

HASQARD Focus Group
Meeting Minutes
March 18, 2010

The meeting was called to order by Don Hart, Focus Group Chairman, at 2:00 PM on March 18, 2010 in Conference Room 408 at 2420 Stevens.

Those attending were: Lynn Albin, Heather Anastos, Glen Clark, Kathi Dunbar, Robert Elkins, Cindy English, Kris Kuhl-Klinger, Larry Markel, Huei Meznarich, Jerry Oelerich, Karl Pool, Steve Smith, Noe'l Smith-Jackson, Andrew Stevens, Chris Sutton, Wendy Thompson, Rich Weis, and Michael Barnes (visitor – WDOE).

Jerry Oelerich (WRPS) and Mike Barnes introduced themselves. Mike was visiting for the current meeting. Jerry has been working with Larry Markel and was joining the group so he could better participate in the processes affected by HASQARD.

Don Hart requested comments on the minutes for the preceding meeting. Don identified that the minutes would be modified to add Steve Smith as the Charter Concurrence from CHPRC and Dave Shugar would be shown for WRPS. Hearing none, he called for approval of the minutes. A motion was made, seconded, and the voting members voted to approve the corrected minutes with no dissensions.

The Action Tracking matrix was discussed. The following updates were provided:

Don has discussed with Ms. Arakali her participation in HASQARD. At this time WTP management does not plan to participate in the focus group until the requirement is added to their contract. In the meantime she said she would be interested in seeing meeting minutes and records of other discussions to keep her abreast of our current activities. Don said he would discuss this with her immediate management to determine the most successful approach. Action item will be closed.

The HASQARD Focus Group Charter has been distributed for review. There were no additional comments and the charter will be circulated for signature. Kris Kuhl-Klinger and Steve Smith have signed them and they will be circulated to the respective individuals for signature. PNNL will identify the specific individual shortly to sign for them.

Action Items initiated as a result of this discussion: “Review and send notice of approval of the revised HASQARD Focus Group Charter to Don Hart.” This action will be assigned to the identified signers and “Collect signatures from designated signatories to the HASQARD Focus Group Charter” assigned to Don Hart.

Al Hawkins has identified an approach to communicate DOE’s expectations for incorporating Focus Group interpretations of HASQARD requirements in the document without a new letter from DOE contracting officers (COs) going out to the companies identifying each new interpretation. The CO’s have agreed to the letter and it is moving through the issuing organizations. As soon as it is out the open

action on taping of containers will be posted to the web site. The action to issue the letter to the companies will remain on the tracking matrix and Al Hawkins has indicated that a goal date of 4/30/10 for issuance of the letters is optimistic.

Development of a process for including interpretations in the HASQARD is related to learning how to most easily post things to the HASQARD web site. DOE-ORP has agreed to continue to host the HASQARD web site and provide resources to help the HASQARD Focus Group representatives to post new material to the site. The action item remains open with Don Hart and Cliff Watkins to meet with ORP web site personnel to learn how best to accomplish this.

Eric Wyse was not present, but members present said he had distributed some communication regarding his issue on MDL determinations. The distribution of the material did not include all HASQARD Focus Group members. Cliff Watkins requested that someone forward the note to him so he could disseminate it to the entire Focus Group so that all that may be interested could review the material. Notes were forwarded.

The discussion of the action item associated with determining the appropriateness “should” vs. “shall” language in Volume 4 of HASQARD resulted in agreement that this effort should interface with the HASQARD to DOECAP comparison that will be initiated. The action item will be dropped pending results of the HASQARD vs. DOECAP requirements review.

Eric Wyse was not present, but members present said he had distributed some communication regarding his previous HASQARD vs. DOECAP requirements gap analysis. The distribution of the material did not include all HASQARD Focus Group members. Cliff Watkins requested that someone forward the note to him so he could disseminate it to the entire Focus Group so that all that may be interested could review the material. Material sent out.

The QSAS section and appendix on NDA was reviewed by Don Hart and Wendy Thompson assisting as needed. Don said he examined the specifics of the NDA requirements in QSAS and also in the specifics of the CHPRC and MSA requirements documents. Those documents were PRC-RD-EN-10484 “Nondestructive Assay Management Program”, and MSA – RD – EN-10484, same subject. In general the QSAS requirements were based on sending samples to a laboratory where the work would be done in fixed NDA systems. The two requirements documents were much more developed for the field of NDA and cited both fixed and portable NDA and a comprehensive ANSI standard. The QSAS appendix cited a different ANSI standard and so was written more as a procedure than an evaluation tool. It was recommended that the NDA portion of Section 6 and appendix E from QSAS not be incorporated into HASQARD and that the existing program standards presented a better option for the Hanford Site. That recommendation was accepted by the Focus Group.

The action to look at the assessment periodicity in HASQARD had not been performed. The statement in section 10.4 under question is “The adequacy of the quality system and its implementation shall be assessed annually as an independent assessment. An external assessment may be used to fulfill this requirement.” The need for the annual periodicity was where the question was raised.

Reported from Task Team for Revision of Volume II, rev 3, Sampling
Chris Sutton reported that the task group had met and were moving forward to evaluate the sections of the volume. The team is utilizing approximately 15 to 20 relevant documents and doing a section by section review of the documents. The sampling process is being viewed for the CHPRC activities, WCH activities and the TOC activities. The tank operations are a new area for this particular volume because the previous volumes addressed the environmental sampling processes. The approach is for the task team to do the review, propose changes and agree on those changes or elevate them to the Focus Group for resolution. It is expected that when the group is completed that they will have a revised volume for the focus group to examine and the specific method for that review was queried by Chris Sutton. The concern was the task team putting in all the work to revise it and then the Focus Group as a whole does a word by word review the document and it takes an extraordinary time to get out. The Focus Group felt that the following was needed:

On completion of various parts of the document or as a whole the task team should provide a briefing to the group on the major changes or issues and how they dealt with them.

The task force represents the expertise of the group. If there is not a major problem the Focus Group should be examining the approach will it work for their operations, is there an impact not recognized and be prepared to present the position to their company management and/or contracting officers.

The Focus Group should have the opportunity to review a copy with track-changes indicating where it was changed from the previous volume. Issues should be exception based.

The Focus Group will review this process as we proceed not only with Volume II but also with the results of Volume I and IV QSAS and HASQARD comparison reports. Chris said their next meeting was on March 30, 2010. Chris said they thought this review process would take approximately 3 months to get completed through a first draft or approximately June 30, 2010.

Report of Sub teams on Identifying Gaps between QSAS and HASQARD

a. Organic Team – Glen Clark, Robert Elkins, Cliff Watkins, Eric Wyse

Glen Clark reported that they had done a first evaluation using the checklists from QSAS and corresponding to HASQARD. (Glen noted that Cliff Watkins had worked feverishly to get the checklist completed.) Gaps between the two were identified and the group needed to evaluate the results. In particular the Organic team saw a need for a singular view of the requirements in Chapter 5 of QSAS because they applied to all methodologies. He recognized there may be some specific items that they should

reach back to for their evaluation from Chapter 5 but the requirements appeared universal and so if they were going to be pulled back into HASQARD may be better to evaluate as a separate group. They will meet one or two additional times before the next meeting.

b. Inorganic team – Heather Anastos, Chris Thompson, Jim Jewett, Eric Wyse

Heather Anastos reported that the inorganic team had met and looked at how to proceed with their review. Much like the organic group they were focused around how to handle Chapter 5 and they were concerned that the review would not capture the implementation of the regulatory methods as well as implementation of QSAS. This group also recommended that a review of chapter be done by one separate group and not each of the Analytical Groups.

The team identified that it would use the DOECAP inorganic checklist by creating a crosswalk of QSAS/SW-846/HASQARD requirements. They will categorize their review as

- HASQARD and QSAS requirements are comparable or
- HASQARD and QSAS requirements are not comparable or
- HASQARD does not address the QSAS requirements.

They will meet again on April 15 to report within the team on the various sections of the checklist and to complete by April 30 a compiled list.

c. Radiochemistry team – Joan Kessner, Rich Weiss, Huei Meznarich, Karl Pool and Eric Weis

Rich Weiss reported that the team had met and had decided to use the approach of the evaluating HASQARD to the QSAS radiochemistry check list. They had discussed the various items on the checklist and will evaluate assigned portions of the checklist. The team will meet again on April 28 to review the completed work and pull the assessment together. This team felt that they needed to integrate the Chapter 5 criteria processes with the radiochemistry checklists unlike what the two other teams were suggesting.

Approach: Each of the teams needed to get more into their checklist review and determine the difficulty experience with either including or excluding Chapter 5 from the review. This was to lead to a decision to do a uniform review of Chapter 5 or to incorporate it into each section.

***Editorial Note:** In looking at the content of Chapter 5 there may be another approach. The first several sections of chapter 5 appear to address requirements which remind one of general QA requirements. In particular this could include section 5.1 through 5.6 and 5.10. Sections 5.7 through 5.9 appear to be more specific to the method type. It may make some sense to therefore include this first group in*

the review done by the group reviewing Chapter 4 and the second set of sections to be examined by each team.

d. Quality Assurance/Management Systems – Steve Smith, Taffy Almeida, Cindy English, Larry Markel, Kris Kuhl-Klinger and Kathi Dunbar

This team had their first meeting on March 18 and agreed that they would evaluate each section of QSAS to the specific set of words in HASQARD to identify the potential gaps. A first pass at this approach is estimated to be completed by the end of April.

Don Hart reiterated that the purpose was

- to clearly understand the gaps,
- to evaluate and recommend what specific items should be moved into HASQARD in some manner,
- to identify those things where it was not appropriate to move into HASQARD and why,
- to gain consensus on those conclusions bearing in mind the need for consistency across the groups and then
- to actually write up the changes.

In view of the actions for Volume II as well as this exercise which impacts most of Volumes I and IV Don Hart agreed to develop a straw man schedule for evaluation by the focus group at its next meeting. (Don did warn the group that his schedules were done using pencil and paper and not computer tools so hopefully they would be sufficient for people.)

The next meeting has been scheduled for April 15, 2010 at 2 PM, in room 408, 2420 Stevens Center.

Don Hart announced that he was retiring after more than 39 years on March 31, 2010. R J Lee Group is working on a replacement chairperson and will coordinate with Al Hawkins. When the individual has been designated an informational note will be sent to the Focus Group.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 PM.