

**HASQARD Focus Group**  
Meeting Minutes  
February 25, 2014

The meeting was called to order by Huei Meznarich, HASQARD Focus Group Chair at 2:07 PM on February 25, 2014 in Conference Room 308 at 2420 Stevens.

Those attending were: Huei Meznarich (Focus Group Chair), Cliff Watkins (Focus Group Secretary), Lynn Albin, Taffy Almeida, Joe Archuleta, Glen Clark, Robert Elkins, Scot Fitzgerald, Joan Kessner, Mary McCormick-Barger, Karl Pool, Noe'l Smith-Jackson, Chris Sutton, Chris Thompson, and Eric Wyse.

- I. Huei Meznarich asked if there were any comments on the minutes from the January 28, 2014 meeting. No Focus Group members stated they had additional comments on the January meeting minutes and, after hearing a motion and second for approval, the minutes were approved.
  
- II. A discussion of the latest efforts to complete Revision 4 of HASQARD was held:
  - a. Prior to discussing the first agenda topic, Mary McCormick-Barger asked a question related to the January meeting minutes. The New Business section of the January minutes included mention of the gap analysis conducted between HASQARD Volumes 1, 2, and 4 Rev 3 and the DOECAP/QSAS in producing the revision 4 of HASQARD. Mary asked if because DOECAP has decided to move from the QSAS to a new interagency QA document as the basis for DOECAP requirements whether a gap analysis should be done to that document as well. The Focus Group members present explained that the QSAS gap analysis, and its reconciliation, was the basis for producing HASQARD Revision 4. This effort has been underway for most of four years. To begin a new gap analysis would add several months to the process of publishing Rev 4 of HASQARD. Also, there has never been a need to ensure HASQARD and the QSAS, or the new Interagency QA document, were identical or that HASQARD was at least as prescriptive as any other document. The HASQARD to QSAS gap analysis was done to ensure the latest practices were considered and incorporated in HASQARD as the Focus Group determined a benefit.
  
  - b. As part of an action item from the January meeting, Huei Meznarich presented a summary of quality control acceptance criteria for the SW-846 inorganic methods in the most recent Update V as published in the Federal Register (October 23, 2013). There were five revised chapters to SW-846 and twenty three methods in the Federal Register publication of Update V (eight new and fifteen revised methods). The Federal Register updates in

the five revised chapters include format changes, editing, allowance of flexibilities, instrument detection limits for metal analyses, removal of a second set of samples without adding an acid preservative for vinyl chloride and styrene, replacement of method detection limit with lower limit of quantitation, etc. The summary presented by Huei to the Focus Group was tailored to five inorganic methods (metals analyses and cyanide determination). Huei also included the quality control criteria in the inorganic methods in the current SW-846 (i.e., hexavalent chromium and anions analysis) in the summary. It was verified during the meeting that the other QC criteria (e.g. laboratory control sample and Lower Limit of Quantitation) in the current Revision 4 of HASQARD Volume 4 were not in conflict with the current SW-846 or Update V methods.

By way of a proposal, Huei incorporated blank acceptance criteria that reflected either 50% or 10% of the regulatory limits in HASQARD Table 6-2 presented this proposal to the Focus Group for comment. The Secretary took the action to distribute the summary table to the Focus Group members. The Focus Group requested a month to review the summary table to determine if any unexpected impacts could occur. If the Focus Group has changes to the proposed QC criteria, Huei stated that it should be no problem to incorporate these changes even after the editor finishes final editing of the document.

- c. The status of production of a final draft for Revision 4 of Volume 4 was discussed. Huei Meznarich reported that the technical editor was supposed to be back from her short term disability on February 18 and should be able to continue the final editing of Volume 4. Huei stated that she hopes to be able to distribute Volume 4 for final review before the next Focus Group meeting.
- d. The Focus Group discussed a vote on Volume 2. Chris Thompson stated that Taffy Almeida had made a few comments he wished the Focus Group to consider prior to a vote. Taffy had provided these comments in electronic media to the Secretary but not in time for him to have the electronic comments at the meeting. Taffy brought printed pages of her comments and the Secretary used the latest electronic mark-up to highlight the location and nature of Taffy's comments for discussion. All of Taffy's comments were resolved to her satisfaction as noted on the hard copy sheets by the Secretary. The hard copy comment sheets were provided to the Focus Group Chair to ensure the technical editor incorporates the resolution to the comments in the final document. The Focus Group Chair asked if the voting members were ready for a vote. Joe Archuleta had submitted his vote in favor of approving the document in absentia to the Focus Group Chair. All other voting members were present. The voting members voted unanimously to approve Volume 2.

- e. The status of review and comments on Volume 3 was discussed. The Secretary stated that no comments on Volume 3 have been received to date except Eric Wyse's question on whether the mention of "process monitoring" in Volume 3 indicated that waste treatment and vitrification plant (WTP) may be required to use HASQARD. Chris Sutton explained that process monitoring was added to address the kinds of testing done in the field at the groundwater pump and treat facilities. In the past, WTP has stated that they will not be using HASQARD and will use NQA-1 as the basis for their analytical laboratory's QA program.

Noel Smith-Jackson stated she remembered a correspondence from Ecology to Bechtel National (BNI) stating an expectation that BNI participate in the HASQARD Focus Group. The correspondence is dated and it is not known whether the statements in the correspondence are consistent with current ORP and/or Ecology policy. Noel took the action to investigate this correspondence and whether WTP will be requested to participate in HASQARD development. The Focus Group reviewed the language in Volume 1 to see if it explicitly excluded WTP. Current sentences that imply WTP should be included include one stating, "HASQARD applies to work done to support process chemistry analysis (e.g., on-going site waste treatment and characterization operations) and R&D projects related to the Hanford Site environmental clean-up mission." HASQARD Volume 1 only specifies exclusion from the scope of HASQARD for operations associated with U.S. Department of Defense samples, the Hanford Radiation Control Program, Industrial Hygiene Program samples and exploratory research.

**NOTE:** As a follow-up to this discussion, Noel Smith-Jackson sent an e-mail to the Focus Group that said, "At the HASQARD meeting yesterday, a topic of discussion was the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and its association, or lack of, with the HASQARD Focus Group. I stated at the meeting that about ten years ago Ecology sent a letter to Bechtel National which discussed the importance of their participation with the group to ensure that the laboratory quality controls that are required for the Hanford Site are also implemented at the WTP. I located the letter that was sent on March 23, 2005 to Bruce Kaiser, BNI. The HASQARD chairman at the time was Dr. Mark Marcus, who was also copied on the letter. The Ecology Nuclear Waste Program lead chemist, Jerry Yokel, will be revisiting this issue with our Tank Waste Treatment Section manager to discuss this issue once again."

Chris Sutton explained that what was sent to the Focus Group for review and comment was a rough draft of Volume 3 that he expected would result in several comments being discussed at the Focus Group meeting(s) until resolved. Scot Fitzgerald stated that his intent was ensure nomenclature used in the draft Rev 4 of Volume 4 was incorporated in Volume 3 and to accommodate the process monitoring done at the pump and treat facilities.

Scot understood the issues of incorporating the term process monitoring as it relates to confusion regarding WTP operations. A proposal to differentiate between “process monitoring” and “process control” made and Scot Fitzgerald accepted the action to review Volume 3 for use of the term process monitoring and revise it to process control and provide definitions to distinguish between the terms. Once Scot has completed that revision, he will send it out for review and comment again.

- f. The Focus Group discussed the Software QA language provided by Joe Archuleta for incorporation in Volume 1. Language concerning commercial off the shelf software and instrument control software was discussed and the proposed language edited accordingly. It was not clear what the requirements in QSAS for instrument software are (if any). Chris Sutton suggested that additional requirements, if needed, can be added to the section to address instrument control software. The revisions made will be provided to the Focus Group Chair for the technical editor to add to Volume 1 during the editing process prior to final review of Volume 1.

- III. The Focus Group Chair asked if there was any new business. No new business was identified.

The Focus Group Chair suggested that the meeting be adjourned. Hearing no objections, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:09 PM.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 18, 2014 at 2:00 PM in 2420 Stevens, Room 308.