

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Voting Board Members in Attendance (general attendance sheet for the meeting is attached):

*Greg Hayward – Idaho	Ken Picha (chair) – Headquarters Acting EM-20
Robert Brown – Oak Ridge	Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah
Ray Corey – Richland	Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-23
*Bill Rowland – Savannah River	No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad
Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety	Jonathan (JD) Dowell - River Protection
T.J. Jackson – EMCBC	

**Note: The by-laws require the voting member to be the Site Manager or assistant/deputy manager. The noted individuals were representing the designated sites at the EM QA Corporate Board meeting but did not meet the requirements in the by-laws as a voting member of the board.*

Introduction by John Eschenberg (Assistant Manager for Environmental Management in Oak Ridge)

John Eschenberg welcomed everyone to the meeting and provided a summary of the current work activities taking place in Oak Ridge.

Presentation by Larry Perkins (EM-23) - Summary of Corporate Board Action Items

Larry Perkins presented the action items from the previous meeting with a status for each action. The actions that have not been completed to date are summarized in the following table with a current status.

<u>SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS</u>		
Action for Follow-Up	Individual Responsible	Current Status
Provide a revised lesson learned document based on previous events surrounding Commercial Grade Dedication.	Linda Weir (BNI)	The revised lessons learned document is still in draft by BNI and is scheduled for completion in March 2011. The completed document will then be provided to the board.
Update the project plan to include new information.	Larry Perkins (EM-23)	Due to multiple changes, the project plan has not been approved. The plan will be updated based on the results of this meeting and provided to the executive committee for review.
Notify the EFCOG chair when the JSEP is ready to populate and the EFCOG chair will send a letter to member encouraging its use.	Christian Palay (EM-23) Joe Yanek (EFCOG)	This action will follow the completion of the JSEP milestones in March 2011.
Survey of the EM complex to evaluate the needs with respect to resources	Bob Murray (EM-23)	This action will be added to a new focus area as discussed later.

Presentation by Ken Picha (Acting EM-20) and Bob Murray (EM-23) - Summary of EM QA Program and Crosscutting QA Issues

Ken Picha and Bob Murray provided a presentation on the status of the EM QA Program and provided a status of current crosscutting issues of concern to senior management.

Bob Murray noted that the 95% confidence level that was put in the SES performance plans as part of Goal #5 in the Journey to Excellence has been changed. The new language in the performance plans now indicates that 95% of the Suspect/Counterfeit items must be caught prior to installation in lieu of the 95% confidence level.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

The EM-20 office has also received an email from the EM front office that requires a monthly status of how EM is meeting the goals of the EM Journey to Excellence. As a group, the EM Corporate Board needs to work together to determine how to provide this type of status (the next report will be due in approximately 30 days.)

Brenda Hawks asked if this discussion was intended to focus on safety significant and safety class items.

Bob Murray and JD Dowell responded that this is correct.

Bud Danielson asked how EM would count this type of effort in start-up etc.

Ken Picha noted that this question is what we are looking at in how to track the status of the requirement.

Bob Murray indicated that the metric was left as 95% of parts going into the facility must meet the requirement to meet the metric. We can discuss this in more detail later.

Bob Murray discussed the concern with S/CI in electronics. EM-23 has completed a review of the Salt Waste Processing Facility and is currently scheduled to perform a review at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Project.

Bob Murray noted that the standard QA contract language update is being worked with a draft included in the meeting materials. We can discuss the details of the changes later.

Ken Picha discussed that Michael Weis was brought in by S-1 to try and help cut out some of the bureaucracy within the Department. OMB is also challenging the agencies to come back with lower budgets. Mr. Weis is working to interface with the offices and S-1 at addressing ways to reduce duplication etc.

Bob Murray discussed that the DNFSB has been looking at how DOE O 414.1C and the CRD are flowed down from prime contractors to subcontractors. It appears that DOE and the DNFSB have some disagreement on how these requirements are flowed down. After working with the General Counsel, DOE has taken the position that the CRD is flowed down to prime contractors only and the prime contractors determine what attributes should be flowed down to subcontractors, but not the Order and CRD in their entirety.

San Horton noted that the DNFSB has reviewed DOE's position and is currently having the DNFSB General Counsel review the position and will respond as necessary after that discussion is complete.

Bob Murray also noted that EM has provided a shorter version of the flow-down response to the DNFSB staff. The short version is more of an engineering approach to further clarify the formal response that was provided.

Bill Rowland asked what reviews would be conducted to include in the summary report to the DNFSB in March.

Larry Perkins summarized the pieces that will be used to provide report to the DNFSB. The report will include:

- Summary of QA Declarations with respect to flow-down
- Summary of Phase II QAP/QIP implementation reviews with respect to flow-down
- Summary of site reports for some period of time (e.g., 6 months) to address flow-down

Bob Murray continued that he feels we have a good handle on the S/CI with respect to hardware and based on his interactions with the DNFSB and DNFSB staff, they appear to agree. The primary area of concern is with respect to electronics. Bob discussed the issue with the DNFSB and indicated the focus should be on safety components in the facility and not necessarily all components such as laptops without interaction with safety components. EM offered to perform a review of S/CI for electronics at both the Salt Waste Processing Facility and the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Project if that would help with the DNFSB concerns. The DNFSB members indicated that would be beneficial.

Bob Murray discussed that development of a memorandum that was provided to the sites with recommendations on electronics and S/CI was based on the results of the SWPF review. Some feedback from the sites has asked if these recommendations are requirements and if they will be used in future audits and assessments of QA implementation. The answer is that they are only recommendations to consider and are not requirements or mandates.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Jim Tisarunni commented that how to manage a long supply chain is a bigger issue than actually shortening the supply chains.

Bob Murray responded that there is certainly a limited supplier base so that is a potential concern. However, if the supply chain is four levels for example (A-B-C-D), the prime contractor has to somehow ensure they look at all of the suppliers in the chain and establish the pedigree for the components.

Rich Salizzoni asked if the memorandum would be updated and revised as new information became available from subsequent reviews.

Bob Murray answered yes that revisions to the memorandum would be made as needed, but there are no issues or specifics to date that warrant a revision.

Rick Warriner noted that the memorandum appeared to be focusing on more than just the safety function of the item.

Bob Murray indicated that was accurate. Embedded software on electronics is also a concern.

Rick Warriner continued that in order to address that issue, you would have to go to the templates to get chain of custody, serial numbers, etc. and that pedigree may not be available. They test a batch for functionality, but this is pretty extensive to address embedded software.

Bob Murray agreed and stated we need to focus on a risk based approach.

JD Dowell asked if we have benchmarked other organizations such as NNSA or Naval Reactors.

Ray Wood indicated we have looked at some and the commercial world is going so far as to manage returns and trace the documented pedigree. They are even x-raying dyes because chips are failing after months and not only after weeks. The bottom line is that the supply chain is doing a lot of work and we need to ensure our suppliers are looking at that information.

Wayne Ledford noted we really want to try to avoid secondary distributors.

San Horton noted that NNSA and DOD are using "Trusted Foundry" that may be a good source of information. He also noted that Rick Warriner's comment was valid in that cost will increase quickly. As such, we can't do this type of pedigree for every piece of equipment but safety significant and safety class equipment and electronics are the primary concern.

JD Dowell noted that we may leverage the existing government contracts to help with the concern.

San Horton stated that risk analysis is the key for cost and addressing the true threat.

Bob Murray noted that this discussion demonstrated the concern which is also present with the DNFSB. Perhaps the Corporate Board should consider forming a focus area to study the issue.

Ken Picha noted that Naval Reactors will be represented at the QA Summit tomorrow and can be engaged on their current approach.

Bud Danielson made two points that the discussion should keep in mind:

- There was a meeting last month and the SAE are developing electronics S/CI standards and guides now. NQA has input on this development. This comment is just intended to point out that this is ongoing and we can get someone tied in with it.
- There was a White House level meeting and NASA and DOD are working the issue for the government. This effort is deciding what guidance is needed and CNS has participated. CNS will share future meeting invitations to keep EM informed of the progress.

Bob Murray mentioned the Phase II reviews at HQ and noted that an independent audit team will be asked to look at the HQ implementation soon. If anyone would like to volunteer for that team, please contact Bob via email.

Bob Murray noted that to date, the EM-23 role has been to support the field, and provided several examples of how that support has been provided. Bob asked that if the field does not have QA resources to complete a

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

task, please call him and EM-23 will work to help support the effort. Bob emphasized that EM-23 is not only responsible for auditing the field organizations, we can also provide support.

Bob Murray discussed that EM needs real time QA metrics that are not just reactive. However, given the number of efforts on this issue, including a previous Corporate Board Focus Area, it may not be possible. He suggested the Corporate Board may want to consider a new Focus Area to address this issue.

Brenda Hawks noted that for the QA Declaration type of metrics, the sooner we can get the updated metrics to the field and contractors, the better equipped they will be to respond.

Jerry Lipsky asked if there is a problem that needs to be solved that is driving the metrics discussion.

Bob Murray indicated that the Journey to Excellence and subsequent metrics are always discussed, but there is more information and a lot of QA resources here today.

Jerry Lipsky noted that he felt his concern/suggestion related to project readiness reviews (so to speak) for QA would address part of this issue.

Butch Huxford stated that Focus Area #3 was covering this type of issue on forethought in their paper much like Jerry Lipsky's suggestion.

Chris Marden noted that EFCOG has a team that is looking at metrics that are more predictive for QA. Bob Toro from EM-23 is currently on that team. Maybe EFCOG is working this issue already without the need for a new Focus Area.

JD Dowell asked to be kept in the loop on the status of the issue.

Presentation by Bud Danielson (CNS) - NQA-1 Accreditation

Bud Danielson indicated that prior to the presentation, he would like to cover a few general topics of discussion:

- CNS has worked to develop a risk ranking for the facilities to ensure they are looking at the hazards and using risk to appropriately assign resources. This risk ranking will be provided to the sites to see if the field offices can also use it to assist in their oversight.
- For those who know Tim Arcano, Tim has been selected for a loan position to teach at the Naval Academy for one year with the option of a second year.
- If you make inquiries to the NQA-1 committee, please ensure you use the correct format or they won't be answered. You may call the chair person or a committee member to ask for help in phrasing inquiries for proper submission.
- The NQA-1 committee is looking to build S/CI in and CGD has been included in the requirements. Section 2.14 is also being reviewed to see if there are any updates needed to address software. A new Part 2 on NQA-1 versus 10 CFR 830 has also been drafted and is working through the comment process.

Debbie Sparkman commented that a software CGD guidance is being developed now.

Bud Danielson presented the NQA-1 Accreditation information and noted that the program is currently scheduled to roll out in June/July 2011 but there are no cost figures to present. Purely as a guess, the cost will likely be similar to an N Stamp or ISO-9001 certification.

Bud Danielson also noted that with an N Stamp, you get the certificate but not the audit report. The NQA-1 certification will also provide the report.

TJ Jackson asked if anyone has looked at ISO-9001 certifications and how similar the NQA-1 certification will be.

Bud Danielson stated that they have looked at them but don't plan to get public comments. The program will all be in-house and will issue a requirements document, but no public comment on procedures. ASME is not applying to be a certifying body with any other organization. The requirements document is drafted and ASME is working in-house to have the program available by the June/July 2011 date. Bud also noted that the service will only be offered to suppliers and not utilities.

Rick Warriner asked if this certification will be similar to the ISO for advertising abilities for a vendor.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Bud Danielson said yes, but ASME says they are looking at the specifics of implementation.

Brenda Hawks asked if we can give credit like in the IMS Order to reduce oversight.

Bud Danielson stated that his personal opinion is yes but HS will need to answer that question formally.

Michelle Dudley asked if similar to the NIAC and NUPIC, will they use services or suppliers.

Bud Danielson stated that this effort is not the same as NIAC or NUPIC.

Mike Mason noted that this is a first attempt so there is more to come. We are still working through the process.

Bud Danielson noted that ANAB could get certification programs for 10 CFR 830 and DOE O 414.1C if we want to pursue that type of effort and get people accredited to do the certification.

Presentation by Mike Mason (BNI) – Focus Area 1: Joint Supplier Evaluation Program

Mike Mason presented the status of the Joint Supplier Evaluation Program. Mike noted that NNSA has BMAC, which is working an issue very similar to JSEP with the same ultimate goal as JSEP. The Focus Area team has been in contact with BMAC and identified that major differences in the two efforts.

Rich Warriner asked that since NNSA has mandated the use of the approved suppliers list, how they handle liability issues. If the list is mandated, isn't it a government supplied item?

Mike Mason said no, they did not treat it as a government supplied item and asked Christina Palay to elaborate.

Christina Palay stated that NNSA has a subgroup of contractors that came up with the MOA and the list was not mandated by NNSA. There is still a sharing of liability since the MOA agreement is among the contractors only. Christian also noted that the information is both ways (i.e., problems with suppliers is also reported into the system).

Bob Murray asked if we have a signed copy of the MOA on BMAC.

Christian Palay said we have a draft but not a signed copy.

Mike Mason noted that the Program Plan for JSEP is out for review now.

Bob Murray stated that we need the Corporate Board to vote on changing the Focus Area to allow further investigation of working with BMAC.

Mike Mason noted that the vote is not to change the existing path but will simply add an additional deliverable to report on the interaction with BMAC.

Ken Picha asked who decides on the representation from the focus area group for JSEP.

Bob Murray responded that he and Christian helped find federal support and Mike Mason found EFCOG support. Bob also noted that interaction with BMAC was ongoing but needed the Corporate Board endorsement.

Ray Corey asked if NNSA was willing to adjust their program to help meet our needs in EM.

Mike Mason indicated that the answer is yes, NNSA has expressed a willingness to work together and adjust as needed.

Norm Barker noted that there have been senior management discussions on the issue as well.

TJ Jackson noted that the tasks for JSEP will be completed with results soon based on the current schedule.

Dave Tuttel noted this could be an added task to the Focus Area or a new Focus Area.

Paul Bills stated that they are finalizing the actions for the Focus Area and will be complete in the next few weeks.

Randy Smyth noted that this was a very good idea to have a common approach and should yield success.

Bob Murray noted that the pilot will be complete in approximately 6 weeks.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Larry Perkins clarified that the vote should add a new deliverable with a date for a status back to the Board within a given time frame and should be included in the project plan for approval.

Norm Barker suggested the status should be provided by the next meeting of the Corporate Board and should address any difficulties discovered.

Vote to realign Focus Area #1 to investigate the integration of EM and NNSA efforts to reduce redundant efforts and improve supplier quality: (PASSED)

*Greg Hayward – Idaho - **YES**

Ken Picha (chair) – Headquarters Acting EM-20 - **YES**

Robert Brown – Oak Ridge - **YES**

Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah - **YES**

Ray Corey – Richland - **YES**

Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-23 - **YES**

*Bill Rowland – Savannah River - **YES**

No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad – **N/A**

Bud Danielson – Chief of Nuclear Safety - **YES**

Jonathan (JD) Dowell - River Protection - **YES**

T.J. Jackson – EMCBC - **YES**

**Note: The by-laws require the voting member to be the Site Manager or assistant/deputy manager. The noted individuals were representing the designated sites at the EM QA Corporate Board meeting but did not meet the requirements in the by-laws as a voting member of the board.*

Presentation by Dennis Weaver (BNI) – Focus Area 2: Commercial Grade Dedication

Dennis Weaver presented the current status of Focus Area #2.

Debbie Sparkman noted that May 16-17, 2011 will have a software CGD training course available. More information should be available soon.

TJ Jackson asked why we are calling the deliverable a guide versus a standard since it is more formal to use a standard.

Dennis Weaver responded that the information provided is more in line with a guide and not a requirements document like a standard.

Brenda Hawks asked if we used a standard would it have to be DOE wide.

Bud Danielson indicated that would only be the case if it was to be used DOE wide.

Bob Murray noted that if we go the route of a DOE Standard, it will take an extremely large amount of time to get approved and distributed.

Debbie Sparkman agreed with Bob and noted that this is needed within EM now. Debbie also noted that NNSA has indicated they are not ready for this type of document as a standards and EM should keep the document/guidance local to EM at this time.

JD Dowell clarified that the document was not directive enough to be a standard.

TJ Jackson asked if there was an intention for the document to be contractual.

Dennis Weaver answered that is not the expectation or intent.

Debbie Sparkman noted that earlier versions of NQA-1 did not have Section 2.14 so that was something to consider when contractual discussions were held.

Rick Warriner commented that his impression was NQA-1-2004 with addenda through 2007 address CGD, just not all in one location.

Bob Thompson asked if we have additional software requirements, will the training for CGD instructors have to be updated.

Dennis Weaver indicated his opinion was yes it would need to be updated to specifically address software.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Brenda Hawks asked if we could have the class with software included at the EFCOG meeting at Richland.

Dennis Weaver indicated he thought that was possible.

Rick Salizonni asked if the comments with resolutions will be sent back out to the reviewers of the CGD guide.

Dennis Weaver indicated he would have to check with Pat Carier but thought the answer was yes.

Bud Danielson asked how to find out about the training and do any suppliers attend?

Dennis Weaver indicated that subcontractors have attended the sessions but he was not familiar with how it was marketed/advertised, but he thinks it is primarily on an as requested basis.

Brenda Hawks added that when HQ pays for the classes, they are primarily federal and prime contractors that attend. When the sites pay for the classes, more subcontractors attend.

JD Dowell recommended EM-23 could put a memo out to the sites as information on the classes.

Bob Murray noted that this type of discussion as scheduled for the EMCBC presentation later in the day, but it seems we are at the point of moving the training over to the commercial sector and EM focusing on any new material that is needed.

Debbie Sparkman stated the only problem was that the commercial sector doesn't understand SQA and utilities have different approaches.

Bob Murray clarified that this is similar to CGD. EM didn't turn those courses over to the commercial sector immediately. We can discuss further during the session this afternoon.

Debbie Sparkman noted that Bud Danielson had mentioned NQA with respect to SQA issues earlier and wanted to clarify that DOE is also represented in those meetings to help maintain consistency.

TJ Jackson noted that we require contractors to comply with NQA-1-2004 with addenda to 2007. If this guidance is written based on NQA-1-2009, we need to ensure it is just guidance and not a requirement for future audits.

Mike Mason noted any changes to the version of NQA-1 would have to go through the CO and contract modifications.

Bob Murray agreed and noted that we have multiple versions of NQA-1 in use across the complex, including NQA-1-2000 programs that have added CGD from NQA-1-2008. We audit to the requirements of the contract and not a guide.

Brenda Hawks noted EM could use the guide to say this is an acceptable method to use.

Dennis Weaver clarified that this document is a guide and the version of NQA-1 used is not crucial.

Russell McCallister suggested the note that this guide does not change any contract requirements be placed in the front of the document and clearly marked.

Vote to change the Task deliverable to a "Guide" and not a "Standard".: (PASSED)

*Greg Hayward – Idaho - YES	Ken Picha (chair) – Headquarters Acting EM-20 - YES
Robert Brown – Oak Ridge - YES	Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah - YES
Ray Corey – Richland - YES	Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-23 - YES
*Bill Rowland – Savannah River - YES	No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad – N/A
Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety - YES	Jonathan (JD) Dowell - River Protection - YES
T.J. Jackson – EMCBC - YES	

**Note: The by-laws require the voting member to be the Site Manager or assistant/deputy manager. The noted individuals were representing the designated sites at the EM QA Corporate Board meeting but did not meet the requirements in the by-laws as a voting member of the board.*

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Vote to base guidance on NQA-1a-2009 with appropriate notations made where that version differs from NQA-1-2004 with addenda through 2007; including a note that the basis for the guidance is not intended to alter any contractual requirements that are based on earlier versions of NQA-1.: (PASSED)

*Greg Hayward – Idaho - YES	Ken Picha (chair) – Headquarters Acting EM-20 - YES
Robert Brown – Oak Ridge - YES	Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah - YES
Ray Corey – Richland - YES	Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-23 - YES
*Bill Rowland – Savannah River - YES	No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad – N/A
Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety - YES	Jonathan (JD) Dowell - River Protection - YES
T.J. Jackson – EMCBC - YES	

**Note: The by-laws require the voting member to be the Site Manager or assistant/deputy manager. The noted individuals were representing the designated sites at the EM QA Corporate Board meeting but did not meet the requirements in the by-laws as a voting member of the board.*

Presentation by JD Dowell (ORP): Improving Mission Execution

Corporate Board Chair Ken Picha added a brief presentation by JD Dowell, Acting Manager for ORP to the agenda.

JD Dowell explained a recent meeting in Washington DC that focused on the Secretary of Energy's initiative on improving Mission Executions. There are 6 goals to improve the decision making process. The effort is focusing on more responsibility in the field offices and clarifying the functional versus line management positions. Another focus is reducing redundancy and reducing resources needed at Headquarters and focusing those resources on efforts in the field. This effort is being led by Michael Weis and is discussed in a recent memorandum from S-1.

Ken Picha asked if they identified points to get back and brief progress to the Secretary and are field managers asked to help work the issues in lieu of other program offices.

JD Dowell indicated that they are going to brief the DASs next on the approach and it is really both. The teams are championed by personnel at the undersecretary level. In addition, an emphasis was made that now is the time to bring up issues that need to be addressed.

Bud Danielson noted from the discussion that ISO was primarily the non-nuclear work and IAEA was the nuclear piece. There is a reason we use NQA-1, and other organizations supplement the ISO 9001 requirements to meet expectations for nuclear work. In discussions on reducing redundancy, this needs to be considered.

Presentation by Butch Huxford (EM-23) – Focus Area #3: QA in Design

Butch Huxford provided a presentation on the status of the QA in Design Focus Area and indicated the effort is nearly complete (85%). The white paper is ready for review outside of the Focus Area team. The group is asking the Corporate Board to upgrade the white paper to a guidance document due to the information that should be used by the projects. A format like the COr CGD guidance that is currently in process, is the best path forward. The next step would be to present the document to the FPDs, EFCOG, and QA groups for comment with final submittal to the Board in June.

Ken Picha asked for clarification since the discussion seemed to originally indicate contractor assurance beyond QA was covered but the focus in the discussion now seems to be focused just on QA.

Bud Danielson explained that they were distinguishing between QA/QE versus quality by the work force. Butch Huxford agreed.

Brenda Hawks noted the paper should consider increasing CGD for example on new contracts.

TJ Jackson asked about the difference in the guide and what is being requested.

Ken Picha asked if we were referring to 'guide' in the same context as the CGD guide.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Butch Huxford responded that this context is correct.

Jerry Lipsky asked if this already existed. It is really how versus what the requirements are.

Butch Huxford indicated the answer was no, this type of paper doesn't exist, but agreed with the explanation. An example was provided on qualifying QC inspectors where the prime contractors have latitude to mandate to subcontractors.

Bob Toro asked if this was something we are trying to standardize.

Butch Huxford answered that the paper provides the steps and a roadmap.

Al Hawkins indicated it should be considered how this relates to 413.

Butch Huxford indicated the guidance would only be for EM.

Jerry Lipsky asked if verification before you do design is a consideration.

Butch Huxford indicated yes to an extent.

Rich Warriner asked is this should be a lessons learned document.

Butch Huxford indicated that the lessons learned document was a consideration.

Ken Picha noted there appears to be some confusion on the reasoning for the Focus Area formation. Should we discuss why this Focus Area was initiated?

Norm Barker explained how things weren't working and discussed procurement versus design.

Brenda Hawks noted that HEUMF had trouble with a recent ORR because design wasn't looking at the end and the documents weren't correct.

Bud Danielson recommended the Board be provided the white paper first and then allowed to discuss what method should be used to distribute the information.

TJ Jackson agreed and thought we may even want to use the lessons learned process.

Bob Murray agreed and indicated the paper needs to be sent out for review by the Board.

Brenda Hawks asked if Butch Huxford could get on the OECM team on 413 that is addressing this type of issue.

Bud Danielson thinks yes and will check on it and provide the team lead/point of contact.

Bob Murray indicated the next step is to distribute the paper to the Corporate Board with the names of potential reviewers and begin participation on 413 team.

Greg Hayward asked if the deliverable schedule would stay the same as presented.

Butch Huxford answered yes.

Ken Picha asked if a crosswalk to 413 guides were included along with other documents that may have pieces of information that should be referenced.

Butch Huxford indicated no crosswalk has been developed but these documents have influenced the white paper and the references were included.

Presentation by Brenda Hawks (ORO) – Focus Area #4: Grading QA for D&D

Brenda Hawks presented the final deliverable for the Focus Area, indicating there is adequate guidance on the subject but the work is on how to use it.

Bob Murray indicated the deliverable was provided with the packages and recommended the Focus Area be closed out.

TJ Jackson asked how we promote the deliverable.

Brenda Hawks recommended the EM QA website or QA Hub for the information.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Bob Murray suggested we may consider the lessons learned process with HSS or have the HSS website link to our QA website. Bob Murray and Larry Perkins will work on how to distribute the information.

Vote to accept the final deliverable and close Focus Area #4: (PASSED)

*Greg Hayward – Idaho - YES	Ken Picha (chair) – Headquarters Acting EM-20 - YES
Robert Brown – Oak Ridge - YES	Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah - YES
Ray Corey – Richland - YES	Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-23 - YES
*Bill Rowland – Savannah River - YES	No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad – N/A
Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety - Abstain	Jonathan (JD) Dowell - River Protection - YES

T.J. Jackson – EMCBC - **YES**

**Note: The by-laws require the voting member to be the Site Manager or assistant/deputy manager. The noted individuals were representing the designated sites at the EM QA Corporate Board meeting but did not meet the requirements in the by-laws as a voting member of the board.*

Presentation by Bob Murray (EM-23) and TJ Jackson (EMCBC) – QA Training Initiative

Bob Murray presented the information and noted there is no real follow up to the previous training efforts.

TJ Jackson discussed that the issue stemmed from losing QA resources to retirement and working to draw younger workers into the profession. The next question is whether this type of training is EM's responsibility. Overall, the vision of the effort got fuzzy and raised the question of whether we needed DOE corporate resources.

Ray Corey noted we have a great imbalance, for example on the federal side we are losing our young people to other disciplines because we can't get higher grades within QA.

Bob Murray noted we went through various options at the CBC and concluded we own a piece of the problem, but not the whole.

Ken Picha asked if this was just a DOE issue.

TJ Jackson answered that it is also a contractor issue on getting and keeping QA resources.

Brenda Hawks noted that this was a concern with the contractors and Oak Ridge has done cost sharing with contractors to help train resources.

Bob Murray noted we have a program on the books that isn't working and going forward we don't have the resources to continue it.

JD Dowell agreed with the approach.

Ray Corey suggested we may want to ask this in the future as well and see how ARRA affected the concept. The landscape may be different in 9 months.

Greg Hayward commented that as EM works our way out of business, there has been a precedent to role these training sessions out, but courses can be expensive without a lot of contractor resources to participate. However, as EM shrinks, we still need QA resources.

Bob Murray noted that projects like Sodium Bearing Waste need veterans in QA not resources with just a few training courses.

Ken Picha asked if we should have two pieces to the recommendation, one on resources now and another in 9 months.

JD Dowell noted this issue is long term and will just get worse, so we need to develop a strategy.

Ray Corey noted our guidance from previous discussions could be distributed via this training initiative.

Brenda Hawks suggested two tasks:

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

- Is there a need for infrastructure
- Training for current workforce

JD Dowell agreed with the suggestion.

Bob Toro noted that Sandra Waisley had developed a QA resource table on federal and contractors resulting in data that showed we were below industry average in QA resources.

Bob Murray noted that a lot of this discussion was brought up at the last Corporate Board meeting.

Bud Danielson agreed that the two issues are related and need a long term strategy, but noted that we need some things now such as qualifications for federal personnel supporting nuclear facilities.

San Horton commented there are 3 TQP standards, but only 2 apply to EM.

Bob Murray commented that we can ask about resources in light of how many people are qualified to 1150 and get a standardized answer. Bob also noted that EM-23 requires all of our staff to be qualified to 1150 but noted that EM-23 could not train the entire QA staff for EM.

Bud Danielson agreed and noted we need to set priorities. Bud suggested the first step is to see if the sites have TQP qualified personnel.

Russell McCallister noted the information is available for required areas, but also suggested breaking it down by skills to help clarify the resources available.

Brenda Hawks and TJ Jackson noted this appears to be two groups and need EFCOG engagement.

Benda Hawks discussed training for Facility Representatives and what is needed for them. There is a need today for training beyond the standard such as design in QA.

TJ Jackson indicated he sees this effort as using what we did before, determine if it is adequate, and evaluate what else is needed.

Brenda Hawks thinks the lack of resources is a known issue. Training has been on QA experts versus quality training for each person on a team.

Jim Tisarunni felt DOE must develop the need for training by finding problems in audits and forcing training to be used to fix the issue. Without this, Jim felt nothing will improve.

Jerry Lipsky suggested before you go to the next step, you need proper staffing. Projects don't focus on QA until something goes wrong, and should not be allowed to proceed without fixing the problems first. Jerry also noted that the use of the facility representative and contractor equivalent programs could help.

Bob Murray noted that this is the point. The current process is not working and we need the Corporate Board to develop a new Focus Area to evaluate a path forward.

Randy Smyth commented that a Focus Area is timely and we need to define the need and skill mix, resources, etc. There appears to be a need to revamp the current approach.

Jim Tisarunni felt we want to improve performance versus just using training.

Bob Murray noted we are looking at training and not all of performance with this recommendation.

JD Dowell asked for a short recess to reword the recommendations and then take a vote. Ken Picha as the chair agreed.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Vote to Assign two focus groups to: (1) Address the September 13, 2010, commitment to the Board to develop a task team to determine if there is a shortage of QA/QC resources within EM; (2) Evaluate and assess the current strategy for EM QA/QC training and provide a recommended path forward.: **(PASSED)**

*Greg Hayward – Idaho - **YES**

Ken Picha (chair) – Headquarters Acting EM-20 - **YES**

Robert Brown – Oak Ridge - **YES**

Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah - **YES**

Ray Corey – Richland - **YES**

Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-23 - **YES**

*Bill Rowland – Savannah River - **YES**

No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad – **N/A**

Bud Danielson – Chief of Nuclear Safety - **Abstain**

Jonathan (JD) Dowell - River Protection - **YES**

T.J. Jackson – EMCBC - **YES**

**Note: The by-laws require the voting member to be the Site Manager or assistant/deputy manager. The noted individuals were representing the designated sites at the EM QA Corporate Board meeting but did not meet the requirements in the by-laws as a voting member of the board.*

Presentation by Kathy Reid (EMCBC) – NQA-1 Records Management

The presentation was presented to discuss the concerns with the differences in records terminology between NARA and NQA-1.

Bud Danielson asked for clarification in the example scope which used the term QA Records. Is it really QA Records?

Kathy Reid indicated this was accurate because QA Records are a subset of the federal records.

Bud Danielson noted that QA Records are discussed in NQA-1 but not DOE O 414.1C.

Kathy Reid noted that this is one of the issues – what is a QA record?

Bud Danielson noted that there are a lot of requirements for records outside of NQA-1.

Brenda Hawks asked about rewording the issues in the recommendations.

TJ Jackson commented that this issue needs a group to further investigate the concerns. For example, lifetime can be for the component, plant, glass product, etc.

Rick Warriner asked if it would be worth adding an end product to the mission statement.

Ken Armstrong suggested we need to give latitude to decide the deliverable and propose that deliverable back to the Board.

Mike Hassell asked if we are focusing on QA records or all requirements for federal records.

Kathy Reid responded that we are focusing on QA records for this proposed group.

Ray Corey asked if we are reconciling requirements and terminology.

Kathy Reid responded yes and indicated both may have to give some to make the process work.

Robert Thompson noted we need to include QAP, NQA-1, QARD, and NARA requirements in the evaluation.

Rick Warriner commented that it would seem everyone with a compliant QAP would have already done this type of evaluation.

Bob Toro asked if there was a cost impact consideration.

Kathy Reid responded that this has not been done since everyone is supposed to be following the requirements anyway.

TJ Jackson noted that some projects have said it's too hard to distinguish and everything is a lifetime record so the overall cost may decrease for the projects.

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Chris Marden asked if the guidance in NQA-1 is inadequate and should a clarification be requested from the NQA-1 committee.

Kathy Reid responded that the guidance is not inadequate but doesn't merge well with NARA.

Dave Tuttel noted that the Corporate Board had a list of original issues to consider that did not include records. Should this be in EFCOG and not a consideration for the Corporate Board?

JD Dowell asked if the list is still valid given the amount of time that has passed.

Norm Barker noted that the list has been revised once and is not 3 years old.

Brenda Hawks asked if they already have the group at the EMCBC and are just needing a couple QA people to support the group.

Kathy Reid responded that this is correct.

Chris Marden asked what the protocol for presenting issues to the Corporate Board was and if it was followed to present this information.

(Note the by-laws are available online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/Pages/QACorporateBoard.aspx>)

Bob Murray stated that given the comments, the request for a focus area will be withdrawn and EM-23 will provide the EMCBC with the requested support outside of the Corporate Board.

Bud Danielson indicated that CNS will also provide support for the effort outside of the Corporate Board.

Presentation by Bob Toro (EM-23) – EM Corporate QA Program: Oversight and Implementation

Bob Toro presented the EM Corporate QA Program: Oversight and Implementation strategy.

Jimmy Winkler requested a copy of the EM-23 assessment schedule.

Jim Tisarunni asked how many sites were included in the Phase II reviews.

Bob Toro responded it was 10-14 sites, he would have to get the exact number but an average of ~10 issues per site were identified.

San Horton asked if there was any double counting between the issues for the chart provided, such as an issue noted as Requirement 2 and also a testing issue.

Bob Toro indicated that there was not any double counting.

Rich Salizzoni asked if the issues were federal or contractor issues.

Bob Toro and Larry Perkins both responded that the issues are primarily federal but do include a few contractor issues.

Ken Picha asked if there was any action requested for this presentation.

Bob Toro indicated no vote or action was requested.

General Discussion by the Corporate Board Members

JD Dowell would like to look at the list of issues that were originally prioritized for the Corporate Board, and recommended a discussion at the next meeting.

A recommendation was made to have HSS provide a status of the DOE O 414.1D revision.

JD Dowell mentioned the QA Summit for the next day.

Ken Picha noted that the Corporate Board is EM and EFCOG but EFCOG is doing their own investigation of some of the issues such as metrics and training. How do we ensure no duplication of effort?

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

Chris Marden noted that EFCOG was working with EM on the Focus Areas and the EFCOG efforts such as metrics were initiated prior to the Corporate Board Focus Areas. There may be a benefit in combining efforts for these Focus Areas.

Norm Barker suggested a discussion of current EFCOG issues be included in the next Corporate Board meeting.

TJ Jackson asked how the teams for the Focus Areas are selected.

Bob Murray answered that EM-23 will work with the appropriate representatives from EFCOG to assign team members.

The next meeting was decided to be a video conference call in the June timeframe.

The next face-to-face meeting was decided to be in Hanford in conjunction with the ISM conference which is scheduled for September 12, 2011.

Meeting Adjourned

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

<u>SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS</u>			
#	Action for Follow-Up	Individual Responsible	Current Status
1.	Provide a revised lesson learned document based on previous events surrounding Commercial Grade Dedication.	Linda Weir (BNI)	The revised lessons learned document is still in draft by BNI and is scheduled for completion in March 2011. The completed document will then be provided to the board.
2.	Update the project plan to include new information.	Larry Perkins (EM-23)	Due to multiple changes, the project plan has not been approved. The plan will be updated based on the results of this meeting and provided to the executive committee for review.
3.	Notify the EFCOG chair when the JSEP is ready to populate and the EFCOG chair will send a letter to member encouraging its use.	Christian Palay (EM-23) Joe Yanek (EFCOG)	This action will follow the completion of the JSEP milestones in March 2011.
4.	EM Corporate Board members should provide recommendations on how to report the status of the Goal #5 metrics in the Journey to Excellence.	EM Corporate Board Members	N/A – New Action Item
5.	Provide the updated QA contract language for review/vote.	Bob Murray (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
6.	Work with the sites to develop a summary report of recent assessments (e.g., last 6 months) to address flow-down	EM Corporate Board Members Bob Murray (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
7.	Evaluate whether the EFCOG efforts on QA metrics can be combined with the needs of EM.	Larry Perkins (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
8.	Realign Focus Area #1 to investigate the integration of EM and NNSA efforts.	Mike Mason (BNI) Christian Palay (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
9.	Provide a resolution to the comments on the CGD guidance.	Dennis Weaver (BNI) Pat Carier (ORP)	N/A – New Action Item
10.	Change the CGD Guidance Task deliverable to a “Guide” and not a “Standard”.	Dennis Weaver (BNI) Pat Carier (ORP)	N/A – New Action Item

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

<u>SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS</u>			
#	Action for Follow-Up	Individual Responsible	Current Status
11.	Base CGD guidance on NQA-1a-2009 with appropriate notations made where that version differs from NQA-1-2004 with addenda through 2007. Include a note that the basis for the guidance is not intended to alter any contractual requirements.	Dennis Weaver (BNI) Pat Carrier (ORP)	N/A – New Action Item
12.	Distribute the draft Design QA paper to the Corporate Board for review.	Butch Huxford (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
13.	Investigate EM participation on 413 development team.	Butch Huxford (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
14.	Investigate the use of the lessons learned process with HSS or have the HSS website link to our QA website for distributing the corporate board deliverables.	Bob Murray (EM-23) Larry Perkins (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
15.	Develop a Focus Area Team to address the September 13, 2010, commitment to the Board to develop a task team to determine if there is a shortage of QA/QC resources within EM (consider a follow up in 9 months).	TJ Jackson (EMCBC) Bob Murray (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
16.	Develop a Focus Area Team to evaluate and assess the current strategy for EM QA/QC training and provide a recommended path forward.	TJ Jackson (EMCBC) Bob Murray (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
17.	Distribute a copy of the most recent EM-23 assessment schedule.	Bob Toro (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
18.	Provide a discussion at the next meeting of the latest list of issues that were prioritized for the Corporate Board.	Larry Perkins (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
19.	Ask HSS to provide a status of the DOE O 414.1D revision at the next meeting.	Bob Murray (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item
20.	Ask EFCOG to provide a status and list of issues they are currently working at the next meeting.	Larry Perkins (EM-23)	N/A – New Action Item

9th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2011 – Oak Ridge, TN

ATTENDANCE			
#	First Name	Last Name	Organization
1.	Larry	Adkinson	DOE SRO
2.	John	Almon	CH2M Hill
3.	Ken	Armstrong	DOE
4.	Norm	Barker	Energy Solutions
5.	Paul	Bills	INL
6.	Robert	Brown	DOE-ORO
7.	Steve	Calvert	Navarro
8.	Ray	Corey	DOE RL
9.	Gustave	Danielson	DOE CNS
10.	Jonathan	Dowell	ORP
11.	Michelle	Dudley	LATA
12.	Jerome	Ebner	AREVA Fed. Svcs.
13.	John	Eschenberg	DOE-ORO
14.	Stacey	Evans	Navarro
15.	Thomas	Fallon	Bechtel-BWXT
16.	James	Gambrell	DOE/EMCBC
17.	Ana	Gonzalez	DOE-EM
18.	Daryl	Green	DOE-ORO
19.	Mike	Hassell	WCH
20.	Al	Hawkins	DOE-RL
21.	Brenda	Hawks	DORO
22.	Rich	Higgins	WRPS
23.	Joyce	Hopperton	WSI-SRS
24.	Walter	Horton	DNFSB
25.	William	Huxford	EM-23
26.	TJ	Jackson	DOE
27.	Dave	Kimbrow	Navarro
28.	Susan	Kimmerly	Bechtel Jacobs
29.	Prakash	Kunjeer	EM-45
30.	Wayne	Ledford	Navarro
31.	Larry	Lewis	PPPO/RSI
32.	Jerry	Lipsky	DOE
33.	Chris	Marden	ES
34.	Mike	Mason	Bechtel

ATTENDANCE			
#	First Name	Last Name	Organization
35.	Patrice	McEahern	Shaw
36.	Tim	McEvoy	Bechtel
37.	Robert	Milazzo	TetraTech
38.	Bob	Murray	DOE
39.	Mike	Nicol	ES
40.	Christian	Palay	DOE-EM-23
41.	Larry	Perkins	EM-23
42.	Ken	Picha	DOE-EM
43.	Kathy	Reid	DOE-EMCBC
44.	Bill	Rowland	DOE-SR
45.	Richard	Salizzoni	SRR
46.	Lawrence	Smith	UDS, LLC
47.	Randy	Smyth	EM-ORO
48.	James	Sowers	Bechtel
49.	Debra	Sparkman	CNS
50.	Billy	Sullivan	Newport News Industrial
51.	Ali	Tabatabai	Link
52.	Robert	Thompson	CWI
53.	Jim	Tisarunni	URS
54.	Robert	Toro	EM-23
55.	Dave	Tuttel	DOE-EM
56.	Rick	Warriner	RL/CH2M Hill
57.	Dennis	Weaver	BNI
58.	Linda	Weir	BNI-WTP
59.	Aaron	White	DOE-EM
60.	Cynthia	Williams	SRS
61.	Peggy	Wilson	DOE-EM-ORO
62.	Jimmy	Winkler	SRNS
63.	Ray	Wood	Trinity Energy