HASQARD Focus Group
Meeting Minutes
June 27, 2018

The meeting was called to order by Jonathan Sanwald, HASQARD Focus Group Chair at 2:00 PM on June 27, 2018 in Conference Room 223 at 2430 Stevens Center Place.

Those attending were: Jonathan Sanwald, HASQARD Focus Group Chair (Mission Support Alliance (MSA)), Cliff Watkins - Focus Group Secretary (Corporate Allocation Services, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) Support Contractor), Marcus Aranda (Wastren Advantage Inc. Wastren Hanford Laboratory (WHL)), Linda Carr (Battelle – Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)), Steve Chalk (DOE-RL), Glen Clark (Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS)), Jim Douglas (CH2M HILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC)), Sheila Hahn (DOE-RL), Markus McGrath (WRPS), Heather Medley (CHPRC), Karl Pool (PNNL), Geoff Schramm (WRPS), Paula Sellers (Waste Treatment Completion Contractor (WTCC)) Noe'l Smith-Jackson (Washington State Department of Ecology), Chris Thompson (PNNL), Wendy Thompson (MSA), Rich Weiss (MSA), Katie Wood (WTCC).

I. The Secretary requested review and approval of the meeting minutes from the HASQARD Focus Group held on May 15, 2018. The draft minutes from the meeting were distributed and time was allowed for one final review. Two editorial comments were provided to the Secretary. Hearing no additional comments on the draft meeting minutes, the minutes from the May 15, 2018 meeting were approved.

II. The HASQARD Focus Group has a standing agenda item to discuss the status of activities associated with the DOE Consolidated Audit Program – Accreditation Program (DOECAP-AP) at all HASQARD Focus Group meetings. This month, the following updates were discussed:

Rich Weiss indicated that the DOE-HQ DOECAP-AP coordinator, Steve Clark, sent out a meeting notice for three separate meetings to ensure all DOECAP auditors could attend one of them. The notice for the meeting indicated there are important matters to discuss as the DOECAP-AP is being implemented.

A list has been posted on the DOECAP web site showing that six laboratories have had DOECAP-AP audits completed between April and June 2018. This list shows that two of these six have completed reports associated with them. Of these six, three are laboratories that no Hanford Contractor has a subcontract with, two are used (one in a pass-through subcontract from General Engineering Laboratories (GEL)) and the sixth was the GEL laboratory in Charleston, SC which was audited the week of June 18-22. Rich

pointed out the Test America Richland (TARL) is on the schedule for a DOECAP-AP audit in late September. Scot Fitzgerald and Robert Elkins are identified as Technical Expert for covering the radiation measurements portion of the TARL audit and as an observer respectively.

Chris Thompson asked about what kind of information is in the completed reports and whether the checklist produced by the accrediting body (AB) auditor is part of the report.

Rich Weiss stated that not a lot of information is included in the reports. It appears to be at the same level of detail as was found on the DOECAP web site when DOECAP was conducting the audits. Rich stated that the AB checklists are not part of the reports.

Glen Clark stated that he participated as an observer at the DOECAP-AP AB assessment conducted at GEL on June 19-21. On day one of that assessment, Glen asked about the HASQARD gap checklist. Neither the laboratory nor the AB lead assessor had seen the HASQARD gap checklist. Steve Clark was at the first morning of this assessment and pointed out to the lead assessor that the American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (A2LA) (the AB conducting this assessment) had been informed by DOE-HQ to click on a link to access the HASQARD gap checklist since it was relevant to this assessment. The A2LA specialist in attendance at the assessment confirmed that A2LA sent both the lead assessor and GEL instructions to download the HASQARD gap checklist from the DOECAP SharePoint. But, the A2LA instructions were either overlooked or not understood and neither the lead assessor nor GEL had downloaded the HASQARD gap checklist. Steve Clark assured that the checklist was provided to the laboratory and A2LA assessor very quickly. The A2LA auditing technique is to distribute the checklist from which they will be auditing to the laboratory ahead of the audit. The A2LA specifies an expectation that the laboratory complete and return the completed checklist to A2LA prior to their arrival. This results in a very efficient use of the AB personnel's time while in the laboratory. The GEL personnel completed the HASQARD gap checklist before day two of the assessment began. Glen was allowed to review the completed HASQARD gap checklist and provided the GEL QA staff clarifying interpretations of the requirements where GEL had misunderstood and had cited incorrect implementing procedure and document. Once Glen was assured that GEL had correctly understood the requirements and had cited the correct implementing procedures and documents, a copy of the completed checklist was then provided to the lead assessor to verify GEL's compliance with the HASQARD requirements. By the end of the assessment, both Glen and the AB lead assessor could verify the objective evidence associated with the laboratory's responses on the HASQARD gap checklist with no issues identified. Glen Clark said that observers from Hanford should plan on doing this same activity when serving as observers on DOECAP-AP assessments.

Jonathan Sanwald asked if Glen felt like he had essentially conducted an audit relative to the HASQARD gap checklist items while he was at GEL. Glen affirmed that he had reviewed the referenced documents cited by the laboratory in their completed checklist and verified that the information adequately addressed the line of inquiry.

Jonathan Sanwald asked if Glen Clark's role on the GEL assessment was to observe and evaluate the assessor. Glen stated that the A2LA auditor was using the A2LA QSM checklist and Glen's role was to ensure he was doing this thoroughly and correctly. Glen stated that the assessment being conducted at GEL was a gap assessment. This assessment was requested by GEL because even though they had been evaluated last year by DOECAP, and accredited last year by A2LA for the DOD's use of the QSM, they needed to be assessed for the DOE specific requirements in the QSM and have 8-10 new methods assessed for which they wanted to be accredited by DOE. Glen stated that the A2LA lead assessor was very thorough. The AB accredits laboratories by individual analyte within each individual method. The auditor reviewed documentation (e.g., calibration curves, performance sample results, etc.) for each metal added to each method to support the sought after accreditation for each. Glen stated that he was very impressed with the technical competence and thoroughness of the A2LA lead assessor. This individual was one of the few auditors within the ABs that has a radiochemistry background. The lead A2LA assessor Glen was working with has conducted more than 400 laboratory audits. Jonathan Sanwald asked if Glen thought that this level of expertise will be common. Glen speculated that it will be common and expressed the opinion that A2LA hires good people for this work.

The Focus Group Secretary asked why or how this was a "gap" assessment when neither GEL, nor any other laboratory, has ever held a DOECAP-AP accreditation. That is, shouldn't GEL be assessed to all of the DOE requirements in the QSM using the DOE-only requirements to determine if the currently held DOD accreditation can be applied for the DOECAP-AP?

Glen replied to the question by stating that GEL is accredited to the QSM using the DOD accreditation program and has been for a long time. The differences between the DOD requirements and DOE-only requirements in the QSM are minor so only the DOE specific requirements and the new methods requested by GEL needed to be assessed this year in determining a DOECAP-AP QSM accreditation status. The Secretary asked how long DOD has been accrediting laboratories to the QSM. Glen replied that DOD has been accrediting laboratories since about 2009. Therefore, DOECAP-AP accreditation will be bestowed on any laboratory that has the DOD accreditation following any successful AB gap assessment at that laboratory after the time the DOECAP-AP began (April 2018).

Wendy Thompson inquired about the role of observers on the DOECAP-AP assessments. Glen stated that the role of the DOECAP-AP observers has been made very clear by Steve Clark. That is, you may ask general questions about the assessment process to the lead assessor but not at such a frequency that it disrupts the assessment and you may not weigh in with your opinions on discussions relative to deficiencies or potential deficiencies. Glen admitted that after many years of performing audits as an auditor, it is very difficult to just watch and not contribute to the discussions being held. The role of the observer is to take notes and provide Steve Clark with any written comments the observer wishes to make. Steve Clark was present for the first half day of the GEL assessment. After the first day of the GEL assessment, Steve Clark had one DOE assessor that was acting confrontational, argumentative or otherwise disruptive removed from the assessment team and asked to go home.

Glen Clark reiterated how impressed he was with A2LA and how they conducted the assessment. At the end of the assessment, the lead assessor issued four deficiencies. Glen and the other DOE observers received copies of the draft deficiencies left with GEL. Glen said there are clearly growing pains o go through as the DOECAP-AP matures and process improvements are made.

Glen Clark stated that he wants to get all of the "gaps" from the HASQARD gap checklist addressed in the new QSM revision (Rev. 5.2). If the requirements that result in gaps are not incorporated into the QSM 5.2 text, the gap checklist will be included in the QSM revision as an addendum. It was stated that Hanford personnel should be receiving the completed gap HASQARD checklists after the DOECAP-AP assessments and will be able to draw conclusions from it accordingly.

Jonathan Sanwald expressed a concern that DOE-HQ is accrediting laboratories and this implies that no other supplier evaluation is required? This without a look at the DOE-only parts of the QSM being assessed? Glen Clark showed an example of a DOD QSM laboratory accreditation certificate. Glen speculated that the DOECAP-AP certificate will look the same. Glen stated that the ABs will be looking at all DOE requirements of the QSM at assessments that are not requested gap assessments like this one at GEL that was to accredit the laboratory for only 8-10 additional method/analyte combinations.

Jonathan Sanwald stated that the accreditation is valid for a two-year period. Most DOECAP laboratories were audited in FY 2017. Jonathan asked if this means most of the DOECAP laboratories will only have a gap assessment done this year. The response was that yes, this will likely be the case, if they were assessed by the DOD accrediting body last year. If they were not assessed by the DOD accrediting body last year they will receive a

comprehensive DOECAP-AP assessment this year.

Glen Clark said he has looked at the schedule of DOECAP-AP assessments this year and noticed that Columbia Basin Analytical Laboratory (CBAL) is on the schedule of upcoming assessments. The CBAL facility has never been assessed by the DOD accreditation program. As a result, Glen speculated that the CBAL assessment will be a full-spectrum DOECAP-AP assessment.

Adding to comments made about the role of the observers on these assessments, Glen Clark stated that with respect to HASQARD, the observer is allowed to ask laboratory staff and the lead assessor any questions, review the completed HASQARD gap checklist, and interact with the assessor and the laboratory regarding HASQARD requirements. The reason for allowing the observers this leniency with regard to HASQARD is that the assessment team cannot write any deficiencies against the HASQARD gap checklist because it hasn't yet been incorporated into the QSM.

Chris Thompson inquired that because the HASQARD portion of the assessment came as a surprise to the AB assessment team, whether there was a corrective action being proposed to ensure this does not happen again. Glen Clark stated that the HASQARD checklist is now known by A2LA and this issue should not recur on DOECAP-AP assessments for which A2LA is the AB. Glen reiterated that what happened this time was that neither the AB lead assessor nor the laboratory knew or understood that the HASQARD gap checklist needed to be downloaded from the DOECAP web site prior to the assessment. This was the first time that a DOECAP-AP was assessing a Hanford Site subcontractor laboratory. Glen said we were lucky that this assessment was of GEL who has historically done well on HASQARD assessments, is familiar with HASQARD compliance and was able to complete the checklist in one day. Jim Douglas stated that his issue should be mentioned during the upcoming DOECAP-AP conference call meetings as a form of feedback. Rich Weiss concurred that the DOECAP-AP is working out the bugs and speculated that some others may have been found recently creating the urgency for all DOECAP assessors to be present for one of the three scheduled meetings. Glen Clark stated a belief that issues identified in the first few assessments is what the upcoming meetings will be about. Glen expressed optimism in the DOECAP-AP meeting our needs especially in light of the fact that they are willing to get HASQARD folded into the QSM.

Glen Clark stated that he will be doing a presentation on HASQARD at the upcoming DOECAP workshop in Las Vegas. Glen plans to take the training material that the HASQARD Focus Group prepared and enhance it for the target audience. Glen will use his experience working with the AB at the GEL DOECAP-AP assessment to emphasize aspects of HASQARD that were not clearly understood by GEL or the lead assessor from A2LA. Glen stated that he would also like to run the presentation by any HASQARD Focus

Group members that would be interested in seeing it prior to the workshop. Several Focus Group members indicated a desire to see what Glen plans to present.

Paula Sellers summarized what Glen had said and posed two questions. Paula stated that the DOECAP-AP is using third party assessors to accredit laboratories for the entire DOE and its contractors. However, she asked for confirmation that there was not clear instruction given to the laboratory or the AB on how to meet Hanford's requirements for assessments (i.e., the HASQARD gap checklist). Glen concurred that this is what was said. Paula then stated that given the delayed communication to the laboratory and AB, how are we to trust this will improve? Paula asked if this is the only assessment we will be observing on. Glen Clark said that Hanford will be requested to provide an observer for all DOECAP-AP assessments conducted during the first year of the accreditation program at laboratories used by Hanford contractors. Paula asked that given that this was a "gap" assessment, and many areas relevant to HASQARD were not assessed, is there anything stopping a contractor from doing an independent audit at GEL to assess flow-down and implementation of QA requirements and /or HASQARD.
Glen Clark said there is never anything stopping her from doing independent supplier evaluations. The CHPRC and WRPS contracts require utilization of the MSA AVS organization for supplier evaluations, but the WTCC contract does not have this requirement. Rich Weiss recounted the history of duplicative auditing that was being conducted by DOE contractors in the 1990s which led to the Office of Inspector General producing a report on the amount of duplicative effort and waste associated with that amount of auditing. Rich stated that this resulted in the formation of the DOECAP initially. Rich stated that Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) did do their own auditing outside of DOECAP due to a compelling need flowed down from their QA program which included implementation of HASQARD. Rich concluded by saying that while there is nothing stopping any DOE contractor from conducting an audit at a laboratory independent from the DOECAP-AP efforts, it is likely Steve Clark would not approve if he heard about it. Paula agreed with WCH's position and stated that they are contractually required to flow-down requirements from their QA program to their suppliers.

Glen Clark stated that there are three ABs. Glen got the chance to observe one of them that did an impressive job. This says nothing about the other two. Glen emphasized the need to provide HASQARD SMEs to attend DOECAP-AP assessments being led by the other two ABs.

Wendy Thompson added that there are times when MSA has had to do laboratory audits in addition to DOECAP because of the relatively unique nature of the analyses requested (e.g., analysis on biota samples). Wendy asked if Glen foresaw a problem with these audits in the future based on the advent of the DOECAP-AP. Glen Clark said he would not expect any issues

with this since biota is outside the scope of the QSM and HASQARD.

Rich Weiss added that the DOECAP-AP is not "approving" laboratories. The approval status of a laboratory will be based on the relationship between the laboratory and the contracting entity. The DOECAP-AP is accrediting laboratories for specific tests using the DOECAP-AP accreditation process as implemented by one of the three ABs. Therefore, if there is a problem, it will be an issue for the AB to address, not the DOECAP-AP administration. Glen Clark added to this by saying that just because a laboratory has DOECAP-AP accreditation does not mean you have to use them. Rich added that he flip side of this is that the laboratories we are using can be said to be accredited for the tests we are having them perform, ostensibly adding validity to the results.

Glen Clark stated that prior to the GEL assessment; he requested a list from the WRPS sample management organization of all methods and analytes WRPS requests from GEL. Glen compared the list to those for which GEL had the DOD accreditation and therefore are accredited through reciprocity by the DOECAP-AP. In reviewing this list, he found that GEL is accredited for all analyses and analytes requested by WRPS. Glen said it would be good to get the entire list of methods and analytes for which GEL is accredited so all the Hanford contractors could make the same evaluation. A question was asked whether an accredited laboratory is required for any analyses conducted at Hanford. A response was that some permits require analyses conducted to support permit decisions be at a laboratory with state of Washington accreditation.

A general concern was raised that we don't want to be viewed as conducting supplier evaluations at laboratories that appear to be duplicative to the DOECAP-AP efforts. Rather, if these audits are required on a project-specific basis, they should be referred to as supplemental audits to fill gaps that are not addressed by the DOECAP-AP.

III. The Focus Group began discussing the status of efforts to produce Revision 5 of HASQARD.

The task of producing Revision 5 of HASQARD has been assigned to three subcommittees focused on revising a specific Volume or, in the case of Volumes 3 & 4, two Volumes. The Chair for each subcommittee began updating the status of the work conducted by their subcommittee since the last Focus Group meeting.

<u>Volume 1 Subcommittee (Chair: Paula Sellers)</u>:

Paula Sellers stated that Glen Clark has been putting a lot of effort into Volume 1 and asked him to summarize his efforts.

Glen agreed that he has been putting a lot of energy into this Volume. Of initial interest has been the scope of HASQARD. Glen stated that there has been general confusion about the scope of HASQARD for many years. Glen has revised the scope section of Volume 1 and has distributed it to subcommittee members for comment. Glen stated that initially, he was going to suggest that the scope of HASQARD be limited to sampling and analysis conducted to meet the Hanford Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) requirements. The TPA Action Plan refers solely to analyses conducted to meet Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) requirements. The TPA Action plan references USEPA documents, SW-846, R5 and G4 as applicable QA requirements. This resulted in Glen asking the question, was HASQARD written originally to address the TPA requirements or for all environmental analyses conducted at Hanford? Rich Weiss stated that the predecessor to the HASQARD document was the Hanford Analytical Services Quality Assurance Plan (HASQAP). This document and the HASQARD that followed were developed with the intent to cover all environmental analyses, not just those required by the TPA.

Wendy Thompson added that in having this discussion with regulators, they have said that if analyses are conducted to provide data to support a compliance program, it is relevant to the TPA. Wendy added that while she agreed with Glen's references to the CERCLA and RCRA drivers in the TPA, the data management section of the TPA refers to a database that contains only data for stack emissions. Therefore, air analyses become relevant to the TPA. Geoff Schramm asked if the stack emission data were required by a permit. Wendy Thompson said, yes that is where the driver for stack emission data originates.

Glen Clark concurred that these discussions are consistent with what he has been discovering in his search for applicability of the TPA and environmental analyses. That is, there is an expectation that there be a QA program associated for all environmental data collection. Glen proposes to make it clear which environmental programs require sampling and analysis be conducted in accordance with HASQARD. For example, HASQARD Volume 4 contains several tables expressing QC limits for various analyses. Glen believes the text associated with those tables should specify which environmental programs are applicable to each table. As part of the effort to define the applicable scope of HASQARD, Rich Weiss provided Glen with a copy of the Hanford environmental monitoring program plan. In that document, HASQARD is referenced as only being applicable to groundwater monitoring analyses.

Glen stated that while there may be no specific driver to use HASQARD for any environmental program, some aspects of HASQARD seem applicable to

more than RCRA and CERCLA analyses. For example, records management requirements are applicable to all environmental programs. As a result, the effort is focusing on making it clear to which programs specific sections of HASQARD apply.

Wendy Thompson added another example: drinking water analyses reported to Benton County, asking whether the sampling and analysis conducted to meet these regulations apply to HASQARD. In response, Glen asked if the environmental program for which these samples are collected requires implementation of a QA program with assessments and the typical QA program requirements. Wendy stated that these samples are collected under a QA program and that one is required.

Rich Weiss stated that HASQARD provides a uniform umbrella of quality requirements that could be used in implementing a quality program for many environmental programs/drivers. Rich agreed that there is likely an improvement to be made in HASQARD by specifying which programs fit explicitly to a section of HASQARD. The section could be applied to other programs, but this would be at the discretion of the program. That is, some programs may be excluded from applicability but choose to use the concepts expressed in HASQARD since they add value and are applicable.

Noe'l Smith-Jackson stated that it would be beneficial for this effort if HASQARD was more explicitly called out in the TPA. Noe'l stated that two years ago she had recommended the HASQARD be added to the TPA in Sections 6.5 and 7.8. No action was ever taken to apply this recommendation.

Wendy Thompson added that using the TPA as the basis for HASQARD will lead to program beyond RCRA and CERCLA. For example, the data section of the TPA references a data management document that lists about ten different databases as being applicable to the TPA. These databases include data collected for more environmental programs than RCRA and CERCLA.

Glen asked Noe'l Smith-Jackson if it was her opinion that the HASQARD applies to all environmental regulations for which samples are collected and analyzed in order to make a decision. Noe'l responded that her opinion is that HASQARD is applicable to all environmental samples collected and analyzed to obtain measurement data used to make a regulatory or TPA decision.

Paula Sellers used the Hanford Dangerous Waste Permit as an example. The Dangerous Waste Permit requires development of DQOs to support sampling and analysis. The DQOs specify the population of interest, number of samples to collect to adequately represent the population of interest, the time and place to collect the samples, the acceptable rate of making a false positive and false negative decision, etc. The DQO documents also specify the QA project plan (QAPjP) under which the samples will be collected and that the

DQO or QAPjP references HASQARD.

Glen Clark stated that the overall driver for HASQARD is to provide a tool specific to environmental sampling and analysis in implementing a QA program to meet the requirements of DOE Order 414,1D. However, there is a need to integrate the sampling and analysis conducted to meet DOE Order 458.1, *Radiation Protection of the Public and Environment*, the Hanford Dangerous Waste Permit, etc.

Wendy Thomson suggested that a figure be made that shows all drivers for environmental sample collection. That figure might be helpful in defining applicability of HASQARD.

Geoff Schramm stated that every Hanford contractor writes a QA Program to respond to DOE Order 414.1 requirements. Having HASQARD be seen as a response to 414.1 creates redundancy and confusion related to implementation of the contractor's QA program.

Glen Clark stated that HASQARD can be referenced in a contractor's QAP as a tool used for environmental sample collection and analysis activities.

Geoff Schramm suggested that statements be added to HASQARD saying something like, "If not covered elsewhere in the contractor's QA program, do this." Glen Clark stated that while statements like this may be beneficial for the Hanford contractors, it would likely not be very beneficial for the off-site laboratories trying to implement HASQARD. The off-site laboratories are not subject to the entirety of the contractor's QA programs and would not know if something was covered.

Jonathan Sanwald stated that it appears to be a large effort to define the scope of HASQARD.

Glen Clark concurred saying that the Focus Group needs to take this opportunity in producing Revision 5 of HASQARD to provide greater detail on the applicability of each Volume (or Section within a Volume). For example, there are no QC acceptance criteria for analyses conducted on air samples. Therefore, if HASQARD is applicable to air sampling and analysis, the subject is not completely addressed.

Paula Sellers reiterated that the Dangerous Waste Permit provides a flow down of expectations.

Geoff Schramm echoed the need stating that it would be a benefit to the HASQARD user community to define what the document applies to.

Jonathan Sanwald stated that with this complicated effort underway, perhaps

the next HASQARD Focus Group meeting should be applied to discussing requirements that do (or could) flow into HASQARD.

Wendy Thompson stated that HASQARD is a tool used by many contractors in meeting many requirements. It is a useful document because if you meet the requirements specified in HASQARD, you will also be in compliance with other QA requirements.

Glen Clark stated the opinion that we should have technical or regulatory drivers associated with all the requirements in HASQARD. Those HASQARD requirements that can be supported by programmatic, technical or regulatory drivers become the "shall" statements in HASQARD and all other statements in HASQARD are simply "should" statement reflecting best practices. Geoff Schramm stated that this was the approach the Volume 2 team took and it is very valuable for future efforts knowing the basis for the requirements specified in HASQARD. Geoff added that the basis of the requirements specified is something we do not have from the past revision efforts for the documents.

Jonathan Sanwald suggested the July HASQARD Focus Group meeting be used to look at sources of requirements that HASQARD is addressing. Glen Clark said he could prepare a chart to project on a screen to show the Focus Group the flow down of requirements. Jonathan revisited the QC tables in asking whether HASQARD would need to have QC acceptance criteria associated with every analysis (e.g., analysis of fish tissue).
Wendy Thompson suggested that a reference to the applicable methods could be made for most QC acceptance criteria. Glen Clark agreed that while the tables in HASQARD that specify the method specific QC acceptance criteria are not necessary, they could be used as a default expectation.

Paula Sellers added that at WTCC, all QC acceptance criteria are specified in the DWP and QAPjPs prepared for a project. Rich Weiss understood but added that the QAPjP could also reference HASQARD if the author of the QAPjP did not want to reproduce the criteria in every QAPjP. . Geoff Schramm stated that at WRPS he has interfaced with project managers that were under the false impression that they did not need to produce a project-specific QAPjP because HASQARD covered it all. As a result, Geoff is working on a new procedure to specify how HASQARD is to be used in the development of environmental QA documentation.

Rich Weiss finished by saying that Glen Clark's efforts have led to a complete revision to the HASQARD scope section. Reviewers of this section what is new and what is from the existing HASQARD language.

<u>Volume 2 Subcommittee (Chair: Geoff Schramm)</u>:

The Subcommittee Chair reported that the draft of Revision 5 for Volume 2 is complete and ready to present to the Focus Group for comment. Geoff asked what the best method for reviewing the document would be.

After discussion it was decided that the draft of Volume 2 would be sent to the Focus Group Secretary who would forward it to the Focus Group as "homework." That is, the expectation would be that the Focus Group members would get approximately a month to work the review into their schedule, take notes during the review and be ready to discuss comments as the document is projected and discussed at a Focus Group meeting.

Volume 3/4 Subcommittee (Chair: Jim Douglas):

The Subcommittee Chair reported that the subcommittee has made some progress. The Chair stated that Rich Weiss has gone through Volume 3.

Rich Weiss stated that his efforts on Volume 3 have been to take it apart and put it back together following the same order as Volume 4. This effort pointed out some holes in covering some expectations (e.g., chain-of-custody requirements were not covered well in Volume 3). Discussions held in the subcommittee meetings have led functional changes to Volume 3. Rich stated that Scot Fitzgerald will be addressing the consistency between Volumes 3 and 4 also. Because Volume 3 relates to Volume 4, it makes sense to have it look as close as possible.

The subcommittee Chair added that the subcommittee discussed combining Volumes 3 and 4 but the consensus was that two Volumes made the most sense.

Wendy Thomson added the historical perspective saying that originally, HASQAP and HASQARD Rev. 1 was one document. The sampling volume was added and then the need to show the regulators how HASQARD QA/QC was going to be applied to all of the mobile laboratories and other field analytical techniques being employed at Hanford resulted in Volume 3 being required to differentiate those requirements from the fixed laboratory requirements specified in Volume 4. Many of the mobile laboratories were subcontracted. Therefore, the idea was to have Volume 3 available for incorporation in the subcontract SOWs for those services.

IV. The Secretary asked if there was any new business to discuss.

Jim Douglas stated that in conducting an audit recently he noted several redundancies in the HASQARD audit checklist and he will be working to revise the checklist to reduce this redundancy.

Jonathan Sanwald suggested that the pdf file showing the status of DOECAP-

AP audits be posted on the HASQARD Focus Group website. Rich Weiss stated that he would provide the most recent version of this list.

Hearing no additional new business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:55 PM.

It was announced that the next meeting of the HASQARD Focus Group will be at 2:00 PM on July 17, 2018 in Conference Room 223 at 2430 Stevens Center Place.