

13th Environmental Management Quality Assurance Corporate Board Meeting Minutes
December 02, 2013 – Nevada Site Office

Voting Board Members in Attendance:

Greg Hayward – Idaho	Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah
Jay Mullis– Oak Ridge	Jose Franco- Carlsbad
Stacy Charboneau – Richland	Brian Harkins - River Protection
Charlie Harris – Savannah River	Bob Murray (vice-chair) – Headquarters EM-43
Bud Danielson –Chief of Nuclear Safety	Matt Moury (chair) – Headquarters EM-40
Jack Craig – EMCBC	

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

Matt Moury provided some introductions and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Larry Perkins provided an update on the outstanding actions for the EM QA Corporate Board and conducted roll call for the voting members. Outstanding actions will all be completed during this meeting.

Opening Remarks - Dave Huizenga

Bud Danielson asked about rework and how it is managed within EM. How well do our contracts control when we have a breakdown and are we set up to have effective control including schedule and redesign etc.? We probably are not there yet.

Dave Huizenga responded that we don't have it sorted out yet, and are still working on trying to wrestle with this issue. We don't have it right yet, with the note that it is sensitive with contractors who want profit. DOE is not opposed to contractors getting profit but when defending the budget to various entities; it looks like we are asking for more money to complete something that should already be done. Some contracts may need adjusted in the future.

Current Discussion from the DNFSB - Sean Sullivan

Sean Sullivan discussed his background and how he came to be a DNFSB member. Mr. Sullivan noted that QA is very important to the DNFSB and the EM QA Corporate Board is likewise important. The DNFSB wants to provide support for this type of meeting. Mr. Sullivan discussed some details from the loss of the Thresher submarine some years back. A number of issues contributed to the event including a component that was intended to be improved but was not tested via a testing program or communicated properly to the customer. Ultimately, all of the problems that led to the event were associated with non-nuclear systems. In reality, there are not many new lessons learned, just lessons that are re-learned. New lessons are associated with new technology, but application of technology is typically not a new lesson, but something we have already experienced previously. QA is the battle against human nature, and it typically takes some time to see results from QA.

Bob Murray stated that every year, EM/HSS/NNSA present on the status of their respective QA programs to the DNFSB. EM was asked how we were achieving QA and our mission and what letter grade we would give our program. EM responded a "B-". That may or may not have been a little critical, but based on the last 15 months, how would the DNFSB grade the EM QA program?

Mr. Sullivan stated he could not speak for the full Board since they have not voted on a letter grade for EM, but he could provide his personal opinion on the status. Mr. Sullivan indicated that he gets the

impression that EM is recognizing issues, problems, and challenges (e.g., budget and personnel), which is 51% of the battle. EM is not lying to themselves which should be commended.

Status of EM Quality Assurance Program - Matt Moury

Mr. Moury started off with a couple notes before beginning his presentation. He indicated that the EM QA Corporate Board had raised complex awareness of QA. He also noted that HQ is supplementing field efforts as a compensatory measure, but that is not the desire for the long term. Mr. Moury also noted that the ISM/QA declaration has been a difficult topic recently. Going forward, there will be a slightly different approach. For 2014, the guidance will be issued in January/February of 2014 with the declaration due at the end of the year. This will allow for the guidance to be in-hand throughout the year versus at the end of the year. In essence, we will be skipping a year.

Debbie Sparkman asked for clarification if the 2013 declarations were not going to be done or will they be completed with new guidance for 2014.

Matt Moury clarified that we are skipping a year, as it is at his discretion - the responsibility for the ISM/QA declaration has been delegated to EM-40.

Mike Hassell asked if the expectation is to still perform the review and incorporate the feedback from the last declaration.

Matt Moury responded that the reviews should still be performed; EM-HQ was just not requiring the submittal at the end of this year. The data does not disappear. He also noted that HQ does use the declarations and the concerns/best practices included.

Mike Hassell noted that usually the declaration guidance includes DART rates etc. Will that still be provided?

Matt Moury responded that this type of submittal comes from the performance agreements and these goals are in process and will still be provided.

Russell McCallister asked what HQ does with the QA declarations.

Bob Murray responded that the declaration information is used. We may not have communicated it well to date, but we review the data as part of looking at the sites. Going forward, EM HQ will use the declaration information during review close-out meetings and compare how the site graded them versus how EM HQ graded them during the review. This will allow a discussion of any differences with the site during these meetings. Mr. Murray also noted that the metrics stop light chart is a deliverable from the EM QA Corporate Board.

Russell McCallister noted he would like to see what other sites are doing as well, which would be helpful.

Bob Murray noted that Steven Ross of the EM-43 staff did a good analysis of the QA declaration metrics this past year and we can provide that summary to the EM QA Corporate Board members.

Jim Hutton noted that the past approach has really been on a 15 month cycle, even though we called them annual declarations. It seems that an 18 month cycle may be the right timeframe.

Matt Moury noted the sites need time and information to do planning. It is data that is collected in the declaration, not a series of new reviews. As such, the sites should already be doing everything that is needed.

Mike Hassell asked if the questions in Mr. Moury's slides were discussion topics for later in the day.

Matt Moury confirmed that was the intent.

Bud Danielson asked why we think things will get any better with respect to resources such that HQ will not have to continue to supplement the site efforts.

Matt Moury answered that this was a goal, but we are not naive and know the current restraints. But we still have to get the mission done. The answer will ultimately depend on resources.

Bud Danielson asked if it was really a bad thing for HQ to provide resources to supplement the field offices.

Matt Moury answered that for focused reviews probably not, but for day-to-day oversight, it isn't really the HQ role. This is a specific topic the sites will address in their presentations.

Efforts on Integrating DOE/RW-0333P and NQA-1- Christian Palay

Mike Hassell asked if 333P will go away after this effort.

Christian Palay responded - yes that is the intent.

A comment was made that the consideration should be made of if NQA-1 subpart 2 would be required and added to the contracts.

Bob Hines commented there have been opportunities missed in the past. We should develop this effort so it is useful for producers of material instead of everything under the sun.

Bud Danielson asked if the new waste feed at the tank farms for WTP needed the QARD to apply for preparing waste.

Christian Palay noted he was not familiar with the specifics but thought it would be best to defer to the EM-23 mission unit.

Bud Danielson noted that the group should remember that the NQA committee allows experts on project teams even if they are not members of a subcommittee.

Jack Craig made a motion that the EM QA Corporate Board forms the focus area recommended by Christian Palay.

Bob Murray seconded the motion.

Duli Agarwal noted that the corporate board should stay involved (when it is necessary) with the NQA-1 Committee for DOE related projects because it takes much longer to get approval from the NQA-1 Main Committee if the effort is not emphasized by the DOE management.

Jose Franco noted that making sure the efforts fit with operations is key.

Jim O'Brien asked if we would be looking for a revision to NQA-1.

Christian Palay answered yes, that is the intent.

Vote to form a Focus Area to develop a gap analysis and strategy for incorporating DOE/RW-0333P into a future revision of NQA-1: (PASSED)

Greg Hayward– Idaho - **YES**

Russell McCallister – Portsmouth/Paducah - **ABSTAIN**

Jay Mullis – Oak Ridge - **YES**

Jose Franco - Carlsbad – **Yes**

Ray Corey – Richland - **YES**

Brian Harkins- River Protection - **YES**

Charlie Harris – Savannah River - **YES**

Bob Murray (vice-chair) – HQ EM-23 - **YES**

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

Matt Moury (chair) – HQ Acting EM-20 - **YES**

Jack Craig – EMCBC - **YES**

Status of Current Activities within HSS - Jim O'Brien

Jim O'Brien asked how well his office was doing in supporting the sites and not being overly burdensome. Are they clear and helping with implementation of directives? There was no answer expected during the meeting, but a question for the participants to think about and answer offline with Mr. O'Brien.

Matt Moury asked how often the Quality Council meets and if their results and deliverables posted anywhere for use.

Jim O'Brien answered that the council meets annually in person and the deliverables are posted on the associated website.

Duli Agarwal told the audience that the next council meeting in person is expected to be held in March 2014.

Ashook Kapor noted that the Quality Council charter etc. is available on the website.

Larry Perkins will distribute the website link to the EM QA Corporate Board participants.

Ashook Kapor asked if we can merge the efforts of the Quality Council and the EM QA Corporate Board so we speak as DOE versus as just individual program offices.

Jim O'Brien pointed out that this is a bigger challenge than you would think. Directives get a lot of comments and changes so the program offices can get program specific guidance out quicker. There is room for better coordination but not an easy thing to do. Either way, EFCOG should be included in the efforts as well.

Jim Hutton noted it may be useful to target at the right level. HSS would be the organization to address issues with DOE Order 414. EM develops implementation guides but relies on directives which are HSS. Maybe we should keep focus at the correct level for new directives instead of at a lower implementation level.

Jim O'Brien noted some groups are getting into the details but documents are not binding. The broader level documents take more time.

Bob Murray commented he is concerned with overlap. EFCOG is the common denominator. There have been discussions of resources and it takes a lot of effort for these deliverables, such as the CGD guide. The Quality Council asked EFCOG to participate with the Quality Council on the development of a DOE CGD guide. EFCOG said they had already done this with EM and wanted to only work on the topic once.

Mike Hassell noted he is now the liaison between EFCOG and the Quality Council and between EFCOG and the EM QA Corporate Board.

Bud Danielson suggested it may be worth some effort to get consensus committee meetings such as NQA-1 removed from the conference tool to make it easier for DOE to attend.

Duli Agarwal commented there was a meeting between DOE and ASME to discuss how ASME could support DOE in September. The meeting was held in Washington, DC.

Ron Schrotke noted that DOE involvement in the NQA-1 committee was important to make sure DOE issues are addressed; otherwise the committee may decide the issue is a DOE issue and since DOE is not part of the committee, the NQA-1 committee does not need to address the issue.

Status of Current Activities within CNS - Bud Danielson and Deborah Sparkman

A question was asked if anyone was looking at empirical data such as Fukushima and how the SASSI code works in those situations.

Deborah Sparkman noted someone was looking at it but not part of the scope for the effort she was discussing. They are looking at the theoretical aspects for any type of event or facility.

San Horton commented that the DOE efforts on SASSI dealt with DOE facilities.

Site Presentation - Charles Harris (SR)

Duli Agarwal noted that few presentations showed issues associated with CGD. Duli asked what type of issues on CGD EM sites are facing given the existing NQA-1 and EM Guidance documents.

Bill Rowland answered that the issue was the change from NQA-1-2000 and NQA-1-2008.

Bud Danielson noted an audit of SRNL vessel testing had been mentioned and asked who did the audit and when was it completed.

Charlie Harris noted it was a BNI supplier quality audit but he will have to follow up with any specifics on when and who performed it.

Site Presentation - Brian Harkins (ORP)

Matt Moury noted that one role of HQ is to be an advocate for the sites to support work activities. The MIP is a 2 year program, so how can the design and construction continue without an effective QA program.

Brian Harkins answered that the details have not been worked out but that is the focus of the MIP with support from HQ. Specific accomplishments give assurance activities performed were adequate to the meet the QAPD. The MIP is key for the path forward.

Bud Danielson thanked the site for a realistic staffing plan and asked if there are any open questions from the turbine generator dedication plan, such as critical characteristics and is that package approved or still in process.

Brian Harkins responded that the package is still in process but noted the procurement is piece by piece and the CGD package is piece meal as well versus a full skid.

Bud Danielson asked if the staffing plan included new projects such as the tank farms.

Brian Harkins answered no; the numbers will go up with new projects.

Site Presentation - Stacy Charboneau (RL)

No Questions

Site Presentation - Jay Mullis (OR)

A question was asked if the Isotek lessons learned system was searchable and were they aware of the OPEX Share at Hanford which may be a good resource for small contractors.

Jay Mullis answered no but it would be good to review.

Ashok Kapoor noted a working group on the drum issue will be presented later this week for those interested.

Site Presentation - Russell McCallister (PPPO)

No Questions

Site Presentation - Greg Hayward (ID)

No Questions

Site Presentation - Oba Vincent and Jose Franco (CBFO)

Greg Hayward asked about the difference in grades for QA specialists at the sites. Some are GS-13 and OPM is pushing back and not letting the postings all be GS-14. That is part of the issue. Feds are leaving to advance salaries since they can't advance here. Not sure how to solve.

Oba Vincent responded that at CBFO they have a national program and can sometimes get a GS-14. The EM QA Corporate Board may be able to help with a path forward here.

Debbie Sparkman noted that the CNS sponsors the SQA support group. A recent technical paper identifies training, reading, etc. to get staff qualified to the 1172 TQP standard. (Larry Perkins will distribute this paper with the meeting minutes.)

Christian Palay noted he had heard that there were active talks about doing drift scale heat tests at WIPP. Is there any more information available on this testing? Specifically, how is QA included in investigative studies?

Jose Franco answered that they are looking at this and implemented an IPT. NE is part of the effort and has reviewed the QAP. If you don't have QA before the test it won't work. The laboratories are working together on the issue.

Christian Palay asked for a copy of the QA plan.

Jose Franco indicated that was not a problem and Roger Nelson would be the POC who could send the document and discuss the details of the QAP.

Site Presentation - Ken Armstrong and Jack Craig (EMCBC)

Duli Agarwal noted that recently S/CI Focus Group has published a white paper on available S/CI training outside DOE. (Larry Perkins will distribute this paper with the meeting minutes.)

Jose Franco noted that CBFO is working with the EMCBC and is involved in a lot of work for EM across the complex.

Close-Out of Meeting

Bob Murray committed to EM-43 collecting the issues and concerns associated with this meeting and providing the list (top 10+) of issues to the EM QA Corporate Board Members. Mr. Murray will then hold a meeting in January/February to discuss and prioritize the issues and set the structure for the next meeting.

Matt Moury noted that all of the sites have resource issues and everyone has a different method of making that determination. We need a basis to get resources so we need a consistent approach to determining needed resources. This will be on the list for the January/February meeting.

Meeting Adjourned

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

#	Action for Follow-Up	Individual Responsible	Current Status
1	Distribute meeting minutes	Larry Perkins	Complete
2	Distribute HSS presentation	Larry Perkins	Complete
3	Distribute CNS presentation	Larry Perkins	Complete
4	Distribute presentation on drum/packaging	Larry Perkins	Complete
5	Distribute the final web-link to the meeting material	Larry Perkins	Complete
6	Distribute the analysis of the QA metrics from the annual declaration	Larry Perkins	Complete
7	Distribute the Quality Council website	Larry Perkins	Complete
8	Distribute the SQA task group white paper	Larry Perkins	Complete
9	Distribute the HSS S/CI training white paper	Duli Agarwal	Complete
10	Distribute details about the SRNL vessel testing audit (e.g., date, POC, report)	Charlie Harris	New Action
11	Distribute the OPEX Share link from Hanford	Larry Perkins	Complete
12	Provide a copy of the QAP for the drift scale heat tests at WIPP.	Jose Franco Roger Nelson	Complete
13	Summarize and distribute the issues and suggested focus areas from the site presentations.	Larry Perkins	New Action
14	Schedule a meeting with the EM QA Corporate Board to discuss prioritizing focus areas from the site presentations.	Larry Perkins Bob Murray	New Action
15	Develop project plan (e.g., scope, team members) for new focus area on DOE/RW-0333P.	Christian Palay	New Action
16	Update EM QA Project Plan to include new focus areas.	Larry Perkins	New Action

#	Name	Site/Company	Participation
1	Larry Perkins	DOE – EM-43	In Person
2	Jerry Lipsky	DOE – EM-43	In Person
3	Dave Huizenga	DOE – EM-1	In Person
4	Matt Moury	DOE – EM-40	In Person
5	Mike Hassell	CH2MHill	In Person
6	Bob Murray	DOE – EM-43	In Person
7	Ray Wood	Trinity Engineering Associates	In Person
8	Christian Palay	DOE – EM-43	In Person
9	Vince Grosso	WRPS	In Person
10	Andrea Davis	FBP	In Person
11	Michelle Dudley	Stoller	In Person
12	Robert Thompson	CWI	In Person
13	Joe Fulghum	SRNS	In Person
14	Keely Hurley	WRPS	In Person
15	Duli Agarwal	DOE – HSS	In Person
16	Rick Runners	URS PS	In Person
17	Ron Schrotke	Ron Schrotke, LLC	In Person
18	Sid Ailes	Energy Solutions	In Person
19	Patrice McEahern	CB&I	In Person
20	Ashok Kapoor	DOE – EM-33	In Person
21	Greg Hayward	DOE – Idaho	In Person
22	Oba Vincent	DOE – Carlsbad	In Person
23	Debra Sparkman	DOE – CNS	In Person
24	Jose Franco	DOE – Carlsbad	In Person

#	Name	Site/Company	Participation
25	Rick Salizzoni	SRR	In Person
26	Prakash Kunjeen	DOE – EM-33	In Person
27	Ken Armstrong	DOE – EMCBC	In Person
28	Norm Barker	EFCOG	In Person
29	Jay Mullis	DOE – Oak Ridge	In Person
30	Bud Danielson	DOE – CNS	In Person
31	Stacy Charboneau	DOE – Richland	In Person
32	Cynthia Williams	SRNS	In Person
33	Jim O'Brien	DOE – HSS	In Person
34	Jack Craig	DOE – EMCBC	In Person
35	Russell McCallister	DOE – Portsmouth/Paducah	In Person
36	Sean Sullivan	DNFSB	In Person
37	San Horton	DNFSB Staff	In Person
38	Ryan Eul	DNFSB Staff	In Person
39	Brian Harkins	DOE – River Protection	Via WebEx
40	Charlie Harris	DOE – Savannah River	Via WebEx
41	Dave Moody	DOE – Savannah River	Via WebEx
42	Bob Hinds	Savannah River	Via WebEx
43	Bill Rowland	DOE – Savannah River	Via WebEx
44	Jacob Miller	Savannah River	Via WebEx
45	Jeff May	DOE – River Protection	Via WebEx
46	Steve Chalk	DOE - Richland	Via WebEx
47	Krishna Vadlamani	DOE – Richland	Via WebEx
48	Liz Bowers	Richland	Via WebEx

#	Name	Site/Company	Participation
49	Ed MacAlister	Richland	Via WebEx
50	Dave Langstaff	Richland	Via WebEx