

HASQARD Focus Group
Meeting Minutes
August 21, 2012

The meeting was called to order by Huei Meznarich, HASQARD Focus Group Chair at 2:10 PM on August 21, 2012 in an alternate Conference Room in 2420 Stevens.

Those attending were: Huei Meznarich (Focus Group Chair), Cliff Watkins (Focus Group Secretary), Lynn Albin, Glen Clark, Robert Elkins, Scot Fitzgerald, Joan Kessner, Larry Markel, Steve Smith, Chris Sutton. Chris Thompson, Amanda Tuttle, and Rich Weiss.

- I. Because the meeting was scheduled to take place in Room 308 and a glitch in the Conference Room Scheduling system occurred, the meeting was moved to another conference room in the same building. This resulted in the meeting being moved to a room with no PC to overhead projector interface being available. Therefore, the meeting began with a discussion of hard copy print-outs Larry Markel provided showing his suggestions to make the chain-of-custody form language consistent between Volumes 2 and 4 of HASQARD. Comments on these print-outs were discussed and the Focus Group Secretary inquired if this was the final language the group desired for incorporation in the document. Chris Sutton stated he would like to provide additional language for consideration in this section. This will be reviewed again at the next Focus Group meeting to ensure the group's desires will be accurately captured.
- II. Huei Meznarich requested comments on the minutes from the July 17, 2012 meeting. No HASQARD Focus Group members present stated any comments on the July meeting minutes and, after hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.
- III. The status of open and recently closed action items was discussed.
 - a. A discussion of the proposed revisions to the Detection Limit sections that Rich Weiss prepared and distributed to the Focus Group prior to the meeting took place. Because the file containing Rich's work could not be projected in the room in which the meeting was being held, Rich provided a discussion on how he developed the material sent to everyone via e-mail. Rich used literature published by the State of Wisconsin and a Commercial Laboratory's QA Manual and also interviewed commercial laboratory personnel. The individuals interviewed said they are starting to see an intermingling and commonality developing between the QA requirements of DOE and Department of Defense (DOD) clients. Rich stated that he thinks language very similar to the draft he provided will be found in the next revision of the DOE QSAS which is intended to

incorporate (or make common to DOE) as much of the DOD's QA requirements as possible. Rich stated that the proposed approach in the draft is to provide several options to determine the detection limit. The language allows laboratories to go outside the prescribed method as long as it meets the project/client's needs and all have agreed to the method selected. The language drafted by Rich is intended to provide a basis for discussing detection limits, lower limits of detection and quantification to ensure HASQARD users and laboratories do not have differing definitions or interpretations of terms. For the method detection limit (MDL) definition, Rich kept 40CFR136 definition for MDL in the draft. For instrument detection limit, Rich uses the typical EPA definition. Rich used the term of "detection limit" to avoid confusing this term with the term MDL. A non-statistical method for determining detection limit was also included (however, this approach needs to be agreed upon between the lab and client). Another concept in the proposed approach is for the laboratory to develop a detection limit and then verify it using a detection limit verification analysis. The proposed detection limit verification (DLV) would occur quarterly. The draft specifies the laboratory is required to analyze a spiked QC matrix at the DLV value. As long as the laboratory shows that the acceptance criteria for detection of the analytes are met, the detection limit study need not be conducted again. Rich provides options and needs to know if any one of them really doesn't work. Focus group members expressed a need of some flexibility on how to determine the concentration level for DLV analysis and will review the proposed detection limit/quantitation limit language and provide comments at the next Focus Group meeting.

The draft of this section has resulted in the working group of Huei Meznarich, Eric Wyse, Glen Clark and Rich Weiss discussing some lingering issues on the subject. For example, how does this approach address the reporting of undetected analytes? That is, should they be reported as less than the detection limit or as less than the DLV value? Rich anticipates that the new DOE QSAS document will specify that undetected results are reported as being less than that DLV value or when using the "U" data qualifier flagging for flagging undetected results, "DLV U." This and other issues are still being resolved by the working group. The goal of the effort is a technically defensible detection limit.

Rich also stated that some of the text in the radiological analysis was rearranged to get it to flow better. The revision adds the caveat that if a laboratory wants to do something different, it's negotiable.

- b. Rich Weiss had the action item to provide the Focus Group with an expanded definition of Carrier to include non-yield carriers. At the end of the meeting, several Focus Group members moved to Room 308 where this new definition could be displayed. The definition was agreed to and

states:

Carrier: A non-radioactive constituent added to an analytical process so that a chemically-significant mass of the constituent is present. Significant mass of the constituent may be necessary to prevent a target radioisotope from undergoing nonspecific (i.e. erratic due to low concentrations) processes or to enhance separation from potential interfering constituents (radioactive or non-radioactive) during radiochemical separation and purification activities. Carriers are added to all samples in an analytical batch (including batch QC samples). Some carriers are used to correct for analytical losses (yield correction) for the overall separation and purification process. Carriers used for yield corrections are typically the same element as the target radioisotope being determined (e.g., Strontium added to Sr-90 determinations) but may be other elements so long as the element used chemically mimics the target radioisotope. Carrier-based yields are not based on decay counting, recovery is determined gravimetrically or by an alternative technique (e.g., inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometry). Mass effects of a carrier on the final sample counting configuration must be taken into account. Carriers used for yield correction must be added as soon as practicable in the overall analytical process.

It was stated that this definition needs to be included in the Glossary in Volume 1. The Focus Group also believes the Glossary from Volume 1 should be found in Volume 4 also.

- c. Larry Markel accepted the action item to address the discrepancy between the information required to be entered on a chain-of-custody form in the proposed language in Volume 2 with the list of information sample receiving personnel should expect to find on a chain-of-custody form in Section 3.3 of Volume 4 and propose language for Volume 4. This action item was discussed as the initial discussion topic of the meeting in Item I. above. With the revisions Larry suggested, the action item was closed.
- d. Eric Wyse accepted an action to research the references for the duplicate acceptance criteria for inorganic analyses found in Table 6-2 to ensure they are accurate and that the methods from which these criteria derive are known and provide results of this research to the Focus Group at the August meeting. Eric was not present at the August meeting, so this action is deferred to the next Focus Group meeting.
- e. At the July meeting, Larry Markel accepted an action to review the proposed revisions to Section 4.0 in Volume 1. Both Steve Smith and Larry Markel looked at this and proposed that the Focus Group no longer consider the revisions made to this Section in Volume 1 and to the Document Control section that would differentiate between the way

revisions and changes to Procedures and Methods are handled. The subject matter seemed to be causing a lot of confusion and was not going to be accepted by consensus without a great deal of effort. Therefore, it was suggested that the language revert to the way it was in Revision 3 of HASQARD and the new language be deleted from the proposed Revision 4 of Volume 1. The Focus Group Secretary will attempt to remove the new language from the files electronically between now and the next HASQARD Focus Group meeting.

- IV. The status of the preparations of Revision 4 for Volume 2 was discussed.
 - a. Chris Sutton stated that it has been a very busy sampling season this summer and no additional progress addressing the comments he received has been made since the last HASQARD Focus Group meeting.

- V. Actions to Complete Draft of HASQARD Volume 4, Revision 4
 - a. All items necessary to complete the draft of HASQARD Volume 4, Revision 4 are now captured in the Action Tracking Matrix as summarized in Item III above.

 - b. Realizing that only final reviews remain, the Focus Group discussed some of the final issues associated with publishing Revision 4. HASQARD is a DOE document and will need to be issued to the Contractors as a contract requirement by the Contracting Officers of RL and ORP. The Focus Group was also concerned about who would be required to provide technical editing support. It was mentioned that support of HASQARD efforts is in the MSA Contract and therefore it is assumed MSA has the lead to provide support for the technical editing for HASQARD. The lead organization for HASQARD has been DOE-ORP in the past and there was a question on whether this needs to be formally transferred to DOE-RL.

- VI. Discussion of Proposed Revisions to HASQARD Volume 1

All items necessary to complete the draft of HASQARD Volume 1, Revision 4 are now captured in the Action Tracking Matrix as summarized in Item III above.

The question of whether anything needs to be done to Volume 3 of HASQARD other than republish it as is with Revision 4 stamped on it was raised. The Focus Group agreed that someone should give it a scrub to make sure it is current and that there are not any outdated references, etc. contained in that Volume. No specific approach or assignees for this review were identified at this meeting of the Focus Group.

The Focus Group Chair would like the QC Tables that will be used in Revision 4 of

Volume 4 to be issued as a deminimis change to HASQARD as soon as possible rather than waiting for Revision 4 to be finalized. The Secretary took an **ACTION ITEM** to address this request.

The Focus Group Secretary stated that getting the document ready for final review will take some effort. The Focus Group appreciated that the end of the effort to produce Revision 4 of HASQARD is close. Because of this, the Focus Group suggested that a month off with no meeting may be in order as the document gets distributed for review and some of the final issues associated with its publication and technical editing are resolved. Hearing no objections, the Focus Group Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:54 PM.

The next meeting is scheduled for October 16, 2012 at 2:00 PM in 2420 Stevens, Room 308.