

**HASQARD Focus Group**  
Meeting Minutes  
August 24, 2010

The meeting was called to order by Huei Meznarich acting for Dave Crawford, Focus Group Chairman who was absent, at 2:10 PM on August 24, 2010 in Conference Room 208 at 2425 Stevens.

Those attending were: Huei Meznarich (Acting Chair), Cliff Watkins (Secretary), Lynn Albin, Taffy Almeida, Heather Anastos, Glen Clark, Robert Elkins, Jim Jewett, Greg Holte, Kris Kuhl-Klinger, Joan Kessner, Larry Markel, Huei Meznarich, Karl Pool, Noe'l Smith-Jackson, Chris Sutton, Cindy Taylor, Genesis Thomas, Chris Thompson, Rich Weiss and Eric Wyse.

- I. Huei Meznarich requested approval of the minutes from the July 20 meeting and, hearing no objections to the minutes as presented, they were approved.
- II. The Action Tracking matrix was discussed. The following updates were provided:
  - a. The process for handling inclusion of interpretations to HASQARD by posting them on the HASQARD web-site has been stalled by poor communication from the ORP web site maintenance personnel. The Secretary has made contact with the personnel that manage the web site that currently hosts the HASQARD document (<http://www.hanford.gov/orp/?page=141&parent=14>). The Secretary was contacted with information on how to establish secure access to the web site. In return communication it was explained that secure access is undesirable and that the Focus Group wants to have all interpretations and other documents posted in a publicly accessible environment like the one where the HASQARD document itself can be downloaded from. No response on when the requested hypertext links would be available and details on the process for submitting new content for inclusion on the web site has been received by the Secretary.
  - b. The issue concerning the required frequency for quality systems assessments in HASQARD was not discussed. At the May 20, 2010 meeting Dave Crawford volunteered to take the **action item** to review the MSA contract to determine if there is an assessment frequency requirement for the WSCF laboratory contained in that document. At the July 20, 2010 meeting this action item remained unresolved and was tabled. The matter was once again tabled for resolution between now and the next meeting.
  - c. From the July 20 meeting, the Secretary was assigned the action to distribute the organic analysis subcommittee's efforts to date on the

HASQARD/QSAS/DOECAP comparison. Those materials were distributed on July 29. This action item is closed and will be moved to the completed actions list.

- d. From the July 20 meeting the Secretary was assigned the action to distribute the proposed revision to the previously issued custody seal deminimis change. This distribution was to allow the Focus Group time to review the proposed language and be prepared for the matter to come to a vote at the next meeting of the Focus Group. The revised language along with some excerpts from the EPA CLP Sampler's Guide on custody seals were sent to all the Focus Group members on July 21, 2010. This action item is closed and will be moved to the completed actions list.
- e. At the July 20 meeting, Al Hawkins accepted an action item to schedule a meeting between DOE, EPA, Ecology and Department of Health to discuss the HASQARD/DOECAP comparison efforts and the language of the MSA Contract to provide the Focus Group clarity on the desired outcome of this effort. That meeting was held August 4, 2010. A summary of the meeting appears in these minutes below. This action item is closed and will be moved to the completed actions list.

III. At the July 20 meeting, a proposal related to the language previously approved and issued as a de minimis change by the HASQARD Focus Group regarding use of custody seals was made by Huei Meznarich. Huei described a specific situation in which the custody seal tape applied to bottles becomes a safety issue. The seal tape tends to flare at the ends as the adhesive loses contact with the bottle through time. This adhesive can stick to lab coat sleeves and result in bottles being inadvertently dragged out of the hood and broken on the floor. Huei provided a proposal for revising the previously issued language to emphasize the need to allow deviation from the current wording when safety concerns have been raised.

Huei's specific proposed language was:

“**HASQARD** Section 4.2.4, Volume 2, Revision 3 requires: "The field custodian shall seal the cap of the individual sample container so that any tampering is easy to detect. Custody seals shall be used to verify that sample integrity has been maintained during transport."

The **HASQARD** Focus Group provides the following clarification to the requirement:

Note: The presence of, or fixative residue from, custody seals can interfere with the functionality of equipment used during analysis or present a safety concern (e.g., the auto-sampler used for EPA Method 5035A analysis of volatile organic compounds). Where these interferences occur or safety issues

are present, in lieu of using a custody seals directly applied to sample containers, the sample container may be placed inside a secondary container that is sealed with custody tape.”

**Secretary’s Note:** Since the meeting, the complete context of the words being discussed were researched. They appear as the sixth paragraph in Section 4.2.4. The entire original text of that paragraph in Revision 3 of Volume 2 of the HASQARD is:

“The field custodian shall seal the cap of the individual sample container so that any tampering is easy to detect. Custody seals shall be used to verify that sample integrity has been maintained during transport. Custody tape shall be selected that is not removable from the shipping container without breaking the seal. Samples shall be shipped in insulated containers with either synthetic ice or ice packed in plastic bags when samples require cooling to  $4\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$ .”

The Focus Group discussed the proposed wording and determined the reasons for not requiring custody seals (i.e., interference with correct operation of laboratory equipment and safety concerns) were not relevant and may lead to confusion by sampling personnel on when these concerns were present and when they weren’t. Therefore, the Focus Group decided to issue a de minimis change to the paragraph so it will read:

“Custody seals shall be used to verify that sample integrity has been maintained during transport. The field custodian shall seal the cap of the individual sample container so that any tampering is easy to detect. In lieu of using a custody seal directly applied to sample containers, the sample container may be placed inside a secondary container that is sealed with a custody seal. Custody tape shall be selected that is not removable from the shipping container without breaking the seal. Samples shall be shipped in insulated containers with either synthetic ice or ice packed in plastic bags when samples require cooling to  $4\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$ .”

Huei Meznarich called for the voting members of the Focus Group to vote on the proposed language. There result of the vote was as follows:

Joan Kessner – Washington Closure Hanford - In Favor  
Steve Smith – CH2MHill Plateau Remediation Company - Absent  
Chris Thompson – Battelle Pacific Northwest National Laboratory – In Favor  
Eric Wyse – Advanced Testing Laboratories – In Favor  
Larry Markel – Washington River Protection Solutions – In Favor  
Huei Meznarich – Mission Support Alliance – In Favor

The Secretary took the **action item** to post the new revised language on the HASQARD de minimis change web site. Chris Sutton also took note of this

language for incorporation in the revision to HASQARD Volume 2 his subcommittee is working on.

- IV. The results of the meeting between the DOE, Ecology, EPA and Department of Health to discuss the DOECAP to HASQARD comparison language in the MSA contract were summarized by Noe'l Smith-Jackson. The meeting attendees determined that the effort was worthwhile and should be continued. The attendees agreed that the in the context of the MSA contract language to "...compare and contrast both the DOECAP and HASQARD to ensure that all applicable DOECAP quality criteria have been included in the HASQARD" the term "applicable" should be interpreted in the sense of "useful to improving the HASQARD." The attendees also agreed that it is essential the working group's analysis of DOECAP be captured as a record, especially the logic for not incorporating differences between the documents. The attendees saw merit in maintaining the HASQARD as a separate, Hanford-specific document
- V. The chair of the organic analysis subcommittee for the DEOCAP/QSAS/HASQARD comparison effort, Glen Clark, presented the subcommittee's efforts to date. The subcommittee first compared just the DOECAP Checklist 2 lines of inquiry against HASQARD requirements. The requirements that the DOECAP checklist contained that were both either not readily identifiable or not present in HASQARD and deemed to be of benefit to the HASQARD were inserted in a Word file version of Revision 3 of the HASQARD. These insertions were done using the "track changes" and "comment" features in Word. Glen Clark projected the results of these editorial changes for the Focus Group to see and comment on. Glen explained that we are not here to debate every point nor are we seeking consensus or final acceptance for any of the changes at this time. This material was simply being presented to show the other groups the level of effort completed to serve as an example of what could be done in the other groups.

After showing the Word document versions of HASQARD Revision 3 with the DOECAP Checklist 2 material incorporated, Glen presented PowerPoint slides showing additional requirements present in the QSAS document Sections 5.7, 5.8, 5.9, and Appendices C and D that are not specified in HASQARD. This was presented for discussion of additional material that may be added to the Word document versions of the file in the future.

As the revisions to the HASQARD and/or the PowerPoint presentation were being displayed the following comments were made by the Focus Group attendees:

During the discussion of the use of refrigerator blanks, Chris Sutton asked if there are any National Functional Guidelines for Data validation references to use of refrigerator blanks that would drive their use. The Secretary took the

**action item** to research this question.

Some members of the Focus Group felt that some of the additional material added to the document is present in another form or in another section from where the organic group had inserted it. The organic group committed to look again and others in the Focus Group said they would also want to look before approving redundant language in the final revision to the document.

There was a discussion on the language associated with secondary sources of standard materials. A final resolution on appropriate language was not achieved as that was not the intent of this day's presentation.

There is an issue with "daily verification" of volumetric dispensing glassware that is used in a hot cell. It is likely that this language will need to be modified to accommodate hot cell laboratories.

The term "shelf life" should be scrubbed from the document in general as it is an ambiguous term. Rather the term "expiration date" should be used.

The concept of requiring dilution of a sample extract or digested sample to allow analysis of all target analytes at concentrations within the range of the lowest and highest calibration standard concentrations should be moved to cover all analyses and not contained only in the organic analysis section of HASQARD.

Some Focus Group members felt that the specific requirements for retention of raw data is contained in HASQARD and the addition made by the Organic subcommittee would not be required.

Regarding revised language on sample receipt requirements, the considerations for samples received in hot cells need to be included in the final revision to the HASQARD.

In general, the Focus Group felt the presentation of the results of this effort was beneficial and provides an example of the level of detail and number of revisions that may need to be made for each analysis type.

VI. The status on the subcommittees established to compare the QSAS and HASQARD requirements was provided by the coordinator for each subcommittee:

a. Sampling: Chris Sutton (Coordinator), Wendy Thompson;

Chris Sutton reported that due to demands on sampling personnel no progress had been made since the last HASQARD meeting.

- b. Organic Analysis: Glen Clark (Coordinator), Robert Elkins and Cliff Watkins

The organic group's presentation (detailed in item V. above) served as their input for this meeting.

- c. Inorganic Analysis: Heather Anastos (Coordinator), Chris Thompson, Jim Jewett, Eric Wyse

Heather Anastos reported that the inorganic group was waiting to see today's example of what others have done allowing a basis discussing what the approach to this effort should be.

- d. Radiochemistry: Joan Kessner (Coordinator), Rich Weiss, Huei Meznarich, Karl Pool, Eric Wyse

Joan Kessner reported that the radiochemistry group is on track with their efforts and will have more to report at the next meeting of the Focus Group.

- e. Quality Assurance/Management Systems: Steve Smith (Coordinator), Taffy Almeida, Cindy English, Larry Markel, Kris Kuhl-Klinger, and Kathi Dunbar:

Kris Kuhl Klinger stated that, similar to the organic group, they have completed a set of examples of what should and what should not be considered for addition to the HASQARD. Kris accepted the **action item** to present a summary of these examples at the next HASQARD meeting.

- f. Section 5:

Steve Smith was not present but had previously reported that efforts have not focused on Section 5 specifically. They intend to incorporate the material required from Section 5 in the HASQARD revisions they propose as a result of the QA subcommittee efforts. If an analysis-specific requirement or revision is identified, it will be discussed with the applicable sub-group prior to incorporating it in the final HASQARD revision proposals.

VII. There was not a copy of the DOECAP/HASQARD activities schedule present to discuss, so this agenda item was tabled until the next meeting.

VIII. New Business

- a. Greg Holte attended the meeting to represent a concern raised by Steve Smith and CHPRC QA regarding language contained in HASQARD

Volume 2. Specifically, the language in the second paragraph of Volume 2, Section 4.7 is of concern. The complete paragraph states:

“Containers shall be capped and stored in a contaminant-free area. Samples should be collected, where and when appropriate, in break-resistant containers. Samples in glass containers shall be transported using secondary containment (e.g., coolers, sealed cans) as specified in the procedure and in accordance with DOT requirements.”

During a recent surveillance, the CHPRC QA personnel discovered unused, new sample containers in a storage location that also contained aerosols containing solvents such as WD40. The question raised is what is meant by “contaminant-free area.” in HASQARD. Chris Sutton believes they may have addressed this language in the revisions to HASQARD Volume 2 his subcommittee is working on. Chris took the **action item** to look into this and, if not addressed, provide a proposed revision to the wording at the next HASQARD Focus group meeting.

- b. Rich Weiss mentioned that the DOECAP meetings will be coming up in September. He requested that anyone that has discovered errata in either the DOECAP checklists or references in the QSAS to please let him know so he can get this input to the appropriate DOECAP people before the meetings.

Hearing no additional new business, Huei Meznarich adjourned the meeting at 3:50 PM.