

HASQARD Focus Group
Meeting Minutes
December 13, 2011

The meeting was called to order by Huei Meznarich, HASQARD Focus Group Chair at 2:04 PM on December 13, 2011 in Conference Room 126 at 2420 Stevens.

Those attending were: Huei Meznarich (Chair), Cliff Watkins (Secretary), Lynn Albin, Heather Anastos, Jeff Cheadle, Glen Clark, Scot Fitzgerald, Shannan Johnson, Kris Kuhl-Klinger, Joan Kessner, Karl Pool, Dave St. John, Noe'l Smith-Jackson, Chris Sutton, Cindy Taylor, Amanda Tuttle, Rich Weiss and Eric Wyse.

- I. Huei Meznarich requested comments on the minutes from the November 8, 2011 meeting. No HASQARD Focus Group members present stated any comments on the November meeting minutes and, after hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.
- II. The Status of the preparations of Revision 4 for Volumes 1, 2 and 3 were discussed.
 - a. The Status of the review for Volume 2 was discussed. The Secretary stated that as the original due date for comments (November 18, 2011) approached, several requests for a later due date were received. The resolution to that request was to discuss the extension at this meeting. After discussion with the Volume 2 authors and the individuals needing the extension, a new deadline of January 17, 2012 was set for receipt of comments on revision to Volume 2.

During this discussion, the topic of whether Volume 2 could or should be issued as Revision 4 ahead of the other three Volumes was addressed. The sampling personnel present felt like they could work within the requirements of Revision 3 of HASQARD if Revision 4 of Volume 2 is not issued before the next sample collection season begins in spring 2012. Also of relevance was the fact that there are call-outs to Volume 1 in both Volumes 2 and 4 of HASQARD. Therefore, there will be a need to a technical editor to ensure all of the call outs are accurate upon completion of Revision 4 of Volumes 1-4. With these points stated, it was agreed that all Volumes of HASQARD Revision 4 will be issued concurrently.

- b. Cindy Taylor reported that the QA Group continues to meet almost weekly and expects that the revisions to Volume 1 will be ready for Focus Group review when the Volume 4 reviews conducted at Focus Group meetings are complete.

- c. Chris Sutton inquired about Volume 3 and the need to revise it during this effort. Joan Kessner reported that Dave St. John had looked at Volume 3 since WCH seems to be one of the primary users of Volume 3, and feels it adequately meets the needs in its current form. Joan recommends that Revision 3 of HASQARD Volume 3 be issued as Revision 4 without changes. Rich Weiss suggested that Chris Sutton and the Volume 2 preparation subcommittee look at Volume 3 to ensure any call-outs to Volume 2 that may be present are adequately addressed when the revision to Volume 2 is completed.

III. HASQARD Volume 4, Revision 4 Proposals

Continuing with the process begun at the November Focus group meeting, the Secretary projected the Word file containing the combined set of proposed revisions to Volume 4 of HASQARD as provided by the organic analysis, inorganic analysis, radiochemistry and quality assurance (QA) subcommittees on a screen for all to view. The Secretary used the software and continued by addressing only those revisions that had comments associated with them because they were either added by the QA group or were highlighted as revisions where equivalent wording had been proposed by two or more groups.

At the November meeting, the subject of revised language for balance checks and check weights used for daily balance checks was discussed. In November, the Focus Group determined that the language should read:

“Check weight values shall be established and verified to at least the readability of the balance to which they will be assigned, preferably to 10% of the balance readability. Daily checks shall include verification by bracketing the expected use range and it is recommended that, where possible, the verification include checking at approximately 2/3 (67%) of the balance capacity.”

At the November meeting it was noted that this language may prove problematic for PNNL and will need to be resolved before a consensus revision to Volume 4 can be agreed to. Therefore, this language was discussed again at the December meeting.

The Focus Group sought clarification from Rich Weiss (who was not present in November) what was meant by the language, “Check weight values shall be established and verified to at least the readability of the balance to which they will be assigned, preferably to 10% of the balance readability.” Rich clarified this language and a “For example” sentence was added to make it more clear in HASQARD.

Also, in order to accommodate both the DOECAP-required (and commonly accepted) practice of bracketing the expected range of weights to be measured and the technically acceptable (and possibly superior) practice of checking only one weight at a reading corresponding to approximately 67% of full scale, the language was revised to read:

“For balance verification, check weight values shall be established and verified to at least the readability of the balance to which they will be assigned, preferably to 10% of the balance readability. For example, if a balance reads to 0.1 gram, check weight values should be established (known) to 0.01 gram. Daily checks shall include verification by bracketing the expected use range or the verification shall include checking at approximately 2/3 (67%) of the balance capacity.”

Two of the subcommittees had incorporated the DOECAP requirements associated with purchased standards in different paragraphs of Section 4.3. The Focus Group spent some time discussing requirements for certification of standard reference materials. After discussion, it was decided that all purchased standards (not just those used for calibration) shall be accompanied by a Certificate of Analysis or record that includes the vendor, lot number, purity, date of preparation and/or expiration, and concentration or activity of the standard material.

With all revisions that had comments associated with them because they were either added by the QA group or were highlighted as revisions where equivalent wording had been proposed by two or more groups addressed, the Focus Group started discussing proposed revisions from the beginning of the document.

All proposed revisions to Section 1 were found acceptable with no comment.

In Section 2.2, the second sentence was changed to read, “The following issues, at a minimum, shall be documented or addressed in the laboratory QA Plan, laboratory procedures or facility operations procedures:”

The fifth bullet in the list in Section 2.2 was changed to read, “Adequate analytical instrumentation sufficient to perform the scope of work.”

The bullet in the list in Section 2.2 that read, “Proper maintenance to prevent from contaminating vacuum systems” was deleted.

A discussion was held about the adoption of DOECAP requirements in HASQARD Volume 4, Section 2.2 for daily temperature monitoring of

temperatures in coolers holding samples. This language will be problematic for the site laboratories that do not have personnel in the facility every day. The language in the proposed revision includes, "Temperature monitoring data loggers are acceptable provided they have the capability of providing notification of an out of control event to responsible individual(s) during routine and non-routine work periods." Temperature monitoring data loggers are used by WSCF, but they do not include an automated notification capability for an out of control event to responsible individual(s) during routine and non-routine work periods. The representatives of the site laboratories agreed that this requirement made sense and that it should be included.

All other proposed revisions to Section 2 were accepted with additional language being proposed.

In Section 3.3, "Sample Receiving", one of the subcommittees had proposed adding the DOECAP requirement that stated: "Personnel dealing with radioactive waste management and/or materials shipping shall be trained in waste management, shipping and handling, and radioactive material control as applicable." After discussion, the Focus Group decided this language added no value and should be deleted entirely.

To clarify the language of the first bullet in Section 3.3, the language was changed to read, "Document transferring samples to the laboratory. When received from a common carrier, a copy of the shipping document shall become part of the permanent laboratory record."

The bullet in Section 3.3 that discusses what information should be provided to the laboratory on a chain-of-custody form was discussed. A note was added to ensure that the final language for chain-of-custody requirements in Volume 2 and this bullet read consistently.

The requirement for checking preservation of field samples during the sample receiving process was discussed. This matter had been discussed in November, but with different attendees in the December meeting, the Focus Group readdressed the issue. The main concern is that this is not always done during sample receiving, but rather on the bench during sample analysis. Also of concern was the need to ensure the requirement did not imply samples for highly volatile constituents were to be opened and examined during sample receipt and check-in. With those issues in mind, the language of the requirement of the activity to take place as part of the sample receiving process was changed to read, "Verify if required field preservation has been performed on water samples (except for samples received for analyses for volatile analytes) using readily available techniques, such as pH. Document

unpreserved samples on the custody form, sample check-in documentation or in the laboratory's non-conformance tracking system.”

All other revisions to Section 3 were accepted by the Focus Group without additional comment.

At this point in the meeting, the Chair stated that rather than start into Section 4 the meeting should be adjourned. The Chair requested that the Secretary send the current version of the proposed revisions to all Focus Group members so they can study what has been accepted in Sections 1-3 and be prepared to discuss the remaining proposals at the next meeting.

Hearing no additional new business, and no objections to the proposal to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 3:47 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2012 at 2:00 PM in 2420 Stevens, Room 308.