

Radiochemistry Expert Committee (REC) Meeting Summary

June 26, 2013

1. Roll Call and Minutes:

Bob Shannon, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1pm EST. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 9 members present. Associate members present: Terry Romanko and Virgene Mulligan.

The minutes from the May 22, 2013 meeting were reviewed. Nile motion to approve the minutes. Todd seconded the motion and they were unanimously approved.

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. Discussion Items with Quality Systems (QS) Expert Committee

Carolyn noted that Bob contacted the QS about the inclusion of quality assurance related items in Module 6 and status of definitions. He has not heard back yet.

When Bob joined the call, Vas asked about any additional information he could provide on the inclusion of quality assurance language in Module 6. The consensus of the committee is that it should be included. Richard highlighted that Quality Control and Quality Assurance (Quality Systems) are two separate things. Bob commented that Quality Control is specifically called out as a subsection in the Module and that the module definitely addresses both QA and QC. Richard suggested everyone take a look at the definitions for Quality Assurance and Quality Control in Volume 1.

Vas asked about how the Asbestos, Microbiology, etc modules are handling this? Bob answered that all modules are working in parallel.

Bob said that he would follow up with the QS committee.

3. Standard Review

V1M6: Section 1.5.2 (Tom)

Detection Capability. Text proposed by Tom was distributed by e-mail. No one had issues with the suggested language. Richard will reword this text in active voice. Once the committee approves, Bob will add text to the base document.

V1M6: Section 1.5.2 and 1.5.3 (Richard)

Richard has rewritten it in the active voice. He will send this to Bob and we will discuss this at the next meeting.

Vas commented that Richard should let him know if he still wants assistance.

V1M6: Section 1.3 (Keith)

Keith was not on the call, so Bob guided the discussion based on the document provided with the agenda. This document was also sent to the QS committee, but additional comments are welcome. Carolyn commented that the definitions are very similar to what was there before.

Bob will check with the QS committee to see if they wish to incorporate the definitions into Module 3.

Vote on Section 1.7.1 b) ii) and iii)

This was discussed on prior calls and everyone was asked to look at the minutes to refresh themselves prior to the vote.

Vas voiced continuing concerns before the vote. He is still concerned about how calibrations are handled after maintenance and repair. He feels that when any repair is done, a complete recalibration should be performed. He does not feel that only a performance check is sufficient. He argued that in order to get reliable radiological data on which decisions are to be made, laboratories must re-calibrate the instruments when any repair/modifications are carried out for the instruments.

A motion was made by Nile to maintain the most recent version of the language as presented in the base document sent out with the meeting agenda for today's meeting. The motion was seconded by Todd. Vote: For – 8 Against – 1 Abstain – 0. The motion passed.

V1M6: Section 1.7.1 c) (Vas and Bob, Tom not present)

Status on 1.7.1 c) and onward based on proposed language in revised standard text. The subcommittee had not had an opportunity to meet on this topic and it will be discussed at the next meeting.

PT Provider (Vas and Larry)

Larry sent an e-mail to the committee regarding this topic:

Current Draft Language

1.5.1 Validation of Methods

- a) *Prior to acceptance and institution of any method for which data will be reported, all methods shall be validated. The laboratory shall document the results obtained, the procedure used for the validation, and a statement as to whether the method is fit for the intended use.*
- b) *The laboratory shall validate reference methods via the procedures specified in Sections 1.5.2 and 1.5.3. For reference methods, the procedures outlined in 1.6 can satisfy the requirements of 1.5.2.*
- c) *For all methods, except reference methods, the validation must comply with Volume 1, Module 2, Sections 5.4.5.1, 5.4.5.2, and 5.4.5.3. This validation must comply with the minimum requirements for method validation outlined here in Sections 1.5.2, 1.5.3 1.5.4 and 1.5.5.*
- d) *Laboratories shall participate in proficiency testing programs for both reference and non-standard methods. The results of these analyses shall be used to evaluate the ability of the laboratory to produce acceptable data.*

Discussion

We want to encourage labs to include analysis of samples from an external source as part of method validation. An independent check provides a higher degree of confidence that the new method is working as intended, which is particularly important for non-reference methods. However, we need to be careful not to be at odds with the PT requirements in Module 1. So rather than making PTs a necessary requirement, which might require a change to Module 1, our intent is to re-write subsection d) to allow QC samples from any nationally recognized source of QC or PT samples.

Proposed 6/14/2013 Language for 1.5.1 d)

For all methods, except reference methods, the method validation includes successful analysis of quality control samples from external sources. PT samples from nationally recognized PT Providers are acceptable for a satisfactory method validation.

Vas emphasized that the question was whether a PT is required for method validation and he agrees with what Larry sent on Monday, July 17th.

Comments:

Nile agreed with the changes. It still gives flexibility.

If an external source cannot be found, then it is not a required PT. A comment was made

that the language should include “shall include when available”. Richard commented that “when available” is used throughout the standard. Larry agreed with this change.

Carolyn suggested the term “recommended”, but Vas felt strongly that the language needs to be stronger.

Bob noted that the lab needs to use PTs that are provided outside of the laboratory, but there is really only one provider at this time. He questioned whether it is necessary that they be nationally recognized. Carolyn asked if an inter comparison would work. Larry noted that it needs to be an independent source prepared separate from the normal processes at the laboratory, so this may work.

Larry, Richard and Vas will re-write the language based on the discussion. This will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Base Document

Carolyn commented that 1.5.1 looks different than the discussions in Denver. Bob commented that there was further discussion during the conference call meetings. Once the standard has been reviewed and changes are incorporated, the committee will look at the standard as a whole and make any additional recommended changes.

All work being done on standard language needs to be distributed to committee members prior to the San Antonio meeting.

4. Action Items

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

5. New Business

Bob asked for volunteers for the final sections needing review and alternative language proposed. The following committee members volunteered:

Work on language for Section 1.7.2.	Carolyn Marty
Work on language for Section 1.7.2.3.	Nile Vas
Work on language for Sections 1.7.2.4, .5 and .6.	Larry Dave
Work on language for Sections 1.7.3.	Larry Dave
Work on language for Section 1.7.4.	Bob Marty

6. Next Meeting and Close

The next meeting is scheduled in San Antonio on August 6, 2013 – 9am – 5pm CT. A phone in line will be provided for those who can not be there in person.

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

The meeting ended at 2:04 pm 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) Absent	Wadsworth Center, NY State DOH Albany, NY	AB	518-474-6071	tms15@health.state.ny.us
Sreenivas (Vas) Komanduri Present	State of NJ Department of Environmental Protection Trenton, NJ	AB	609-984-0855	Sreenivas.Komanduri@dep.state.nj.us
Marty Johnson Absent	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 (1:33 pm)	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 Present	Dade-Moeller and Associates Oak Ridge, TN	Other	865-481-6050	nile.luedtke@moellerinc.com
Larry Penfold Present	Test America Laboratories, Inc; Arvada, CO	Lab	303-736-0119	larry.penfold@testamericainc.com
Richard Sheibley Present	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
2	Richard will look at all of 1.5.2 (including 1.5.2.1) and propose some new language. He will review it with Nile before submitting to committee. (2/27/13: Carolyn and Tom also asked to review this before submission to the committee.)	Richard	2-26-13	
3	Richard will prepare language update for 1.5.3 and submit to committee.	Richard	2-26-13	
10	Prepare definition for “activity” based on today’s conversation.	Bob	5/22/13	
11	Complete and distribute language proposed for 1.7.1.	Bob Tom Vas	5/22/13 To be finished for 6/26/13 meeting. Next Meeting	In Progress
12	Prepare language on ii) and iii) discussed on 5/22/13 call and send out for committee review and vote at the next meeting.	Bob	6/26/13	Complete
13	Does a PT Provider need to be a TNI PTPA approved provider? Language will be worked on and discussed at next meeting.	Larry Tom	6/26/13	Status: Discussion provided alternate language to be worked on for next meeting.
14	Work on all definitions so they can be sent to QS Expert Committee for comment (Critical Value, Activity, Activity Concentration, etc.)	Tom Keith	6/26/13	Status: Sent to QS, but no comments received yet. Complete
15	Work on language for Section 1.7.2.	Carolyn Marty	Next Meeting	
16	Work on language for Section 1.7.2.3.	Nile Vas	Next Meeting	
17	Work on language for Sections 1.7.2.4, .5 and .6.	Larry Dave	Next Meeting	
18	Work on language for Sections 1.7.3.	Larry Dave	Next Meeting	
19	Work on language for Section 1.7.4.	Bob Marty	Next Meeting	

Attachment C – Back Burner / Reminders

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
1	Update charter in October 2013	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	