Radiochemistry Expert Committee (REC)
Meeting Summary

August 24, 2022

1. Roll Call and Minutes:

   Terry Romanko, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1pm Eastern on August 24, 2022 by teleconference. Attendance is recorded in Attachment A – there were 10 members present. Associate members in attendance: Mark McNeal, Bob Shannon, Keith McCroan and Carl Kircher.

2. Comments on TNI Standard

   The comments were added to the Committee's Summary of Changes table (Attachment D).

   A motion was made by Mary Beth and seconded by Amanda to approve lines 27-31 in the Committee's Summary of Changes document (Attachment D) and that the comments addressed were non-persuasive, and approve that this information be transferred to the Response to Comment form for notification to the comment submitter and posted to the TNI website. There was no further discussion. A roll call vote was taken:

   Jim - For
   Sherry - For
   Crystal - For
   Stan - For
   Amanda - For
   Velinda - For
   Mary Beth - For
   Greg - For
   Terry - For
   Brian – For

   The motion was approved.

   Ilona will prepare an email to the commenter once she receives a copy of the Response Comments form from Terry. (SOP-2-100-Rev3.4-CSDP-Standards Development Response Comments Form). The Committee documented why comments were Non-Persuasave.

   (Addition: The Comment Response Form can be found in Attachment E. The Comment Response form was sent to Bob Wyeth to post on the TNI website and for notification as per SOP 2-100: Procedures Governing Standards Development.)

3. Committee Vice-Chair

The Committee is still looking for a new Vice Chair. One person has expressed interest, but others can still volunteer. The Committee will vote next month.

4. Summer Conference Update

Amanda - Radiochemistry items were discussed in other meetings.

- During PTPEC - Reporting of Radiochemistry Uncertainity. There were a lot of questions that came up.
- During Quality Management Systems - Review of Technical Specialist. Where are courses supposed to be taken? The feedback was to consider rewording equivalent training. They didn't like the term "course". The paragraph about new technologies was received well. Jerry liked it too. QMS will look at adding some of this language to all the module sections.
- Alyssa Wingard (DoD). QSM for the DoD is essentially going to drop the Technical Specialist requirement. DoE will still have it.

5. Committee Membership

Associate members were asked to exit the meeting.

Patrick Garrity submitted an application to the Committee for Voting Membership. Terry reviewed the information with the Committee.

A motion was made by Chrystal to approve Patrick Garrity's as a Voting Member on the Committee. The motion was seconded by Amanda and there was no further discussion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Committee now consists of 5 Laboratories, 3 Others, and 3 ABs.

6. New Business

- Ilona let the Committee know about leadership changes on the PTP Executive Committee. The new Chair is Stacie Crandall and the new Vice-Chair is Susan Jackson.

7. Action Items

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

8. Next Meeting and Close

The next meeting will be September 22, 2022 at 1pm Eastern.

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

Terry adjourned the meeting at 1:45pm Eastern.

Attachment A
Participants
Radiochemistry Expert Committee

Members	**Affiliation**		**Contact InAffirmativemation**
Terry Romanko Chair (2024) **Present**	TestAmerica Laboratories, Inc.	Lab	Terry.romanko@testamericainc.com
Sherry Faye (2022*) **Present**	Wadsworth Center, NY State DOH Albany, NY	Lab	sherry.faye@health.ny.gov
Velinda Herbert (2024) **Present**	National Analytical Environmental Laboratory	Lab	Herbert.velinda@epa.gov
Brian Miller (2024) **Present**	ERA	Other	bmiller@eraqc.com
Stan Stevens (2023*) **Present**	Perma-Fix Environmental Services	Other	stanws@aol.com
Amanda Fehr (2023*) **Present**	GEL	Lab	amanda.fehr@gel.com
Jim Chambers (2023*) **Present**	Fluor-BWXT Portsmouth LLC	Other	jim.chambers@ports.pppo.gov
Greg Raspanti (2022*) **Present**	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection	AB	Greg.Raspanti@dep.nj.gov
Chrystal Sheaff (2024*) **Present**	Energy Laboratories, Inc.	Lab	csheaff@energylab.com
Mary Beth Gustafson (2024*) **Present**	Virginia	AB	mary.gustafson@dgs.virginia.gov
Ilona Taunton (Program Administrator) **Present**	The NELAC Institute	n/a	Ilona.taunton@nelac-institute.org

Attachment B

Action Items – REC

	Action Item	Who	Target Completion	Completed
90	Send note about method codes and concerns to the PT Expert Committee. Is there a way to limit the codes a lab can use to report PT data?	Bob	TBD	
115	Send new Technical Specialist recommendation to QMS.	Terry	6/4/22	Complete
116	Place comments into Comments Response Form/Table to prepare for final voting on comments. (SOP-2-100-Rev3.4-CSDP-StandardsDevelopment-ResponsetoCommentsForm)	Terry	9/20/22	

Attachment C – Back Burner / Reminders

	Item	Meeting Reference	Comments
5	Affirmativem 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	
6	From Action Item # 75: Prepare copy of Standard annotated with summary document language.		This is a project Carolyn was working on, but the committee decided it may duplicate the Small Lab Handbook. This project has been put on Hold.

Attachment D.

Module 6 Standard Update - Summary of Suggested Changes - Final (3/24/21) – Additions on 7/27/22 (Lines 27-33)

Original Text	Suggested Change	Justification
Section 1.5.3(c) uses the phrase “entire measurement system.” Presumably, this would include all sample preparation and analytical steps.	None.	Yes, Section 1.5.3(c) is a subset of 1.5 (“Method Validation”) which includes all preparation and analysis steps.
Section 1.7.1.1(a) uses the phrase “radiation measurement system.” I am not sure that the “system” would pertain to one particular analytical instrument, one sample-detector combination, or all instruments of a given measurement technique or technology.	None.	In context within 1.7.1.1(a) itself, “system” applies to “produce consistent, comparable results across multiple detectors used for a common method.” Thus, it would apply to whatever radiation measurement system is used for a particular “common” method. This would be true whether the laboratory had only one detector or many detectors associated with the system.
Section 1.7.1.4 uses the phrase “detection system” in several places.	None.	Section 1.7.1.4 is in regard to instrument performance checks (to "measure and track the stability of key detector response-related parameters over time.") As such, it is clear in the context of use that "detection system" relates to the instrument/detector, not to other variables (e.g. method/preparation).
Section 1.7.2.1(b) uses the phrase “analytical system.” (Is this the same as a detection system? Or a radiation measurement system?)	None.	Section 1.7.2.1(b) is a general requirement to “process batch and sample-specific QCs to provide empirical evidence that demonstrates that the analytical system is in control”. Section 1.7.2.1(c) goes on to further detail how this relates to when “sample testing is performed that involves physical or chemical processing which affects the outcome of the test” (c.i) and when “testing is performed that does not involve physical or chemical processing…” (c.ii).

Original Text	Suggested Change	Justification
There is a high degree of specificity in frequency for running a “subtraction background measurement” but not how often a “short-term background check” must be run (except for the liquid scintillation detector). Again, this is an existing standard and assessing to it may not be consistent. I guess, at a minimum, the short-term background checks need to be at least as frequent as subtraction background measurements.	None.	Except for the case of LSC, the Standard leaves the frequency to be defined and documented the laboratory (1.7.1.6.a.i). The risk the laboratory takes by “choosing” a longer duration between short-term background checks is the potential of having to initial corrective action on a large number of samples, possibly leading to qualification or rejection of data (1.7.1.6.c).
The Draft Standard has Section 1.7.2.6(c) subdivided into (i) through (viii), but the Excel file of Expert Committee revisions to the Standard splits (iii) in the Draft Standard into (iii) and (iv). Is this correct, and Section 1.7.2.6(c) should have (i) through (ix) now?	None.	This is correct, and this is how it appears in the version sent.
The Draft Standard has a Section 1.7.1(a) but no 1.7.1(b). Is this by design, so as to put the normative requirement in 1.7.1(a) as different from the 1.7.1 general description?	None.	That is correct. The portion in the first 2 paragraphs of 1.7.1 are descriptive. The portion in a) is prescriptive.

Addition: Attachment E – Response to Comment Form

Radiochemistry - DRAFT Module 6

Disclaimer: The NELAC Institute (TNI) accepts no liability for the content of any comment on a standard.

Any views or opinions on a standard are solely those of the commenter and do not necessarily reflect those of TNI.

Comment Number	Vote & Justification (Persuasive/non-persuasive)	Editorial (Y/N)	Section/ Clause	Comment	Committee Action	Date Addressed	Committee Comment	Date Submitted	Date & Method of Submitter Notification
1	*Non-Persuasive*	N	*1.5.3(c)*	*Section 1.5.3(c) uses the phrase "entire measurement system." Presumably, this would include all sample preparation and analytical steps.*	*None*	*Discussed 7/27/22; Voted on 8/24/22*	*Yes, Section 1.5.3(c) is a subset of 1.5 ("Method Validation") which includes all preparation and analysis steps.*	*1/28/22*	*12/28/22, email*
2	*Non-Persuasive*	N	*1.7.1.1(a)*	*Section 1.7.1.1(a) uses the phrase "radiation measurement system." I am not sure that the "system" would pertain to one particular analytical instrument, one sample-detector combination, or all instruments of a given measurement technique or technology.*	*None*	*Discussed 7/27/22; Voted on 8/24/22*	In context within 1.7.1.1(a) itself, "system" applies to "produce consistent, comparable results across multiple detectors used for a common method." Thus, it would apply to whatever radiation measurement system is used for a particular "common" method. This would be true whether the laboratory had only	*1/28/22*	*12/28/22, email*

							one detector or many detectors associated with the system.		
3	*Non-Persuasive*	N	*1.7.1.4*	*Section 1.7.1.4 uses the phrase "detection system" in several places.*	*None*	*Discussed 7/27/22; Voted on 8/24/22*	Section 1.7.1.4 is in regard to instrument performance checks (to "measure and track the stability of key detector response-related parameters over time.") As such, it is clear in the context of use that "detection system" relates to the instrument/detector, not to other variables (e.g. method/preparation).	*1/28/22*	*12/28/22, email*

4	*Non-Persuasive*	N	1.7.2.1(b)	*Section 1.7.2.1(b) uses the phrase "analytical system." (Is this the same as a detection system? Or a radiation measurement system?)*	*None*	*Discussed 7/27/22; Voted on 8/24/22*	Section 1.7.2.1(b) is a general requirement to "process batch and sample-specific QCs to provide empirical evidence that demonstrates that the analytical system is in control". Section 1.7.2.1(c) goes on to further detail how this relates to when "sample testing is performed that involves physical or chemical processing which affects the outcome of the test" (c.i) and when "testing is performed that does not involve physical or chemical processing…" (c.ii).	*1/28/22*	*12/28/22, email*

5	*Non-Persuasive*	N		*There is a high degree of specificity in frequency for running a "subtraction background measurement" but not how often a "short-term background check" must be run (except for the liquid scintillation detector). Again, this is an existing standard and assessing to it may not be consistent. I guess, at a minimum, the short-term background checks need to be at least as frequent as subtraction background measurements.*	*None*	*Discussed 7/27/22; Voted on 8/24/22*	Except for the case of LSC, the Standard leaves the frequency to be defined and documented the laboratory (1.7.1.6.a.i). The risk the laboratory takes by "choosing" a longer duration between short-term background checks is the potential of having to initial corrective action on a large number of samples, possibly leading to qualification or rejection of data (1.7.1.6.c).	*1/28/22*	*12/28/22, email*

6	*Non-Persuasive*	N	1.7.2.6(c)	*The Draft Standard has Section 1.7.2.6(c) subdivided into (i) through (viii), but the Excel file of Expert Committee revisions to the Standard splits (iii) in the Draft Standard into (iii) and (iv). Is this correct, and Section 1.7.2.6(c) should have (i) through (ix) now?*	*None*	*Discussed 7/27/22; Voted on 8/24/22*	This is correct, and this is how it appears in the version sent.	*1/28/22*	*12/28/22, email*
7	*Non-Persuasive*	N	1.7.1(a)	*The Draft Standard has a Section 1.7.1(a) but no 1.7.1(b). Is this by design, so as to put the normative requirement in 1.7.1(a) as different from the 1.7.1 general description?*	*None*	*Discussed 7/27/22; Voted on 8/24/22*	That is correct. The portion in the first 2 paragraphs of 1.7.1 are descriptive. The portion in a) is prescriptive.	*1/28/22*	*12/28/22, email*