Voting Board Members in Attendance:

Randy Kay – Idaho

Jay Mullis– Oak Ridge

Steve Chalk – Richland

Charlie Harris – Savannah River

Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety

Ken Armstrong – EMCBC*

Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah

Mike Brown- Carlsbad

Brian Harkins - River Protection

Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-43

Matt Moury (chair) – Headquarters EM-40

Representing the site but not designated as a voting member.

Introductions, Roll Call, and Status from Last Meeting - Larry Perkins

Roll call was held to confirm a quorum was present for the meeting. 10 of 11 voting members were present so a quorum was established.

A status of the actions from the last meeting provided. The only remaining open actions were to have this call, select focus areas, and update the project plan based on the focus areas. All other actions are complete.

Quality Assurance Program Briefing to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board – Bob Murray

Bob Murray discussed that EM will be participating in the annual QA program status briefing with the DNFSB in March (tentatively March 25th or 26th). EM-HQ would like to get input from the EM sites on areas that should be discussed (e.g., accomplishments) during the briefing. The DNFSB staff has provided a list of topics that the DNFSB would like DOE to address during that briefing. Mr. Murray will distribute the list of topics this week and is requesting the sites provide any input for that briefing. EM will receive approximately 25 minutes of the 2 hour meeting to discuss our program. Others participating include HSS and NNSA.

Matt Moury added that Mr. Sean Sullivan from the DNFSB attended the last EM QA Corporate Board meeting and would like a briefing on the actions from that meeting in advance of the QA program briefing if possible.

Discussion of Potential Topics for Focus Areas

Topic 1 – Inadequate Resources and Staffing

JD Dowell noted that Dae Chung had completed a site analysis when he was the DAS, but he was not sure what the sites had done with that analysis. We should discuss if we need a general guidance on staffing or an analysis of the site needs.

Bob Murray recalled the staffing discussion two meetings ago which indicated there was a shortage of resources and asked what the need really is. The question was whether there was an adequate level of staffing and how is that level determined. The sites provided inconsistent responses, with some counting TQP qualified QA staff and others counting FRs and QC type staff.

JD Dowell noted his site (ORP) has just filled four bodies with no difficulties. Mr. Dowell believes the previous responses indicate the sites understand the demand and are managing it locally.

Bob Murray asked what level of QA staff is needed at the site offices.

Steve Chalk commented that it is difficult to staff QAEs because the four year degree requirement is restrictive.

San Horton commented that the DNFSB question had been related to QA resources. Has the department established and evaluated the needs consistently among the departments, including HSS, NNSA, etc. Is DOE able to get enough resources to meet requirements given the current budget restrictions?

Larry Perkins noted that it sounded like we had two questions for this topic: (1) how is the needed level of QA resources determined? (2) what can the EM QA Corporate Board do to assist with this concern?

Topic 2 – Incorporation of QARD Requirements into NQA-1

Previously selected as a focus area so no discussion.

Topic 3 – ISM/QA Declaration Clarifications and Feedback

Jay Mullis explained that the QA declarations (including the stop light chart) are completed annually and require some effort for the sites. The sites are not clear on how this data is used and what is done with the submittals.

Matt Moury noted this has been an issue in the past and there has been a push to cut back to the bare minimum for the annual declarations. EM-40 is providing feedback to the sites, but noted that we have gotten out of sequence and delayed in responding. As a result, the declarations have been moved to essentially skip a year and get everything back on schedule.

Bob Murray added that from a QA standpoint, Steven Ross of EM-43 did an analysis of the data and compared the various sites. The analysis will help compare the responses and will be included in the formal response from EM-40 to the declarations. In addition, EM-43 is looking at using the declarations for comparison to audit findings in FY14, and presenting that comparison at the audit out-briefings going forward.

Topic 4 – More Consolidation and Consistency in Audits

Bob Murray asked if someone could expand on the concern in this topic. If the concern is multiple EM-40 and EM- audits at the sites, then EM-40 is working to consolidate some of the audits. For example, multiple offices in EM-40 look at corrective actions. EM-40 is working to consolidate this type of review in lieu of each office performing a corrective action review. Ted Wyka is leading this effort for EM-40.

The consensus was that this approach seemed to address the topic with no additional discussion.

Topic 5 – More Guidance on Graded Approach to Implementing EM-QA-001

Russell McCallister commented that PPPO has infrastructure contractors that are not performing nuclear activities. Do other sites have any issues with this type of graded approach, or any guidance/lessons?

Charlie Harris noted that SR has been working to get new QAP documents updated to use NQA-1-2008/2009 and this is something that has not been easy.

Jeff May discussed that ORP had a bumpy road implementing EM-QA-001 Revision 1 on a graded fashion. For example, the expectations were not understood on whether they were requirements. The contractor felt in the past they had been audited to expectations and asked for more clarification.

Larry Perkins explained that EM-QA-001 Revision 1 intentionally addressed this question in the front matter of the document.

Jeff May agreed but noted the contractors at ORP had still asked for more clarification.

Mike Hassell noted that the previous efforts from the EM QA Corporate Board on graded approach had focused on procurements.

Topic 6 – Good Commercial Grade Dedication Examples

Bud Danielson noted that HSS was working on collecting some examples and may be addressing this topic.

Bob Murray agreed and indicated he had discussed this with Norm Barker of EFCOG and EFCOG is also supporting the HSS effort.

Bud Danielson noted that something else to consider here is that the hardware portion is easier but the electronics is where we need more work.

Mike Hassell noted that EFCOG is working this topic as a task and suggested that the team could keep the EM QA Corporate Board apprised of the progress.

Bob Murray noted there is a lot of activity on this topic right now. Unless there is something specific that we need to fill a gap and address, the best approach may be to allow the HSS Quality Council to address this topic.

Steve Chalk commented that one additional factor to consider is the construction projects and applying the rules there versus operations, but agreed there is a lot of activity ongoing.

Topic 7 – Better Information Exchange Between Sites

Bob Murray noted that the approach so far has been to use the lessons learned system developed by the department and not re-invent such a system. We can help disseminate things in EM-40, but the formal system should remain at the corporate level.

Sandra Waisley noted that EM had implemented an alert system for S/CI a few years back and asked what happened with it.

Christian Palay explained that there was an issue at WTP where the alert system was going to be used. However, the alert got caught up in GC and was never issued.

Sandra Waisley noted she recalled this issue now, but agreed that EM should not re-invent a system that is already available.

Russell McCallister noted that this is useful for good things too. If a site is doing something correct, getting it to the other sites so they can do similar things would be nice. EM-HQ sees the entire complex and could help with this type of effort.

Bob Murray agreed and noted EM-40 is trying to do some of this now. Specifically, sharing issues from Idaho and IWTU with SR and SWPF, but we can probably do a better job of getting some of this information distributed.

Topic 8 – Development of Standard QA Metrics

Jay Mullis explained that this topic could be useful if we had something like a pick list or setoff metrics to use for POMCs for contractors. Previous experience has used re-work rate as a metric, but most contractors are not interested in including that in the metrics. An endorsed set of metrics from the QA community would be useful, similar to what is done with radiological protection or environmental safety and health.

Russell McCallister noted that about a year ago there was an effort to do something similar but didn't recall details. The effort was part of EMERS.

Steve Chalk noted that this is not part of the current EMERS effort.

Greg Hayward noted there have been a number of requests for this type of information and he has seen some progress, but it has been primarily focused on construction. The Quality Council in HSS is also looking at this topic.

Mike Brown noted CBFO has been working to utilize effectiveness of corrective actions and repeats of issues as a metric.

Jay Mullis noted that most metrics for QA that he has seen have been the number of assessments planned versus completed and the number of open corrective actions.

Bud Danielson agreed and noted that numbers like this may be useful for the local manager, but there is some reluctance to use POMCs like rework rate or number of design changes that may be perceived as negative by the contractors.

Mike Brown noted that corrective actions are things that can be fixed. The NRC used repeat offenses as one of the most significant fines.

Bud Danielson noted we could also look at the rest of the nuclear industry for comparison.

Topic 9 – Common List of NQA-1 Suppliers

Brian Harkins explained it would be desirable to have a list of suppliers that could be used across the complex and cut down on the efforts for qualification.

Christian Palay asked if ORP was going to be willing to audit with other organizations.

Brian Harkins responded that ORP could probably help with such audits.

Christian Palay explained that JSEP has already been working on this type of list but is maintained by EFCOG versus DOE.

Mike Hassell agreed and explained that they were trying to coordinate with NNSA as well. JSEP does have a joint suppliers reviewed list, but it is not EFCOG evaluated suppliers. Vince Grosso is running this effort and is trying to work on expanding it now.

Brian Harkins noted that JSEP may be what he is looking for and will talk to Mike Hassell off-line to get more information.

Topic 10 – Holding QA Changes to Allow for Full Implementation

Bob Murray discussed the EM-QA-001 revisions and the fact that changes went on for a few years via memo. Revision 1 consolidated those changes in 2012. These changes included the incorporation of DOE Order 414.1D and asked if anyone had clarification on what this topic was intended to address.

Jeff May explained that for ORP, there has been discussion on changes procedures etc. The discussion is on effective dates and how they allow for time to update all of the associated documents. There are a number of procedures below the QAP documents that are updated for full implementation.

Bob Murray asked if this was regarding the federal offices.

Jeff May answered it was both federal and contractor offices. What timeframe should be allowed for procedure updates and should there be a common method/timeframe to do those updates (e.g., 90 day allowance is what ORP is using)?

Greg Hayward noted that when we went to NQA-1-2008, there were some expensive changes. The new contractors have 90 days to implement a QAP, but for federal offices it was not too difficult. Contractors had more changes and it cost more money. Some guidance in this area would be useful.

Jeff May agreed but noted he was looking broader at normal maintenance of the program and procedures. For example, one method that has been used in other places is incorporation of effective dates that are later than approval dates for all procedures, with training etc. required by the effective date. Consistency would be helpful.

Bob Toro noted that there is a yearly requirement to look at QAPs for modifications and updates.

Jeff May agreed but noted that the changes other than just the yearly review is also what he is referencing.

Bob Murray clarified the question as - if BNI has changes in the QAP then what time is reasonable for updating the procedures etc., even if the change is not a directed change from DOE.

Jeff May agreed that was the issue and noted that 90 days is currently allowed at ORP, and senior management approval is required to extend beyond 90 days.

Bob Murray indicated we should get some guidance and advice from the office of primary interest on the DOE order.

Topic 11 – Clarification on QA Programs for Shipping Containers

Mike Hassell explained that this topic is currently being worked by EFCOG and they are looking at how to develop criteria for the containers if credited in the safety basis. They can make a standard report for the activity and provide to the EM QA Corporate Board.

General Discussion of Topics

Mike Hassell noted that EFCOG QA task groups are working on Topics, 5, 9, and 11 now.

Larry Perkins asked for any motions to form focus areas.

Bud Danielson made a motion to use Topic 1 on resources as a focus area.

Jay Mullis provided a second to the motion.

Russell McCallister asked for clarification on what the outcome or deliverable will be for this effort.

Jay Mullis explained there should be two outcomes: (1) guidance such as the FR algorithm for determining staffing levels that could be applied to QA and (2) evaluate the potential to hire and maintain resources needed to meet existing QA requirements.

Matt Moury agreed and noted in the past we have been determining the level of oversight based on the available resources therefore we have adequate resources by definition.

Roll call vote was held on forming a focus area to address Topic 1.

Vote to form a Focus Area to provide recommendations on resources and staffing issues (i.e., standard method for determining needed resources and areas where the Corporate Board can assist in meeting those needs including evaluation of available resources) **(PASSED)**

Randy Kay – Idaho - **Yes**	Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah - **Yes**
Jay Mullis– Oak Ridge - **Yes**	Mike Brown- Carlsbad - **Yes**
Steve Chalk – Richland - **Yes**	Brian Harkins - River Protection - **Yes**
Charlie Harris – Savannah River - **Yes**	Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-43 - **Yes**
Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety - **Yes**	Matt Moury (chair) – Headquarters EM-40 - **Yes**
Ken Armstrong – EMCBC* - **Yes**	

Representing the site and agreed with effort but not designated as a voting member.

Bob Murray noted that for the remaining topics, there really were not any that required EM QA Corporate Board action at this time. Specifically the following suggestion was made:

- Topic 1 – selected as focus area
- Topic 2 – selected as focus area
- Topic 3 – currently being worked by EM-40 outside of the EM QA Corporate Board
- Topic 4 – currently being worked by EM-40 outside of the EM QA Corporate Board
- Topic 5 – being addressed by EFCOG and/or HSS
- Topic 6 – being addressed by EFCOG and/or HSS
- Topic 7 – currently being worked by EM-40 outside of the EM QA Corporate Board
- Topic 8 – EM-40 is working on some benchmarking of other nuclear industry QA programs and can include this in the discussions
- Topic 9 – being addressed by EFCOG via JSEP
- Topic 10 – EM-43 can follow-up with the office of primary interest on the order for guidance
- Topic 11 – being addressed by EFCOG and/or HSS

The group agreed with Bob Murray's assessment and no additional motions were made on focus areas.

Discussion of Revision to EM QA Corporate Board By-Laws – Larry Perkins

Larry Perkins gave a brief discussion of the needed changes to the EM QA Corporate By-Laws changes and asked for any comments.

Bud Danielson noted that there was a question on the need for two EM-40 voting members, but also noted that without both there would be an even number of voting members.

No additional comments were provided.

Close-Out of Meeting – Matt Moury and Bob Murray

Bob Murray and Matt Moury thanked everyone for their continued support with the EM QA Corporate Board and noted we will be seeing some additional information on the pending DNFSB QA Program briefing shortly.

Meeting Adjourned

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS			
#	Action for Follow-Up	Individual Responsible	Current Status
1	Distribute meeting minutes from conference call	Larry Perkins	Complete
2	Distribute list of topics for DNFSB QA program briefing to be held in March 2014	Bob Murray	Complete
3	Work with the sites and EFCOG to select team leads for the new focus areas selected by the EM QA Corporate Board	Bob Murray Larry Perkins	New Action
4	Request guidance the office of primary interest on timeframes for implementing QA program changes in procedures and implementing documents.	Bob Murray	New Action
5	Update By-Laws for vote	Larry Perkins	New Action
6	Update project plan to address the new focus areas	Larry Perkins	New Action

#	Name	Site/Company
1	Ken Armstrong	DOE – EMCBC
2	Mike Brown	DOE – CBFO
3	Steve Chalk	DOE – Richland
4	Bud Danielson	DOE – CNS
5	George Delullo	PPPO Support
6	Jonathan Dowell	DOE – River Protection
7	Jim Gambrell	DOE – EMCBC
8	Brian Harkins	DOE – River Protection
9	Charlie Harris	DOE – Savannah River
10	Mike Hassell	CH2MHill/EFCOG
11	Greg Hayward	DOE – Idaho
12	San Horton	DNFSB Staff
13	Randy Kay	DOE – Idaho
14	George Mata	MSA – Richland
15	Jeff May	DOE – River Protection
16	Ed McAlister	DOE – Richland
17	Russell McCallister	DOE – Portsmouth/Paducah
18	Matt Moury	DOE – EM-40
19	Jay Mullis	DOE – Oak Ridge
20	Bob Murray	DOE – EM-43
21	Christian Palay	DOE – EM-43
22	Larry Perkins	DOE – EM-43
23	Bob Toro	DOE – EM-43
24	Ray Wood	Trinity Engineering Associates
25	Sandra Waisley	DOE – Savannah River