

HASQARD Focus Group
Meeting Minutes
April 27, 2010

The meeting was called to order by Cliff Watkins, Focus Group Secretary, at 2:00 PM on April 27, 2010 in Conference Room 208 at 2425 Stevens.

Those attending were: Dave Crawford (Chair), Cliff Watkins (Secretary), Heather Anastos, Glen Clark, Robert Elkins, Cindy English, Kris Kuhl-Klinger, Joan Kessner, Huei Meznarich, Jerry Oelerich, Karl Pool, Steve Smith, Andrew Stevens, Chris Sutton, Chris Thompson, Wendy Thompson, and Eric Wyse.

- I. Cliff Watkins introduced the new Chair of the HASQARD Focus Group, Dave Crawford of RJ Lee Group. Because there were several people Dave had not met, Dave requested those present to introduce themselves and identify their company affiliation.
- II. Dave Crawford introduced himself and provided details on his background and expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work with the Focus Group.
- III. Dave Crawford requested comments on the minutes for the preceding meeting. There was some confusion regarding whether the minutes had been distributed. The Secretary was not in attendance at the preceding meeting, but had distributed the minutes received to the Focus Group on March 25. Because of the confusion, it was agreed that the minutes should be redistributed for approval at the next meeting. The Secretary took the action to redistribute the March 18 meeting minutes. Dave Crawford suggested an internal e-mail feature be used that allows recipients of the minutes to indicate approval of the minutes by clicking an "Approval" button associated with the note transmitting the minutes. Huei Meznarich took the **action item** to set-up the next minutes transmission with the approval function.
- IV. The Action Tracking matrix was discussed. The following updates were provided:
 - a. The activity of allowing customer specific QA requirements to be addressed in work orders throughout the HASQARD will be addressed in the revision to the HASQARD that is expected as a result of the QSAS to HASQARD evaluation that is on-going. This action will be closed from the active tracking matrix assuming it will be addressed as the revised HASQARD is prepared.
 - b. The process for handling inclusion of interpretations to HASQARD requirements agreed to by the Focus Group has been determined. Interpretations and de minimis changes will be posted on the HASQARD

web-site. The Secretary has not had time to become proficient in getting these interpretations posted and has taken the **action item** to become familiar with the process and report to the Focus Group when a process is finalized.

- c. Al Hawkins has completed the task of communicating 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. Al worked with DOE-RL COs in issuing a letter to each company stating, in part, *"Where the Focus Group determines a change or interpretation to the HASQARD is de minimis (an editorial change or interpretation clarifying but not modifying a requirement – example attached), contractors will be notified by electronic mail and the change or interpretation will be placed on the Focus Group website (<http://www.hanford.gov/olp/?page=1411&parent=14>). When the Focus Group determines that a change or interpretation to the HASQARD is de minimis, no impact analysis will be requested by the Contracting Officer (CO) and the contractor's implementation of the change or interpretation will be determined to have no cost or schedule impacts. If the contractor disagrees and believes there is an impact, the contractor shall notify the CO of such impact in accordance with FAR 52.243-7, Notification of Changes."* The action item is completed and will be moved to the completed actions matrix.
- d. The HASQARD Focus Group Charter has been signed by all signatories identified and was approved by the DOE-ORP representative, Andrew Stevens, at the meeting. This leaves only one approval signature left to complete the action. Cindy English took the **action item** to obtain the DOE-RL approval signature from Al Hawkins.
- e. The action item associated with the language requiring periodic assessments and what the HASQARD Focus Group's interpretation of that language is was tabled. Huei Meznarich took the **action item** to forward some details on this issue to the Secretary for distribution to allow a meaningful discussion of the topic at the next Focus Group meeting. The specific issue has to do with the frequency of assessments required in Section 10 of Volume 1 of the HASQARD.

V. The status on the subcommittees established to compare the QSAS and HASQARD requirements was provided by the coordinator for each subcommittee:

- a. Sampling: Chris Sutton (Coordinator), Wendy Thompson;

Chris Sutton reported that a group has been formed to prepare a revision to

Volume 2 of the HASQARD. The group has held several meetings. They have agreed to the rewritten sections 1-3 with only a few editorial issues yet to be resolved. The next meeting of this group is scheduled for May 5 where they plan to project the proposed wording for the document and interactively edit it real-time. Chris reported that because the RI/FS sampling is beginning in the areas in May, progress will likely be slowed and anticipates a schedule slip.

- b. Organic Analysis: Glen Clark (Coordinator), Robert Elkins and Cliff Watkins

Glen Clark reported that the organic analysis team has completed a review of the DOECAP checklist to identify if all items assessed by the DOECAP are also contained in the HASQARD. The subcommittee met on April 27 and determined the next step will be to two things. For the indentified gaps, the subcommittee will try to determine the driver for the requirement in the DOECAP checklist. If the basis for a DOECAP requirement is an analytical method or is required by one site's contract, it is likely these items would be an unnecessary addition to HASQARD. The second effort will be to go through the QSAS to ensure that all DOE specific requirements in the QSAS (as represented in the gray boxes placed in the QSAS) are also captured in the DOECAP lines of inquiry. This will ensure all relevant QA requirements of the QSAS have been assessed against the HASQARD regardless of whether they are present or missing on the DOECAP checklist. The group expects to have these next two efforts completed by the next HASQARD Focus Group meeting.

- c. Inorganic Analysis: Chris Thompson (Coordinator), Heather Anastos, Jim Jewett, Eric Wyse

Heather Anastos reported that a similar effort to that of the organic team is underway. She acknowledged the idea associated with the DOE-specific requirements review being done by the organic team and said they will include that in their effort.

- d. Radiochemistry: Joan Kessner (Coordinator), Rich Weiss, Huei Meznarich, Karl Pool, Eric Wyse

Joan Kessner reported that the radiochemistry team plans to take the same approach as the organic and inorganic subcommittees but that they have not had time to meet but planned to meet on April 28. They have divided the effort up and two subcommittee members have completed their assignments but the others have not due to urgent work priorities.

- e. Quality Assurance/Management Systems: Steve Smith (Coordinator), Taffy Almeida, Cindy English, Larry Markel, Kris Kuhl-Klinger, and

Kathi Dunbar:

Steve Smith reported that the subcommittee has completed their review of the QSAS to HASQRD gap analysis. They have begun to prepare a red-lined copy of the relevant sections of the HASQARD that would be required to ensure consistency in the general QA requirements between the two documents.

f. Section 5:

A discussion was held about who was working on Section 5 of the QSAS as it relates to the other sections. No specific Section 5 subcommittee exists but the HASQARD Focus Group meeting minutes of March 18 included the following:

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.”*

None of the groups have completed this specific action Steve Smith volunteered to take the **action item** to report to each subcommittee on where material in Section 5 will need to be addressed by their group.

VI. Don Hart’s Schedule

A discussion was held regarding the schedule Don Hart issued for completion of the QSAS to HASQARD gap analysis and HASQARD revision activities. It was decided that putting the graphic in a more easily read format would be beneficial for determining if the schedule looks valid, achievable and consistent with the actual proposed activities of the subcommittees. Dave Crawford took the **action item** to put the schedule into an electronic format that allows printing the schedule in a Gantt chart format that easier to read and distribute to the Focus Group.

VII. New Business

- a. Chris Sutton brought up the concept of using some form of electronic chain-of-custody to increase productivity in the field. His interests were in whether anybody thought there were any fundamental issues with using electronic chain-of-custody and maintaining compliance with the HASQARD requirements. The group discussed the fact that there are several different “mechanics” on how electronic chain of custody might be used in the field, none of which have been selected as a preferred alternative at the time of the meeting. Chris took the **action item** to provide the Focus Group with several “story board” presentations on how electronic chain-of-custody might be used. This would provide the group greater detail on determining if HASQARD would interfere with the use of one or more of the proposed techniques. The general feeling of the Focus Group was that there would (or should) not be anything in the HASQARD to preclude use of electronic chain-of-custody.

- b. Eric Wyse discussed the issues with the way method detection limits are prescribed in the HASQARD. He would like to see us the Focus Group discuss a revision to the current manner in which MDLs are approached in the HASQARD. It would be beneficial to move toward an approach where you determine a quantification limit and then verify the method detection limit based on that level. Also, to be consistent with most analytical QA requirements a frequency for the determination of MDLs should be specified in the HASQARD. Eric was not suggesting that determination of MDLs be eliminated; just that specifications or guidance concerning the method of determining them should be provided. He believes the HASQARD should also provide guidance on what (or how many) matrices MDLs must be determined for, whether they are required on different instruments or not, etc. There was no representation from the regulators at this meeting of the Focus Group, so it was agreed this matter needs to be tabled to ensure their input is provided. No specific action items were assigned as a result of this issue. It was just tabled as a matter to be discussed and considered in future Focus Group meetings.

Hearing no additional new business, Dave Crawford adjourned the meeting at 3:14 PM.