

HASQARD Focus Group
Meeting Minutes
August 21, 2019

The meeting was called to order by Sarah Nagel the HASQARD Focus Group Chair at 2:00 PM on August 21, 2019 in Conference Room 199 at 2430 Stevens Center Place.

Those attending were: Sarah Nagel – Focus Group Chair (Mission Support Alliance (MSA)), Cliff Watkins - Focus Group Secretary (Corporate Allocation Services, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (RL) Support Contractor), Samuel Adams (Battelle Memorial Institute – Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)), Glen Clark (Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS)), Erika Cutsforth (CH2MHILL Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC)), Jim Douglas (CHPRC), Scot Fitzgerald (CHPRC), Anthony Nagel (CHPRC), Walter Scott (U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (ORP)), Paula Sellers (Waste Treatment Completion Contractor (WTCC)), Noe'l Smith-Jackson (Washington State Department of Ecology), Chris Thompson (PNNL), Rich Weiss (MSA), Tricia Wood (Wastren Hanford Laboratory (WHL)).

- I. The Chair requested review and approval of the meeting minutes from the HASQARD Focus Group held on July 24, 2019. The draft minutes from the meeting were distributed and time was allowed for one final review. Two comments were received and incorporated prior to a motion for approval of the minutes being heard. Hearing no objections to the motion and no additional comments on the draft meeting minutes, the minutes from the July 24, 2019 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:

In July there was one DOECAP audit that was supported by a HASQARD Focus Group member. This audit was a close-out audit of the Test America Richland (TARL) facility in Richland, WA. This audit was necessitated by the Port of Benton not renewing the lease on the property on which the laboratory is located and the Port's desire to repurpose the land. The DOECAP-AP has no role in close-out audits because their focus is laboratory accreditation. However, the DOE-HQ Analytical Services Program (ASP) Manager recognizes the value for these audits to ensure DOE's liability is reduced when a laboratory ceases to do business, is decommissioned and demolished.

Rich Weiss conducted the close-out audit of TARL for DOECAP and provided a summary of the effort. Rich stated the audit was conducted on

August 5. At that time, one third of the laboratory had been deconstructed. The effort of the demolition crews at the time of the audit was focused on removing the laboratory bench tops which needed to be handled as potentially asbestos containing. The crews at work at the time were expecting the facility to be “clean and dark” by August 20. When Rich arrived, there was no documentation of any kind remaining in the building. All documentation that was not taken to St. Louis by Test America was sent to Iron Mountain. That repository claims that any document they receive can be retrieved in one or two days. All data stored in the Test America Laboratory Information Management System (TALS) is still in the TALS and are accessible at other Test America locations. The servers that were present in Richland have been moved to St. Louis and are in “warm standby.” The data reduction software used by TARS on Hanford samples (e.g., radcalc) is resident on those servers. Rich stated that in September, the Washington State Department of Health will visit the facility for a final close-out inspection prior to authorizing the building to be razed. The demolition of the building will result in only the parking lot being left unaltered at the TARS site. There were some drums of waste on site but some of those were generated during deconstruction activities.

Glen Clark asked Rich Weiss if he knew what the Port of Benton’s plans for the former TARS property are. Rich did not know the answer to this question and speculated that it may just be used as a parking area for the wine center. It was stated that Jodie Carnes and Albert “Rusty” Vicinie are still employed by Test America and remain good contacts for any Hanford contractors needing anything related to TARS. Mr. Vicinie was present at the close-out audit and did a good job of responding to all of the close-out audit lines of inquiry. Rich has prepared the closure report for DOECAP and has forwarded it to the DOE-HQ ASP Manager. Rich did not know the schedule for release of that report. Glen Clark thanked Rich for doing that audit and for the detailed account of the activity. Rich said it was a bit sad to see a facility that had been so critical to the environmental clean-up efforts at Hanford being shut down and deconstructed. Rich also remarked that, surprisingly, the personnel doing the facility deconstruction stated that they encountered very little radioactive contamination during the process. The hoods and furnaces in the medium level laboratory had a little contamination, but there was less than anticipated. Jim Douglas asked if Rich had any concerns as he left the audit. Rich stated that he had no concerns at all. From what he could tell, Rich believes Test America has adequately addressed everything necessary.

Sarah Nagel asked if there were any other DOECAP or DOECAP-AP assessment activities involving HASQARD Focus Group members since the last meeting of the Focus Group. No other assessments have occurred in that time frame. Scot Fitzgerald stated that the DOECAP-AP has scheduled the assessment at Test America St. Louis for December 9-11, 2019. Scott said he is scheduled to participate as an observer at that assessment. Scot commented

that the forewarning of this upcoming assessment was much better than the DOECAP-AP accrediting bodies (ABs) have been providing in the past. Glen Clark stated that the assessment at ALS in Salt Lake City is scheduled to occur in two weeks and Robert Elkins is scheduled to observe at that assessment. Glen added that he is still scheduled to observe the Eurofins assessment scheduled at the new facility in Fife, WA. That assessment is scheduled for October 16-18, 2019. The Eurofins facility in Fife is an existing Test America environmental laboratory and much of the equipment being installed there is moving from the facility closing in Bothell, WA. The DOECAP-AP assessment will be a full assessment this year. The DOECAP close-out audit of the Bothell Eurofins laboratory will be conducted by Gene Kumamoto.

The recent activities associated with the DOE Data Quality Workgroup (the DOE advisory group to the committee responsible for the *DoD/DOE Consolidated Quality System Manual for Analytical Services (QSM)*) were discussed.

A conference call of the DQW was held on August 1. Sarah Nagel asked if the presentation materials had been distributed from that call. The Focus Group members stated they did not recall seeing them. The Secretary took the action to distribute the presentation slides to the Focus Group. The subject of the conference call was the initial planning for revision 6.0 of the QSM.

Sarah Nagel recalled that the only other DOE DQW activity since the last HASQARD Focus Group meeting was a question from the DOECAP-AP ABs regarding Lucas Cell radioanalytical measurements. Several HASQARD Focus Group members participated in providing input on the response to this inquiry. To summarize the question, for gamma analysis, the calibration range is typically specified but what is not specified is the required range for quality control (QC) sample analysis.

Prior to the meeting, Glen Clark provided the Focus Group with a copy of a table containing the QSM Appendix E, HASQARD Gap Checklist, showing columns to show the HASQARD Checklist Item Number, Proposed Location for the requirements in QSM Rev. 5.3, Proposed Wording of the QSM if the HASQARD requirement is accepted, the HASQARD Line of Inquiry, the source of the requirement in HASQARD, the source of the requirement from other QA references and a discussion/recommendation. The table was projected on a screen for group discussion. For several of the items on the table, Glen was requesting Focus Group input to resolve issues he has identified with the items (e.g., a requirement that is derived from only NQA-1 should not be flowed down to a laboratory when no equivalent EPA, ISO, etc. requirement exists).

Glen Clark mentioned the timing problem related to issuance of HASQARD

Revision 5 stating that the QSM is the source of requirements while the QSM has a HASQARD gap checklist where the Focus Group has determined some of the requirements in Appendix E of the QSM are no longer required. Noe'l Smith-Jackson asked what assurance we have that the DOE DQW will incorporate all of the Appendix E requirements in HASQARD. The response to this was that we have no assurance of this. If the DQW chooses not to incorporate a requirement that the Focus Group feels must be included, it will have to be addressed in procurement documents with the laboratories.

Glen Clark continued presenting the table being displayed on the screen for Focus Group review explaining that each statement in the QSM Appendix E is based on a stand alone requirement from HASQARD. The HASQARD reference of the requirement was provided to the DOE-HQ ASP Manager but was lost when Appendix E was published in the QSM. Glen wants to approach the DOE DQW with a consolidated Focus Group proposal for incorporation of Appendix E in the body of the QSM requirements. This requires the Focus Group to agree which of the Appendix E requirements are important. Rich Weiss agreed saying that when we are happy with which requirements from Appendix E are important, the matrix can become the basis for the Focus Group's submittal to the DOE DQW.

The Focus Group reviewed the matrix and agreed with the comments provided by Glen and Rich on which requirements were not adding value or were redundant given the requirements found in the QSM text. Action items were taken by Rich Weiss to look deeper into the requirements being stated in QSM Appendix E items number 2.3, 2.4 and 5.2. Rich agreed to look at these items and provide a recommendation.

III. The status of production of Revision 5 of HASQARD was discussed.

The status of Revision 5 to Volume 1 is that it is waiting for Volume 3 and 4 to be finalized prior to being able to complete the revision.

The status of Revision 5 to Volume 2 is that it is ready for Focus Group review as long as Volume 1 does not result in additional revisions being required.

The status of Revision 5 of Volume 4 is that the 222-S Laboratory and PNNL are reviewing the revision to determine if they will be able to comply with the revision as written. This is likely going to be problematic because the revision to Volume 4 will invoke the DoD/DOE QSM as the source of requirements and not all of DoD/DOE QSM requirements can be met at those two laboratories. The work of reconciling requirements and determining exceptions that will be required is on-going by 222-S and PNNL.

Jim Douglas reported he took the input received at the June 19 and July 24

meetings of the HASQARD Focus Group and has applied this input in producing a draft for Revision 5 of HASQARD Volume 3. Jim had completed an initial draft of that revision and projected it on the screen to discuss specific questions he had for the Focus Group before completing the draft and submitting it for formal review.

Jim Douglas had reorganized Volume 3 to combine redundant requirements in one place. He has also used section numbering to ensure each statement that reflects a requirement has a section number to allow reference to requirements by number. Jim has organized items that are informational and do not reflect requirements by using bullets rather than section numbers. Jim presented a version of Revision 5 of Volume 3 showing changes tracked and comments added. Where Jim had a comment requiring Focus Group input prior to proceeding with revision of the document, he highlighted the comments statement. Jim stated he was presenting the document in its current state of revision to get concurrence from the Focus Group that the approach makes sense. The discussion went beyond the highlighted comments and the Focus Group discussed details of the revisions being made. Running out of time, the highlighted comments were addressed by the Focus Group before the meeting was adjourned.

IV. Sarah Nagel asked if there was any new business to be discussed.

No new business was identified.

Sarah Nagel summarized the action items she collected from the discussion:

1. Rich Weiss will look at the QSM Appendix E matrix to determine additional details related to Appendix E checklist items number 2.3, 2.4 and 5.2.
2. Cliff Watkins will forward the presentation slides from the DQW teleconference meeting that occurred on August 1.

Hearing no additional new business, Sarah Nagel adjourned the meeting at 4:24 PM.

The next meeting of the HASQARD Focus Group was announced as being scheduled for 2:00 PM on Wednesday September 18, 2019 in Conference Room 199 at 2430 Stevens Center Place.