

**HASQARD Focus Group**  
Meeting Minutes  
August 21, 2018

The meeting was called to order by Jonathan Sanwald, HASQARD Focus Group Chair at 2:10 PM on August 21, 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), Linda Carr (Battelle – Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)), Glen Clark (Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS)), Fred Dunhour (U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)), Joel Hebdon (Northwind Services, DOE-ORP Support Contractor), Markus McGrath (WRPS), Heather Medley (CHPRC), Karl Pool (PNNL), Rich Weiss (MSA), Tricia Wood (Wastren Advantage Inc. Wastren Hanford Laboratory (WHL)).

- I. The Secretary requested review and approval of the meeting minutes from the HASQARD Focus Group held on July 17, 2018. The draft minutes from the meeting were distributed and time was allowed for one final review. One editorial comment was provided to the Secretary. Hearing no additional comments on the draft meeting minutes, the minutes from the July 17, 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:

Heather Medley stated that, unlike what she understood Glen Clark’s experiences with the DOECAP-AP Accrediting Body (AB) American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (A2LA) were like at the General Engineering Laboratories (GEL) assessment, the CHPRC experience with another AB, Perry-Johnson Laboratory Accreditation, Inc. (PJLA), has been quite different. The PJLA lead assessor did not contact the Hanford representative for the assessment (Jim Douglas) until one week before the assessment was supposed to occur. At the time of the contact, PJLA was unaware that ALS – Fort Collins was a laboratory to which the HASQARD gap checklist applied. Jim Douglas informed the PJLA lead assessor that ALS-Ft. Collins did need to complete the HASQARD gap checklist and the lead assessor transmitted it to the laboratory. Jim was in Ft. Collins at the time of the Focus Group meeting and Heather stated he is not especially impressed with the assessment that is occurring there (i.e., Jim is having trouble maintaining the expected protocol for an observer and not participating).

Glen Clark stated that these observations are consistent with those received from Robert Elkins who represented Hanford at the DOECAP-AP assessment lead by PJLA at the Eurofins laboratory. Glen stated that Robert reported that PJLA had two assessors at this assessment but all of the assessors that were part of this assessment did not feel they had enough time to complete their scope of the assessment. Glen stated that Robert did not have enough time to complete his review of the HASQARD gap checklist and that Joe Pardue didn't have time to complete the DOECAP Module 6 checklist on Hazardous and Radioactive Material Management. Glen stated that Robert Elkins has indicated that because he did not have enough time to complete the HASQARD gap checklist evaluation at the assessment, he will have to follow-up with the laboratory to collect all of the procedures and complete the evaluation. Glen added that Robert Elkins was impressed with the technical knowledge of the lead assessor but that overall the assessment did not go well. Glen stated that the DOECAP-AP assessment to occur at ALS-Salt Lake next month is scheduled for three days so hopefully there will be enough time to complete the assessment.

Heather Medley said that PJLA did not identify the applicability of including the HASQARD gap checklist in the application for an assessment received from the laboratory so they did not think it was required. Glen Clark said that when he was at GEL with A2LA, the laboratory had received an email instructing them to download and complete the HASQARD gap checklist but they did not understand that instruction.

Glen has received the audit report from the GEL assessment that he attended to observe and ensure the HASQARD gap checklist is being completed. Glen stated that the report included a completed HASQARD checklist with references to the objective evidence provided/reviewed to assess each item on the checklist. However, the checklist in the report provided no indication of the assessor's acceptance/rejection of the referenced evidence as being satisfactory to meet the requirement. Glen stated that at the close-out meeting the lead assessor stated that he felt that GEL had met all the requirements associated with the HASQARD gap checklist but the report did not indicate an opinion one way or another.

Cliff Watkins asked if he should call Steve Clark and provide this feedback to him. Glen Clark said he will be attending the DOECAP annual conference in Las Vegas next week and will meet with Steve Clark to discuss the HASQARD Focus Group's concerns.

Cliff Watkins asked what the application process consists of. Heather Medley and Glen Clark explained that the laboratory completes one of the AB's applications requesting a DOECAP-AP accreditation. It is the responsibility of the laboratory to indicate that the HASQARD gap checklist applies to

them. Heather added that the ALS-Ft. Collins laboratory may not realize that HASQARD still applies to them because the HASQARD document is not referenced in the SOW they have from CHPRC due to MSA not allowing reference to HASQARD in SOWs. Cliff Watkins suggested that the application be modified to not ask if a laboratory is associated with HASQARD but to ask if a laboratory holds a contract with a Hanford Contractor (which would invoke the HASQARD gap checklist as a default to an affirmative response). Glen stated that Robert Elkins communicated directly with the laboratory to have them get the HASQARD gap checklist and have them work on it before he arrived at Eurofins. Glen stated that Robert also found that PJLA did not include dimethyl-mercury on the scope of their analyte-specific assessment even though Eurofins performs this analysis for WRPS by subcontract. They had methyl-mercury instead. At the assessment, the PJLA assessor made the change to dimethyl-mercury with no issue in doing so when advised of the concern by Robert.

Heather Medley said she was asked by George Mata (MSA QA Manager) about how other Hanford Contractors were indicating the DOECAP-AP requirement in their SOWs. This requirement has not been added to SOWs used by CHPRC yet.

Glen Clark indicated an additional confusion with the first DOECAP-AP assessment report he has seen (the report for GEL). Specifically, Glen thought separate accreditations would be indicated in the report; one accreditation for DOECAP-AP and another A2LA accreditation for the Department of Defense (DOD). Glen stated that this could be due to the fact that the assessment he attended at GEL was a gap assessment being conducted for GEL to add a few analytes to their accreditation rather than the full-blown accreditation assessment that will be done every other year.

Heather Medley added that in conversations the CHPRC personnel had with Test America – Richland (TARL), the TARL personnel were telling CHPRC that the DOECAP-AP assessment being scheduled there would last seven days. There was speculation that this may be because they don't have a DOD accreditation and the full assessment for DOD and DOECAP-AP accreditation must be done.

Glen Clark inquired on whether CHPRC had any interest in sending an observer to the upcoming DOECAP-AP assessment at the Columbia Basin Analytical Laboratory (CBAL) assessment in Pasco. Heather Medley said that CHPRC does not use CBAL for environmental testing. Therefore, they would not have any interest.

Jonathan Sanwald added that he hoped the meeting between Glen Clark and Steve Clark at the workshop next week would help in addressing some of the issues being noted on the DOECAP-AP assessments. Glen Clark agreed and

committed to contacting Jim Douglas on Monday August 27 to get s thorough debriefing on Jim's impressions of the ALS-Ft. Collins assessment.

The July 17, 2018 meeting of the HASQARD Focus Group was primarily a discussion of the scope of HASQARD and confusion the scope statements in HASQARD were creating as Revision 5 of HASQARD is being developed. At the July meeting, the HASQARD Focus Group requested DOE to evaluate the concerns and suggest a direction.

Cliff Watkins indicated that he had held several meetings between the July meeting and this meeting. The discussions were held with DOE-RL and DOE-ORP personnel. The concept being discussed by DOE (in both offices) is based on the fact that laboratories are now being approved through accreditation by the DOECAP-AP. This accreditation uses the DOD/DOE Quality Systems Manual (QSM) as the basis for laboratory QA requirements. The HASQARD Focus Group has conducted an extensive effort to identify QA requirements that are present in the HASQARD and are not present in the QSM. This effort has resulted in identification of approximately 55 differences. These differences are being assessed by the DOECAP-AP ABs using the HASQARD gap checklist. Cliff Watkins stated that conversations he has had with Steve Clark have indicated the DOE-HQ desire to see all of the 55 HASQARD differences included in the text of the QSM in a future revision to that document. Cliff stated that given that this is the future of the QSM, there would be no value in continuing to maintain HASQARD Volume 4. The HASQARD would be revised to say the analytical services conducted in fixed laboratories (i.e., subcontracted to laboratories that operate in a commercial facility or done at the 222S Laboratory) are conducted in accordance with the QSM. This would leave a Volume 1 that included only administrative requirements related to the other two Volumes (Volume 2 on field sampling requirements and Volume 3 on field analytical requirements). Cliff indicated that conversation with Federal environmental project managers has resulted in finding that the HASQARD is referenced in some documents that have been approved by Ecology (e.g., permits and groundwater action plans). However, the Federal project managers agreed that as long as HASQARD is available to reference how fixed laboratory services are conducted (i.e., in accordance with the QSM), there is no need to maintain a detailed set of requirements separate from the QSM. Cliff asked the Focus Group for input regarding any unanticipated issues that might arise if Volume 4 of HASQARD were to be deleted in favor of the QSM reference.

Glen Clark noted that the HASQARD gap checklist being used by the DOECAP-AP currently references Revision 4 of HASQARD. The issue being that if we produce Revision 5 of HASQARD, we may be out of sync with the DOECAP-AP at that point. Jonathan Sanwald stated that Revision 4 of HASQARD would still be in document control for reference, it just

wouldn't be used in contracts for analytical services.

Karl Pool stated that if the HASQARD is merged with the QSM, then the Hanford Contractors would lose control of revisions to the analytical QA requirements being applied to their samples as the QSM is revised. Cliff Watkins replied that he had anticipated this issue and asked Steve Clark whether additional Hanford participants could be added to the Data Quality Workgroup (DQW). The DQW is the national workgroup that maintains the QSM. Steve Clark said he did not see any issues with adding more people to the DQW and also having an Ecology representative as an observer to DQW meetings. This would allow Hanford Contractors to fill the current role of the HASQARD Focus Group at a national level. Cliff added that if a QA requirement were to be dropped from the QSM by the DQW and one or more Hanford Contractor(s) and/or Ecology felt strongly about the requirement, the Contractors could address adding the requirement in the SOWs they have with the laboratories they contract with. Heather Medley agreed to this approach and noted that Hanford Contractors could also use SOWs to relieve a laboratory from a QSM requirement if they felt the requirement was unnecessarily added by the QSM DQW.

Heather Medley asked who of the HASQARD Focus Group members present are in the DQW. The response indicated that Hanford's presence in the DQW should be increased.

Rich Weiss noted that the HASQARD gap checklist includes several lines of inquiry that originate from Volume 1 of HASQARD and if we adopt the QSM, then Volume 1 of HASQARD would not be required either since it is mostly relevant to fixed laboratory facilities. Cliff Watkins asked if any of the Volume 1 administrative requirements apply to Volumes 2 and 3. Glen Clark responded that Volume 1 is really for analytical laboratories not for sampling and field analysis. Cliff Watkins suggested that as the Focus Group produces Revision 5 of HASQARD, thought should be given to the role of Volume 1 if only Volume 2 and 3 remain someday.

Rich Weiss stated that one of the issues with the DOECAP-AP is that it accredits laboratories on a method and analyte-specific basis. For example, if a laboratory wants to be accredited for a given metal that can be analyzed by atomic absorption (AA) and inductively couple plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) the laboratory must be accredited for that metal on both methods. This results in issues when a Hanford Contractor needs to add an analyte to be tested by a specific method to those for which the laboratory is accredited. The accreditation assessment may not occur until well after the analyte/method is needed. This is why DOECAP (before the DOECAP-AP) approved the laboratory QA program and did not focus on specific analytes being analyzed by a specific method. The DOECAP would assess a laboratory's compliance to the QA requirements associated with, for example,

semivolatile organics analysis rather than approve individual analytes that may be analyzed using a specific semivolatile organic analysis method. Heather Medley added that Ecology accredits laboratories for analysis of specific analytes being analyzed by a specific method in the same way the DOECAP-AP is doing. Heather stated that this is problematic when requesting multi-analyte methods from the laboratories (e.g., semivolatile organics analysis by EPA method 8270). That is, will it be necessary for the laboratory to have performance testing data for every possible organic compound that could be tested using method 8270? The response the CHPRC has received from Ecology is that yes, the laboratory needs to be accredited for all analytes of interest. This has become problematic because CHPRC does a lot of analyses for the 40CFR 264 Appendix IX list of groundwater contaminants of interest. There are not many laboratories that have standards for all of the Appendix IX analytes. Therefore, without a reference standard, obtaining internal performance testing results to support accreditation on an analyte-specific basis cannot be achieved for some analytes. This same issue occurs when attempting to find a laboratory accredited for all possible volatile organic compounds (e.g., formaldehyde). Glen Clark asked if CHPRC is using a laboratory that is not accredited for an analyte of interest is CHPRC allowed to use the data the laboratory produces for that analyte anyway. Heather stated that when analytes are requested at a laboratory that does not have accreditation for that analytes, the lack of detection and/or concentration measured by the laboratory is considered suspect and requires a great deal of explanation if the data are used. Heather Medley stated that George Mata had asked her how other requesters of laboratory services handle this issue. Heather was unable to help George with an unequivocal answer to that question. Glen Clark added that many analytes were added to the GEL accreditation for the DOECAP-AP assessment he attended in July.

Jonathan Sanwald asked if all the ABs will accredit laboratories the same way. Glen Clark said that he has seen all the assessment checklists that will be used by the three ABs and they will be doing it the same way. Heather Medley said that the first few reports received from Hanford observers at DOECAP-AP assessments will provide us a good benchmark on whether the three ABs are conducting business the same way.

Glen Clark stated that he will bring up the multi-analyte method accreditation issues when he meets with Steve Clark at the Workshop. Heather Medley asked if we could request accreditation at the method level rather than analyte level for some of these methods. Glen Clark stated that the laboratories should know the analytes they are required to report by each method so they should be requesting the correct accreditation on their applications. Heather said this is true at the time of the laboratory completing the application, but new analytes are requested by her customers frequently. This can be so frequent so as to not allow the laboratory time to be able to be accredited for the requested analytes before samples are collected for analysis. Tricia Wood

stated that the scope of accreditation at a laboratory is rather fluid. Tricia's experience is that their accreditation scope/need is changing all the time. Heather Medley stated that because of this need to have accredited laboratories for new analyte requests, one of the laboratories CHPRC contracts to had applied for Washington State Department of Ecology accreditation for some analytes using their National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Coalition (NELAC) accreditation as reciprocity. The latest Heather had heard on this was that Ecology would not recognize NELAC accreditation as reciprocal without doing an on-site assessment (audit). Tricia Wood echoed the frustration for requesting/receiving accreditation in a timely manner by mentioning that a laboratory can have the accreditation removed for an analyte if they fail two performance testing (PT) studies in a row for that analyte. If corrective actions are implemented, they still have to wait until the next accreditation cycle to gain accreditation for that analyte. Heather said this is similar to the issue with needing accreditation when a new analyte is needed. Glen asked if it would be better if accreditation was by method rather than analyte. Heather indicated that accreditation by method would be better because CHPRC could then add analytes to appropriate methods in their requests for laboratory analysis and Ecology would recognize accreditation rather than having to wait until the accreditation for the specific analyte was attained. Heather stated that at this time, CHPRC must ensure that the laboratory receiving the samples is accredited by Ecology for all analytes requested in a given SOW for services. If a laboratory forgets to put an analyte of interest to CHPRC on their application for accreditation, it won't be evaluated and they will not be accredited. Glen Clark asked what would happen if this came to light during an accreditation assessment. That is, could they add the new analyte to the scope of the accreditation during the assessment? Rich Weiss stated that the AB would likely say no, we will add this analyte to your accreditation next year. Tricia Wood stated that when new analytes are added to a multi-analyte method, some accreditation allows for an application for expansion of the accreditation based in internal PT studies. Heather Medley asked if the DOE community always knew that the DOECAP-AP accreditation would be at the analyte level (rather than method level). Fred Dunhour asked if there is a DOECAP-AP Program Plan or some other document that would define how to handle situations like the addition of new analytes to multi-analyte methods. None of the Focus Group members present knew of a DOECAP-AP Program Plan.

Glen Clark stated that a DOECAP-AP program plan needs to be written. One example of the need for this was visible in the report Glen reviewed on the GEL assessment he attended as an observer. That report included words saying that GEL was formerly DOECAP accredited. Rich Weiss stated that DOECAP never accredited laboratories. Rather DOECAP conducted audits and provided supplier evaluation reports. Rich added that the current position of DOECAP is that they will use the ABs to accredit laboratories to the QSM

for the analytes required by DOD and DOE. Rich stated that it's not clear how all this is being applied right now. Glen Clark said, referring to the GEL accreditation assessment report, that the report states that the AB was assessing the laboratory to the QSM. Fred Dunhour said that this indicates that the AB was not doing an overlay of the existing DOD accreditation but rather was doing a DOECAP-AP accreditation evaluation. Glen said that while that is true, the AB was only assessing new scope added to the GEL accreditation since the last full accreditation evaluation that occurred approximately one year ago. Fred Dunhour stated that he has seen an accreditation program plan for the DOD laboratory accreditation program and assumed there would be something similar for the DOECAP-AP. Rich Weiss stated that there was supposed to be a revision to the AD-1 document which was to serve as the program plan for the DOECAP-AP.

Returning to the discussion of the scope of HASQARD that led to the idea that HASQARD Volumes 1 and 4 may not be necessary given the DOECAP-AP, Glen Clark stated he was able to find a copy of Revision 0 or the HASQAP (the original document that was revised to become HASQARD). Glen wanted to find out how the scope of HASQAP was originally worded. The scope statement in the original HASQAP ties its purpose and scope to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). The scope is very similar to the one found in HASQARD today but is clear in that it is designed to address data collection to support RCRA and CERCLA decisions.

Glen read the HASQAP scope statement to the Focus Group which says:

“The Tri-Party Agreement binds the DOE to actions and commitments to comply with the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)*, the *Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)*, and the *State of Washington Hazardous Waste Management Act*. The signatories (DOE, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Washington State Department of Ecology) view the Hanford Site as a single entity and, as such expect a uniform level of quality in all work supporting the Tri-Party Agreement. To meet this expectation, the HASQAP has been written to provide a set of requirements and guidelines. The quality requirements of HASQAP, however, are consistent with the requirements in other regulatory-based statutes that are not included in the Tri-Party Agreement. Therefore, these analytical activities could be performed under HASQAP providing the data quality requirements are determined, documented and agreed upon.”

Glen added that HASQARD Volume 1 was written primarily for laboratory facilities (as opposed to mobile laboratories) and Volume 4 addresses primarily RCRA and CERCLA analysis methods (except for the radiochemistry material). While laboratories need to know the requirements associated with other environmental programs (e.g., Safe Drinking Water Act,

Clean Water Act) it appears that HASQARD was written to address data needs associated with the TPA which applies to only RCRA and CERCLA.

The confusion created by HASQARD Volume 1 was discussed. The HASQARD has been referenced in the contracts DOE-RL and DOE-ORP have awarded to CHPRC, MSA, WRPS and WAI as an applicable document. Therefore, some of the contractors' internal assessment organizations are assessing if the entire company has systems in place that are required in HASQARD. This does not make sense because HASQARD was written as a set of requirements for environmental sampling and analysis activities only. One remedy suggested to alleviate this issue was to specify in Volume 1 that certain sections do not apply to the Contractors because those aspects are covered under the Contractor's QA programs.

Glen Clark read the scope statement from Revision 0 of the HASQAP to the Focus Group members present. Glen surmised that the scope statements in the HASQAP indicated that the document was not applicable to analytical services performed for data generated for purposes other than the TPA. That is, the intent in the HASQAP was to provide QA requirements for analytical services conducted to support TPA data collection not to become an element of a Contractor's QA program. It was stated that if this is how HASQARD is to be viewed, the scope of HASQARD could be narrowed to specify it is only applicable to data collection for use in TPA decision making. The Volume 1 requirements could be removed from (or specified in) Volumes 2 and 3 and Volumes 1 and 4 could be removed in favor of the QSM.

Cliff Watkins asked whether given there seems to be some concurrence that a path toward elimination of Volume 1 and 4 in favor of the QSM is worth exploring, is there a need to continue with the production of Revision 5 of HASQARD. Jonathan Sanwald said that the subcommittees should at least "pause" their efforts as this new path becomes more clear. Glen Clark stated there is merit for retention of some of the HASQARD material found in Volumes 1 and/or 4. For example, the HASQARD is the place where several "exceptions" to analytical methods are documented. These are exceptions that are required when handling samples with high radioactivity (e.g., less sample used than is specified in the EPA method). There have been other documents that have tried to provide for these exceptions (e.g., RL-94-97, *Selection of Analytical Methods for Mixed Waste at the Hanford Site*, and WHC-SD-WM-LB-009, *Deviations from Approved EPA Methods at Hanford Site Laboratories*). These documents were produced in 1994 and have not been updated because HASQARD became the source referenced for the exceptions described in them. Fred Dunhour asked if these exceptions might better be applied at the project or laboratory level (in the case of the 222S Laboratory) rather than have an overlying document that tries to cover all possibilities. Glen Clark agreed that that this level of detail could be managed at the project level. Glen stated that most samples with radioactivity at levels where

exceptions would need to be implemented are analyzed at the 222S Laboratory or at PNNL. Tricia Wood said that the 222S laboratory has exception tables in each analytical method/procedure to provide details on how samples with high radioactivity are to be handled. These tables include deviations from standard method requirements for mass/volume of sample to use, sample preservation, etc. Glen Clark said that the Hanford Contractors should be able to document deviations from the standards required due to high radioactivity at the site/project level and not rely on HASQARD to define these.

Heather Medley asked if the loss of HASQARD would have an impact on AVS when they are approving laboratories. Jonathan Sanwald stated that AVS does not approve laboratories. The [practice at AVS has been similar to DOECAP. That is, they produce a report indicating any nonconformance from known requirements and allowing the users to evaluate the importance of each nonconformance to the work the laboratory is going to do for them. Fred Dunhour stated that this is similar to the approach taken by the auditors that maintain the Master Approved Supplier List (MASL). The MASL is a complex wide approved suppliers list. Jonathan Sanwald stated that MSA AVS has had mixed results in trying to use MASL reports as the basis for a desk evaluation of some suppliers. The typical issues with the MASL reports are that they do not discuss the results at the level of detail required by MSA in their process. Heather Medley asked how contractor employees can get access to the MASL. Jonathan Sanwald committed to send Heather the information. Joel Hebdon asked if the MSA AVS (or MASL) provide evaluation information of laboratories at the analyte level. Jonathan Sanwald said that no, the MASL is just an accumulation of audit reports for a number of suppliers. Joel said that for an audit to be meaningful, the supplier needs to be cognizant of the QA program under which they are being evaluated. Jonathan Sanwald agreed adding the MSA is one of four sites that entered results into the MASL system so far. The MASL system also has a user board that allows personnel from across the complex to communicate on upcoming audits, suggest audit participants, etc. Fred Dunhour stated that he believes the MASL effort was started to attempt to achieve some consistency in the way suppliers are evaluated across the complex. Jonathan added that he is aware of an upcoming meeting to discuss that issue. That is, there are lots of methods used to approve suppliers. This results in MSA AVS still feeling like they need to do 50% of the audit they would typically do at a supplier due to things not covered in the MASL reports.

Glen Clark brought up Section 10 of HASQARD Volume 1 of HASQARD as being an issue that could be alleviated if Volume 1 was no longer a requirement. Section 10 of HASQARD Volume 1 addresses assessments. This section states that management assessments are required annually. This annual requirement is not in line with DOE Order 414.1D which does not mention a frequency requirement. The NELAC Institute (TNI) has added

annual management assessments as a requirement also. Joel Hebdon stated that he was not aware that management assessments were being conducted annually on all the scope required to fall under HASQARD. For example, Joel stated that he does not believe a management assessment has ever been done on environmental sampling at WRPS. Glen Clark concurred stating that under HASQARD they should be doing them annually. Glen added that he believes it seems like overkill to do a management assessment on sampling annually. Jonathan Sanwald stated that compliance with HASQARD in the area of management assessments varies widely but recalling the PNNL does a monthly management review which is more than is required by HASQARD.

I. The HASQARD Focus Group Chair asked if there was any new business.

Rich Weiss stated that he anticipates the future Revision 6 of the QSM to be a major effort to incorporate the ISO 17025 and TNI updates. Glen Clark concurred in this view based on the review of the latest revision to ISO 17025 he has done. Rich Weiss stated that if we are to adopt the QSM as Hanford's replacement for HASQARD, the Hanford contractors need to become more conscious and involved in commenting and providing suggestions for the QSM updates. The activity of updating the QSM has been largely driven by DOD in the past. But, with DOE adopting the QSM as the standard for the DOECAP-AP, DOE needs greater involvement. Glen Clark agreed and stated he would bring this up with Steve Clark at the workshop next week.

Glen Clark stated that he found out the Savannah River Site (SRS) had sent samples to the Eurofins laboratory that had been released as "non-radioactive." However, when they arrived at Eurofins, the laboratory screened them, found radioactivity inside the shipping container and had no paperwork from SRS. This highlights the need to ensure the laboratories are following the Hazardous and Radioactive Materials Management requirements found in the DOECAP-AP assessment modules to ensure samples are not accepted without appropriate paperwork.

Hearing no additional new business, Jonathan Sanwald 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 September 18, 2018 in Conference Room 223 at 2430 Stevens Center Place.