

**HASQARD Focus Group**  
Meeting Minutes  
April 19, 2011

The meeting was called to order by Huei Meznarich who was acting for the absent Dave Crawford, Focus Group Chairman at 2:04 PM on April 19, 2011 in Conference Room 208 at 2425 Stevens.

Those attending were: Huei Meznarich (Acting Chair), Cliff Watkins (Secretary), Taffy Almeida, Heather Anastos, Courtney Blanchard, Jeff Cheadle, Glen Clark, Kathie Dunbar, Robert Elkins, Scot Fitzgerald, Greg Holte, Joan Kessner, Noe'l Smith-Jackson, Chris Sutton, Cindy Taylor, Chris Thompson, Amanda Tuttle, Eric Wyse.

- I. Huei Meznarich requested approval of the minutes from the March 15, 2011 meeting. The Secretary noted that the comments made were shown in the text of the minutes distributed. No Focus Group members present stated any comments on the March meeting minutes and, after hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.
- II. The Action Tracking matrix was discussed:
  - a. The action item related to organizing a working group to address the HASQARD language regarding independent assessments to ensure the language addresses all organizations requiring assessments (i.e., sampling organizations and laboratories), acceptable methods for meeting the independent assessment requirement, the thoroughness of the assessment and the frequency required was discussed. The Secretary was under the impression that the independent assessment being scheduled for this summer at WSCF resolved the issue at least until Rev. 4 of HASQARD can be approved with revised language. Huei Meznarich indicated that this was not the case and a deminimis change still needs to be posted on the HASQARD web site. The Secretary and Huei will address this matter again and report back to the Focus Group. The action was deferred one more month.
  - b. The issue of the posted deminimis language for use of custody seals was discussed. Jim Conca and Huei Meznarich have agreed that the language proposed by CHPRC personnel on November 29, 2010 is acceptable but suggested that a temperature specification for cooled samples be stated as  $<6^{\circ}\text{C}$  rather than  $4^{\circ}\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$ . They also requested CHPRC to specific language concerning the term "shipping container" to ensure it reflects current practices. Chris Sutton took the **Action Item** to check the language with CHPRC sampling personnel and provide the final language to the Focus Group for concurrence vote at the May meeting. If approved, the Secretary will post the deminimis change on the HASQARD web site after the May meeting.

- c. The schedule for presentation of the subcommittee recommendations for revision to the HASQARD document was discussed. The schedule will be updated based on input at this meeting (see item IV below) and provided in hard copy form at the May meeting.
- d. At the February 15 meeting, Rich Weiss took the action to determine if language concerning customer complaints proposed for Section 5.1 by the QA subcommittee should be placed elsewhere in the HASQARD. Rich was absent from this meeting and had not addressed the action item prior to the meeting date. Joan Kessner said she would remind Rich he has this action pending. Completion of this action was rescheduled to May 17.
- e. At the March Focus Group meeting the QA subcommittee presented proposed revisions to the quality records section of HASQARD. The title of Section 6.1 in HASQARD is "Quality Records." In March, the Focus Group members discussed the fact that some of the records listed in this section were not quality records. At that time, Eric Wyse noted that the terms "records" and "quality records" seem to be used interchangeably in HASQARD, therefore removing the modifier "quality" before the term "record" might be appropriate. During the March meeting Huei Meznarich accepted the action item to research the difference between quality records and records and propose a resolution to the words used in this section to clarify requirements associated with records. Huei did not have the opportunity to complete this action prior to the April meeting and requested that the completion of this action be rescheduled to May 17.
- f. At the March Focus Group meeting the QA subcommittee presented a proposed requirement that says: "All generated data, except those that are generated by automated data collection systems, shall be directly, promptly and in permanent ink." At the March meeting Rich Weiss noted this is an antiquated requirement and does not apply to an automated world because data can be collected in other than automated data collection systems. In March the Focus Group felt like the reference to permanent ink may not be necessary in this section regardless of its presence elsewhere in the document. At the March meeting Steve Smith accepted the action item to determine if the requirement to record entries in permanent ink is found elsewhere in HASQARD (e.g., the notebooks/logbooks section). Because Steve Smith was not present for the April meeting, completion of this action was rescheduled to May 17.

III. An agenda item was requested by Glen Clark regarding the March HASQARD Focus Group meeting discussion of a proposed revision to HASQARD Section 6.7.1 made by the organic subcommittee. The proposed revision addressed the data collection requirements for organic analysis instrument run logs and bench sheets. The proposed revision was sent to the Focus Group membership so they could perform a more detailed review for

consideration of whether to approve inclusion of the proposed language or not. The Secretary sent the proposed language, along with Huei Meznarich's reasons for not including any of the additional language, to the Focus Group via e-mail on April 13.

Glen Clark stated that he has heard from Jim Jewett concerning Jim's reservations about excluding some of the language regarding instrument run logs in HASQARD. Huei Meznarich has stated that data collection is adequately covered in Section 5.1 of HASQARD and that section applies to all analyses. Huei also believes that the proposed language's use of the word "should" makes it so it is not required anyway, so it is of no added value. Glen Clark agreed that Section 5.1 provides requirements for all analyses, but the organic group included some of the proposed items in Section 6.7.1 because they were specific to organic analysis data collection (e.g., pH of samples analyzed for volatile organic constituents). Glen suggested that perhaps Section 5.1 is where any additional specific requirements for instrument run logs or bench sheet data would be more appropriately specified in HASQARD. Because the Focus Group had not had time to review the e-mail and neither a hard copy of the e-mail or an electronic file summarizing the issue could be presented to the Focus Group during this portion of the meeting, Glen suggested the issue be discussed in the May meeting.

IV. The schedule status of the subcommittees established to compare the QSAS and HASQARD requirements and propose revisions to the HASQARD accordingly was discussed.

a. Organic: Glen Clark (Coordinator), Robert Elkins, Cliff Watkins

Glen Clark has completed the organic analysis revisions to HASQARD and believes the HASQARD Focus Group input is now addressed in the revised document he has on hand (except for the issue discussed in item III of these meeting minutes).

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

Chris Sutton presented a summary of the sampling groups efforts (see item VI in the meeting minutes below).

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

Heather Anastos reported that the inorganic subcommittee is on schedule to meet all milestones shown on the last updated schedule.

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

Joan Kessner reported that the radiochemistry subcommittee is on schedule to meet all milestones shown on the last updated schedule.

- e. Quality Assurance/Management Systems: Steve Smith (Coordinator), Taffy Almeida, Cindy Taylor, Greg Holte, Larry Markel, Kris Kuhl-Klinger, Amanda Tuttle and Kathie Dunbar:

Steve Smith was not present at this month's meeting and there was no presenter available for the QA subcommittee. Therefore, the QA subcommittee's presentation of proposed revisions will continue in the May meeting. This will result in the schedule for the QA subcommittee slipping by a month. This one month schedule slip also results in the schedule for all subcommittees that have a finish-start relationship for their presentations to the end of the QA group's presentation to slip by one month except for the sampling group.

## V. New Business

Two items of new business were discussed:

- a. Glen Clark mentioned that the organic analysis subcommittee is very close to having their document revision efforts completed including incorporating the HASQARD Focus Group's comments. Glen asked how the Focus Group wants to assure that the work of the subcommittee correctly addressed the Focus Group's comments and the revised document has Focus Group approval. That is, should the final revision be distributed, reviewed and discussed again at an upcoming meeting? Chris Thompson suggested that we finish looking at the work done by all the subcommittee's and then roll all of the revisions together in one document for review and comment. All in attendance seemed to agree this is the approach that should be taken.
- b. Glen Clark updated the Focus Group on the efforts to ensure a HASQARD audit is conducted at WSCF this summer. Glen said this audit is probably needed in June to ensure all report preparation, responses, etc. can be completed prior to the end of the approval period for WSCF on the WRPS and CHPRC Evaluated Suppliers Lists. Glen has checked on availability of AVS resources to lead the assessment and the personnel at WSCF to support the presence of the audit team. The assessment of availability indicates that the only two weeks where all required resources are available that still meet the schedule requirements are the weeks of June 6-10 (June 6-9 due to June 10 being the Hanford Friday off) or July 11-15. Glen requested volunteers to serve as auditors or technical specialists for this assessment. Glen asked that if people could not commit at this meeting (due to inability to adequately review their other commitments for those weeks), but later find that they can participate that they please send

an e-mail as soon as possible. Glen collected a list of volunteers and the disciplines they would prefer to evaluate during the assessment. As of this meeting, the plan is to conduct this assessment the week of June 6-9, 2011.

## VI. HASQARD Revision 4 Proposals

Because the QA Subcommittee had no presenter available for their presentation this month, Chris Sutton volunteered to present a summary of what the Sampling Subcommittee has done to create revision 4 of HASQARD Volume 2. Chris used three methods to present the summary of their efforts.

First, Chris projected a version of Volume 2 and quickly went through the pages showing the entire set of changes in “track changes” form to display a marked-up version of revision 3 of Volume 2. The highlights of the revisions Chris discussed were:

A large amount of new text has been added to Volume 2 to accommodate the special considerations samplers must take when collecting samples from highly radioactive populations.

The material addressing the DQO process has been reduced in detail since that material is also covered in Volume 1 of HASQARD. The material on DQOs that was retained has been brought up to date with more recent EPA guidance on systematic planning. This includes some added content to incorporate some of the concepts of the TRIAD approach which utilizes the conceptual site model in the environmental data collection planning process.

Revision 3 of Volume 2 of HASQARD has a subsection on Facility Management in the Sampling Systems section of the document. The proposed text in revision 4 will expand this section to include content on ISMS/EMS implementation in the sampling process.

The order of presentation of the material in Section 4 will be revised to fit the chronological flow of the typical sample collection campaign. The material in this section is not completely new, it has just been re-ordered. Section 6 has also been re-ordered.

Second, Chris passed out a copy of the table of contents from revision 3 and the draft table from revision 4 of Volume 2. These tables were used to illustrate how the sections have been re-ordered and where the new material discussed above has been added.

To close, Chris handed out a summary of major changes to Volume 2. This summary listed each major section present in revision 3 of Volume 2 and between one a thirteen bullets per section on how the material in each section will be revised.

For Focus Group members not present at this month's meeting, copies of all presentation materials (Table of Contents comparisons and summary sheets) are available from Chris Sutton upon request.

The Focus Group then discussed how to best review and comment on this major revision to Volume 2 of HASQARD. The Secretary suggested that once the draft document is complete, that it be sent to the Secretary. The Secretary will issue the draft of revision 4 of Volume 2 along with a Document Review Record (DRR) form. The Focus Group members will be given about a month to review the draft and submit their comments to the Secretary on the DRR form. The Secretary will collect the DRR forms and forward them to Chris Sutton as they are received. The Secretary will also compile one master DRR form to collect the balance of comments made on the draft. As the Sampling Subcommittee resolves comments, they will enter the proposed resolution to the comment on the DRR form and transmit completed comment resolutions to the Secretary for inclusion on the master DRR form. Prior to the meeting during which the comments will be discussed, the Secretary will distribute the master DRR form to all Focus Group personnel so they can see all comments made and the proposed resolutions to each. This will allow all to be prepared to discuss the draft revision of Volume 2 and hopefully reach consensus on approval in a timely fashion.

Because the end time for the meeting had not been reached, Huei Meznarich asked Glen Clark if he had the files available to project on the screen so we could expand upon the discussion documented in Section III of these minutes above. Glen had the files and projected the proposed revisions to Section 6.7.1 and Section 5.1 on the screen to encourage discussion of the data collection requirements text. After hearing no strong opinions one way or the other, Glen suggested that the Secretary distribute a summary of the matter to the Focus Group in an e-mail note using voting buttons to either vote for inclusion of the proposed revisions to Section 6.7.1 or against including these additional requirements in the revision 4 of Volume 4 of HASQARD. The group agreed to this approach.

Hearing neither additional new business nor objections to the proposal to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 3:25 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for May 17, 2011 at 2425 Stevens, Room 208.