

## QA/QC Workgroup Meeting

March 22, 2012

1. Attendees: Murage Ngatia, Bill Burkhard, Kelley Pepper, Don Guy, Bill Templin
2. Location of Workgroup Documents: Murage has loaded the previous QA policy documents on the 'nasdes' shared drive.
  - a. **Action Item: Murage will load WREM 60 in the shared drive folder.**
3. Mission Statement of the Workgroup: This should describe why the group exists. It should indicate that QA and QC are dynamic processes.
  - a. Background of the program: QA/QC was authorized by WREM 60. WREM 60 requires a department wide QA/QC program and policy. The policy was signed by the Director in 1992 and is on the shared drive. Program managers are in charge of the policy's implementation. WREM 60 does not necessarily need to be updated to provide teeth or authority. The EPA provides guidelines about QA/QC for environmental monitoring.
  - b. Mission Statement Discussion: The statements should include the continual update of methods as the group stays on top of the science. Should we look towards bringing awareness to QA/QC or work towards minimum standards? The minimum standards are already set based on the 1998 QA/QC policy document but few staff is aware of the document. Not many employees know they exist. There is a 2006 law that addresses statewide water quality. The Environmental Coordination Committee's Water Quality subcommittee is also discussing QA issues. The group could work backwards to find the appropriate mission statement.
    - i. **Action Item: Everyone will put their ideas for a mission statement on the shared drive before the next meeting.**
4. Workgroup Meeting Ground Rules
  - a. Murage sent attachments with the meeting request describing how to create successful meetings. The group will follow these ideas.
  - b. There are lots of personal views from each person and each is motivated.
  - c. Keep cell phones off during meetings.
5. QC Definition: Bill Burkhard's presentation
  - a. There are three parts to the definition of quality control: protocols, competence, and character.
  - b. Should the word "character" be included in the definition? Should it be changed because of perception? Should this portion refer to the training and management of data and possibly hiring procedures? What can supervisors/project managers do about employees who don't care about the process, product, or equipment? There is the possibility of job rotation so if there is a person who does not care in the rotation, they can be kept from field work and data collection. Character can partially be controlled by the supervisor through management techniques and performance management. This is a disciplinary issue if the person is not doing their job. The supervisor can send the

person to do a blind sample. This is why blind samples are sent to the lab and certified standards. The problem was that others in the department would not use the contracts. A suggestion is to instigate a QA process so the group can check the data.

- c. There is an existing definition in the Department created QA/QC training class binder in two places: pages 6 and 46.
6. Environmental Monitoring QC Framework
    - a. The EPA guides and produces framework for QA/QC processes. Murage hands out visual and written ideas of framework. The department should be run on the same structure QA/QC classes reinforce the framework and maybe we should include project charter template (from Project Management Workshop).
    - b. Every project should answer one or two questions. If there are any more questions, the project should be split. Otherwise, you are setting yourself up for failure.
  7. Discussion
    - a. There are individual groups in the department who run a QA/QC program including the Bryte Lab and others who deal with regulatory agencies.
    - b. Bryte Lab is working towards becoming SWAMP compliant with their QA/QC standards. Bryte Lab is ELAP certified.
    - c. Bryte's data does not go on CEDEN's website. The information CEDEN wants on their site is similar to the data that the WDL incorporates. The WDL does not show QC data to the public but neither does CEDEN.
    - d. Dale Hoffman-Floerke represents the department at California Water Quality Monitoring Council meetings and the QA/QC workgroup should know what is happening in those meetings.
    - e. QA/QC classes are provided. The next class is in May. They used to be put on in-house but became too time consuming so they are now contracted out. There are files available from the period the class was taught by the department staff.
      - i. **Action Item: Murage will put the documents from the old QA/QC classes on the shared drive.**
    - f. The following questions were raised: What do you do with the lab data once it is given to you? How do you create data quality objectives? Who in the department can explain the data validation? Sid can but the project manager should be able to explain it as well. The QA/QC data package should as well. If the project manager creates data quality objectives in the beginning of the project, they should be able to validate their data.
    - g. Who should this group encompass and what measures should it include? The workgroup could possibly encompass the department but it should start with the division. It will cover water and soil measurements for now and can possibly expand to biological measurements.
      - h. **Action Item: Murage will provide a MWQI report that shows the data quality objectives. It is included in all of their reports.**
      - i. **Potential Action Item: Kelley or Bruce Agee can provide a presentation on FLIMS.**
      - j. **Action Item: Someone will share SOP's for a sampling plan.**