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If you have a sample with a qualifier that states the testing lab lacks NELAC/TNI accreditation for EPH and VPH analysis and assuming the results are valid, then the following language could be used to explain how this qualifier affects the results:

“The lab appended the qualifier N2 to several EPH and VPH results because the lab does not hold NELAC/TNI accreditation for these parameters.  NELAC/TNI accreditation is a national accreditation that does not apply to EPH/VPH analysis, which is a state method.  Montana DEQ requires a Montana Modified Massachusetts Method-based EPH/VPH analyses.  Montana DEQ does not currently have an accreditation program for its Montana Modified Massachusetts Method-based EPH/VPH.  If the EPH/VPH results are determined to be valid following data validation, then the results are acceptable to Montana DEQ.  Based upon the data validation report, the EPH/VPH results are valid.”

If a qualifier states the testing lab lacks NELAC/TNI accreditation for another compound (i.e., trichloroethylene via EPA Method 8260B), then N2 can mean accreditation is lost (if that constituent is indeed accredited).  When a lab loses NELAC accreditation, it can be the result of a unique problem versus a more systemic problem.  Therefore, you can ask the lab for its performance proficiency test results and determine what corrective actions the lab implemented.  Your data validator can then determine how this affects your project results and explain the outcome in the data validation report and text of your document. DEQ does not have any example language to share in this case because each sample set could be unique.