

Radiochemistry Expert Committee (REC) Meeting Summary

February 26, 2014

1. Roll Call and Minutes:

Bob Shannon, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1pm EST on February 26, 2014. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 7 members present. Associate members: Ariana Mankerian, Bill Ray, Carl Kircher, Joe Pardue, Terry Romanko, Reed Jeffrey, and Virgene Mulligan.

The January 15, 2014 minutes were reviewed. A motion was made by Marty to accept the minutes. The motion was seconded by Todd and unanimously approved.

The January 28, 2014 minutes were sent to Bob for review. Bob will send these out as an email vote in the next day. He would like everyone to vote by March 7, 2014.

(Addition: By email, a motion was made by Larry Penfold to accept the meeting minutes from 1/28/14 as distributed. The motion was seconded by Nile. Vote: 6 – For (Larry, Nile, Bob, Tom, Carolyn, Vas), 0 – Against 5- Did not vote (Marty, Dave, Keith, Todd, Richard.) The motion passed.)

Associate members need to let Bob and Ilona know they own a copy of ISO 17025 so they can be included in distributions of the draft working standard updates.

2. Update PT Expert Committee

Virgene provided an update. The PT Expert Committee is updating all 4 volumes. She expressed some concern that the preparation and evaluation of Radiochemistry PT Standards is not adequately addressed.

Carl Kircher, associate member, chairs the Chemistry FoPT Subcommittee. He explained how the subcommittee gathers data for calculation of limits and directed people to the Limit Acceptance SOP (SOP 4-101: Recommendation and Calculation of Acceptance Limits for Chemical, Radiochemical, and Microbiological Components of Proficiency Tests). This committee prepared the DW FoPT table that includes Radiochemistry PTs. Virgene asked if there should be a specific definition for how the assigned values are determined. Carl reviewed the procedure currently used. Carl also noted that the committee should substitute “concentration” for “activity” when reading the procedures.

Bob also noted that uncertainties need to be taken into consideration when establishing limits.

Iлона noted that there is a PT Program SOP Subcommittee that is working on an update to SOP 4-101. Is there someone that would like to join that subcommittee to represent Radiochemistry interests? Bob will distribute a request for a volunteer for email.

Bob raised some concerns that Radiochemistry affects more than DW. Shouldn't there be additional PTs? Iлона commented that the program can be expanded through an application process described in SOP 4-107: FoPT Table Management.

Iлона will provide a copy of SOP 4-101 to the committee.

Virgene agreed to coordinate any responses the Radiochemistry Expert Committee should make when reviewing PT documents.

3. Standard

Revised Text – Section 1.7.1 Backgrounds (Tom, Vas and Bob)

Tom provided an update to Section 1.7.1 that Bob forwarded by email. Bob reminded everyone to be sure to review the updates prior to the meetings since we are coming to a close on these updates.

1.7.1 d) 2) (text under (v)): Tom added this text from one of Bob's documents, but upon further review Bob would like to delete this text. Carolyn suggested additional language, but Tom did not think this was consistent with the language of minimum checks. After review of where the text came from, it was decided to go ahead and delete it.

1.7.1 d)3: Tom added the concept of substituting an LCS for the instrument performance check. Bob provided the following comment: I do not recall this discussion. This is not an acceptable solution – although it is permitted under the cert manual. There are too many factors associated with batch QCs, and most of all, the criteria used to evaluate them are looser than for instrument QCs (instrument QCs assume that they contribute only part of the overall uncertainty in a result and must be more stringent than batch QCs).

Terry commented that the acceptance criteria would need to be the same as the daily checks and this probably does not match. It would be difficult to use an LCS. Carolyn asked how one would know if an issue exists – is it the chemistry or the instrument?

1.7.1 e) 3) ii): Tom asked if the statement below should remain (The frequency of subtraction ...) Bob commented that this is not auditable. Carolyn noted that it is not a requirement. Marty added that this is something a lab would normally do. Could this be added as a note or part of an introduction? It is really just there to provide some guidance. Carl thought it should be marked as a note and this note concept should be used looking back at the standard to include other guidance as a note. Tom chose to remove this paragraph.

1.7.1 f) 1) i): The paragraph is added as guidance. Should this be a note instead of a paragraph. This paragraph is not auditable. Carolyn also thought it might be something that could be put in the introduction. It was decided that at this time the standard will not be updated with “Notes” for guidance comments. This can be looked at when the standard is complete and it is being formatted. Carl commented that assessors don’t require anything listed as a “should”. This type of language would be OK in notes.

1.7.1 f): Remove “s” on “detectors”. Should be “detector”.

1.7.1 f) 1): This is now a “Note”. Carolyn did not see anything that requires it be done on every detector. It may be obvious, but it is not stated.

1.7.1 f) 4: Delete the final sentence: ~~Also, an MB within this batch may substitute for the short term background check.~~

Tom asked if one week should be increased to two weeks? Tom thought it would be rare that anyone would count longer than two weeks. This text is intended to deal with situations where longer counts are needed. There is no text that requires a specified frequency on background checks.

Terry noted that there are times when you have long sample counts in a run and other times where there are lots of samples in a run. In the case where a number of samples are being jammed into one sample run, you can stop the sequence and do necessary checks and then count the rest of the samples. He was concerned with the one week limit in those situations where a lab has extremely long alpha spec counts.

Section 1.7.1 f) 3 means if you have a better measurement then you can use it.

Bob’s concern is how to figure out you have a sufficient quality of background checks.

There was a lot of discussion on this topic and Bob suggested that the language discussed today be placed into the larger standard and be reviewed again in the context of the entire standard. Language can be changed as needed then.

Tom will make the changes and Bob will put it in the base standard. Tom asked if prescriptive notes need to be used. This will be looked at when the entire standard is done.

Revised Text – Section 1.7.2.1 and 1.7.2.2 – Positive and Negative Controls (Carolyn, Marty and Bob)

The changes requested in Louisville were incorporated.

Section 1.7.2 – paragraph 5: Bob will look at some additional language so labs don’t need to prove they are random.

Section 1.7.2.1 d): Carolyn provided two different wording options and asked for input. The preference is Alternate d). The other optional language was deleted.

Section 1.7.2.2 a): This paragraph needs input from Tom who is working on discussing preparation batch versus analytical batch. Is this more appropriate in 1.7.2 so it is applicable to the entire section. Batch is discussed in other sections too. It was decided to leave wording as is.

1.7.2.2 f): There were a few additions made to this section. No concerns were raised.

1.7.2.2 g): No concerns raised.

1.7.2.2 h): No concerns raised.

Carolyn will send it to Bob and it will be placed into the base document.

1.7.3 (Larry, Dave, Terry)

The comments from Louisville have not been incorporated yet. This will be provided at the next meeting.

1.7.4 (Marty, Bob)

Marty reviewed the changes made to Section 1.7.4. No specific numbers were included.

Carl suggested adding “test” results in the last sentence in section 1.7.4 c).

No additional comments were given and this will be added to the base document.

Small Group Reviews

Not all comments have been received yet. Everyone needs to forward his or her comments to Tom. A deadline has been set for March 7, 2014.

4. New Business

The upcoming DC meeting was briefly discussed. This will possibly be a 2-day meeting (suggest plan for two days) depending on comments to be reviewed. More on this will be shared as things develop.

5. Action Items

A summary of action items can be found in Attachment B.

6. Next Meeting and Close

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 26, 2014 at 1pm EST.

A summary of action items and backburner/reminder items can be found in Attachment B and C.

The meeting was adjourned 2:45pm EST.

Attachment A
Participants
Radiochemistry Expert Committee

Members	Affiliation		Contact Information	
			Phone	Email
Bob Shannon (Chair) Present	QRS, LLC Grand Marais, MN	Other	218-387-1100	BobShannon@boreal.org
Tom Semkow (Vice Chair) Present	Wadsworth Center, NY State DOH Albany, NY	AB	518-474-6071	tms15@health.state.ny.us
Sreenivas (Vas) Komanduri Absent	State of NJ Department of Environmental Protection Trenton, NJ	AB	609-984-0855	Sreenivas.Komanduri@dep.state.nj.us
Marty Johnson Present	US Army Aviation and Missile Command Nuclear Counting Redstone Arsenal, AL	Lab	865-712-0275	Mjohnson@tSC-tn.com
Dave Fauth Present	Consultant Aiken, SC	Other	803-649-5268	dj1fauth@bellsouth.net
Carolyn Wong Present	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Livermore, CA	Lab	925-422-0398	wong65@llnl.gov
Keith McCroan Present	US EPA ORIA NAREL, Montgomery AL	Lab	334-270-3418	mccroan.keith@epa.gov
Todd Hardt Present	Pro2Serve, Inc. Oak Ridge, TN	Other	865-241-6780	HardtTL@oro.doe.gov
Nile Ludtke Absent	Dade-Moeller and Associates Oak Ridge, TN	Other	865-481-6050	nile.luedtke@moellerinc.com
Larry Penfold Absent	Test America Laboratories, Inc; Arvada, CO	Lab	303-736-0119	larry.penfold@testamericainc.com
Richard Sheibley Absent	Sheibley Consulting, LLC	Other (Former AB)	651-485-1875	RHSHEIB111@yahoo.com
Ilona Taunton (Program Administrator) Present	The NELAC Institute	n/a	828-712-9242	Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org

Attachment B
Action Items – REC

	Action Item	Who	Target Completion	Actual Completion
33	Provide updates for sections reviewed in Louisville.	Section Authors	2/25/14	
34	Distribute Drinking Water Certification Manual to committee.	Bob	1/31/14	1/31/2014
35	Review standard through Section 1.7 and get comments to Tom.	All	2/12/14	3/11/14
36	Prepare summary of comments on standard through Section 1.7.	Tom	2/25/14	3/12/14
37	Send January 28 th meeting minutes out for an email vote.	Bob	2/27/14	3/16/14
38	Send SOP 4-101 to committee members.	Ilona	3/25/14	
39	Send updates from 2/26/14 meeting to Bob for incorporation into the standard base document.	Tom	3/14/14	3/12/14
40	Send updates from 2/26/14 meeting to Bob for incorporation into the standard base document.	Carolyn	3/14/14	
41	Look at additional language so labs don't need to prove sample ordering is random	Bob	3/23/14	

Attachment C – Back Burner / Reminders

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
1	Update charter in October 2014	n/a	
2	Issue of noting modifications to methods.	1/16/13	
3	Look at batching when QC is looked at.	1/16/13	
4	Look at need to reference year for any standard references– which version is being referenced. Is this necessary?	5/22/13	