

**HASQARD Focus Group**  
Meeting Minutes  
December 3, 2019

The meeting was called to order by Sarah Nagel, the HASQARD Focus Group Chair, at 2:10 PM on December 3, 2019 in Conference Room 199 at 2430 Stevens Center Place.

Those attending were: Sarah Nagel – Focus Group Chair (Mission Support Alliance (MSA)), Cliff Watkins - Focus Group Secretary (Corporate Allocation Services, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (RL) Support Contractor), Samuel Adams (Battelle Memorial Institute – Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)), Billie Arthur (Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS)), Glen Clark (WRPS), Heather Medley (CH2MHILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC)), Anthony Nagel (CHPRC), Karl Pool (PNNL), Geoff Schramm (WRPS), Walter Scott (U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (ORP)), Noe'l Smith-Jackson (Washington State Department of Ecology), Tricia Wood (Wastren Hanford Laboratory).

- I. The Focus Group Chair requested review and approval of the meeting minutes from the HASQARD Focus Group held on September 18, 2019. The draft minutes were distributed and time was allowed for one final review. One additional editorial comment was provided. Hearing no additional comments and no objections to approval, the minutes from the September 18, 2019 meeting were approved.
  
- II. The HASQARD Focus Group has a standing agenda item to discuss the status of activities associated with the DOE Consolidated Audit Program – Accreditation Program (DOECAP-AP) at all HASQARD Focus Group meetings. This month, the following updates were discussed:
  - A. Glen Clark stated that in September, Robert Elkins of WRPS observed the DOECAP-AP assessment conducted by the accrediting body (AB) Perry Johnson Laboratory Accreditation, Inc. (PJLA) at the ALS Environmental laboratory in Salt Lake City (see the September 18, 2019 HASQARD Focus Group meeting minutes for a more complete summary of the comments Glen made about this assessment at that time). By way of follow-up to the comments Glen made in September, Glen reported that the assessment report for the ALS Salt Lake City assessment has been received by WRPS. The PJLA report includes 15 nonconformances. All of the nonconformances listed in the report are classified as “minor.” Robert Elkins attended the assessment with a specific interest in ALS Salt Lake’s performance of hexavalent chromium analysis. In reviewing continuing calibration verification (CCV) data generated by ALS Salt Lake, the assessor noticed peak integration issues (i.e., the automated integration routines used by the laboratory were not integrating the entire peak potentially leading to results reported with a low bias). In reviewing data received from ALS Salt Lake, WRPS has also noticed significant retention time shifts for hexavalent chromium peaks were occurring. The retention time shifts were sometimes as

large as one minute. Because of the observed issues with peak integration and retention time shift, WRPS has become concerned about the quality of data being produced by the High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) analysts at ALS Salt Lake. In addressing an unrelated issue, WRPS prepared and submitted spiked samples to ALS Salt Lake for analysis. One of the analytes present in the spiked samples was acrolein. This analyte is an analyte of interest for WRPS and the analytical results on the spiked samples provided by ALS Salt Lake indicated acrolein was not detected in the spiked samples. The WRPS interface with ALS Salt Lake asked the laboratory to determine why this is happening. Upon review, ALS Salt Lake determined that acrolein and acetone were eluting from the chromatograph at the same time. Because of that, the ALS Salt Lake personnel were interpreting the acrolein peak as an acetone peak and, because acetone was not an analyte of interest for WRPS, were not reporting a concentration for acrolein or acetone. After determining this technical problem with the analyses being conducted at ALS Salt Lake, WRPS has discontinued use of the laboratory for analysis of samples where acrolein is a target analyte. They have begun sending samples to be tested for aldehydes, including acrolein, to Columbia Basin Analytical Laboratories (CBAL).

Glen Clark also reported that in October, WRPS observed the PJLA assessment of the Eurofins laboratory in Fife, WA. At this assessment, the lead assessor was about ready to shut down the effort and reschedule it due to the fact that the laboratory was in a state of disarray. The Fife laboratory location is a Test America Laboratory that Eurofins was moving in to. The Eurofins corporation owns all of the Test America facilities. The Fife laboratory is being reconfigured to perform the analyses that Eurofins had previously performed in their Bothell, WA facility. Due to a delay in receiving building permits, the reconfiguration had not been completed at the time of arrival of the PJLA assessment team. The presence of construction crews made conduct of the assessment difficult but the lead assessor determined it would be possible. One section of the laboratory that could not be assessed due to incomplete construction was the area where the inductively couple plasma (ICP) metals analyses are to be conducted. Because of this, PJLA will exclude ICP metals from the accredited analyses until they can return and assess that portion of the laboratory. The WRPS employee observing this assessment, Glen Clark, was particularly interested in Eurofins' analysis of samples for dimethyl mercury. The laboratory indicated that the standard solution they have prepared for calibrating instruments was prepared several years ago. The stock solution used to prepare that standard was properly disposed of several years ago because it was very dangerous material to work with. The laboratory has a method for standardizing the prepared solution annually. The PJLA assessor conducting this portion of the assessment was also accredited to assess calibration Reference Material Producers under the ISO-17034, *General Requirements for the Competence of Reference Material Producers*, accreditation program. This background came into play as the assessor was able to provide Eurofins information on how to internally certify their dimethylmercury standard, which would allow them to validate their dimethylmercury method, as required for

DOECAP-AP accreditation. Glen asked the laboratory how they knew that the instrument response being obtained from the standard was all due to dimethylmercury and was not contributed by methylethylmercury or elemental mercury that could be present in the standard due to degradation. The laboratory did not have an adequate response to that line of inquiry.

Glen Clark also reported that in conversations he has held with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) laboratory accreditation program manager it has been stated by Ecology that there is a reciprocity process under which a DOECAP-AP accreditation could be recognized by Ecology as a State of Washington accreditation. With that stated, WRPS will continue to have laboratories accredited by the DOECAP-AP and ask laboratories to seek the Ecology reciprocity when required.

- B. The schedule for upcoming DOECAP-AP assessments at laboratories utilized by the Hanford contractors was discussed.

Scot Fitzgerald will be going to Test America St. Louis (TASL) the week of December 9.

- C. The HASQARD Focus Group has a standard agenda item to discuss any of the DOE Data Quality Workgroup DQW activities that have occurred since the last Focus Group meeting. The DOE DQW is the group responsible to coordinate DOE's input for all revisions to the *DoD/DOE Consolidated Quality System Manual for Environmental Laboratories* (QSM).

Since the last Focus Group meeting Glen Clark has communicated with Gary Griffin from the DOE DQW. The communication was on the material sent to the DOE-HQ Analytical Services Program manager, Steve Clark, requesting that items from the QSM Appendix E (HASQARD Checklist items not contained in the body of the QSM) be included in the text of the QSM. The suggestions proposed by the HASQARD Focus Group for inclusion of these items in the QSM is being received positively.

### III. The status of production of Revision 5 of HASQARD was discussed.

The Focus Group Secretary stated that he has received formal comments on HASQARD Volumes 1-4 from the CHPRC Environmental QA Lead and from the Ecology monitor for the Focus Group. The comments that have been received as of the meeting were printed and distributed to those in attendance to review. The subcommittee leads for revision of each of the Volumes were either present or represented by someone on their subcommittee. The written comments were reviewed by volume, some were discussed, and all were acceptably resolved.

Glen Clark stated that discussions between the Volume 1 and 4 subcommittee personnel regarding the applicability and appropriate placement of the discussion on

data usability assessment had been held. In the initial discussions it was agreed that the material on data usability found in Volume 4 should be moved to Volume 1. However, there was no logical place to put the data usability assessment discussion in Revision 5 of Volume 1 either. Upon further discussions, it was determined that Volume 2 should be where this material will reside in Revision 5. The Volume 2 subcommittee Chair, Geoff Schramm, agreed to insert this text in that Volume.

The Focus Group discussed the path forward for completion of HASQARD Revision 5.

It was stated that, to ensure the technical requirements being implemented by the laboratories are easily accessible to those needing to know them, a link to the QSM should be placed on the HASQARD website. The Focus Group Secretary took the action to ensure that a pdf version of the current version of the QSM is provided to the webmaster for placement on the HASQARD website.

The Focus Group discussed the path forward. The Secretary stated that he knew that comments from the CHPRC sample management organization had not been received and additional time for that review has been requested. Heather Medley stated that she believes the Volumes are in pretty good shape and suggested that the comments from her group be submitted during the final review of that documents after they have been through technical editing.

Heather Medley stated that the sample preservation table in Volume 2 may need some work. Heather stated she would send a suggested revision to the table currently in Volume 2 to Geoff Schramm for incorporation in Volume 2 prior to submittal to the technical editor.

Anthony Nagel suggested that the Secretary produce a dashboard indicating the status of review comments received to allow a quick and easily shareable reference to that status. The Secretary accepted the action item to produce something to indicate review comment status.

#### IV. The Focus Group Chair asked if there was any new business for the Focus Group.

Sam Adams suggested that a post-work get together be organized as a Holiday celebration. The Secretary said that if someone sent a note suggesting a date, time and location it would be forwarded to the Focus Group and those that could/wanted to would have the option to attend.

Sam Adams stated that he is an executive member of the American Society for Quality (ASQ) and was aware of training resources for both lead auditor and software quality assurance training. The Focus Group members present stated that HAMMER offers lead auditor training a few times per year so there is likely little need for that. However, there was lots of interest expressed for training in software QA to come to Hanford. Sam agreed to look into that possibility.

Hearing no additional new business, the Focus Group Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:07 PM.

The next meeting of the HASQARD Focus Group will occur on January 22 at 2:00 PM in 2430 Stevens Center Place, Room 199.