

**Radiochemistry Expert Committee (REC)  
Meeting Summary**

**May 27, 2015**

1. Roll Call and Minutes:

Bob Shannon, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm EST on May 27, 2015. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 8 members present on the call. Associate Members: Ariana Mankarian and Brian Miller.

Minutes for the 2/25/15 and 3/10/15 minutes will be reviewed and voted on by email.

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. July Conference in Chicago, IL

The Radiochemistry meeting is Monday at 1:30 pm in Chicago. Richard, Tom, Dave and Vas will not be able to attend. Tom, Dave and Vas can attend by phone. Richard will be on vacation.

Bob will be doing a presentation on Wednesday afternoon to give an update on the changes to the Standard.

3. Review of Standard

Bob shared the file received from William to summarize the voting on the Standard. There were no negative comments.

Comment 1:

Richard said it gets someone partially there, but the complete link is needed to get to the manual. This change will be made.

Comment 2:

Tom and Carolyn would prefer to keep them because there are references to them in the note in the definitions. Vas suggested adding “such as” and examples to the definition. Larry and Tom would prefer to keep it as is. Bob commented that any changes to the standard should have a very valid reason for the change given all the review that has already been done. The Committee needs to be very careful about any changes. Vas agreed it was not a substantial issue. It will be left as is.

Comment 3:

Richard thought all references to days was calendar days. Business days can be different between states. Tom feels it implies calendar days and no change is needed to the wording of the standard. This is similar to references to 24 hours. Tom thinks if it does not say business days, it is implied as calendar days. Others felt this has been an issue in the past and it should be clear.

Calendar will be added to all references for days in the standard as appropriate. This will clarify that business days were not intended. This is an editorial change. Ask QS to consider making this change for all of Volume 1 in future updates.

Comment 4:

Change made.

Comment 5:

Larry thinks the change is an improvement without changing the meaning. This is an editorial change. Others agreed.

Comment 6:

Change will be made. Editorial.

Comment 7:

Bob can go either way after re-reading the comment. Others agreed it should be “are”. This editorial change will be made.

Comment 8:

Carolyn comment that “whenever” was put in for the instances when there may not be a traceable source available.

Richard thought “on an ongoing basis” should be deleted, but “whenever” should be left in. Others agreed. This editorial change will be made.

Comment 9:

Richard is OK with leaving as is. His concern was that it could be found.

Comment 10:

There was agreement to make this editorial change.

Comment 11:

There was agreement to make this editorial change.

Comment 12:

Bob and Larry think this is important to do. Most of the others see this as a reality check. Vas is not disputing its usefulness – he just doesn’t think it needs to be in the standard as a requirement.

Larry commented that frequently the estimates of uncertainty don't line up with precision results.

Bob noted that this was in the standard before.

Vas does not think it is necessary to be in the standard, but the remaining members on the call thought it should be kept. It is not a show stopper. The committee agreed to move forward. No change made.

Comment 13:

Bob commented that he thinks the comment takes it to another level. The suggested change would need further work. No change will be made.

Comment 14:

Carolyn asked why this needs to be added because it is stated in other parts of the standard. Bob clarified

Larry asked if it is a problem samples are counted on different days? He understood the concern.

Carolyn asked why it needs to be this specific. Vas thinks it adds to the ruggedness of the initial demonstration.

Ilona noted that this appears to be a request for a change to the standard. Based on the discussion, it is clear that this comment is not a clarification of intent. Richard and Bob agreed.

Bob agrees with Vas's concern, but is concerned that it is a new requirement. Most would agree this is best practice.

Vas was OK with moving forward without making the change. Bob will put it on a future issues list – place it on hold for the next revision of the Standard.

Ilona read through the comment review instructions in SOP 2-100 and clarified how to put comments on hold and require their review at the next standard update.

Comment 15:

This editorial change will be made.

Comment 16:

No change needed. It is clear as stated.

Comment 17:

No change needed. It is clear as stated.

Comment 18:

Editorial change was made.

Comment 19 and 20:

Editorial change was made.

Comment 21:

Editorial change was made.

Comment 22:

Suggest putting this on hold for the future. Detection efficiency is used frequently. Activity is not really saying the right thing either.

Comment 23:

The change was made.

Comment 24:

This editorial change will be made.

Comment 25:

Ariana also agreed she could misinterpret it.

Perhaps adding a note would be appropriate. A note is a clarification – not a requirement.

The committee decided to add the following text: and appropriate to the method.

Comment 26:

No change made. This was discussed.

Comment 27:

Change in 1.7.1.6 - Make first change, but leave second as written.

Comment 28:

Editorial change made.

Comment 29:

Editorial change made.

Comment 30:

Editorial change made.

Comment 31:

Editorial change made.

Comment 32:

Editorial change made.

Comment 33:  
Editorial change made.

Comment 34:  
Editorial change made.

Bob proposed working through the last 6 comments by email.

Bob will review the table and make sure the responses are accurate and ready for submission to the inquirers. Ilona will review it for format and then the committee will vote on the accuracy of the table. Ilona will prepare responses to each of the commenters using the language in the table and then send them out by email.

*(Additions 8/13/15: Email Votes*

*The final table and copy of the Standard with the relevant changes were distributed to the committee on 6/5/15 by Bob (see Attachment D for table).*

*The following motion was made by Dave and Larry on 6/5/15:*

*The Radiochemistry Expert Committee approves the disposition of comments received in the balloting of the VDS as documented in the comment matrices and approves the modified standard (June 5 revision – attached.)*

*Vote:*

*Bob – For (6/5/14)*

*Carolyn – For (6/5/15)*

*Dave – For (6/9/15)*

*Marty – For (6/13/15)*

*Vas – For (6/17/15)*

*Nile – For (6/15/15)*

*Keith – For (6/17/15)*

*Larry – For (6/29/15)*

*Tom – For (6/15/15)*

*Richard – For (6/18/15)*

*The motion passed. The summary table is ready to be used to prepare responses and be posted. The changes to the standard based on the VDS comments have been approved. One additional vote was needed to confirm that the committee did not think the changes made were substantive and the Standard can be moved on to Interim Standard status. Only the changes made to the IS are considered for vote and go through the voting process.*

*A motion was made by Tom and seconded by Larry on 8-12-15:*

*All changes in the attached document (VDS Comments and Responses – Final – PDF Posting -6-29-15.pdf) are deemed to be non-controversial and the Voting Draft Standard, as modified, should therefore be advanced to interim standard status.*

*Vote:*

*Dave – For (8/12/15)*

*Carolyn - For (8/12/15)*

*Bob - For (8/12/15)*

*Tom – For (8/12/15)*

*Kieth – For (8/12/15)*

*Vas – For (8/12/15)*

*Marty – For (8/12/15)*

*Richard – For (8/12/15)*

*Larry – For (8/12/15)*

*Nile – For (8/13/15)*

*The motion passed. The standard was posted for vote on 8/14/15.)*

#### 4. New Business

- None.

#### 5. Action Items

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

#### 6. Next Meeting and Close

The next meeting will be planned by email.

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

The meeting was adjourned 3:15 pm EST. (Motion: Larry Second: Vas Unanimously approved.)

**Attachment A**  
**Participants**  
**Radiochemistry Expert Committee**

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





**Attachment C – Back Burner / Reminders**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Meeting Reference</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	Update charter in October 2015	n/a	
2	Issue of noting modifications to methods.	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	
5	Form subcommittee of experts in MS and other atom counting techniques to see that these techniques are adequately addressed in the radiochemistry module.	9/24/14	

Attachment D.

Attach PDF of table posted on website with final summary of disposition and comments.