

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

Note: Revised by-laws for the EM QA Corporate Board were approved including the resolution of comments from the last meeting. The revised by-laws are posted at <http://www.em.doe.gov/Pages/QACorporateBoard.aspx>.

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

Brian Anderson – Idaho	Steven Krahn (chair) – Headquarters EM-20
Brenda Hawks – Oak Ridge	Jack Zimmerman – Portsmouth/Paducah
Ray Corey – Richland	Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-23
Jack Craig – Savannah River	No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad
Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety	Jonathan (JD) Dowell - River Protection
T.J. Jackson – EMCBC	

Presentation by Mr. Robert Murray and Dr. Larry Perkins: Welcome & Actions from Chicago Meeting

Bob Murray welcomed everyone to the meeting and provided a summary of the agenda for the day.

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.	Dave Jantosik	Effectiveness review will be conducted in September 2010 and an updated lesson learned will be prepared at the conclusion of that review and provided to the board.
Provide support for populating the corrective action Hub.	Site Managers	This activity is ongoing. Several sites have provided support for the use of the Hub and Larry Perkins will be contacting the sites to help update the current information.
Assign a JSEP coordinator.	Site Managers	Some sites have provided a contact for the JSEP coordinator while others have not. Christian Palay is working with the sites to identify the remaining points of contact.
Consider incorporating the Commercial Grade Dedication guidance into the next revision to the Standard Review Plan.	Larry Perkins	Once the guidance is completed, it can be evaluated for inclusion in the SRP.
Add an additional column in the spreadsheet attachment to the project plan for Focus Area #4 to include examples of grading for each requirement.	Brenda Hawks	The completion of this action is tied to the need for more site support as noted in the following action.
Assign representatives to assist in the development and completion of Focus Area #4.	Site Managers	In progress. As noted later in the minutes, Brenda Hawks has not received sufficient support from the sites for Focus Area #4. The action items for this meeting reflect the need to identify contacts for Focus Area #4.
Generate a whitepaper to discuss what EFCOG has experienced with respect to audits overseas.	Chris Marden	This paper has been drafted and provided for EFCOG review prior to presentation to the board.

Presentation by Dr. Steven Krahn: Cross Cutting Corporate QA Issues

Dr. Steven Krahn provided a discussion of several topics that are of current interest to the federal and contractor QA professionals. Specifically, the presentation addressed:

- Requirements Flow-down
- Suspect and Counterfeit Items
- Commercial Grade Dedication
- High Level Waste/Spent Nuclear Fuel

Dr. Krahn noted that a phone conversation has taken place with the DNFSB Staff regarding the DOE-EM response to the May 5, 2010 DNFSB letter on requirements flow-down. The response has been formally provided to the DNFSB and the conversation served to answer preliminary questions from the DNFSB staff. The dialogue between DOE-EM and the DNFSB is ongoing.

It was noted that a copy of the flow-down response is included in the meeting package. Dr. Krahn also noted that the response is much longer than a typical response due to the specific concerns addressed in the DNFSB letter. The response resulted in the DOE-EM concern that the letter could have called into question the overall EM approach to QA, and a detailed response was warranted.

Dr. Krahn addressed the general summary of items called out in the response including:

- Flow down of technical requirements versus flow down of the order itself. The DOE-EM program allows for the order to be flowed down from DOE to Prime Contractors and the appropriate attributes to be flowed down to sub-contractors (without flowing down the full order).
- A review of HQ assessments was conducted as part of the response; however, the numbers were not sufficient to be statistically valid. As such, the Phase II QAP/QIP implementation self-assessments and the ISM/QA Annual Declarations will specifically address requirements flow-down (as noted in memorandums to the Sites from EM-20). Both reviews are due to EM-HQ by the end of Calendar Year 2010 with a final consolidated report due to the DNFSB by March 2011.

Brian Anderson noted that a standard QA clause was developed by the QA Corporate Board and disseminated to the sites for future contracts. The question is whether the response is consistent with the standard QA clause. Bob Murray answered the question and indicated the standard QA clause had been reviewed and the response provided to the DNFSB is consistent with the clause.

Dr. Krahn discussed that DOE-EM has received a request for information from the DNFSB staff regarding the status of our Suspect and Counterfeit Items program. The request utilized a recent press release on integrated circuits as the driver. Since we use integrated circuits in our defense nuclear facilities, it makes sense to provide a focus in this area of concern. A preliminary response has been provided to the DNFSB staff based on the response received from the field offices.

Dr. Krahn outlined a few points from the information gathered on S/CI in addressing this request. Specifically:

EM noted that the S/CI requirements were flowed down to contractors and we rely on the M&O contractors to help identify potential problems.

There was a good understanding of the concern and the need for reporting as part of our QA programs.

Dr. Krahn noted that as a team, we need to work on a couple items to help with consistency. First, we did not get clear responses in some areas for flow-down of S/CI requirements. Second, reporting (e.g., IG and HSS) was not clearly indicated in each response.

Dr. Krahn also noted that based on the wide variety of responses, EM has decided there is a need for a quick look at the construction projects with large orders of equipment and parts. Bob Murray and his team are working to put a plan together for the four major construction projects. SWPF and WTP will be completed by early October 2010.

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

Dr. Krahn noted that SRS has responded to the request in more detail (not shown in the status presented on the presentation slides). He also noted that the CBC is working the issue for the small sites as necessary.

JD Dowell asked about the approach to S/CI. He noted that we are already doing QA reviews as part of the Construction Project Reviews and suggested that we could include the S/CI in the CPRs. Dr. Krahn agreed that this approach will work for the upcoming CPRs, but noted that all of the major construction projects may not be reviewed again by the end of the calendar year, providing a need for other opportunities to address the issue.

Pat Carier asked if the DNFSB was dissatisfied with the EM program or if are they trying to drive EM somewhere specifically with respect to S/CI? He noted the information request seems like a lot of questions that require a response. Bob Murray answered the question and indicated he has met with the DNFSB staff several times and his take was that it is not clear what will happen. Some DNFSB staff members are more passionate about the issue than others. Mr. Murray had a discussion with one DNFSB staff member on Friday (September 10th), and there appears to be a lot of energy to resurrect the issue. The DNFSB members themselves also seem to be focused on S/CI. The Board seems to think we (DOE) understand how to address the standard nuts/bolts/brackets, but when it comes to circuitry and electronics, there is a concern. DOE is saying that we have a program in place and should be able to address this issue as well (specifically at SWPF and WTP where we will be purchasing \$500 million dollars in equipment in the next few years). DOE has told the DNFSB staff that we will take a vertical slice of safety significant and safety class components at the major construction projects. The review will include at least two purchase orders to evaluate the pedigree of the vendors and suppliers. Assuming the programs are adequate to address this issue, we should be able to show the DNFSB that we have a robust program in place to identify electronic type S/CI. A meeting with the DNFSB staff was also held about 5-6 weeks ago and the DNFSB staff has expressed a concern that there were people in attendance that thought this was not an issue. The DNFSB staff believes that EM fully understands the concern and EM will review the process to see if the concern is valid for the EM program. It is important to go to the construction projects and identify the upcoming procurements, do the vertical slice, and tell the DNFSB if we have a problem. Dr. Krahn noted it is not just high visibility projects in the review, but those where we are doing a lot of purchases. This approach will address the concern and demonstrate that we are responsive to the DNFSB.

Joe Yanek asked if we will be able to differentiate the safety significant and safety class components and see which component was the one used as the end item, or are we removing installed components and sending them for testing? Dr. Krahn responded that the plan should not be developed in this forum, but concern is noted for inclusion in the offline discussions of the approach.

Dr. Krahn continued with details on the commercial grade dedication responses to the EM-2 memo. The memo asked for an evaluation of the CGD programs for each site. EM-20 has received the responses from the sites and some issues and strengths in the CGD programs have been noted and a summary is included in the meeting materials.

Dr. Krahn then gave a brief status of the High Level Waste/Spent Nuclear Fuel programs (Yucca Mountain). He noted that a commitment has been received from EM-1 to continue to use the QARD for HLW/UNF within DOE-EM. An interim policy has been drafted and currently pending in the approval cycle.

Dr. Krahn also noted that we are providing information on the EM QA Corporate Board at the ISM meeting. The emphasis that will be provided is the QA Corporate Board develops deliverables and tangible results. We do not just talk about issues, but take action. This approach is what makes the Corporate Board successful.

Dr. Krahn also noted that there is now a small hand book for senior management to use as part of the Standard Review Plan. The hand book will help senior management to ensure quality is worked into each of our project life cycles.

Several participants asked to get a copy of the hand book. Larry Perkins will respond to these requests.

Presentation by Mr. Christian Palay: Focus Area 1 - NQA-1 Suppliers – Joint Supplier Evaluation Program Database Presentation

Mr. Palay provided a demonstration of the Joint Supplier Evaluation Program (JSEP) including screen shots from the database. He noted that the JSEP is a jointly owned database developed by EFCOG and DOE.

Mr. Palay noted that lead auditor certifications are included in the database but are considered PII and therefore OOU. The team is continuing to work through how to address this issue.

Joe Yanek asked if the company and lead auditor are noted in the database. The user may need to be able to contact the team but how do they obtain that contact information? Mr. Palay noted the comment and will evaluate it with the Focus Area team.

Mr. Palay indicated the database is ready to go online and has gone through the Idaho SQA process. Once the system is online, the team will populate with legacy information to provide a starting point for use.

Mr. Palay also noted that not all sites have participated to this point and he encouraged the sites and EFCOG to fully endorse this approach.

Mr. Palay also noted that the individual responsible for the audits at each site would be the best JSEP coordinator.

Mr. Palay indicated there were some issues to continue working. For example, a recent Idaho assessment was reviewed which was led by a WIPP audit and used WIPP procedures. An individual from CWI indicated they don't use the WIPP procedure. The result is that the coordinator for each site would help develop a procedure to allow the use of the JSEP audits in their program.

Brenda Hawks asked if the JSEP coordinator needed to include federal representatives. Mr. Palay responded that the answer would be yes only if the federal office has an approved suppliers list. For example, ORP has a list but it may not be useful for them to include it in the JSEP given the items that are purchased.

Brian Anderson asked if the point of contact is the same as the JSEP coordinator. Mr. Palay indicated yes – they are the same person.

Mr. Palay discussed the project milestones and noted the deliverable dates have been adjusted.

Bob Murray asked about the list of common vendors on the schedule/milestones. The system is up and running as of this week, so why do we have 15 months before completion of the list of common vendors? Mike Mason and Paul Bills both indicated this appeared to be a typographical error. The POCs will put together a list of vendors to match up and develop a schedule, but the laundry list of vendors has been developed and is included in the schedule in JSEP now (without assigned dates).

Joe Yanek indicated that at some point, EFCOG can send a letter out to encourage their members to use the JSEP and help remove any barriers to participation. He just needs to know when to send the letter, preferably once the system is ready to populate.

Brenda Hawks asked if the database is being used today. Paul Bills said it will roll out tonight (September 13th).

A comment was made that other organizations such as NNSA and Science may also be interested, but agreement was reached that this topic would be discussed offline vs. in this board meeting.

Presentation by Pat Carier: Focus Area 2 Commercial Grade Item and Services Dedication Implementation – Lessons Learned

Mr. Carier provided a status of the draft guide and procedure as the major initiatives that are ongoing with the focus area.

Mr. Carier provided a recap of where we have been, including development of a training program. As an example, Mr. Carier noted that the presentation on CGD was recently provided to the Washington State Department of Ecology with a very good response. Mr. Carier also noted that there is currently an effort underway to provide the training for the DOE Quality Council, with a specific date pending. Input is currently being solicited from

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

anyone interested to determine where the training should be held next. Mr. Carier will work with your point of contact to help coordinate the training.

Brenda Hawks asked if this was referring to the basic CGD training. Mr. Carier indicated yes.

Mr. Carier indicated the CGD standard is nearly complete and ready to be placed in the concurrence cycle based on the board's recommended actions. He also noted the standard is consistent with NQA-1-2009 as requested by the Corporate Board. Mr. Carier also noted the slide is a little misleading in that the draft standard is consistent with NQA-1-2009 but not really based on it. As part of the development, Subpart 2.14 of NQA-1 was reviewed and the guide is consistent with the discussion in Subpart 2.14.

Bob Murray asked what was meant in the statement there is a lack of a sub-task group. Mr. Carier noted the only person currently assigned is Dennis Weaver through the engineering group but he is not named by BNI for example. Norm Barker asked if they were on the same page with Dennis and Mr. Carier indicated yes. Mr. Carier just wanted to emphasize that Mr. Weaver has not been designated by the contractor, but the involvement is there and there is no hindrance.

Bob Murray noted that the project plan indicates we will have representation from each site. Is this the case? Mr. Carier said some individuals involved in the CGD training development have volunteered, but the point is if you want someone on the team, now is the time to speak up.

Joe Yanek stated that when he signed the project plan, his understanding was there would be a point of contact from each site.

It was also noted that Mr. Weaver is commenting as the subgroup chair for EFCOG, not just as an individual.

Dr. Krahn and Joe Yanek restated that we need to make sure we have buy in and feedback from all of the sites to ensure accountability. Dr. Krahn assigned an action item for Mr. Carier to provide Bob Murray a copy of individuals involved. Mr. Murray will provide that list to the Corporate Board members and have them ensure each site is appropriately represented in the process.

Brenda Hawks asked if Mr. Carier felt all sites have been adequately represented. The answer was no.

Mr. Carier proceeded to provide a brief outline of the draft standard.

Dr. Krahn noted that there has been a lot of concern about method 4 in the CGD process. Do we currently have any caution in the standard? Mr. Carier said yes, but not as strong as the NRC uses. The draft document strongly recommends using another method with #4, since each effort to use #4 only has failed. Mr. Carier also noted that the CGD training includes text that cautions on the use of method #4 alone. Dr. Krahn indicated we need to clearly state somewhere in the document that method #4 alone it is not an approved method. He also noted that EM does not have to allow the use of method #4 alone just because other organizations do. He noted that any disagreement should be vetted with the team prior to issuing the document.

Brenda Hawks asked about the use of DOE LAP and other independent bodies which have been performing successfully. Mr. Carier noted that you still have a responsibility to ensure the accreditation applies to you and is adequate.

Dr. Krahn stated that the bottom line is the words will need to be strong with respect to the use of method #4.

Mr. Carier indicated all comments to date have been addressed and the standard is ready for a broader corporate board review.

Norm Barker noted we should not have 2 scenarios (EFCOG and EM) for CGD guidance and procedures.

Joe Yanek asked if we have allowed enough time in the plan for the dissemination and contract change orders. Mr. Carier indicated the current schedule will be tight, but it is the current plan.

Bud Danielson noted that we are talking about an EM standard and not a DOE technical type standard. Mr. Carier agreed and indicated we will work with HSS before going down the path of a DOE technical type standard. Dr. Krahn also noted that EM has used this approach on technology readiness assessments previously so there is

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

precedence. Dr. Krahn also noted that we need to be leaders and willing to take the first step to have a consistent approach in the EM program.

Brenda Hawks asked if we will update the dates in task plan. Mr. Carier said yes.

A question was asked about populating the commodities section of JSEP with CGD data if you are looking to buy something and don't have much history. Will it be in the JSEP database? Dr. Krahn stated this could be addressed with something like a box to check if you find a problem with a vendor CGD process; however he noted that we may not publish all of the details (just a means for dissemination of CGD performance). Based on the comments we have received, there were concerns in the level of detail for sharing that information. The concern revolves around legal and regulatory issues. Dr. Krahn also noted that we could address S/CI information similarly. A problem with a program and actual material issues, we could flag as a general item.

Norm Barker asked if it is premature at this point. Mr. Carier indicated the surveys may be a good place to start and Mr. Barker agreed.

A recommendation was made to consider a database to allow sites to share what vendors they have used for specific items with others across the complex to aid in identifying qualified vendors.

Brenda Hawks asked if we need another train the trainer class and indicated Oak Ridge could host it. Mr. Carier stated that there has been some discussion on the fundamental training but not the train the trainer course; but in either case, we need around 20 people to hold the class.

Mr. Carier also asked for any suggestions on how to get the word out about the training (help in promoting the classes). Brenda Hawks suggested that if EM sponsors and pays for trainers – the course could be released through the training matrix (noting that if it is paid by the sites the advertising is done differently). Bob Murray will take an action to find out about the training.

Presentation by William Huxford: Focus Area 3 Design Quality Assurance Focus Area

Mr. Huxford provided a discussion on the scope and current status, noting that the biggest risk and reward is focusing on the construction projects. Mr. Huxford also noted that the team is looking to identify the best practices across the complex.

Mr. Huxford noted the original schedule would not be met for each milestone, but the slip is not substantial and will be addressed in the project plan.

Dr. Krahn asked what the discussion of the focus area is centered on, capital or large construction projects, noting the difference. Mr. Huxford indicated the intent is large construction projects. Dr. Krahn noted there are only approximately 6 of these projects, and he is worried that this is too restrictive, especially since some of these projects are past the point where recommendations from this focus area would help these projects.

Jack Craig noted that we appear to be talking about two extremes and asked if we are intending to look at line items versus construction projects or are we looking at a certain select few operating projects? Dr. Krahn responded that he is aware of multi-million dollar projects that are coming but don't trip the line to be a major capital construction project. He also noted that this effort won't benefit SWPF which is at 99% design complete. The other upcoming projects that are not capital construction projects could be benefited though. In addition, Dr. Krahn noted that projects that did a good job with engineering should be noted to help inform other sites of the noteworthy practices.

Mr. Huxford will use this information in further developing the focus area and circulate the new scope to Board members prior to the next Corporate Board meeting.

Chris Marden asked who some of the team participants were representing and if it would be good to get people from other locations? Mr. Huxford agreed and indicated he is currently working with Brenda Hawks to get support from Oak Ridge. Ms. Hawks noted that Energy Solutions may also want a representative and Norm Barker agreed.

Brenda Hawks noted that it would help in the field to address documentation and records required in transition from design to construction, possibly with some lessons learned from WTP.

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

Chris Marden asked if we have any good practices noted from the assist visits EM-23 has conducted. Bob Murray indicated he was not looking at previous and current assist/audit reports; however, noted that Ray Wood is on the focus area team and participated in the assist visits, so the expertise is currently present on the team to address the question.

A question was asked to determine if this area is also going to be a focus of CPRs, noting it has not necessarily been in the past. Dr. Krahn asked everyone to look at the SWPF CPR report that is coming out soon since it does specifically address this issue.

Presentation by Brenda Hawks: Focus Area 4 Proposed Technical Approach for Grading QA for Deactivation & Decommissioning Projects

Ms. Hawks indicated that she has sent out the existing information provided at the last meeting to multiple reviewers. She has received no comments, suggesting the information may not have been reviewed in depth. While Chris Marden at EFCOG has assigned an EFCOG lead to assist with the team, no other sites have provided any input. There was a commitment to provide a person from each site involved in D&D to the team, but this has not been provided to date.

Norm Barker noted that EFCOG has a team for D&D that could support the effort.

Dr. Krahn expressed his disappointment with the board members and emphasized the need to get names for the Focus Area #4 team. Dr. Krahn will take an action to follow up with the board members within a week to obtain names of people assigned to work on this area.

Bob Thompson from CWI expressed an interest in participating.

Presentation by Bob Murray: EM HQ Quality Assurance (QA) Assessments

Mr. Murray gave a brief background of the efforts to revitalize QA within EM, which originated in 2007. At that time, EM was tasked with specifically assessing the construction projects as part of the revitalization. In FY2010, the focus for the HQ assessments was CPRs, ORRs, issue driven audits, and HLW audits. Mr. Murray noted that while this is still a focus, we are transitioning from a pure audit mode to the A3 concept of awareness, assistance and assessment. The upcoming focus will also include Phase 2 reviews for QAP/QIP implementation. Mr. Murray noted that EM-23 now has a contract in place with multiple companies (e.g., Navarro and Trinity Engineering) to help provide direct assistance to the field including these Phase 2 reviews. It was noted that the resource disparity across the sites (for different reasons) helps explain the variation in maturity and effectiveness of the QA programs.

Mr. Murray noted some accomplishments and deliverables from FY2010 such as the DOE-EM response to the DNFSB letter on requirements flow-down.

Dr. Krahn emphasized some other positive success areas, such as success in getting QA requirements in the procurement process (as was a focus a year ago). As a specific example, Dr. Krahn provided details on the low level waste ID/IQ contract from the CBC. The original procurement indicated a NRC license removed the need for a QA program. After a robust discussion, the procurement was corrected before being issued. Dr. Krahn also noted that even with this type of success, there is still a need for continued focus in this area.

San Horton asked for expansion on the second bullet on Common QA Issues and Observations slide. Specifically, is this proactive integration of QA early in design tied to any of the CD phases? Would you specify a particular QA standard, e.g., should a consensus standard be specified by CD-1? Dr. Horton noted that the reason for the question is that there appears to be some confusion with respect to the code of record being at CD-2 but is the consensus standard specified earlier? What is the message to the contractor? Dr. Krahn answered the question by indicating that we now have QA reviewed as part of the CPRs (the listed elements for the CPRs did not originally contain QA). Dr. Krahn also noted that the fact we have a code of record at CD-2 does not mean the QAP is not needed prior to that point. Bob Murray also noted that we have the QAP implemented at CD-1 (in agreement with the standard QA contract language).

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

Brenda Hawks commented that a contractor may be given additional scope, in which case the selection of a consensus standard and QAP implementation would already be completed before initiating the new work scope.

William Huxford also noted how this fits in with the issues they are addressing as part of the focus area #3.

Brian Anderson noted that CD-1 is design and CD-3 is construction – but the bullet questioned by Dr. Horton is a broad and sweeping statement that is too much in a single thought.

Dr. Krahn indicated the question was which requirements from NQA-1 would be expected in CD-1 etc?

Joe Yanek noted that integration of 414.1c was done under the DOE O 413.3A re-write for all CDs; however, Colette Broussard noted it is not clear on when to choose a consensus standard in that guide.

Dr. Krahn noted we have found additional items to investigate for the Focus Area 3 task with Mr. Huxford.

Dr. Krahn pointed out the proposed priority list for FY2011 and asked for any comments from the group to be provided to Bob Murray.

Brenda Hawks asked if the site specific QAP focus is federal or contractor. Mr. Murray said the HQ focus is federal, and the federal QAP focus is where EM-23 will need participation on the assessment teams.

Bud Danielson asked if the order of the priority list relevant or are these all things we definitely will do. Mr. Murray indicated this list is intended to be the priorities we will definitely complete. For example, we have not looked at the tank farms in the recent years and should address them in FY2011.

Mr. Murray noted this priority list is based on available resources and will require a lot of teams on audits for multiple weeks. Our budget request for FY2011 is commensurate with the priorities.

Brenda Hawks noted that she was trying to have a HQ federal employee on all of the major reviews. Mr. Murray indicated our priority list would support this approach.

Charlie Harris asked if there was any path forward for QA resources. He noted that there are people moving around and high turnover rates.

San Horton asked if this was being tracked or a perception. Multiple federal and contractor personnel indicated it had been tracked and appeared to be a real issue.

Mr. Murray commented on the Aiken Technical College effort to develop QA resources that EM-20 is currently supporting. The initiative has already resulted in a DACUM (development of a curriculum) and EM-23 currently has funding for a grant included in the FY2011 budget requests. This funding will provide seed money for the first year, but additional funding from other resources (e.g., EFCOG members) will be required to continue the program. Charlie Harris agreed this effort is vital and suggested the need for funding across the corporate complex to help develop the program. Mr. Murray also noted there is an existing 4 year program in QA at a university in Missouri that we may be able to use to jumpstart our BS program. The desire is to get the first set of QA students in the QA certificate program this year. Mr. Murray noted the real question is where we want to be 5 years from now when we have a class from the program present in the work place with 3 years experience.

Mr. Murray also noted that the QA Academy, which was started in Carlsbad, is currently planned to be moved to the EMCBC in Ohio where we can rejuvenate the QA course (intended to train individuals and send them to be mentored under experienced QA professionals).

Brenda Hawks recommended a consideration also be made to forming a pool of federal staff to allow sharing resources (e.g., each site provides 2 auditors to the pool to allow other sites to draw from for assessments).

Joe Yanek recommended the board consider putting a QA/QC task team together to help look at this training and resources issue from a macro perspective.

San Horton noted that other groups have addressed this issue and concluded that the final answer is the availability of funding (i.e., dollars).

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

Rick Warriner commented that the crisis was closer than it appeared with the ARRA funding going away. He indicated that half of the staff could be gone without the ARRA money including voluntary reductions in force. Mr. Warriner also noted that the people lost in this effort would likely be the most senior QA personnel.

Dr. Krahn commented that there seemed to be a lot of unease on resourcing, but asked what do we do with this concern?

JD Dowell recommended a study be performed to confirm whether the concern is a real issue.

Brenda Hawks noted that the resource numbers used in the past have been arrived at differently for each site making it hard to compare numbers.

A comment was made that the market demand and lead times for hiring are real time data that could be used to determine if there really is a problem with resources.

Brian Anderson noted that – the ages of the QA staff could be a leading indicator for retirement concerns.

Bud Danielson suggested if we know the ARRA money is running out and we know the types of people we have, we may be able to look at the current ARRA staff and transition/train these resources to help fill QA positions.

Mike Mason commented that it would also help from the DOE side if the contractors were allowed to hire more college graduates and train them instead of requiring strictly experienced QA professionals.

Joe Yanek noted that we have the short term perspective with what vacancies are open today and a longer term perspective with an integrated approach.

Dr. Krahn recommended the group work in the remaining time to develop the ideas and questions that should be addressed in a survey of the complex.

The attendees developed the following Topical Areas/Questions that should be addressed in the resources survey:

1. How many vacancies do you currently have? How long have those vacancies been unfilled? Can you fill the vacancy?
2. Possibly include the Supply chain as needed
3. QA demographics (age, years to retirement, number of subcontractors)
4. Specific Positions (e.g., auditor) and applicable certifications
5. Turnover rate
6. Available training and education programs
7. Specialty needs
8. Current staffing – ARRA versus base
9. Future needs/loss projections – experience /education
10. Causes of the problem
11. Experience (relevant) from other industries
12. How much is it costing you? Bonuses, incentive pay, etc. Maybe word such as “are you providing incentives for these personnel”.
13. Major impediments

Volunteers to assist Mr. Murray in Developing the Resources Survey include:

- John Almon
- Larry Adkinson
- Rick Warriner
- Al Hawkins
- Bob Hinds
- Norm Barker
- Joe Yanek
- Mike Mason
- Chris Marden

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

Presentation by Mr. Christian Palay: Status on Path Forward for Oversight of High Level Waste and Spent Nuclear Fuel Quality Assurance Programs

Due to time restraints, the presentation specific to the Yucca Mountain status was preempted and will be included in the presentation material posted online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/Pages/QACorporateBoard.aspx>

Presentation by Gustave (Bud) Danielson: National Nuclear Quality Assurance Certification and Accreditation Programs

Due to time restraints, the presentation specific to the NQA-1 accreditation program was preempted and will be included in the presentation material posted online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/Pages/QACorporateBoard.aspx>

The next EM QA Corporate Board meeting will be planned for the January/February 2011 timeframe.

Meeting Adjourned

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

<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.	Dave Janitosik	Effectiveness review will be conducted in September 2010 and an updated lesson learned will be prepared at the conclusion of that review and provided to the board.
2.	Provide support for populating the corrective action Hub.	Site Managers	This activity is ongoing. Several sites have provided support for the use of the Hub and Larry Perkins will be contacting the sites to help update the current information.
3.	Assign a JSEP coordinator.	Site Managers	Some sites have provided a contact for the JSEP coordinator while others have not. Christian Palay is working with the sites to identify the remaining points of contact.
4.	Consider incorporating the Commercial Grade Dedication guidance into the next revision to the Standard Review Plan.	Larry Perkins	Once the guidance is completed, it can be evaluated for inclusion in the SRP.
5.	Add an additional column in the spreadsheet attachment to the project plan for Focus Area #4 to include examples of grading for each requirement.	Brenda Hawks	The completion of this action is tied to the need for more site support as noted in the following action.
6.	Assign representatives to assist in the development and completion of Focus Area #4.	Site Managers	In progress. As noted later in the minutes, Brenda Hawks has not received sufficient support from the sites for Focus Area #4. The action items for this meeting reflect the need to identify contacts for Focus Area #4.
7.	GS-R-3, ISO, and NQA-1 Overview with Comparison Matrix and examples of audits results from overseas audits	Chris Marden	This paper has been drafted and provided for EFCOG review prior to presentation to the board.
8.	Focus Area leads will provide input for updating the project plan (including any new deliverable dates).	Larry Perkins	N/A – New Action
9.	Distribute a copy of the Standard Review Plan handbook.	Larry Perkins	N/A – New Action
10.	Update project plan to reflect any new deliverable dates	Bob Murray	N/A – New Action
11.	Notify EFCOG when the JSEP is ready to populate and the EFCOG chair will send a letter to member encouraging its use.	Christian Palay Joe Yanek	N/A – New Action
12.	Follow up with the board members within a week to obtain points of contact for work on Focus Area #4.	Steve Krahn	N/A – New Action

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

<u>SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS</u>			
#	Action for Follow-Up	Individual Responsible	Current Status
13.	Provide a list of individuals that have been involved in the CGD standard to the Corporate Board members to ensure each site is appropriately represented in the process.	Pat Carier Bob Murray	N/A – New Action
15.	Evaluate EM-HQ sponsorship of CGD courses to be hosted at various field offices.	Bob Murray	N/A – New Action
16.	Evaluate upcoming projects that are not capital construction projects for inclusion in Focus Area #3 (Design).	William Huxford	N/A – New Action
17.	Evaluate the selection of consensus standards with respect to CD phase as part of Focus Area #3 (Design).	William Huxford	N/A – New Action

8th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
September 13, 2010 – Augusta, GA

ATTENDANCE				
#	First Name	Last Name	Contact Email	Organization
1.	Larry	Adkinson	larry.adkinson@srs.gov	DOE-SR
2.	John	Almon	john.almon@ch2m.com	CH2M Hill
3.	Brian	Anderson	andersbs@id.doe.gov	DOE-ID
4.	Norm	Barker	nrbarker@energysolutions.com	Energy Solutions
5.	Paul	Bills	paul.bills@inl.gov	BEA/INL
6.	Colette	Broussard	colette.broussard@hq.doe.gov	DOE-HQ (HSS)
7.	Steve	Calvert	calvert@navarro-inc.com	Navarro
8.	Pat	Carier	patrick_p_carier@rl.gov	DOE-ORP
9.	Ray	Corey	ray.corey@rl.doe.gov	DOE-RL
10.	Jack	Craig	jack.craig@emcbc.doe.gov	DOE-SR
11.	Cherri	DeFigh-Price	cherri.defigh-price@parsons.com	EFCOG Eng. Subgroup
12.	Jonathan (JD)	Dowell	jonathan.dowell@rl.doe.gov	DOE-ORP
13.	Jerome	Ebner	jerome.ebner@areva.com	Areva Federal Services
14.	Al	Hawkins	albert.hawkins@rl.doe.gov	DOE-RL
15.	Charles	Harris	charles.harris@srs.gov	DOE-SR
16.	Brenda	Hawks	hawksbl@oro.doe.gov	DOE-ORO
17.	Robert	Hinds	robert.hinds@srs.gov	URS/SRR
18.	W. San	Horton	walterh@dnfsb.gov	DNFSB
19.	Butch	Huxford	william.huxford@srs.gov	DOE-HQ
20.	TJ	Jackson	tj.jackson@emcbc.doe.gov	DOE-EMCBC
21.	Ashok	Kapoor	ashok.kapoor@hq.doe.gov	DOE-HQ
22.	Dave	Kimbro	kimbro@navarro-inc.com	Navarro
23.	Steve	Krahn	steven.krahn@em.doe.gov	DOE-HQ
24.	Wayne	Ledford	ledford@navarro-inc.com	Navarro
25.	David	Lowe	john.almon@ch2m.com	CH2M Hill
26.	Chris	Marden	cmarden@energysolutions.com	Energy Solutions
27.	Mike	Mason	mjmason@bechtel.com	Bechtel National
28.	Russell	McCallister	russell.mccallister@lex.doe.gov	DOE-PPPO
29.	Bob	Murray	robert.murray@em.doe.gov	DOE-HQ
30.	Christian	Palay	christian.palay@hq.doe.gov	DOE-HQ
31.	Larry	Perkins	larry.perkins@hq.doe.gov	DOE-HQ
32.	Steven	Ross	steven.ross@em.doe.gov	EM-HQ
33.	William	Rowland	bill.rowland@srs.gov	DOE-SR
34.	Robert	Thompson	robert.thompson@icp.doe.gov	CWI
35.	Dave	Tuttel	david.tuttel@parsons.com	Parsons
36.	Tilak	Verma	trverma@energysolutions.com	ES/UDS
37.	Rick	Warriner	richard_d_warriner@rl.gov	CHPRC-RL
38.	William	Webb	efkhwebb@aol.com	Longenecker & Associates
39.	Jimmy	Winkler	jimmy.winkler@srs.gov	SRNS
40.	Joe	Yanek	joe.yanek@fluor.com	Flour Government Group
41.	Jack	Zimmerman	jack.zimmerman@lex.doe.gov	DOE-PPPO
42.	Rochelle	Zimmerman	rochelle.zimmerman@lex.doe.gov	DOE-PPPO