

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

---

Voting Board Members in Attendance:

Randy Kay – Idaho	Matt Moury (chair) – Headquarters EM-40
Jay Mullis – Oak Ridge	Cynthia Zvonar– Portsmouth/Paducah (non-voting)
Ray Corey – Richland	Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-43
David Moody – Savannah River	Courtland Fesmire - Carlsbad
Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety	Scott Samuelson- River Protection
Jack Craig – EMCBC	

---

**Introductions (Larry Perkins)**

Larry Perkins covered the agenda, introductions of Corporate Board voting members, and general announcements.

**Status/Closure of Current Focus Areas - Focus Area 2 – Resources (Jim Davis)**

Jim Davis provided the results from the recent resources survey that was provided to the EM site offices. All large sites and some small sites responded to the survey. Overall, contractors have more flexibility and fewer constraints on obtaining resources in QA, QC, and QE areas. The federal resources are marginally adequate.

San Horton asked if he could get a copy of the draft report to more fully understand the responses that have been provided. Jim indicated there was no formal report, but he does have a table of the results from the survey. Jim Davis and Larry Perkins will ensure the data table is distributed to the Corporate Board participants for review.

Bob Murray commented that the previous meetings had linked resources to training needs. If these results are correct, then we may not need the training we have been discussing.

Ray Corey noted this was a snapshot in time and not a succession planning survey.

Bob Murray noted that the INPO presentation at the EFCOG ISM/QA Working Group meeting earlier in the day discussed losing QA resources and this could also generate a gap for EM. In addition, EM-43 has provided follow-up Phase II reviews of the site office QA programs throughout the past year. In these reviews, the number one observation is that the site offices have insufficient QA resources for the current mission. Mr. Murray asked for some of the sites to provide a perspective on their office resources in this area.

Randy Kay indicated that Idaho had lost one person and were going to have a hard time replacing the individual in the near future due to sequestration concerns. Overall, the Idaho office needs at least 3 additional QA FTEs.

Charlie Harris indicated SR has 2.5 people for QA with one of those eligible for retirement. SR is working to get one additional QA person now. They need 3-4 more FTEs but are not authorized to hire those individuals.

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

Jeff May indicated ORP is working to hire one person now. In addition, 2-3 individuals will likely be retiring in the next 3 years. Overall, ORP needs another 2-3 FTEs.

Steven Chalk indicated RL has 2 QA individuals now and is working to hire a 3<sup>rd</sup>. This is down from 8 QA individuals during the ARRA funded work. RL uses SMEs and support contractors to help ensure adequate QA coverage. Overall, RL could use more QA staff, but the current staffing is not impeding work.

Jeff May noted that ORP is shifting from oversight to IPTs and the projects are asking for quality engineering work versus QA oversight.

Bob Murray noted that the federal staff hiring is difficult. EM-43 is currently down 5 QA staff members.

Ray Corey noted this is not specific to QA. All other ESH&Q areas are experiencing the same trend.

Jay Mullis indicated OR is stable at 5-6 QA staff. There is no large need for additional QA resources at this time as the ARRA funded work is reducing.

Bob Murray noted this was an issue on the original list provided by the Corporate Board. It seems that now there are some sites that welcome additional resources and some don't think it is necessary at this time.

Ray Corey thinks that is accurate for the contractor staff, but overall the federal staff is thin.

Bob Murray asked if the reported results were accounting for the support provided by EM-43.

Jeff May indicated ORP was only accounting for ORP resources, but they will be looking to EM-43 for support if available going forward.

Steve Chalk indicated RL is using SMEs and contractor support, as well as changing focus to review the contractor reports as a source of information.

Overall – the consensus was that the EM-43 resources were not included in the survey responses.

San Horton noted that it seems like doing a survey is a step to understand the needs but this should be compared to a baseline of required needs. The required needs could be based on something like dollar value of the contract, headcount of the contractor, etc. to see if we have adequate resources to complete the EM mission.

Bud Danielson commented that it seems we are saying that EM is just getting by versus addressing what is really needed.

Matt Moury noted that traditionally this approach is correct, but we are looking at budget restrictions and need new ideas on how to meet the needed requirements.

San Horton agreed but noted we need to know a number based on assumptions traceable to requirements.

Matt Moury clarified that resources are restricted by headcount in addition to overall cost.

San Horton suggested we make sure to tell the story so nobody is surprised in the future and asks about why QA resources were not available.

Bob Murray mentioned that we discussed getting funds for the federal headquarters office to support the sites during our QA managers VTC about 3 months ago. Some limited amount of funding is available for this effort. We need to each take a look at the data and see if we need to do anything else.

Ray Corey commented that we are focusing on federal staff and numbers which are swamped by the contractor numbers in the survey.

Tony Umek noted the contractors have functional groups with reserve at a central location. If the federal staff could consider hiring an expert to cover multiple sites, it may be useful.

The conclusion was that the raw data will be distributed to the Corporate Board participants for evaluation and determination on how to proceed with the focus area.

**Status/Closure of Current Focus Areas - Focus Area 3 – Training (Ken Armstrong)**

Ken Armstrong provided the status of the training focus area and what has happened over the past year.

San Horton commented that there is a non-mandatory subpart in the next version of NQA-1 scheduled for release in February 2013. The subpart will address commercial grade dedication of software and may be a good resource for training information.

A comment was made that a lot of S/CI training is being performed across the complex without a review of the training material and should probably be reviewed.

Ken Armstrong feels the focus group has completed its mission but the Corporate Board should consider looking at the implementation of the training going forward.

Debora Sparkman asked if the training provided by the contractors is the same for the federal staff and if so, is that appropriate.

Ken Armstrong replied that it is not necessarily the same. The need for training may not be the same level for the federal staff but the federal staff should be adequately trained to assess the contractor.

Debora Sparkman asked if it would be valuable to have a separate set of classes for the federal staff that is somewhat less than the contractor training.

Ken Armstrong felt that developing two classes would likely be cost prohibitive.

Steve Chalk commented that the federal staff should be as technically competent as the contractor staff.

Debora Sparkman added that this discussion applied to commercial grade dedication as well, and not just S/CI training.

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

Bob Murray noted the focus group was developing a catalogue and asked if that information has been posted online.

Ken Armstrong responded that he does have the material and was waiting on the EMCBC system to go live before he posted it. The material will be posted soon.

Larry Perkins noted that the listing/catalogue was a listing only and not an endorsement of the classes.

Ken Armstrong agreed and indicated the catalogue was simply a search of available classes.

Bob Murray noted he went online to the Aiken Technical College website and didn't see some of the information on classes. Most classes seem to be starting in the fall of 2013 and some courses are not available. Is there something else available?

Ken Armstrong noted that some of the classes are not available every semester but he will follow up with what is available and provide the link to Bob Murray.

Richard Salizzoni noted that he is on the Aiken Technical College committee and the college is developing the classes as they come up so they are not all ready at this time. That would explain why they could not all be found online.

Bob Murray asked if the classes were only on campus at this time.

Richard Salizzoni replied yes, but there is an ongoing effort to move them online.

Jack Craig made a motion to close the focus area.

Ray Corey provided a second to the motion.

---

**Vote to Close Training Focus Area:**

Randy Kay – Idaho - **Yes**

Matt Moury (chair) – Headquarters EM-40 - **Yes**

Jay Mullis – Oak Ridge - **Yes**

Jack Zimmerman – No Voting Member Attending

Ray Corey – Richland - **Yes**

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

David Moody – Savannah River - **Yes**

Courtland Fesmire – Carlsbad - **Yes**

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

Scott Samuelson - River Protection - **Yes**

Jack Craig – EMCBC - **Yes**

---

**EM QA Corporate Board Approach and Focus (Matt Moury and Bob Murray)**

Matt Moury and Bob Murray provided a discussion of the presentation on the focus of the EM QA Corporate Board.

Matt Moury noted that there were some changes in EM-43. Jerry Lipsky is now at SR and Larry Perkins is now in Oak Ridge. Mr. Moury added that a lot of good effort has been put in by the Corporate Board, but the QA issues are persisting, so should there be a change in focus? A recent discussion with the DNFSB board member indicated this was a concern with the DNFSB as well, and the DNFSB is a big supporter of the Corporate Board. One of the DNFSB board members will likely attend the next EM QA Corporate Board meeting.

Bob Murray summarized that the Corporate Board has been productive and this presentation is not intended to be criticism. Basically, are we on the right track? Mr. Murray provided a brief history of the Corporate Board and asked if the Corporate Board should be doing the work through the focus areas or looking at more programmatic issues. The by-laws allow for utilizing SMEs etc., but should the Corporate Board be solving the problem or identifying the problem and providing it to HSS and EFCOG for addressing the issue? Basically, are we focused on the right mission? In FY13, we are going to be working on substantiating the implementation of the QA programs in EM. Talking to EFCOG and HSS, they are open to working closely with the Corporate Board to address specific issues. Basically, are we duplicating efforts with groups such as the teams within the HSS Quality Council? The recommendation is not to dismiss the focus areas, but what is the path forward and should we keep going down the same path. For example, the recent discussion on resources is a challenge that may be a good area for the Corporate Board to provide assistance on a path forward.

Tony Umek commented that this strategy makes sense from a strategic perspective. EFCOG has more resources available, and asking the individuals experiencing the problems is a good approach. Basically, what areas are strategic versus tactical. Attempting to address individual challenges does not get to the root cause of the issue.

Bob Murray asked if EM is trying to solve DOE wide problems with things such as the commercial grade dedication guidance document.

Debora Sparkman noted the commercial grade dedication guide is a deliverable that is very good and was developed by the Corporate Board. This type of information has not been developed by NNSA or EFCOG. In addition, the guide has been passed along to HSS and there has been little movement on the document from them. EM has offered 15-20 training courses and has included students from other DOE organizations. Maybe the Corporate Board should look at modeling focus areas after the commercial grade dedication focus area.

Paul Harrington commented that we are not looking for the Corporate Board to develop specific solutions. The current list of potential focus areas is not broad enough for things like receipt of bad items. The focus should be more strategic for solutions such as the QARD and are the processes inefficient in its use? We need process issues addressed.

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

Ray Corey noted that what is really being discussed has to do with all of DOE. EM was leading QA and other organizations were not at the same level. Now, other organizations are caught up, so is it EM's role to drive DOE down the QA path, or should we focus on internal EM problems? We need to look more at the implementation level, like S/CI in computer chips. Does HQ see other organizations picking up the ball and how much does the EM QA Corporate Board really need to do?

Bob Murray commented he would like to focus the EM QA Corporate Board on implementation of the QA program and bring QA managers in to tell us what is going on at their sites.

Debora Sparkman expressed a concern that if EM doesn't do it, nobody will. Ms. Sparkman would hate to see the Corporate Board go away, especially when it is a leader in QA.

Bob Murray indicated if EM is leading the department, then we are really doing the job for HSS.

Bud Danielson noted that HSS does not have ownership of implementation. Basically, you have to worry about your own needs, or nobody else will. It doesn't help to just ask why someone else isn't doing it, because you will be accountable if you could have done something and didn't. The Corporate Board has a role to get management involved at the senior level to have both attention and intention to implement QA. The Corporate Board should stay for that reason.

Jeff May noted that each site is unique. The catalyst for tasks may be driven by individual sites and the Corporate Board is where you go to get EM to focus on the issue.

Bob Murray noted that the Corporate Board has been writing guides and standards versus focusing on oversight.

Make Hassell indicated the contractor organizations struggled with this on functional versus programmatic focus. The Corporate Board came into existence when the program issues were there. The issues now are at a lower level. We know we have a program, but line management needs to own the implementation of the program. The Corporate Board had to play on the functional side initially, but now it is a balance for giving line management sponsorship. It is valuable now to be on the line management side versus the programmatic side, focusing on crosscutting issues and focusing our energy. For example, we developed the QA metrics that are reported in the ISM declaration, but nothing is really coming from that data. Should the Corporate Board be looking at that data?

Jeff May noted that in the field, he sees a need for resources to oversee the contractors and things like the ISMS declaration are not providing much bang for the buck and just tie up resources.

San Horton suggested looking at the mission and asking if the Corporate Board is struggling with continuous quality improvement.

Ray Corey noted that the last meetings have not been as interactive and more of report outs on products. The Corporate Board seems to be hitting a new phase and needs to consider where do we go from here and who should be involved? The question is do we think the rest of DOE is giving the appropriate focus to QA or not?

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

Bob Murray noted that if we take control we can dictate the outcome and when we get the results. If we pass things to EFCOG or HSS, we have to wait on them to develop a product. Our current by-laws allow for focus areas. Some of our focus areas such as EM-QA-001 Rev. 1 are an appropriate use of the Corporate Board focus areas. Some of the other focus areas could probably have been handled by someone else.

Matt Moury asked that the Corporate Board members review the slides, review the by-laws, review the charter memo, etc. and evaluate how the Corporate Board should proceed.

Mike Mason commented he sits on two other corporate boards and they talk about budgets and financial issues for example. A reference was made in the ISM meeting about \$65 million in unplanned QA work. Other corporate boards look at trends and what is seen across the complex. Mr. Mason is also surprised that the QA resources are ok from the previous discussion. He has never heard anyone on the contractor side say they have plenty of QA people. Maybe a template on how many audits or surveillances are done per supplier for example would be a valuable effort to fully evaluate the resource issue.

Bob Carter clarified that the focus area did have some typical numbers such as from the NRC etc. but didn't want to mandate numbers in the focus area.

Mike Mason noted that the discussion really centers on regardless of the numbers, we don't have enough resources. Bechtel has enough QC resources, but not enough QA.

Matt Moury asked the site QA managers to meet with the EM-43 office and list what QA issues the sites are currently experiencing. The Corporate Board can then address whether those issues are strategic or tactical and whether the Corporate Board should address the issues.

**EFCOG Current Efforts in QA (Mike Hassell)**

*There are two corrections to the presentation provided in this discussion. Roy Schepens is now the EFCOG Board Sponsor for ISM/QA. Also, the Quality Council is an HSS group and not an EM group.*

Mike Hassell provided a discussion of the presentation on the current EFCOG efforts in QA.

Kim Loll discussed the MASL and JSEP integration. There is agreement in principle and there is interest in combining these efforts. There is still a need to brief NNSA management to get agreement on the integration and development of a governance model.

Bob Murray asked who is leading the EFCOG Quality Programs Task.

Mike Hassell responded that the lead is Bob Carter.

Bob Murray asked if there is any estimate on when the integration will be completed.

Mike Hassell indicated the answer is yes but he did not have that information on hand and will provide it after the meeting.

Steve O'Connor asked if the efforts were also looking at the nuclear industry such as NEI, NUPIC, etc. for specific reviews such as software.

Mike Hassell answered yes; they utilize a lot of expertise with experience throughout the private nuclear industry.

Mike Mason provided specific examples of individuals from NUPIC that have participated with JSEP.

Bud Danielson mentioned a drum supplier and the recent paragraph 100 interpretation from ASME on NQA-1. The question is what is reasonable for implementation?

Mike Hassell noted this also falls into the procurement area and fits better in tailoring versus use of the graded approach.

#### **NQA-1 Committee Update (Bud Danielson)**

Bud Danielson provided an update of the current activities associated with the NQA-1 committee.

Debora Sparkman noted that guidance on dedication of computer programs is included in NQA-1 and is in line with the EM commercial grade dedication guidance.

#### **Need for Appropriate QA Requirements for Commonly Used DOT Containers (Steve O'Connor)**

Steve O'Connor provided a discussion of the need for appropriate QA requirements in DOT containers. Type B containers go through a certification process and are required to be fabricated in accordance with 10 CFR Part 71, and typically NQA-1 is used to implement these requirements. Type A containers are required to meet DOE O 414.1. Right now, each site utilizes a different set of procurement specifications for Type A drums, and there is only one drum manufacturer. That manufacturer has stated that if they are required to meet NQA-1, the cost of drums will increase by 300%. Mr. O'Connor proposed the use of a standardized procurement specification for Type A drums and use of a graded approach to quality for manufacturing. This would result in a cost reduction for Type A drums complex-wide. In addition, the use centralized procurement for the Department on commonly used items such as these drums would result in further cost avoidance through economies of scale in purchasing large volumes.

Jack Craig noted the EMCBC is integrated and does centralized procurements with Kansas City which was specifically mentioned in the discussion. Mr. Craig suggested Mr. O'Connor call him to discuss.

Bud Danielson asked how many of the drums that are purchased by DOE got to WIPP.

Steve O'Connor indicated CBFO has its own procurement group to support WIPP shipments, but doesn't procure drums for the rest of EM nor the Department.

Bob Murray noted that JSEP recently evaluated the drum manufacturer being discussed.

Ronald Natali explained that Idaho, Hanford, Savannah River, Oak Ridge, EM-Headquarters, and Los Alamos National Laboratory were all represented on the recent review. The drum supplier has provided the



12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

corrective action plan and is not going to develop a full NQA-1 program. In fact, the supplier is transitioning to an ISO quality program.

Bud Danielson noted that the ASME interpretation is not an edict that says you have to implement the full NQA-1 for all activities. The problem is that only using paragraph 100 does not even ensure all of the areas of the NQA-1 standard are addressed.

Ronald Natali noted that some sites do use the drums as safety class or safety significant.

Bob Carter commented that it sounds like we are trying to inspect in quality versus design in quality.

Jeff May noted that commercial grade dedication should be the selection of last resort. You could use an ISO quality program and compare to NQA-1. The applicable requirements are put in the procurement specification. The audit is performed and the supplier put on the approved suppliers list for that limited scope/item. This seems to be missing.

Ronald Natali stated the DOE sites sometimes go to the contractors and simply state you are required to implement all of NQA-1.

Jeff May noted that is where procurement planning comes into play. In addition, some suppliers won't even talk to you if you require NQA-1, but will if you require other quality programs.

Steve O'Connor commented the flow-down seems to require full NQA-1 right now.

Paul Harrington stated that our role should be to better explain the NQA-1 requirements to the contractors.

Jeff May agreed and stated we need to better explain the middle ground between full NQA-1 and only paragraph 100.

Bob Murray clarified you can't grade away requirements but you can administratively control them. For example, if the supplier doesn't do design then requirement 3 is not applicable.

Paul Harrington suggested that this issue seems to be something warranting Corporate Board attention based on the previous discussion of a path forward for the Corporate Board.

**EM-QA-001 Revision 1 Implementation Status (Larry W. Perkins)**

Larry Perkins provided a brief history of EM-QA-001 Rev. 1 and recent questions that have been brought up by the sites. The sites were then asked to provide a status of the implementation for the federal office and the contractors at their site.

Richland (Steve Chalk): The federal QIP is completed and the gap analysis has been submitted to EM-HQ. The updated EM-QA-001 is being flowed down to the contractors via the contracts. CHPRC has already implemented DOE Order 414.1D and will have a minimal impact. WCH and MSA are continuing to work on the implementation and there are no additional issues requiring attention at this time.

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

Oak Ridge (Jay Mullis): Oak Ridge has one IDIQ contract with 2 tasks. One task will be completed in December 2012 and the other in April 2013, so implementation may not be warranted for this contractor. Two other primes have already started the implementation process with one providing a gap analysis in the near future. The Oak Ridge federal office is going to need an extension due to the current reorganization. Mr. Mullis will work with EM-40 and EM-43 to formally request that extension.

River Protection (Jeff May): The federal site office is revising their programmatic documents and is approximately 90% complete. Once these documents are complete, the procedure set will still need to be revised to address the changes. The prime contractors are currently performing a gap analysis to get a cost estimate, but an extension will likely be needed for each of the contractors. BNI-WTP is recommending maintaining the current version of NQA-1 as the code of record and not moving to anything beyond the NQA-1-2000 version currently in use. It was noted that BNI-WTP does not currently have an exemption to the EM-QA-001 Rev. 0 requirements. EM-40, EM-43, and ORP need to discuss this issue further.

Savannah River (Charles Harris): The M&O contractor is moving along with the gap analysis. Minimal impact is expected. The FAR contractor is implementing NQA-1-2008/2009 in a method that takes longer to implement but results in little to no cost impact. As such, an extension request will likely be needed. The federal site office is working on implementing EM-QA-001 Rev. 1 in its entirety as the site QAP with a good QIP to support implementation. This effort will reduce the impact on the site office with changes to the corporate QAP.

Consolidated Business Center (Jack Craig): Moab is complete with the gap analysis. West Valley and SPRU are on track for the December 2012 target date. ETAC has minimal activities at this time and may need an extension. The EMCBC staff will work with EM-40/EM-43 office for the extension. The EMCBC federal office is on track for the December 2012 target date.

Idaho (Randy Kay): The federal office has submitted the updated QAP for EM-HQ approval. The ITG contractor is compliant with the updated document. CWI is compliant with the updated document but has not completed a gap analysis. An extension will likely be needed. The Idaho staff will work with EM-40/EM-43 office for the extension as necessary.

Carlsbad (Courtland Fesmire): Carlsbad has an exemption approved for maintaining use of NQA-1-1989.

Paul Harrington emphasized that it may be valuable to look at what a code of record means to DOE-EM and how it could be applied to the EM corporate QA program.

**Meeting Adjourned**

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

<b><u>SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS</u></b>		
<b>Action for Follow-Up</b>	<b>Individual Responsible</b>	<b>Current Status</b>
Provide input from the sites offices for the annual DNFSB briefing.	Bob Murray Larry Perkins	Pending - Email request will be provided to the site offices
Distribute the data from the resources survey to the Corporate Board participants	Jim Davis Larry Perkins	Pending
Review the resources data and evaluate what additional work in needed with this focus area	Corporate Board Members	Pending
Review the EM QA Corporate Board by-laws, charter, mission, and presentation material and determine the best path forward for the Corporate Board	Corporate Board Members	Pending
Provide the EM-43 office with a listing of the current QA issues being encountered by the site offices and contractors	Site Office QA Managers	Pending
Provide a schedule or milestones for the current JSEP MASL integration effort.	Mike Hassell	Pending
Review the information provided for the EFCOG/PMC Joint Working Group involving identification of quality requirements in drums. If in agreement, consider endorsing the effort. Once endorsed, any deliverables will be provided to the Corporate Board for endorsement.	Corporate Board Members	Pending

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

<b>#</b>	<b><u>Attendees</u></b>	<b><u>Organization</u></b>
1	Bob Toro	DOE-HQ
2	Christian Palay	DOE-HQ
3	Steven Ross	DOE-HQ
4	Jim Davis	DOE-HQ
5	Ken Armstrong	DOE-EMCBC
6	Larry Perkins	DOE-HQ
7	Mike Hassell	CH2MHill/CHPRC
8	Jason Armstrong	DOE-OR
9	Robert Carter	WCH Hanford
10	Vince Grosso	WRPS Hanford
11	San Horton	DNFSB Staff
12	Randy Kay	DOE-ID
13	Charles Harris	DOE-SR
14	Larry Adkinson	DOE-SR
15	Jack Craig	DOE-EMCBC
16	Ray Corey	DOE-RL
17	Mike Mason	Bechtel
18	Bob Murray	DOE-HQ
19	Matt Moury	DOE-HQ
20	Robert Thompson	CWI-INL
21	Richard Salizzoni	SRR
22	Courtland Fesmire	DOE-CBFO
23	Steve Chalk	DOE-RL
24	Jeff May	DOE-ORP
25	Bud Danielson	DOE-CNS
26	Wayne Ledford	NWP, QA
27	Porf Martinez	CTAC, Portage Inc.
28	William Verret	CTAC, Portage Inc.
29	Greg Knox	CTAC, Portage Inc.
30	Berry Pace	CTAC, Portage Inc.
31	Cynthia Zvonar	DOE-PPPO
32	David Moody	DOE-SR
33	Bill Rowland	DOE-SR
34	Clarence Mabry	DOE-SR
35	Tom Cowlam	SRNS
36	Joe Fulghum	SRNS
37	Cynthia Williams	SRNS
38	Dave Shugars	SRR
39	Art Murphy	Moab
40	Ted Wyka	DOE-HQ
41	Scott Samuelson	DOE-ORP
42	Tony Umek	Fluor
43	Linda Weir	BNI WTP
44	Paul Harrington	DOE-ORP
45	Patrice McEahern	Shaw
46	Ray Wood	Trinity Engineering
47	Charlie Kronvall	CHPRC
48	Jay Mullis	DOE-OR
49	Debra Sparkman	DOE-CNS

12<sup>th</sup> Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes  
November 27, 2012 – Hanford, WA

<b>#</b>	<b><u>Attendees</u></b>	<b><u>Organization</u></b>
50	Kim Loll	NNSA
51	Ashok Kapoor	DOE-HQ
52	Ronald Natali	ORNL
53	Stephen O'Connor	DOE-HQ