

SCIENCE OVER SCARE TACTICS

SciAps



DEBUNKING THE MISINFORMATION: THE TRUTH ABOUT HANDHELD LEAD PAINT ANALYZERS

Recently, a document made the rounds in the industry under the guise of an official safety alert. While styled like a technical paper, its true nature leans far closer to promotional propaganda. It levels serious – and frankly unfounded – allegations about the safety and accuracy of tube-based L-shell XRF analyzers for lead paint testing. ***Let's set the record straight.***

MISREPRESENTING DATA TO DISCREDIT THE COMPETITION

The so-called “alert” asserts that tube-based L-shell analyzers are incapable of accurately testing at the HUD-defined 0.5 mg/cm^2 level and dangerously unreliable. Ironically, the very device referenced in the critique is notorious for its own sensitivity limitations, which is why it requires longer testing durations to achieve acceptable statistical certainty.

The document claims “Viken stopped PCS testing at 0.5 mg/cm^2 and accepted an “inconclusive” result at 0.5 mg/cm^2 due to clear PCS test limitations.” This statement suggests the instrument manufacturers have control over the PCS results. They do not. All instruments seeking a PCS are tested by the same company, and the results are not known until the document is ready for publication. Manufacturers have no choice but to accept the results. Their instrument has the same inconclusive range at the 0.7 mg/cm^2 action level.

QUESTIONABLE SAFETY PRACTICES

The document features imagery of someone placing their hands near the business end of an analyzer – a basic x-ray safety violation. This alone calls into question the training and expertise of the individuals making these sweeping safety claims. Safety, after all, is about practice as much as product.

If a competitor's business strategy requires casting doubt on science, regulation, and safety standards while spreading unfounded rumors, it's worth asking: **WHAT ARE THEY REALLY AFRAID OF?**

CASTING DOUBT ON LABS AND REGULATIONS

The document goes a step further by casting suspicion on laboratory testing, implying that discrepancies between their results and lab reports stem solely from laboratory error. This assertion is deeply problematic. Laboratories accredited by the National Lead Laboratory Accreditation Program (NLLAP) must meet strict EPA-mandated proficiency requirements – often quarterly or even monthly.

To discredit these labs while failing to specify whether the lab in question was accredited is not only disingenuous, it suggests a dangerous willingness to undermine established regulatory frameworks in the name of self-promotion.

LICENSING LOOPHOLES AND FINANCIAL MOTIVATIONS

The paper touts the lack of a licensing requirement for their analyzer as a major safety win. The truth? This exemption was granted because they use a much weaker Co-57 source. While that may avoid certain regulations, it comes at a cost to users – longer test times and more frequent source replacements. With a replacement cost of around \$4,000, users are essentially re-buying the device every five years. That's not innovation; that's planned obsolescence dressed up as regulatory compliance.

THESE SCARE TACTICS ARE PURELY USED TO LOCK YOU INTO YEARS OF COSTLY CO-57 SOURCE REPLACEMENTS—GREAT FOR THEIR PROFITS, NOT FOR YOUR BOTTOM LINE.

RUMORS AND FEAR-MONGERING

Perhaps most troubling is the attempt to stir fear through rumor. The claim that housing authorities in New York were planning to ban the use of a specific analyzer was found to be baseless. According to a source in the Lead Hazard Control Division, there has been no discussion of such a ban with vendors, and no complaints have been received since a previously identified issue was resolved.

There has also been no word from HUD regarding any such move – yet this false narrative continues to be spread. Why? Because when you don't have the technology to compete, misinformation becomes your marketing strategy.

STANDING BEHIND THE SCIENCE

The reality is this: tube-based XRF analyzers, like the SciAps X-550, continue to be validated by regulators and relied upon in the field by professionals across the country. When used correctly and safely, they offer fast, reliable, and precise lead paint detection without the drawbacks of isotopic sources.



The ability to accurately determine the lead-content of surface and buried lead paint without destructive testing is vital to ensuring the safety of children and renovators.



According to the CDC, exposure to lead through inhalation or ingestion can cause a wide array of developmental issues, including slowed speech, focus, and general intellectual functioning. No amount of lead exposure is considered safe. Often paint containing lead is left in place and covered with other layers of paint to prevent the lead-containing paint from flaking off. However, if construction or demolition is required during a renovation, lead paint testing is a necessity to ensure that both children and workers are protected from airborne lead exposure. The best instrument available for this analysis is the SciAps X-550 Pb because of its ability to determine the levels of lead in buried paint without disturbing it. In addition, SciAps X-550 Pb is the only XRF analyzer able to measure the presence of lead paint with accepted PCS at three action levels for HUD lead paint assessments without utilizing a radioactive isotope.

SciAps X-550 Pb allows the user to accurately determine the lead-content of surface and buried lead paint without destructive testing at all action levels without the need to replace a radioactive isotope every couple of years, and with no loss of speed over time, making it the best choice for anyone who needs to conduct lead paint analysis.

SciAps

For more information, or to
schedule a demonstration:
sales@sciaps.com
SciAps.com
+1 339.927.9455



**SCIAPS X-550
SPECIFICATIONS**