

**HASQARD Focus Group**  
Meeting Minutes  
October 4, 2011

The meeting was called to order by Huei Meznarich, HASQARD Focus Group Chair at 2:04 PM on October 4, 2011 in Conference Room 208 at 2425 Stevens.

Those attending were: Huei Meznarich (Chair), Cliff Watkins (Secretary), Lynn Albin, Heather Anastos, Jeff Cheadle, Glen Clark, Scot Fitzgerald, Shannan Johnson, Kris Kuhl-Klinger, Joan Kessner, Larry Markel, Karl Pool, Noe'l Smith-Jackson, Dave Shea, Cindy Taylor, Amanda Tuttle, Mary Ryan, Rich Weiss and Eric Wyse.

- I. Huei Meznarich requested comments on the minutes from the August 16, 2011 meeting. No HASQARD Focus Group members present stated any comments on the August meeting minutes and, after hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.
  
- II. The Secretary called a point of order to the meeting. Huei Meznarich had announced that Dave Crawford would no longer be serving as the Focus Group Chair. The Secretary cited the HASQARD Focus Group Charter which states, "The contractor having contractual responsibility for HASQARD will nominate the Chairperson annually at the October meeting. Voting members will confirm the individual nominated as the Focus Group Chairperson who does not have to be a voting member." The Secretary cited e-mail notices he had received indicating MSA has nominated Huei Meznarich to serve as the HASQARD Focus Group Chairperson. With this nomination being stated, the Secretary asked for a vote of the voting members present regarding seating Huei as Chair. The voting members present confirmed Huei as the Chairperson by a vote five in favor, none opposed.
  
- III. The Action Tracking matrix was discussed:
  - a. The issue of the posted de minimis 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 provide specific language concerning the term "shipping container" to ensure it reflects current practices. At the April meeting, 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 would have posted the de minimis change on the HASQARD web site after the June meeting. However, Chris Sutton was not present at the June, August or October meetings. The action remained open and deferred to the November

meeting for completion.

- b. 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 III below) and provided in hard copy form at the November meeting. Huei Meznarich pointed out that the latest completeness results (i.e., items stated as completed at or since the last meeting) are now being shown in yellow highlighted text on the hard copies she is providing at the monthly meetings.

- IV. Huei Meznarich did not request a status update from the subcommittees established to compare the QSAS and HASQARD requirements and propose revisions to the HASQARD. The only remaining group to present results is the radiochemistry group and Joan Kessner stated they should be able to complete their presentation at today's meeting.

A discussion of what will follow completion of the HASQARD-DOECAP comparison was deferred to the end of the meeting.

- V. New Business

A new business discussion on the current process used for approving a de minimis change was held. Eric Wyse had stated a concern that based on the available definition of a de minimis change, we were perhaps approving changes that were not really de minimis. The definition for these changes is found in the letters the DOE-RL and DOE-ORP Contract Officers sent to the contractors in April of 2010. These letters describe a de minimis change as one that is "an editorial change or interpretation clarifying but not modifying a requirement." The letters further state that "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 Federal Acquisition Regulation 52.243-7, Notification of Changes." Eric stated that he felt the de minimis change on assessments that the Focus Group made did not fit the definition of de minimis. That is, the change made was more than editorial and did modify a requirement.

As for the change to the assessments section itself, Kris Kuhl-Klinger noted that the QA subcommittee has revised the language for the draft of Revision 4 of HASQARD and the language of the de minimis language approved will likely change again when Revision 4 of HASQARD is approved. Therefore, rather than revoke or change the de minimis language currently posted on the web site she suggested we just wait until Revision 4 of HASQARD is

approved.

The resolution of this issue was that if and when new de minimis changes to HASQARD are suggested, the Focus Group will first evaluate whether they meet the “editorial change or interpretation clarifying but not modifying a requirement” definition of a de minimis change. If the suggested change modifies a requirement, the vote on the change will be deferred for a month so that each company can evaluate the change further. That will allow each contractor to assess whether the change is such that 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. That is, the change would not result in the contractor disagreeing and believing there is an impact, such that the contractor needs to notify the DOE CO of such impact in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation 52.243-7, Notification of Changes.

## VI. HASQARD Revision 4 Proposals

Rich Weiss presented the Radiochemistry Subcommittee's proposed additions to HASQARD as a result of their gap analysis between HASQARD and the QSAS. The highlights of the discussions that occurred during the presentation are captured below.

Rich noted that there were several sections in Revision 3 of HASQARD that the Radiochemistry subcommittee felt DOECAP requirements (or at least more specific requirements than those currently in HASQARD) would be beneficial (e.g., balances). But, seeing that these had been addressed by other groups, the subcommittee did not address them again. Rather, any specific suggestions they have on these sections that are different than those offered by the other groups will be addressed during comment resolution for Revision 4 of HASQARD.

Rich noted that the requirements or criteria for allowing an expired standard to be re-verified needs to be specified in HASQARD and provided a suggested wording which may result in comments.

The Radiochemistry subcommittee made several revisions to the Tables in Section 4 of HASQARD Volume 4 that were carried through several of the Tables. The wording for initial calibration of the instrument was revised to say “Before initial analysis, ...” Huei Meznarich suggested that this say something like “Before initial use of the system” or something that would not imply “before initial use daily” or something that was not intended by those words. Kris Kuhl-Klinger added that these tables should make it clear that a system can be shown to re-establish stability after maintenance without recalibration being absolutely necessary. Rich agreed and said he would

revise the tables accordingly before providing the proposed revision for final review.

Rich pointed out several sections of the document where the Radiochemistry subcommittee has proposed to address the DOECAP/QSAS requirements in HASQARD at a higher level than the QSAS document and/or associated DOECAP checklist does. The Radiochemistry subcommittee appreciated some of the requirements from DOECAP/QSAS and felt that some of them would add value by stipulating them in HASQARD. However, many of these were not required at the level of detail (e.g., exact cocktail formulation, specific count times, etc.) contained in DOECAP/QSAS. The Radiochemistry subcommittee focused on the changes that would get us better specification of acceptable laboratory criteria without being overly prescriptive.

In discussing requirements for tracer recovery, Rich noted that HASQARD currently has no criteria for acceptable tracer recovery. The Radiochemistry subcommittee added the requirements found in the QSAS as a recommended basis for recovery limits using the word “should” rather than “shall” in the text.

Upon completion of Rich Weiss’ presentation, the next steps in the process to produce Revision 4 of HASQARD were discussed. It was agreed that all revision suggestions from the subcommittees would be transmitted to the Secretary. The Secretary would compile all suggestions in a master file showing proposed changes in a Word document with “Track Changes” on, and where two groups provide alternative language for the same section, a comment will show the two options. If the Word files are transmitted soon, the plan would be to merge the changes in time for the Focus Group to review two weeks prior to the November meeting.

Kris Kuhl-Klinger stated she believes the QA group could have Volume 1 complete before the December meeting.

Regarding Volume 2 of HASQARD, Larry Markel said there is some language concerning requirements that must be included on Chain-of Custody forms that are still being worked out within the Sampling subcommittee. Once that is resolved, Volume 2 will be issued for review with a comment resolution form. Larry committed to get the Chain-of-Custody matter either resolved or out for Focus Group comment prior to the next meeting.

Hearing no additional new business and no objections to the proposal to adjourn, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for November 8, 2011 at 2:00 PM in 2425 Stevens, Room 208.