

EM Corporate Board Meeting
Denver, CO
July 29 - 30, 2008
8:00am - 5:00pm

Meeting Notes

The meeting was held at the Hyatt Regency Tech Center, Wind River Meeting Room (See Attachment 1, Agenda).

Welcome/ Opening Remarks

Dae Chung, Joe Bader, and Leo Sain provided opening remarks

Intro of Board Members and Other Participants

Sandra Waisley provided logistics information. Materials included in the folder and logistics for lunch. Intro of Board Members and members introduced staff in attendance.

EM QA Initiatives Update

Sandra Waisley- Developing the first EM performance metrics system
Ensure implementation of DOE Order 414.1C
15 Audits to finish up in FY08
Mr. Bader- NRC '03 report on NQA-1
Sain: why waist time trying to update NQA-1

Actions:

Draft EM Corporate QA Program Plan (QAPP) Overview/ Discussion

Presenter: Kriss Grisham

Intro Development Writing Team—TJ Jackson (CBC), Dave Shugars, Bob Carter, Al Hawkins, Roy LaBelle (BNL)

Presentation (See Attachment 2, Presentation)

Discussion on the presentation
2000 vs. 2004 changes are not substantial

In the back of the draft QAP please look at the wheel

Bader: Board believes the general approach is a good idea. Have you given thought to a complex wide EM-NNSA watch list-- of who has had problems lately. Possibly a list of approved vendors.

-There is not a singular system; however it is handled more informally (i.e. emails/ calls to the field managers)

-maybe we can think about where there are audit findings posting it to a list and providing so others can see.

Q&A:

- Will everyone receive a standard contract clause? That is the intent
- What is going to integrate? 5 programs managed

Actions:

- Add Idaho to the Org chart-page 5 (dotted line)
- Send any comments within the next 2 weeks to Kriss Grisham and Sandra Waisley by August 15th
- Looking for feedback from sites on the implementation time
Have you given thought to a complex wide EM-NNSA watch list (i.e. companies that have had problems). Possibly a list of approved vendors.

-----15 MINUTE BREAK-----

Norm Barker gives a few comments regarding what NRC will in endorse forNAQ-1

Joe Yanek and Longennecker provide comments on the EFCOG

EM/EFOCOG QA Improvement Project Overview and Discussion

Presenter(s): Sandra Waisley and Dave Tuttel
(See Attachment)

#1 Requirements Flow Down Project

Presenter(s): Butch Huxford and Alice Dosewell
(See Attachment)

Discussion

What are people doing in the oversight element—this was one element of the survey

Bader: Amazed that he is hearing that people are stating that they just don't do oversight, that is just plain Bad Business

Sain: To element 3rd tier subcontractor would be nearly impossible

WTP Broad Base Review Flow Down Req (Carrier)

- 12,000 req, looking at about 7,000 line items
- 45 people are working on this
- Having some issues, no show stoppers
- How far you go down to look at requirements
- Focused attention on Bechtel National, they flow down to their subs

Actions:

- Missing RW
- Need to follow-up on some missing EM sites, check via EFCOG Master List, provide what we have vs. not have
- Input into Area 5, the oversight element

#2 Adequate NQA-1 Suppliers Project Plan

Presenter(s): Bill Rowland and Rich Campbell

(See Attachment)

Discussion

Q&A:

Task 2.13—is there a reason why we are not going to other elements of DOE (i.e. NNSA, SC)— we are not trying to exclude other program offices, but anytime you try to implement a new initiative it is always difficult. The focus is on EM first and then get the initiative presentable and then make more Departmental Wide.

Actions:

- May want to follow-up in reaching out to the small businesses, look and see if we would like to address it

#2b Suppliers Auditing Concerns

Presenter: Jeffrey Allison

(See Attachment)

Discussion

Q&A:

Is there enforcement prospective on the investigation? ---they are aware

Bader: Understanding that there was documentation signed

On the audit team, more compliance base (paper) than performance base

What type products were you getting out of this company?

Actions:

-----LUNCH-----

#3 Commercial Grade Dedicated Implementation Project Action Plan

Presenter(s): Pat Carrier and Shelby Turner
Steve Foelber-WTP Project CDG Lessons Learned
(See Attachment)

Discussion

Q&A:

How many items are we talking about?—95% to date items have been purchase from Q suppliers.

Do you do any documentation to justify?---really look at all NAQ-1 suppliers doing CGD, make decisions based on what is the most appropriate thing to do for that project

Do you believe 2004 allow you to dedicate engineered items?—yes

When you do dedication, what kind of factor on cost have you been experiencing?—
NQA-1 is cost 2-3x more.

Actions:

- May have to change and look to the 2004, instead of 2000. Suggestion to get with Ava Holland
- May want to look at reversing task 3.4 and 3.5

#4 Graded Approach to Quality Assurance Project Action Plan

Presenter(s): Al Hawkins, Rich Higgins, and Leo Sain
(See Attachment)

Discussion:

Bader—Head of a large document, you will see a sentence will say a graded approach may apply. It should be transparent and well documented. If not clear and transparent then that document gets special attention

Q&A:

Actions:

#5 Line Management Understanding of QA and Oversight Project Action Plan

Presenter(s): TJ Jackson
(See Attachment)

Discussion

Q&A:

Actions:

-----30 MINUTE BREAK-----

Board Member Vote on EM/ EFCOG Quality Assurance Improvement Project Action Plan

Board Members for:

Allison, J.

Brockman, D.

Brown, R.

Chung, D.

Craig, J.

Provencher, R.

Taylor, H. (for Oliniger)

Board Members Against:

None

The EM/ EFCOG QA Improvement Project Action Plan passed unanimously.

Actions:

- **Status will be provided if there are changes/modifications to the EM/EFCOG QA Improvement Project Action Plan**
- **Increase number of members on Team #5 (TJ Jackson)**

Corporate QA Performance Metrics Discussion

Presenter: Sandra Waisley

(See Attachment)

Discussion

Actions:

- **If there are sites that already have quantification type metrics already we would want them rolled into the EM Corporate Performance Metrics System**
- **Please provide feedback to Sandra Waisley by August 15th**
- **Maybe have a group to do some focus in this matter and do investigating, possibly form this group early August**

The group will reconvene tomorrow morning at 8:30AM in the Wind River Meeting room. The meeting adjourned 4:30PM

EM Corporate Board Meeting
Denver, CO
July 30, 2008
8:00am – 12:00n

Meeting Notes

The meeting continued Wednesday, July 30th at the Hyatt Regency Tech Center, Wind River Meeting Room (See Attachment 1, Agenda).

Dae Chung gave opening remarks

Hugh Taylor (ORP) gave remarks for Shirley Olinger who was not able to attend.

Jack Zimmerman (PPPO) gave remarks

Joe Yanek (Fluor) gave remarks

Mike Mason: Next time maybe I can share lessons from commercial industry QA program and how changes effect

FY2008 Integrated Annual ISMS and QA Effectiveness Review and Declaration

Bob Murray provides information

Discussion:

Actions:

Site QA Resources (Federal and Contractor) Progress Report and Discussion

Presenter: Sandra Waisley

Discussion:

Actions:

-----15 MINUTE BREAK-----

Additional Site QA and Oversight Issues and Concerns

Next Steps/ Actions

- Discuss/ Finalize High Priority Action Items
- Discuss next Meeting date/ Logistics

Adjourn

EM Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting

Denver, Colorado

July 29 – 30, 2008

Meeting Notes

July 29, 2008, 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Opening remarks were presented by Dae Chung. Dae stated that he was proud of the accomplishments to date. He acknowledged that the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) was in attendance at the meeting, thanked the Energy Facilities Contractor's Group (EFCOG) for its support to EM, and stated the need to focus attention on the issue of improving quality for EM projects and programs and to learn from past mistakes to improve performance. The attendance of more than 50 people shows good support of the effort. This effort has created a lot of momentum to improve quality. Dae turned the floor over to Joe Bader (Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board - DNFSB) for his opening remarks.

Joe Bader provided opening remarks, noting that the problems today are similar to those that occurred in the nuclear industry in the 1970's. The industry is seeing a shortage of qualified suppliers again today, and the DNFSB is concerned about quality.

Specific DNFSB concerns include competent inspectors, quality control, QA overall – this involves a review of more than the paperwork for the program. Joe commented on the many problems seen coming from inadequate flow down of requirements and supported DOE's need for getting out in the field and looking at the sub-suppliers and sub-sub-suppliers. Problems have shown up in the past in rebar, welding, material quality, and poor or missing inspections. These quality problems require an industry wide solution. The US industry will buy most of the heavy components overseas since there is not enough US capacity. This presents additional challenges. Key skills are in extreme short supply, such as welding and NDE. DNFSB will monitor this topic from a broad perspective and of course will continue to have its field representatives monitor quality on each project.

Leo Sain (Washington Savannah River Company) provided an industry perspective by stating that Quality Assurance is a critical line management function. He stated that when he arrived at SRS in 2002, the site drive was to cut costs. This was a good goal, but it resulted in cutting some essential functions, such as QA. He commented on vendor problems in the 2003 time frame that should have been identified in QA audits, but were not identified. This was primarily due to the

audits being paper reviews and not performance reviews of critical functions. Leo stated there needs to be a focus on QA, and nuclear projects need a good QA program to be successful.

Sandra Waisley (EM) made introductions. She stated that over the past 12 months EM has worked hard on instilling a QA culture in the EM Program. Over this time period, EM has set up a new office and is on an aggressive hiring path. They have conducted eight assist visits, performed nine EM audits, and performed three EM/RW audits. The first QA Corporate Board meeting was held in March 2008, and EM has established five working groups which will be reporting out later in the meeting. EM and EFCOG have prepared the EM QA Improvement Project Plan and the EM Training Academy has been established with the first 40 hour course scheduled to begin August 18, 2008. The Training Academy has created 23 modules for the training. EM has completed the first draft of the EM Corporate Quality Assurance Program (QAP), and has developed the first QA Corporate performance metrics concept. EM is working to assure implementation of DOE Order 414.1C at the field locations, allocation of QA resources at the sites, and site QA managers reporting directly to the site managers or deputy managers. Three more field audits are planned to be conducted before end of FY 2008.

Joe Bader then raised the question of the use of ISO 9000 vs. NQA-1. He noted an NRC report dated in 2003 [2004?] related to ISO 9000 and 10CFR50 Appendix B. He indicated that this will become an issue as we acquire more goods and services overseas in the future. In addition, IAEA is developing international quality standards. At a minimum, we need to identify the differences in the requirements.

Kriss Grisham (EM) presented an overview of the EM Corporate QAP (see Attachment 1). Kriss reviewed the five-point strategy, and the QAP vs. the QA Implementation Plan. He noted that EM plans to formally issue the QAP by September 30, 2008. There was considerable discussion about which version of NQA-1 to use (2000, 2004, or 2008). Although no final decision was made regarding which version to use, the consensus was leaning towards the 2008 version. Kriss requested comments on the QAP by August 15th.

Dae Chung noted that the implementation schedule would be established later, based on inputs from each of the sites. EM knows that there are now gaps in the program, and the goal is to catch up, and ensure that there is effective requirements flow down. A key question is whether EM could pass an audit on this. EM is also working to define and manage the interfaces with RW and other DOE program offices.

Jack Craig (EM/CBC) indicated that future EM Requests For Proposals (RFPs) will be much more specific regarding the applicable QA requirements. These will be contained in the ES&H section, and will include standard clauses.

Bob Toro noted that EM had included latitude in the QAP to accommodate the fact that sites often work with multiple sets of QA requirements in meeting their missions (NQA-1, WIPP,

OCRWM QARD, DOE Order 414, etc.). Dae Chung stated that EM had selected NQA-1 for its projects since the majority are nuclear related.

Dave Jantosik (Bechtel National, WTP) noted that changes in the OCRWM QARD have caused a lot of concern for the WTP project. In discussing what version of NQA-1 was most appropriate, it was noted that a gap analysis of the requirements for a project will help to justify either upgrading or staying with an older version of NQA-1. Joe Yanek (Fluor) suggested that each project review the latest revisions to NQA-1, and decide independently whether to adopt the changes. Mike Mason (Bechtel National) noted that DOE Order 414.1C allows the use of requirements that are most appropriate.

Regarding the Integrated Safety Management (ISM) approach, Dae Chung noted that EM was not asking for anything new, but rather documentation of what is currently being done.

Joe Bader questioned if there is a “black list/watch list” of vendors that are having quality problems, and without one, how can other sites find out about a vendor with substandard performance so that vendor is not also used at another site. Apparently DOE does not keep such a black list, but there is communication among the sites. There was some discussion on this topic, and an action item was recorded.

Joe Yanek (Fluor) provided background on EFCOG’s support of the EM QA initiative. He identified the five working groups and noted that EFCOG has worked successfully on similar focused projects in the past including the ORPS system redesign and the Electrical Safety Improvement project.

Dave Tuttel (Westinghouse Savannah River Company) provided an overview of the EM/EFCOG QA Improvement Project Plan, noting that the working groups could use more volunteers from the contractors. Each of the five working groups then provided an overview of its activities.

Working Group #1, Requirements Flow Down – Alice Doswell (Parsons) presented the status of Working Group #1 and provided the results of a survey done by the working group. The group needs assistance in its ongoing survey. The results of the survey thus far indicated that flow down of requirements occurs over a wide range of methods, with a conclusion that this variability is confusing to vendors. There was a question regarding the oversight of sub-tier suppliers. It was stated that the EM audits are showing a significant weakness in this area. It was decided that Working Group #1 should discuss this matter with Working Group #5. An action item was recorded. See Attachment 2 for Alice’s presentation.

Tom Stevens (Areva) noted that many companies are now forced to relearn the nuclear culture. This requires a lot of training on what NQA-1 compliance involves.

Jack Zimmerman (EM/PPPO) observed that DOE and vendors both would benefit from having an Approved Suppliers List.

Joe Bader commented that he is surprised to hear that oversight of the sub-tier suppliers is not being conducted by the contractors, and that not enforcing QA requirements is always a risky proposition for any project.

Leo Sain commented that control of sub-tier vendors is a challenge; that it took WGI more than two years of well organized effort to address this at Savannah River Site (SRS).

Pat Carier (EM/ORP) stated that Office of River Protection (ORP) and the Waste Treatment Plant (Richland) are doing a thorough scrub of approximately 7,000 to 12,000 requirements to be flowed down to the sub-contractors.

Working Group #2, Adequate NQA-1 Suppliers – Bill Rowland (EM/SRS) and Rich Campbell (Energy Solutions) presented the status of Working Group #2 (See Attachment 3). There was some discussion on the exchange of audits so that the same supplier does not have to get audited more than once. It was noted that there are barriers to using non-US suppliers for nuclear projects. Conducting joint QA audits and maintaining a common vendor data base would be a benefit. EM has many common vendors and, thus, joint audits would benefit EM where it might not benefit other programs. Such programs must also show benefits to vendors.

Sandra Waisley emphasized that EM wants to address its QA problems quickly, and not wait for all of DOE to react.

Joe Yanek offered that EFCOG might assist EM in conducting small business QA forum for EM to explain nuclear QA programs, and assist them in joining the DOE supplier base.

Jeff Allison (EM/SRS) next addressed Supplier Audit Concerns. He noted that the issue began with an employee concern that was filed against an established SRS vendor that the vendor wasn't implementing NQA-1. DOE Inspector General and Department of Justice investigations of this event are still underway. Wright Industries is the vendor, and this company had experienced a Price Anderson Act (PAAA) violation in 2000. In 2003, Wright had QA problems with its products on the Idaho site. Jeff noted that contractors who violate DOE rules can be banned from doing business with DOE for 3-4 years, but Wright has many project critical components that are now being manufactured.

Working Group #3, Commercial Grade Dedication (CGD) Implementation – Pat Carier presented the status of Working Group #3 (See Attachment 4). Pat made the following key points:

- The industry associations such as NEI and INPO may be able to assist DOE.
- The process of CGD for new items is different than for replacement parts.
- Training in how to do effective CGD is crucial. Could DOE and EFCOG sponsor workshops?
- The process of justifying CGD needs to be standardized.
- DOE and its contractors need to provide explicit CGD guidance in contracts.

There was some debate on which organization should be responsible for dedication. It was felt that engineering should own the process for CGD.

Working Group #4, Graded Approach to Quality Assurance – Al Hawkins (EM/RL) and Rich Higgins (CH2M HILL Hanford) presented the status of Working Group #4 (See Attachment 5). There was a fair amount of discussion on graded approach and defense in depth. It was stated that a graded approach is not the equivalent of tailoring. DOE is working on a draft DOE standard on graded approach. Dae Chung emphasized that he is not a fan of using the graded approach. A graded approach needs to be done using a well documented analysis. The graded approach must be documented and approved by DOE. Joe Bader noted that one of his pet peeves is when someone says that a graded approach has been used, but it is not transparently documented. He stated the need to be very transparent in the use of graded approach. There was a recommendation that OSHA requirements should not be included as part of the graded process.

Working Group #5, Line Management Understanding of QA and Oversight – TJ Jackson (EM/CBC) presented the status of Working Group #5 (See Attachment 6). Dae Chung noted that a key action on EM's part was to require EM project managers to report quarterly on QA issues and QA risks to their projects (Technology Readiness is also being added). Other topics that were discussed include:

- Use of EM QA Training Academy to improve QA skills
- Mentoring the QA leaders of the future.
- Instilling a quality culture (similar to the safety culture) in every organization.

Dae Chung presented the EM/EFCOG Quality Assurance Improvement Project Plan for approval by the QA Corporate Board members. Approval was unanimous. There was some discussion regarding whether the 3/31/09 date for EM Corporate QAP implementation was realistic, but it was agreed that each contractor would approach implementation differently based on its mission. It was recommended that the Project Plan specify a revision number and/or date of Board approval. An action item was recorded.

Sandra Waisley presented an overview of the draft EM Corporate QA Performance Metrics concept (See Attachment 7). There are three phases to the EM process including assessment, audit, and continuous improvement. The three types of criteria include Management, Performance, and Assessment.

EM did not issue numerical ratings, but instead used Red-Yellow-Green grades. EM is seeking volunteers for pilot tests of new systems, with metrics evaluated on a quarterly basis. This process is intended to stimulate a dialog between EM and the contractor counterparts. Sandra requested that any comments on the metrics be provided to her by August 15th. An action item was recorded. The meeting was adjourned for the day.

July 30, 2008, 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Dae Chung provided some opening remarks and turned the floor over to Hugh Taylor (EM/ORP) for opening remarks. Hugh reinforced the need for cross-pollination of QA initiatives and commended the Corporate Board. He noted that the value of good safety and quality programs is evident to DOE ORP.

Jack Zimmerman discussed a quality program problem related to pre-stressed concrete panels and embeds on the DUF6 project. He noted that flow down of QA requirements to subcontractors had been a critical issue for the project, and that some support vendors were working to past verbal agreements rather than the contractual requirements.

The project ended up with a three-month schedule delay, scrapped about 13 panels, and had to repair in place another handful of panels. Had the project gone another 30 days without identification of the problem, the problem would have ended up in a major rework effort, much more significant than what had occurred.

Jack also discussed issues related to liability and privity when DOE attempted to get involved in resolving issues with its contractors subs. In evaluating quality problems on the project, DOE also concluded that subcontractor control was a problem, with multiple parties authorizing work. At present, the work control issues have been fixed, although configuration management remains a challenge. One effective solution was using mentors, who helped to set expectations, particularly in the area of operations.

The project is applying NQA-1, assuring the people have the right expectations. Some problems arose because people initially thought that the DUF6 plants were simply a scale up of a smaller existing plant. In reality, the plants that were constructed were essentially first of a kind. The project has also implement human performance improvements, and assured that employees were encouraged to raise issues.

Joe Bader inquired about the issue of subcontractor privity, and why this was a constraint on DOE. Zimmerman clarified that DOE could observe audits conducted by WSRC on its vendors. Also, evaluation of some vendor issues (such as DUF6 autoclaves) was limited by the strictures of an employee concerns investigation.

Joe Yanek provided comments regarding the transition at SRS to Fluor. They approached the transition with a “don’t fix what isn’t broken” philosophy, giving credit for the fine work performed by the previous contractor and the willingness of the contractor to support the transition. He said the QA program was solid, and based on NQA-1. However, there was some drift in the program in 2001-2002 as a program to cut costs was implemented. Joe noted that the quality program is only as good as the Project Manager’s knowledge of QA. In addition, the

vendor auditing program must be robust. To address revisions to NQA-1, SRS was proactive in evaluating any revisions with a gap analysis and then taking action. Several key summary points were:

- Assure that you have good people executing the QA program.
- Transition team must understand the program and the mission.
- Must establish a good baseline on QA program maturity with respect to NQA-1
- Must tap into resources who know the program historically, and be ever vigilant for drift away from the basic principles.
- Use of independent outside reviewers to assure program focus and effectiveness.

Bob Murray (EM) discussed the annual declaration process for QA programs. EM is moving forward to integrate QA into the annual ISMS review. There will be a separate annual QA declaration process starting in FY 2009. There was quite a bit of discussion about the mechanics of the declaration process. Several options were discussed.

Sandra Waisley provided an update on the EM QA organization resources (See Attachment 7).

Brian Anderson (EM/Idaho) put in a plug for the August ISMS Workshop (August 26 through 28, 2008).

Sandra Waisley summarized the working group actions as follows:

WG #1 – Work with WG #5 regarding QA oversight
WG #1 – Interface with Pat Carier for input on QA oversight
WG #2 – Consider an alert system (black list) for suppliers not performing
WG #2 – Consider an outreach program for national suppliers in addition to local suppliers
WG #3 – Pat Carier callout for EPRI, NEI, utilities, and INPO for contacts to benchmark CGD
WG #3 – Switch task 3.4 and task 3.5 on the working group schedule
WG #3 – Review the training academy training module on CGD
WG #4 – No action items
WG #5 – Oversight Project Action Plan

Sandra Waisley summarized the general actions as follows:

Sandra Waisley and Dave Tuttel will schedule an integration meeting for the 5 Working Groups
Need to decide on how to update the Board members on progress of the tasks (quarterly?)
Add date to cover page of the EM/EFCOG QA Improvement Project Plan
Convene a HQ/Field Working Group to meet the afternoon of July 30 th to discuss performance

metrics
Provide comments to Sandra Waisley on performance metrics concept by August 15 th
Provide comments to Sandra Waisley on the Corporate QAP by August 15 th
Add/revise the site QA resources sheet
Mike Mason to present an example of QA “drift” at the next Board meeting

There was some additional discussion on whether the DOE O 414 will endorse/require NQA-1 2004 or NQA-1, 2008. Again the consensus was leaning towards the 2008 version. The same question was asked regarding the Corporate QAP, and again the consensus seemed to lean towards the 2008 version.

Dae Chung made some closing remarks and asked Joe Bader to provide closing remarks.

Bader commented that the dialogue in this meeting had been very constructive. He stressed that DNFSB strongly believes that ISMS and QA need to be reinvigorated, and that this forum was making a major contribution to that goal. DNFSB will monitor DOE performance during the upcoming transition. The Board is looking at some additional hearings and the continued evaluation identification of some problem sites. A focus area for the future is the preparation of a “watch list” for poor performers, either contractors or vendors. EM needs to develop additional nuclear-qualified suppliers, and asked what is done to encourage suppliers to be ready to respond to RFPs. He said that more suppliers on the front end should reduce the effort the DNFSB will need to take. Joe asked Larry Brown (DNFSB) for his comments. Larry responded concurrence with Joe’s comments and added the DNFSB does focus on QA and it is important to getting it right.

Everyone was thanked for their participation and the meeting was adjourned.

**EM QA Corporate Board Meeting
Denver, Colorado
July 29 – 30, 2008**

Summary of Decisions and Proposed Actions

I. General:

- a. Revise Participant List and issue to Board attendees (completed).
- b. Establish EM Working Group on QA Performance Metrics System (completed – met on 7/30/08 – working on revisions).
- c. Any additional comments on proposed QA performance Metrics System – due by 8/15/08 to Jim Davis and Bob Toro.
- d. Any additional comments on draft EM Corporate QAP due by 8/15/08 to Kriss Grisham.
- e. Randy Smith (ORO) will be added to the QAP development team led by Kriss Grisham (completed).
- f. EM/EFCOG Project Plan approved by Board vote: cover/title page will reflect this action and dated.
- g. Update the Board on the EM/EFCOG Project Plan status on a quarterly basis.
- h. Obtain from Mike Mason materials relating to the QA “drifting” lessons learned and add to the next Board meeting agenda.
- i. Update the Site QA Resources Table Summary: 1) add HQ and PPPO input; 2) compare to year old survey taken by DOE/HSS and update their database; and 3) EM/HQ work with EFCOG (Joe Yanek) to conduct a more detailed survey of the EM complex.
- j. EM/HQ will discuss with Jack Surash (DAS of Project Management and Acquisition) about what role the EM QA community can play with the next DOE Small Business Conference in terms of the adequate nuclear suppliers issue/concern.

II. EM/EFCOG Project Plan Recommendations/Actions:

- a. Working Group (WG) #1: needs to work with WG #5 in terms of QA oversight issue; also need to interact with Office of River Protection WTP BNI staff and obtain Broad-Based Review information.
- b. WG #2: assign additional task - at the site level, conduct a small business nuclear QA reach out/symposium similar to the EM nuclear protégé program.
- c. WG #2: develop a formal process or “alert system” for documenting and notifying the EM-complex and other DOE offices of nuclear suppliers not meeting QA requirements and not performing quality work at the site(s).

- d. WG #3: Pat Carrier, QA manager at ORP, asked for assistance in identifying contacts in the commercial sector. Several people offered assistance: EPRI; NEI (Longenecker); and INPO (Yanek).
- e. WG #3: switch in order tasks 3.4 and 3.5.
- f. WG #3: need more Commercial Grade Dedication training/workshop for the EM-complex; add 8 hour training module within EM QA Training Academy 40-hour course in the future).
- g. WG #4: no further actions except need to make sure that the scope of work is not too broad.
- h. WG #5: add new members to the team – Dave Hall (WSMS), Tom Fallon (Bechtel BWXT Idaho), Brian Anderson (DOE-ID), and Clark Vanderneit (Isotek Systems).
- i. WG #5: change date for training Federal Project Directors (FPDs) - too aggressive a schedule.
- j. WG #5: develop a QA training module for EM management (3 hrs).
- k. Add Isotek Systems members to WGs #1-#4 in addition to WG #5.
- l. EM/EFCOG Project Managers: hold a one day meeting with all working groups for the goal of integrating and aligning work scope and tasks; also determine how the working groups will deliver their products to the EM-complex (the “rollout”).