Facts

- # accredited labs (1º/2º)
- Staffing
- Assessments, team size & duration
- Handling of repeat findings
- PT processing
- Renewals
- Turnaround times and deadlines
Challenges

- Application
- Follow-ups
- Enforcement
- PT enforcement
- Dual programs
- Complaints and appeals
- Etc…
Florida Facts

- 449 labs, 400/49
- 6 assessors (down from 8), 6 in-house staff
- Assessor-days based on lab scope
- Repeats
  - Any needs documented CAR
  - “Numerous or serious” trigger follow-up (15 in 2007)
- PTs partially electronic; process by IHPs
- Renewals by FY (Jul-Jun), fee and attestation
- Turnarounds by NELAC, initial in 4 months
Florida Challenges

- Applications
  - Incomplete
  - 2° apps for FOAs not on 1° scope
  - Getting scopes from primary
- Making time for follow-ups (assessments in general)
- Enforcement usually avoided by negotiation
- Manual PT processing for enforcement; unnecessary PTs; many QTs; off-schedule PTs
- One program; early confusion over 2° duals
- Changing methods
- Staffing and training
Louisiana DEQ Facts

- 109 NELAP labs, 40/69; 90 State (including stack testers)
- 5 assessors (1 doubles as Supervisor); 10 contractors
- Team size & assessment duration depends on scope and number of assessors or contractors available
- Repeats are documented; “3peats land lab into” intensive management” and teleconference
- PTs tracked electronically or on paper
- Renewal apps tri-annual; certificates issued annually
- Turnarounds by NELAC
Louisiana DEQ Challenges

- App needs updating (on-line in future?)
- Follow-ups if cause is serious
- Suspensions & revocations infrequent
- PT failures caught during pre-assessment review
- NELAP labs must also follow state regs
- Complaints and appeals occasional, handled case-by-case
Louisiana DHH Facts

- 26 NELAP labs, 4/22; 3 State
- 2 assessors (1 doubles as Program Mgr)
- Team size & assessment duration
  - Scope
  - Initial vs. continuing
  - Information received from lab
- Repeats
  - Lab given time to correct; Follow-up; Suspension followed by revocation if CAR not implemented
- PTs partially electronic; tracked electronically
- Renewals by CY
- Turnarounds by NELAC
Louisiana DHH Challenges

- Staffing
- Initial applications require extensive time to process
New Hampshire Facts

- 100 labs, 45/55
- 2 staff
- Sm – 1, Lg – 2
  - Duration based on history and scope
- Handling of repeats depends on severity
  - Additional on-sites
  - Pull accreditation in extreme cases
- Going electronic on PTs
- Renewals are cyclic
- Turnarounds according to NELAC
New Hampshire Challenges

- Incomplete applications
- Follow-ups rare
- Enforcement rare
- PT enforcement routine
- Single NELAC program
- Complaints rare, usually about standards
1°: 45, 2°: 97, both: 116, State: 708
17 assessors, 5 in-house staff
Assessor-days based on lab scope, more time for initial assessments
Labs allowed to correct repeats in lieu of enforcement
Electronic PT tracking
Renewals by fiscal yr, app, fees, personnel changes, full scope from 1° AB
Deadlines according to NELAC, 15 d to initially process app, 60 days for renewals
New Jersey Challenges

- Out of state travel approval
- Varying accreditation effective dates
- No notification of loss of 1st accreditation
- No national DB
- “Approved” NELAP training courses
- Offering accreditation for little-used or non-required methods (recognition issues)
- Assessment reporting and response deadlines too restrictive
New York Facts

- 509/101 labs
- 7 “general” assessors, 3 asbestos, 8 in-house staff
- Team size based on scope & complexity
- Severe repeats may halt assessment, commonly hold certification until corrected
- Electronic PT processing
- Renewals fiscal yr (Apr-Mar), “short application”
- Turnarounds per NELAC
New York Challenges

- No special problems with applications
- Follow-ups frequent based on assessment outcome
- Suspension with no hearing rights for uncorrected severe QS and/or repeat deficiencies
- Suspension with no due process for 2/3 PT failure
- Single program
- Complaints rare
- Appeals to proposed suspension common and considered on their merit
Oregon Challenges

- Staffing and assessor training
- Method version tracking
- Handling updated methods
- Difference between accreditation and regulation (we can accredit anything, but the regulators decide what to accept)
Pennsylvania Facts

- 33/82, State: 423
- 11 Assessors
- Assessor-days based on lab scope
- Handling of repeats depends on severity
  - Severe – suspension or revocation
  - Less severe – correct on first CAR
- Monthly PT processing by spreadsheet
- Cyclic renewal application & fees required
- Turnarounds by NELAC, initial assessments in 3-6 months
Pennsylvania Challenges

- **Application**
  - Insufficient TD qualifications
  - $2^o$ apps for FOAs not on $1^o$ scope
  - Varying app and scope formats

- **Dual program**

- **Unnecessary PTs, many QTs, off-schedule PTs**
Utah Facts

- 104 labs, 55/49
- 2 assessors (down from 4)
- Team size minimum of 2, based on scope
- Severe repeats may halt assessment, commonly hold certification until corrected
- Electronic PT process, human review for final action
- Renewals cyclic
- Turnarounds based on NELAC
Utah Challenges

- Getting current and timely cert from 1°
- Follow-ups rarely required
- PT and other enforcement rare due to responsiveness of lab community
- Single program (early challenge getting some labs into compliance)
- Established process for complaints and appeals rarely needed