

7th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2010 – Chicago, IL

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

Brian Anderson – Idaho	Steven Krahn (chair) – Headquarters EM-20
Robert Brown – Oak Ridge	Russell McCallister – 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	No Voting Member Present - River Protection
Ralph Holland –Consolidated Business Center	

Bob Murray discussed the Revision to the EM Corporate QA Board By-Laws which were sent out via email prior to the meeting. The By-Laws were passed by the email vote; however, Idaho provided comments to have addressed before voting in favor of the revision. Mr. Murray indicated that he and Larry Perkins of EM-23 would meet with Brian Anderson from Idaho to address the comments during the week of June 14th. Based on the resolution agreed to in that meeting, the by-laws will be finalized and posted via the web or will be re-sent for vote via email if the changes are substantive. Although not required, the desire is to have unanimous agreement on the document.

Presentation by Dr. Steven Krahn: Corporate Quality Assurance Issues, Challenges, and Priorities

Dr. Krahn discussed the previous day's activities as part of the Nuclear Energy Institute Outreach Workshop prior to his presentation and encouraged everyone to participate in the future workshops. DOE-EM partnered with representatives from our construction projects to present forecasting and procurement opportunities to the potential vendors and manufacturers at the event.

During the presentation, Dr. Krahn encouraged sites to provide feedback on the ongoing Construction Project Reviews at our major locations/sites.

Headquarters is currently working on a draft response to a recent Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board letter regarding requirements flow-down and will provide the draft response to the various EM sites for review once the draft is complete.

Sites need to check with EM-23 to verify they have formally submitted a response to the October 2009 memo requesting a status regarding Commercial Grade Dedication. Not all sites have provided a formal response.

Bechtel National has committed to provide a revised lesson learned document based on previous events surrounding Commercial Grade Dedication.

Robert Brown had a question about cross-training with field assessments and whether outside field elements would participate on the self-assessments. The consensus was that this is a good idea that would be considered during the assessments as appropriate. The QA resources database also needs to be updated and possibly placed online for update real-time.

For QAP/QIP implementation self-assessments, the protocol document is posted as part of the SRP on the DOE-EM website and questions about the assessments can be directed to Bob Murray, EM-23.

Bud Danielson noted that there is an Office of Engineering and Construction Management guide available on staffing resources that could help during the self-assessments. EM needs to make sure we are consistent. EM-23 will verify this consistency.

A brief introduction to the purpose of the corrective action Hub was presented. The site offices were asked to provide a commitment to help populate the Hub, noting that collaboration is a key to the success of QA.

Presentation by Joe Yanek: Nuclear Quality Assurance Industry Perspectives – One View

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has endorsed NQA-1-2008 with 2009 addenda (RG 1.28, R4).

Based on recent discussions, it was noted that it was never intended that only Part 1 Paragraph 100 would be implemented to achieve compliance with NQA-1.

Yanek asked the board to consider including implementing Subpart 2.14 from the 2009 addenda to NQA-1 regardless of the version of NQA-1 that was currently required (e.g., NQA-1-2004).

Yanek also asked the board to consider forming a QA/QC human capital task group. This effort could help provide a smoother approach to getting temporary resources to the sites that need them.

During the discussion, Tony Umek brought up the recent Rad Con program at a local community college and thought this approach would be beneficial for QA. Murray discussed the current efforts with Aiken Technical College to produce a certificate and also a 2 year AS program focused on QA/QC. This effort is under way and a Developing a Curriculum (DACUM) meeting has already been held. The current efforts are to have a certificate program in place soon (goal of this calendar year) with the AS program to follow (ultimately offering the program online). In addition, the University of Cincinnati has expressed an interest in ultimately having a 4 year BS program with a focus on QA. EM-20 is helping fund the initiation of the program, but other funding support will be needed to maintain the program beyond the first year.

In closing out the presentation, Bud Danielson emphasized the importance of the NRC endorsement of NQA-1-2008 with 2009 addenda and the impact it will have upon DOE contractors and suppliers who also support the commercial nuclear power industry, especially new nuclear power plants. Having all of the nuclear regulating agencies in sync will reduce supplier confusion; reduce costs for supplier compliance; increase supplier base; and, simplify DOE contracting, QAP approval and oversight. In order to reap the maximum from the newly endorsed NQA-1, DOE and its prime contractors need to accept the new edition and addenda as an equivalent or better standard for all DOE nuclear facility applications regardless of the current contracts or Orders. This is not to say that contract requirements would be superseded, but that DOE would accept the new edition and addenda as an alternate/equivalent. DOE PSOs should develop boilerplate language that accepts the new NQA-1 without necessarily requiring the QAP, procedures, commitments, etc. to be altered immediately. This effort highlights the need for other agencies (DOE, EPA) to agree and endorse the new revision in rules and Orders.

Presentation by Christian Palay: Project Focus Area #1 - NQA-1 Suppliers

The proposed information from the Draft Project Plan for Focus Area #1 was presented emphasizing the use of the Joint Supplier Evaluation Program (JSEP). The Board subsequently discussed the focus area.

Palay noted that a JSEP coordinator was needed from each site to make the program work and asked for a commitment to providing a coordinator.

Brenda Hawks asked if this was headed to be something like the DOE CAP program. Palay and Mike Mason emphasized that there would not be an EM “approved” list, only an “evaluated” list that could be used as a basis for leading in to the site’s individual reviews.

Brenda Hawks noted that the Office of Science has been closely using similar items, but we need to address ISO and NQA-1.

Ray Corey emphasized the reduction in the burden to the vendors with multiple reviews from different contractors.

Norm Barker noted that the NNSA has a similar need now and this would be beneficial.

Robert Brown asked what the shelf-life for an EFCOG evaluation was in the program. Paul Bills indicated it was currently 3 years, but this was not a hard number and could be adjusted as needed.

Joe Yanek asked that the Board be careful to not confuse the triennial supplier audit with the 3 year oversight review.

7th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2010 – Chicago, IL

Rick Warriner asked how the system would work because to use a previous review the organization would need to know how the audit was performed and what was addressed and not just a copy of the report. Paul Bills addressed the question by noting that the current program has one procedure and the various audits are all performed to that procedure. Everyone is on the same playing field.

Brenda Hawks asked if there was any expectation that all suppliers would be in the database or only those with an audit performed under the one procedure. Palay responded that it was only those under the one procedure and not every supplier that EM uses at any site.

Brian Anderson asked if any audits that have already been completed to date but did not follow the procedure noted would qualify to go into JSEP. Paul Bills responded that some could be included initially, but ultimately the audits will be required to be performed per the procedure. Palay also noted that there is no real database information to turn on, but the data will have to be loaded as the audits are completed.

Bob Murray asked what obstacles were envisioned for this Focus Area. Palay answered that the JSEP coordinator is the primary need and asked that the upcoming vote provide agreement to provide resources to support the JSEP.

Brenda Hawks asked if EM would be joining with EFCOG in the JSEP or would be maintaining a separate database. The response was that there will be only one database. However, Mike Mason indicated that ultimately the management of the JSEP will turn into a full time job. EFCOG will continue to manage the system until there are 20-25 vendors and then it will likely require a fulltime person to manage the system. Joe Yanek agreed that the JSEP will have to be transitioned to DOE at some point; it won't be able to stay with EFCOG.

Bud Danielson asked if a discrete step was needed in the project plan to address the interaction/transition plan with EFCOG. Mr. Danielson did not see how the existing steps addressed this interaction. Steve Krahn noted that he felt the list of milestones in the project plan, as a whole, addressed this concern.

Tony Umek noted that similar efforts have been successful in the past such as the Electrical Handbook. As such, there is a precedent and there is no need to get bogged down, but should move forward with the approach.

Brian Anderson went through the items listed in the project plan and asked the Board to vote to adopt the plan for Focus Area #1.

Steve Krahn called for a vote to adopt items 1.1 through 1.2.8 as listed in the draft project plan for Focus Area #1.

Brian Anderson – Yes

Steven Krahn (chair) – Yes

Robert Brown – Yes

Russell McCallister – Yes

Ray Corey – Yes

Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Yes

Jack Craig – Yes

No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad

Bud Danielson – Abstain

No Voting Member Present - River Protection

Ralph Holland – Yes

Presentation by Pat Carrier: Project Focus Area #2 - Commercial Grade Items and Services Dedication Implementation

The proposed information from the Draft Project Plan for Focus Area #2 was presented regarding Commercial Grade Dedication. The Board subsequently discussed the focus area.

There is currently no EFCOG lead for this Focus Area. Chris Marden will take an action to provide an EFCOG lead to support this team.

Carrier gave a status of recent training classes involving Commercial Grade Dedication.

7th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes

June 9, 2010 – Chicago, IL

Rick Warriner asked if the “train-the-trainer” course is the same as the fundamentals class. Carier answered no and elaborated on some of the main differences in the course including who should attend the “train-the-trainer” courses.

Al Hawkins asked how the information on CGD guidance will be put out to the sites. Carier indicated the expectation was a memorandum from HQ to the field offices including the guidance document for CGD.

Norm Barker noted that there was a need to merge what EFCOG is doing (Joint Engineering Working Group) to ensure consistency with the guidance from EM.

Bud Danielson asked what the difference would be between the “guide” deliverable and the “procedure” deliverable. Carier explained the level of detail would be more enhanced in the procedure since it would not be expert based for general use. Carier also noted that a lot of homework has been completed to ensure consistency with the existing corporate CGD information.

Joe Yanek asked if Subpart 2.14 from NQA-1 would be considered in the guidance document. Carier indicated the draft guidance should be consistent with Subpart 2.14 and the team will review and verify the consistency before distribution.

Ray Corey asked what the goal was for the number of trainers needed for EM. Carier indicated there was not a hard number goal, but there were estimates generated as to whether adequate trainers were available. Carier also noted that efforts were still underway to evaluate how to maintain the list of trainers.

The group briefly discussed upcoming courses that were scheduled for CGD.

Brenda Hawks asked if the development with EFCOG included both the QA and Engineering groups. Carier and Norm Barker both said yes, and Barker expanded that the Engineering group is now taking the lead for EFCOG.

Brian Anderson noted that federal employees don’t perform Commercial Grade Dedications and asked how this approach and guidance will fit in with the existing procedures in place by contractors. Norm Barker and Carier noted this approach was only considered a tool for use to demonstrate the EM expectations.

Steve Krahn indicated that his vision would be that this Commercial Grade Dedication guidance would be a perfect fit as a review module in the next revision to the Standard Review Plan.

Rick Warriner asked if this guidance would be a good fit with the upcoming revision to DOE O 414.1C. Colette Broussard addressed the question and indicated that the current direction and guidance provided would not lend itself to including this type of information in the revision to DOE O 414.1C.

Ray Corey and Pat Carier asked how the responses from the October 2009 memo requesting a status regarding Commercial Grade Dedication would fit in with the Focus Area. Steve Krahn committed to providing a lessons learned document from the status reports as soon as all sites have completed the status and the submittals have been reviewed by HQ.

The team was asked to evaluate the consistency of the draft guidance with Subpart 2.14 of NQA-1 for Task 1 (Develop EM Guidance on Commercial Grade Dedication) & Task 2 (Develop, with EFCOG, a common process to perform Commercial Grade Dedication).

Steve Krahn called for a vote to adopt the draft project plan for Focus Area #2 with the added requirement to evaluate the guidance for consistency with Subpart 2.14 of NQA-1 and lessons learned from the Commercial Grade Dedication status reviews.

Brian Anderson – Yes

Bud Danielson – Yes

Robert Brown – Yes

Ralph Holland – Yes

Ray Corey – Yes

Steven Krahn (chair) – Yes

Jack Craig – Yes

Russell McCallister – Yes

7th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2010 – Chicago, IL

Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Yes

No Voting Member Present - River Protection

No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad

Presentation by Butch Huxford: Project Focus Area #3 - Design Quality Assurance Focus Area

The proposed information from the Draft Project Plan for Focus Area #3 was presented regarding Design Quality Assurance. The Board subsequently discussed the focus area.

Huxford noted that the proposed schedule was aggressive and good support was needed from the various site offices.

Ray Corey asked how the projects to be included on the team were selected. Huxford addressed the question that the main projects were included but an attempt was made to keep the team broad. Additional members could be included as needed.

Russell McCallister indicated he would need to check with the various contractors before committing the resources from the projects, but did not oppose the approach.

Broussard asked if the approach was to look at QA level for each critical decision. If so, there is a guide DOE M 413.3-1 that may be useful for consideration in this work. The answer was yes and the guide will be reviewed by the focus area team, including how CD phases and QA are broken out.

Ray Corey indicated there seems to be a focus on construction and maybe some representatives from D&D groups would be useful. Joe Yanek indicated the D&D group at EFCOG would be available. Chris Marden will address providing an EFCOG representative for D&D to the team and will assist the team with any needed modifications to the scope of the Focus Area.

Ray Corey also noted that configuration management needs to be considered.

Bud Danielson noted that feed-back from recent the Construction Project Review at Idaho should also be considered.

Steve Krahn called for a vote to adopt the draft project plan for Focus Area #3 with the added requirement to evaluate the additional team members and feedback from the recent Construction Project Review at Idaho.

Brian Anderson – Yes

Ralph Holland – Abstain (not present during vote)

Robert Brown – Yes (but noted that given current status – the U₂₃₃ project may not be able to provide resources for the effort)

Steven Krahn (chair) – Yes

Russell McCallister – Yes (but noted the DUF6 project may be resource limited at this time)

Ray Corey – Yes

Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Yes

Jack Craig – Yes

No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad

Bud Danielson – Yes

No Voting Member Present - River Protection

Presentation by Robert Brown and Brenda Hawks: Project Focus Area #4 - Proposed Technical Approach for Grading QA for Deactivation & Decommissioning Projects

The proposed information from the Draft Project Plan for Focus Area #4 was presented regarding Grading of QA for D&D. The Board subsequently discussed the focus area.

Brown and Hawks emphasized that Oak Ridge is a Science site; therefore, they need to use ISO and not just NQA-1. In addition, most of the actions proposed for this Focus Area have been completed and everything is already in

7th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2010 – Chicago, IL

place to address grading of QA for D&D. It was noted that more details of the approach are in the draft project plan.

Joe Yanek asked if the lessons learned from Rocky Flats have been incorporated in this approach. Hawks explained that yes, K-25 and some of the other larger projects in Oak Ridge have addressed these lessons learned; however, some of the smaller contracts are not feasible to address all of the items addressed at Rocky Flats.

Joe Yanek asked about records retention for items such as worker exposure and how they were maintained with a graded approach. Hawks explained that the plan is for them to turn the records over to DOE earlier than would normally be expected, but the details are still being worked.

Steve Krahn noted that the focus of this team needs to stay on D&D and not get too broad.

Bud Danielson noted that the approach seems to be taking exceptions to some of the requirements and not strictly grading. The comment was not intended to question the validity of the approach but to emphasize the need to be careful with the terminology of “grading”.

Rick Warriner asked about EM work and how the work was performed to the NQA-1 standard via EM-QA-001. Hawks agreed and explained that EM-QA-001 is flowed down in their contracts but then the contractors have to provide ORO with an explanation of how they meet the EM-QA-001 requirements.

Steve Krahn noted that Hawks is presenting a concept for comment and the grading is based on time and risk – not because it is hard for the contractors to meet. Dr. Krahn also indicated he liked the spreadsheet example in the draft project plan and would urge the board to provide other resources from the various sites to support ORO on this team.

Steve Krahn asked that an additional column be added to the spreadsheet in the draft project plan to include additional examples of each grading.

Ray Corey noted that the Board should recognize that grading can be more restrictive, for example: shipping requirements. It is not always less. Broussard acknowledged the concept, but emphasized to be careful with the term “grading” as it is normally meant to indicate less and not more. Broussard also suggested using a term more like “tailoring” in lieu of “grading” if the intent was that additional requirements may be needed.

Steve Krahn asked that EFCOG provide a member to help ORO in this effort to provide more prospective. In addition, some other sites with D&D work may want to have some input by providing a team member. Chris Marden will work to provide an EFCOG representative to the group.

Steve Krahn asked the team to update the spreadsheet table in the draft project plan to include the comments discussed by the next Board Meeting.

Steve Krahn called for a vote to adopt the draft project plan for Focus Area #4 with the request to update the project plan table and add additional prospective from other sites.

Brian Anderson – Yes

Steven Krahn (chair) – Yes

Robert Brown – Yes

Russell McCallister – Yes

Ray Corey – Yes

Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Yes

Jack Craig – Yes

No Voting Member Present - Carlsbad

Bud Danielson – Yes

No Voting Member Present - River Protection

Ralph Holland – Yes

Presentation by Norm Barker - EM-EFCOG Cooperation Strategy EFCOG Tasks

Norm Barker provided a presentation on what EFCOG is currently working on with respect to the priorities expressed by the Board in the past.

Dave Janitosik noted that overseas work does not have the same approach as the U.S. For overseas work, if a vendor is ISO, then it is good enough and no more reviews are needed.

Steve Krahn noted we are not looking for an answer now, but would like a couple pages from EFCOG on what has been seen in audits overseas. Mike Mason and Norm Barker agreed to take the lead to generate a white paper to provide this information.

It was noted that the distinction between Quality programs and Quality Products was not clear and may need to be addressed.

Presentation by Colette Broussard - Quality Assurance Directives Revision

Colette Broussard presented an overview of the primary changes that are in the process for DOE O 414.1X and indicated the RevCom process was anticipated in late summer 2010 with issuance in early 2011. The draft Order will include a requirement to use the new NQA-1-2008/NQA-1a-2009 edition and addenda for new DOE nuclear facilities that have not reach Critical Decision-2.

Joe Yanek asked how the standard contract language from previous Board meetings impacted the revision. Broussard explained that the various offices (e.g., EM) can be more restrictive so there is no impact on the revision. Steve Krahn noted that the response was consistent with senior EM DOE management expectations.

Bud Danielson noted that each office will go through their individual process on what to do and how to implement once the new revision to the order is issued.

Brenda Hawks asked how nuclear work was defined (e.g., Hazard Category 1, 2, 3). Since this is the reference, can we clarify the order to indicate nuclear work is not simply Hazard Category 1, 2, 3? Broussard indicated the clarification was included in the order.

Joe Yanek asked how radiological facilities will be addressed. Broussard indicated they were only addressed in "other work". Hawks noted that "radiological" facilities do not exist anymore (they are Less Than Hazard Category 3 Facilities) and the use of the term should not be included. Broussard is going to ensure the terminology is consistent in the revision (e.g., radiological hazards versus radiological facilities).

Hawks asked if there would be any elaboration on what is safety software. Broussard said there has been a lot of discussion but there is no commitment to any changes at this time.

Presentation by Larry W. Perkins - Enhance Corporate Operational Awareness of Corrective Action Plan Commitments, milestones, and Implementation Effectiveness

Larry Perkins discussed the need for a corrective action tracking Hub at HQ. The need was to prevent reoccurrence, provide visibility, transparency, and lessons learned to the sites, and ensure root cause analysis was completed properly.

Perkins provided a live demonstration of the Hub and showed the various functionalities and uses.

Perkins encouraged the sites to contact EM-23 if they would like a demonstration of the Hub onsite for their personnel.

Perkins encouraged feedback as the system is used and committed to addressing any concerns (e.g., issue numbering question was previously discussed with Richland and is being worked).

Steve Krahn encouraged the sites to learn the system and see how the system could benefit the sites and the interaction between the field and HQ.

Presentation by Rick Warriner - Managing Suspect/Counterfeit Items – The CHPRC Experience

Rick Warriner presented the background and approach used by Richland to address the Suspect and Counterfeit Item issues.

Joe Yanek asked how this related to UL certifications. Is UL purifying their chain or is this an area that needs to be a concern for EM – i.e., what percentage of UL items are found to be suspect or counterfeit? Warriner discussed that not all items are required to be UL listed, however on the big items that are procured the suspect/counterfeit items are probably less than 0.1% - on general items it may be 1-5%. Warriner does not have any hard numbers on this but is estimating based on his experience.

Brenda Hawks noted the difference in UL parts and a combined system that uses UL parts. Just because you use UL parts does not necessarily mean you can construct a system from those parts and the system is UL approved.

Steve Krahn noted that ORP has had Richland personnel come over and perform training on SC/I identification. If you look at the items identified (illustrated in Warriner's presentation) – is it really reasonable to say that 80% of all SC/I within EM is located at Hanford? Obviously not – you find what you are looking for in the field. Other sites need to look at this area and determine how to address the concern similar to RL. EM has been lucky so far that none of the SC/I found have been on credited safety equipment and challenged the ability of the equipment to perform.

Steve Krahn indicated the ISM review for 2010 will ask that sites look at their SC/I program and make sure they are identifying the SC/I – especially associated with safety equipment.

Presentation by Christian Palay - Potential Implications of Recent RW Developments on EM QA Oversight of HLW/SNF Activities

Christian Palay presented the background and current approach associated with developments in RW and HLW/SNF activities.

Ray Corey asked if RW was on the same schedule as far as Yucca Mountain. Steve Krahn explained that we are working with NE and they are putting together an implementation plan to address this type of concern.

Steve Krahn also discussed that this topic is very sensitive given the current litigation. EM will continue to update the various sites at the QA Corporate Board Meetings until we have a clear path forward. If there are any specific questions, please contact the EM-20 office to discuss in more detail.

General QA Corporate Board Discussion

San Horton gave a brief list of issues that the DNFSB is interested in and indicated that several of those issues were discussed during the QA Corporate Board Meeting.

Bud Danielson reinforced importance and interaction with the NQA Committee. Specifically, Mr. Danielson addressed the NRC endorsement of NQA-1-2008 with 2009 addenda; noted that nearly ½ of the committee is associated with DOE in some form and asked for support by EM management to continue to allow this participation; and the committee would be happy to discuss current work activities and how they fit in with the QA Corporate Board objectives (e.g., possibility of a new subpart 2 to address gaps with 830, address management assessment elements you may not pick up elsewhere, etc.). Mr. Danielson also noted that the other CNS items are on the priority list of the board and they continue to focus on the PSO-site level assessments.

Robert Murray thanked everyone for attending and participating in the discussion. He also thanked those that participated in the NEI meetings the previous two days.

Meeting Adjourned

7th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2010 – Chicago, IL

<u>SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS</u>		
Action for Follow-Up	Individual Responsible	Status
Evaluate the possibility of updating the QA resources database online (real-time).	Bob Murray	In Progress
Provide a draft copy of response to recent Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board letter regarding requirements flow-down to the sites for comment.	Steven Krahn	In Progress – 45 day extension requested for response to DNFSB
Submit a response to the October 2009 memo for status on Commercial Grade Dedication.	Site Managers that have not responded to date	Follow up email from EM-20 to be sent requesting a status
Provide a revised lesson learned document based on previous events surrounding Commercial Grade Dedication.	Dave Janitosik	In Progress
Ensure consistency on self-assessments for QAP implementation with OECM guide on staffing resources.	Bob Murray	In Progress
Provide support for populating the corrective action Hub.	Site Managers	In Progress
Assign a JSEP coordinator.	Site Managers	In Progress
Assign an EFCOG lead for Focus Area #2.	Chris Marden	Dennis Weaver has been identified and has communicated this to Pat Carier. - Complete
Evaluate and merge the EFCOG Joint Engineering Working Group with Focus Area #2 as appropriate during development.	Butch Huxford	In Progress
Review and verify Tasks 1 and 2 of the draft project plan for Focus Area #2 are consistent with NQA-1 Subpart 2.14.	Pat Carier	In Progress
Consider incorporating the Commercial Grade Dedication guidance into the next revision to the Standard Review Plan.	Larry Perkins	In Progress
Provide a lessons learned document from the status reports on Commercial Grade Dedication as soon as all sites have completed the submittal.	Bob Murray	In Progress
Review DOE M 413.3-1 as part of the deliverable preparation for Focus Area #3.	Butch Huxford	In Progress
Assign an EFCOG representative to address D&D and configuration management representation on the Focus Area #3 team.	Chris Marden	In Progress
Review the recent Construction Project Review at Idaho which assessed inspections, tests, analyses and acceptance criteria. Consider the results of the review as part of the deliverable preparation for Focus Area #3.	Butch Huxford	In Progress
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	In Progress
Assign an EFCOG representative to assist in leading Focus Area #4.	Chris Marden	An EFCOG member has been identified and will be assigned by July 1, 2010. – In Progress
Assign representatives to assist in the development and completion of Focus Area #4.	Site Managers (specifically Savannah River and Richland)	In Progress

7th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2010 – Chicago, IL

<u>SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS</u>		
Generate a whitepaper to discuss what EFCOG has experienced with respect to audits overseas.	Mike Mason Norm Barker	In Progress
Include a review of the SC/I program in the 2010 ISM review/declarations.	Bob Murray	SC/I was included in the declaration which is currently in the approval cycle. - Complete
Consider a discussion for the next board meeting to address how DOE sites and contractors can be encouraged to allow the use of NQA-1-2008 with 2009 addenda.	Bob Murray	In Progress

7th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
 June 9, 2010 – Chicago, IL

ATTENDANCE				
#	First Name	Last Name	Contact Information	Organization
1.	Larry	Adkinson	803-952-6012	SR
2.	Brian	Anderson	208-526-0086	ID
3.	Norm	Barker	404-269-4116	Energy Solns.
4.	Paul	Bills	208-526-5726	INL
5.	Colette	Broussard	301-903-5452	HSS
6.	Robert	Brown	865-576-4444	ORO
7.	Pat	Carier	509-376-3574	ORP
8.	Ray	Corey	509-376-0108	RL
9.	Jack	Craig	513-233-5147	SR
10.	Bud	Danielson	301-903-2954	CNS
11.	Tom	Fallon	208-557-6344	Bechtel-BWXT-ID
12.	TJ	Jackson	513-246-0077	EMCBC
13.	Dave	Jantosik	509-371-2377	BNI
14.	Ashok	Kapoor	202-586-8307	EM-45
15.	Steve	Krahn	202-586-5151	EM-20
16.	Al	Hawkins	509-376-9936	RL
17.	Brenda	Hawks	865-576-2503	ORO
18.	Butch	Huxford	803-646-5455	EM-23
19.	Ralph	Holland	513-744-4000	EMCBC
20.	San	Horton	202-694-7114	DNFSB Staff
21.	Jerry	Lipsky	865-574-2208	EM-23
22.	Dave	Lowe	720-286-2221	CH2MHill
23.	Mike	Mason	240-379-3581	BNI
24.	Chris	Marden	303-589-9720	Energy Solns.
25.	Russell	McCallister	859-219-4012	PPPO
26.	Robert	Murray	202-586-7267	EM-23
27.	Christian	Palay	202-586-7877	EM-23
28.	Larry	Perkins	202-287-5502	EM-23
29.	Eric	Runnerstrom	703-519-0200	MPR
30.	Tony	Umek	803-952-7198	SRNS
31.	Rick	Warriner	509-366-6996	CHPRC
32.	Cynthia	Williams	803-645-5451	SRNS
33.	Joe	Yanek	864-281-6282	Fluor