring perspective. Many small treatment plants that require Grade 3 and 5 certifications from CWEA or AWWA already have a difficult time reaching Grade 5. To then require an additional 2 years of in laboratory experience (or certification) over Grade 5 requirements, plus requiring independence from laboratory function (as is required in section 4.1.7.1(b)) would result in requiring over-qualified individuals to perform the basic tests that small treatment plants conduct.

Second, 2016 TNI allows laboratories to self-audit. In instances where a smaller laboratory has a single person acting as the technical manager and quality manager are the same

[6] In some occasions, a municipal laboratory may have an outside customer in the form of a nearby, smaller local agency that does not have its own laboratory. Even in these circumstances, the municipal laboratory typically does not take on this work from a profit-seeking or marketing perspective, making the arrangement different than that of a commercial laboratory.

person, pursuant to section 4.1.7.1, this would require the generation of a set of additional protocols to demonstrate how this individual is going to judge him-or-herself. Alternatively, the laboratory could hire someone else to do such an audit. Both of these scenarios requires a significant expense on the part of a smaller laboratory, especially when compared with a smaller laboratory's limited budget and overall size.

Again, these are but a few of the additional hardships facing small laboratories generally, and small municipal laboratories specifically, due to specific provisions in the 2016 TNI Standard. These alone show that modifications are necessary to make ELAP's accreditation system workable for California's diverse laboratory community.

10. Regulations Should Reduce Uncertainty in Audits and the Accreditation Process

As stated previously, the foregoing are but some of the provisions in 2016 TNI Standard that would be overly burdensome for municipal laboratories, if not modified to reflect the realities of these laboratories. This is but one reason why CVCWA is concerned with an approach that would incorporate these provisions by reference. An approach that codifies the provisions in TNI—along with the modifications requested, which could include a two-tier system for commercial and non-commercial labs—should be able to specifically address these concerns in a clear way to aid ELAP staff in performing laboratory audits and determining compliance. This would also increase certainty in laboratory audits, because the requirements are expressly addressed in a public and universally accessible format.

Uncertainty under the current ELAP regulations, due to variability in interpretations of those regulations by individual auditors, is a significant concern for laboratories. As such, ELAP's forthcoming regulations should make very clear what is permitted and required for ELAP accreditation.

The more certainty that can be included in the accreditation regulations would also ensure that when laboratory staff are required to divert time and effort away from performing analytical tests to document management tasks included in the 2016 TNI Standard, their time is spent making the appropriate changes and reporting tasks necessary to meet ELAP audit requirements. CVCWA also supports a three- to five-year implementation period with a clear plan for training and ELAP assistance to bring small and municipal laboratories into compliance with forthcoming regulations.

11. Conclusion

Again, as stated in our September 16, 2016 letter, CVCWA acknowledges the need to update ELAP's regulations, and we appreciate the ability to provide these comments in order to achieve improved and workable laboratory accreditation regulations.

ELAP should draft regulations exempting small municipal and regional laboratories from policies and procedures they cannot legally implement, and from redundant documentation to allow these small laboratories to effectively use their limited resources towards providing continued high quality data in a timely manner. As an example, the Virginia regulations governing non-commercial laboratories included some provisions that were more specific than the 2003 TNI standard that they were based on, which helps non-commercial laboratories understand exactly what auditors are looking for and helps municipal laboratories bring their laboratories into compliance more efficiently. A dual system, where specific and more extensive modifications are made applicable only to non-commercial laboratories, would ensure that municipal laboratories can continue providing high-quality data as well as timely process information, while remaining ELAP accredited.

If, instead of pursuing a dual system, ELAP chooses to make modifications within a single accreditation regulation, ELAP should ensure that modifications exempting municipal laboratories for specific provisions are clear and enforceable. Many provisions in the 2016 TNI Standard use mandatory language (i.e., "shall"). Thus, municipal laboratories need enforceable language codified in regulation that will provide them certainty and legal defensibility when complying with a modified standard.

Finally, CVCWA requests that, in furtherance of an informed stakeholder process, ELAP release its analysis of where current regulations fail to meet the needs of the State Agency Partners. This would enable stakeholders to more specifically address those areas of the accreditation process that create concerns for the State Agency Partners.

We appreciate your consideration of these comments. Given the limited timeframe and importance of these issues to municipal and small laboratories, we continue to encourage ELAP to engage its stakeholders in a collaborative effort and provide continued time for adequate review, engagement, and input. If you have any questions, or if CVCWA can be of any further assistance, please contact me at (530) 268 1338, or eofficer@cvcwa.org.

Sincerely,

Debbie Webster

Debbie Webster,
Executive Officer

cc: Frances Spivy-Weber, Vice Chair, State Water Resources Control Board
Tam M. Doduc, State Water Resources Control Board
Steven Moore, State Water Resources Control Board
Dorene D'Adamo, State Water Resources Control Board
Christine Sotelo, Chief, ELAP