



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

September 28, 2007

Mr. Cary D. Alstadt, Plant Manager
Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel
Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC
5801 Bluff Road
Columbia, SC 29250

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT 99900005/2007-201, NOTICE OF VIOLATION,
AND NOTICE OF NONCONFORMANCE

Dear Mr. Alstadt:

On August 27-29, 2007, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspectors conducted an inspection at the Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel (WNF) facility in Columbia, South Carolina. The enclosed report presents the details of that inspection.

This was a limited scope inspection which focused on assessing your compliance with the provisions of Part 21 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR Part 21), "Reporting of Defects and Noncompliance," and selected portions of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B "Quality Assurance Program Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants and Fuel Reprocessing Plants," to Part 50 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (Appendix B). This NRC inspection report does not constitute NRC endorsement of your overall quality assurance or Part 21 programs.

It was found that certain activities appeared to be in violation of NRC requirements which are discussed in the enclosed Notice of Violation (NOV), Notice of Nonconformance (NON), and NRC Inspection Report. Specifically, during a review of WNF's safety-related basic component procedures that WNF had established to control deviations and failures to comply, the NRC inspectors identified that WNF had not adopted procedures that were appropriate to ensure that deviations and failures to comply were evaluated in all applicable cases. It was identified that a procedural process gap existed between several procedures used to document nonconforming conditions which could contribute to preventing a potential defect from being processed in accordance with §21.21, "Notification of failure to comply or existence of a defect and its evaluation," of 10 CFR Part 21. The inspectors identified that the process gap could potentially circumvent WNF's program for evaluating such issues within its corrective action program and the associated Part 21 evaluation and reportability of potential defects. One violation of Part 21 is cited in the enclosed NOV, and the circumstances surrounding the NOV is described in the enclosed report. Please note that you are required to respond to this letter and should follow the instructions specified in the enclosed NOV when preparing your response. The NRC will use your response, in part, to determine whether further enforcement action is necessary to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements.

The NRC inspectors also found an example where the implementation of your QA program failed to meet NRC requirements imposed on you by your customers. During the review of WNF procurement documents for top nozzle leaf springs of fuel assemblies, it was identified that the WNF purchase specification had imposed incomplete quality requirements on the supplier. The procurement documents specified ASME NQA-1 for its component design control

activities without identifying which year and addendum was being imposed. This failure to adequately convey similar Appendix B quality programs to suppliers conflicts with the regulatory requirements specified in Criterion IV, "Procurement Document Control," of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Public inspections, exemptions, requests for withholding," a copy of this letter and its enclosures will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room.

Sincerely,

(/RA by P. L. Hiland)

Patrick L. Hiland, Director
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

1. Notice of Violation
2. Notice of Nonconformance
3. Inspection Report 99900005/2007-201

cc w/enclosures:

Mr. David S. Harris, Product Assurance Manager
Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel
Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC
5801 Bluff Road
Columbia, SC 29250

activities without identifying which year and addendum was being imposed. This failure to adequately convey similar Appendix B quality programs to suppliers conflicts with the regulatory requirements specified in Criterion IV, "Procurement Document Control," of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Public inspections, exemptions, requests for withholding," a copy of this letter and its enclosures will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room.

Sincerely,

(/RA by P. L. Hiland)

Patrick L. Hiland, Director
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:

- 1. Notice of Violation
- 2. Notice of Nonconformance
- 3. Inspection Report 99900005/2007-201

cc w/enclosures:

Mr. David S. Harris, Product Assurance Manager
Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel
Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC
5801 Bluff Road
Columbia, SC 29250

DISTRIBUTION:

JAEargle	JACrutchley(signed copy)	BDavis	DMCollins, RII-DFFI
BRReilly, NMSS	JJPetrosino (signed copy)	DJPasquale	PCPrescott
KKavanaugh	GCwalina		

DISK/DOCUMENT NAME: G:\ADES\DE\EQVB\Westinghouse Fuels\Westinghouse Insp Rpt-99900005
PETRO_1.doc

ADAMS Accession No.: ML072710236

Check for ADAMS: Public Non-Public Sensitive Non-Sensitive

OFC	DE:NRR	DE:NRR	DE:NRR	DE:NRR	DIR:DE:NRR
NAME	JJPetrosino	JEargle	DPasquale	DThatcher	PHiland
DATE	09/25/07	09/25/07	09/25/07	09/26/07	09/28/07

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel
Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC
5801 Bluff Road
Columbia, SC 29250

Inspection Report 99900005/2007-201

During a U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspection conducted from August 27, 2007 through August 29, 2007, a violation of NRC requirements was identified. In accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy, the violation is listed below:

1. Section 21.21, "Notification of failure to comply or existence of a defect and its evaluation," of 10 CFR Part 21, requires each entity subject to 10 CFR Part 21 to adopt appropriate procedures to evaluate deviations and failures to comply to identify defects and failures to comply associated with substantial safety hazards as soon as practicable, and except as provided in Part 21, in all cases within 60 days of discovery.

Contrary to the above, as of August 29, 2007, Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel failed to adopt adequate and consistent procedures to ensure that deviations were consistently identified and dispositioned in accordance with Westinghouse Electric Company Policy, WEC-21.0, "Identification and Reporting of Conditions Adverse to Safety." Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel allowed a procedural process gap that did not adequately review discrepancies related to design, fabrication and purchasing documentation, to exist in its facility procedures regarding nonconforming issues that could prevent a Part 21 evaluation from being performed. Violation 99900005/2007-201-01.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement VII).

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, "Notice of violation," Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel is hereby required to submit a written statement or explanation to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, with a copy to the Director, Division of Engineering, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, within 30 days of the date of the letter transmitting this Notice of Violation.

This reply should be clearly marked as a "Reply to a Notice of Violation" and should include: (1) the reason for the violation, or, if contested, the basis for disputing the violation; (2) the corrective steps that have been taken and the results achieved; (3) the corrective steps that will be taken to avoid further violations; and (4) the date when full compliance will be achieved. Your response may reference or include previous docketed correspondence, if the correspondence adequately addresses the required response. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the response time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 28th day of September 2007.

ENCLOSURE 1

NOTICE OF NONCONFORMANCE

Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel
Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC
5801 Bluff Road
Columbia, SC 29250

Inspection Report 99900005/2007-201

Based on the results of a U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspection conducted on August 27 through August 29, 2007, at the Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel (WNF) facility in Columbia, South Carolina, it appeared that certain WNF activities were not conducted in accordance with NRC requirements which were contractually imposed upon WNF by NRC licensees.

1. Criterion IV, "Procurement Document Control," of 10 CFR Part 50, states, Measures shall be established to assure that applicable regulatory requirements, design bases, and other requirements which are necessary to assure adequate quality are suitably included or referenced in the documents for procurement of material, equipment, and services, whether purchased by the applicant or by its contractors or subcontractors. To the extent necessary, procurement documents shall require contractors or subcontractors to provide a quality assurance program consistent with the pertinent provisions of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix B, "Quality Assurance Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants and Fuel Reprocessing Plants."

Westinghouse Nuclear Fuels document SQARS-1013135 Rev. 2 (SQARS-1013135) "Nuclear Fuel Supplier Quality Assurance Requirement Summary" states, that the supplier is responsible to apply the QA Manual identified in the SQARS Audit/Evaluation Summary to meet the latest revisions of SCM-507 and QCS-1/PF102.

Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel Procedure QCS-1/PF102 "Supplier Quality System Requirements, Level 1," establishes and delineates the requirements for the supplier's quality system used in design, testing and manufacture of nuclear safety-related equipment, systems and components. These requirements are derived from the basic and supplemental requirements of ASME NQA-1, Part 1.

Contrary to the above requirements, WNF did not assure that the applicable regulatory quality assurance requirements were imposed on the top nozzle leaf spring supplier. Furthermore, WNF did not assure that its safety-related component document, QCS-1/PF102, referenced in the procurement document "SQAR-1013135 Rev. 2" delineated a specific QA program. The document failed to identify the correct year and addendum for ASME NQA-1, Part 1 (i.e., not all versions of NQA-1 have been endorsed/approved by the NRC). Notice of Nonconformance 99900005/2007-201-02.

Please provide a written statement or explanation to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, with a copy to the Director, Division of Engineering, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, within 30 days of the date of the letter transmitting this Notice of Nonconformance.

ENCLOSURE 2

This reply should be clearly marked as a "Reply to a Notice of Nonconformance" and should include: (1) a description of steps that have been or will be taken to correct this item; (2) a description of steps that have been or will be taken to prevent recurrence; and (3) the dates your corrective action and preventive measures were or will be completed.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 28th day of September 2007.

**U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION**

Report No: 99900005/2007-201

Organization: Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel
Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC
5801 Bluff Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29250

Vendor Contact: Mr. David S. Harris, Product Assurance Manager
(803) 647-3769

Nuclear Industry: Westinghouse Electric Company's Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel (WNF) facility in Columbia, South Carolina processes nuclear fuel and provides fuel bundle assemblies for the nuclear power industry. The focus of this inspection was limited to assessing compliance with select portions of WNF's Appendix B quality program and the provisions of 10 CFR Part 21.

Inspection Dates: August 27-29, 2007

Team Leader: Joseph J. Petrosino, Vendor Inspector, DE/NRR

Inspectors: Jason A. Eargle, Vendor Inspector, DE/NRR
Daniel J. Pasquale, Vendor Inspector, DE/NRR

Approved By:

(/RA by D. F. Thatcher)

Dale F. Thatcher, Branch Chief
Quality and Vendor Branch
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

09-26-2007

Date

1.0 INSPECTION SUMMARY

The purpose of this inspection was to evaluate selected portions of the quality assurance (QA) and 10 CFR Part 21 controls that Westinghouse Electric Company's (WEC's) Westinghouse Nuclear Fuel (WNF) has established and implemented for its nuclear fuel bundle assembly activities.

The WNF facility in Columbia, South Carolina processes nuclear fuel and provides fuel bundle assemblies for the nuclear power industry. The inspectors focused on WNF's quality assurance program as it applies to the purchase of safety-related materials and services required to support the fuel bundle assembly fabrication business unit. The inspection also assessed certain WEC/WNF policies and procedures that were associated with the identification, control and disposition of issues potentially reportable in accordance with 10 CFR Part 21.

The inspection was conducted at the WNF facility in Columbia, South Carolina. The inspection bases were:

- Appendix B, "Quality Assurance Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants and Fuel Reprocessing Plants," to Part 50 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (Appendix B), and
- Part 21 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (Part 21), "Reporting of Defects and Noncompliance."

2.0 STATUS OF PREVIOUS INSPECTION FINDINGS

The previous inspection, 99900005/98-01, did not identify any findings.

3.0 INSPECTION FINDINGS AND OTHER COMMENTS

3.1 PART 21 PROGRAM

a. Inspection Scope

The NRC inspectors reviewed WEC/WNF policies, procedures and records related to the identification and evaluation of deviations for overall program adequacy in identifying and evaluating applicable deviations in accordance with WNF's established program for compliance with the requirements of Part 21.

b. Observations and Findings

The NRC inspectors reviewed the WNF Part 21 program adopted to implement the provisions of Part 21 and reviewed several project specific documents, such as Electronic Problem Notices (EPN) and Corrective and Preventative Actions (CPAs) that were controlled in accordance with the WNF quality program to assure adequate interaction between the Part 21 and QA program.

b.1. Policy and Procedures Adopted to Implement Part 21

Recent revisions to WNF Columbia Area Administrative Procedure CA-204, "Deviation Disposition Request (DDR)," invoked considerable procedural changes in the way this facility processes and dispositions a deviation. Potential or known nonconforming conditions not

meeting the threshold of a DDR may now be processed in accordance with an alternate procedure that evaluates potential problems without the additional administrative burdens associated with a DDR. The emphasis of the NRC's inspection of this area was to assess if these changes created process gaps that may affect WNF's Part 21 reporting program.

The inspectors noted that a deviation, as defined in CA-204 is "A condition where a measurable attribute or characteristic of a component or item departs from a specified requirement (e.g., specified in a product drawing, in a product specification, in a design Bill Of Materials (BOM), in a process Flow Outline (PFO), in a manufacturing and Quality Plan (MAQP) or in a contract as a specific requirement)."

Previous versions of CA-204 required "deviations" to be documented and processed on a DDR form and assigned a corresponding Corrective Action Process (CAP) Issue Report. As a result, each DDR has a companion CAP. CAPs are generated and processed in accordance with WNF Procedure CA-007, "Corrective and Preventative Action," and carry the additional requirement for evaluation as potential issues adverse to quality. A significance level is also assigned, and subsequently reviewed by an Issue Review Board (IRB) during the review of a CAP issue. This is intended to direct resources and alert management to the actual or potential consequences and the extent of condition of the issue. When the IRB determines that these consequences are significant enough to warrant additional analysis, the issue is processed in accordance with Westinghouse Electric Company Procedure WEC-21.0, "Identification and Reporting of Conditions Adverse to Safety." This procedure provides guidance for evaluating and processing "conditions adverse to quality" (or "significant conditions adverse to quality"), as pre-requisites to initiating Part 21 reporting activities. Additionally, many of WNF's customers have contractual requirements with WNF to be made aware of any and all DDRs (and their dispositions) generated against their fuel assemblies.

The inspectors noted that an EPN is defined in CA-204 as: "A system that is used to identify and process potential or known nonconforming conditions and notifications. This system is generally used to identify the need for a DDR". QA-617 is the controlling procedure for EPNs.

When the EPN procedure is utilized to process a deviation, additional process steps, added via revision to CA-204, require potential or known nonconforming conditions to be documented on an EPN, and to be pre-screened for applicability to the CA-204 definition of a "deviation" before being elevated to a DDR. This pre-screen was intended to limit the DDR/CAP evaluations to only those items that definitively meet the "deviation" threshold.

Procedure QA-617, "Processing an EPN (Electronic Problem Notice)," Revision 16, Section 6.2, "Create a CAPS issue for the following situations," provides guidance to the user for determining whether to elevate the subject issue to a higher level of review or to resolve the issue and assign the required tasks to closeout the EPN. Issues approved for further evaluation are documented on either a unique stand-alone CAP or on a DDR with a corresponding CAP.

A review of the items listed in this section indicates that the list fails to include discrepancies related to design, fabrication and purchasing documentation. This omission introduces the potential to inadvertently miss performing evaluations associated with deviations of nuclear safety significant items or components. The process is inconsistent with the regulatory requirements of Appendix B, Criterion V, "Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings," and §21.21 of 10 CFR Part 21. Therefore, the inspectors identified that the process gap could potentially circumvent WNF's program for evaluating such issues within its corrective action program and the associated Part 21 evaluation and reportability of potential defects. This issue is identified as Violation 99900005/2007-201-01.

b.2 Select QA Program Procedure Review

The inspectors determined that any review and analysis of the effects of the identified process gap will eventually center on WNF's definition and application of the terms "condition adverse to quality," "significant condition adverse to quality," "deviation," and "defect." As a result, a review of the following key procedures was performed by the inspectors: CA-007, "Corrective and Preventative Action," Revision 22; CA-204, "Deviation Disposition Request," Revision 10; EP-DEF, "Nuclear Fuel Product Management and Engineering Procedure Definitions," Revision 8; NF 13.1, "Control of Nonconforming Product," Revision 3; QA-615, "Control of Nonconforming Product," Revision 14; QA-617, "Processing an EPN (Electronic Problem Notice)," Revision 16; and WEC 21.0, "Identification and Reporting Of Conditions Adverse to Safety," Revision 4.

Consistency in evaluating, dispositioning and processing deviations in an organization that maintains the quantity and diversity of implementing procedures as evidenced at WNF, requires that instructions, procedures, or drawings include the appropriate quantitative or qualitative acceptance criteria for determining that important activities have been satisfactorily accomplished. Without this level of clarity inherent in the body of the text, as was evidenced at WNF, the benefits of written guidance are offset by the frequent and often miscommunicated interpretations being applied by participants in these processes. Processes containing such ambiguities present multiple opportunities to avert or delay evaluating potential defects from the reporting requirements established in §21.21 of Part 21. At WNF, it was noted that these ambiguities begin at the lowest level of guidance, and the definitions of frequently used terms. Several of the procedures reviewed maintained some variation of a term captured in another department's procedure. These variations are of particular concern in the area of identification and categorization of potential defects and deviations. Examples of some of the variations evidenced during the inspection are discussed below:

The terms "conditions adverse to quality" and "significant conditions adverse to quality," discussed in Criterion XV, "Nonconforming Materials, Parts, or Components," of Appendix B, are not readily identified within the WNF body of procedures. QA-615 introduces the phrase "significant adverse effect on the safe operation of a reactor plant," but neither defines the phrase, nor provides concise guidance for applying it to nonconforming items and services. It does, however, refer the reader to CA-007 when identifying "suspect conditions which may be adverse to quality." The term "adverse to quality" does appear in CA-007, but it is not defined there. The terms "Condition Adverse to Safety," "Failure to Comply," and "Substantial Safety Hazard" are defined in WEC 21.0, but the procedure also places the responsibility for identifying such conditions on the individual managers, who in turn must refer them to the "appropriate evaluating organization in accordance with local procedures..." Engineering Department Procedure EF-DEF is the central repository for engineering terms. However, the inspectors identified that the procedure makes no mention of "conditions adverse to quality," "significant conditions adverse to quality," "conditions adverse to safety," "failure to comply," or "substantial safety hazard."

Similarly, each implementing procedure contains some form of definition for the term "deviation." The CA-204 definition stated above appears to be the most comprehensive. The other procedures provide similar definitions; however, no two are identical. None of the WNF definitions for "deviation" as stated in the reviewed procedures refer to either 10 CFR Part 50 (Part 50) or Part 21. The term "defect" appears to be used less frequently than "deviation" at WNF. The only obvious definition is found in WEC 21.0, which submits four separate and distinct definitions for the term "deviation." All four refer to a deviation that is identified in a Basic Component. All four definitions reference either Part 50 or Part 21. The inspectors' review of WEC-21.0 did not identify any inconsistencies, and WEC-21.0 addressed the salient portions of 10 CFR Part 21.

b.3 Interaction with Part 21

EPN-0082421A (leaf springs manufactured by L&S Machine Company (L&S) with surface finishes out of specification) was reviewed by the inspectors to assess if this issue was adequately evaluated by WNF for applicability to Part 21. The issue documented an anomaly discovered during receipt inspection between a product being supplied to WNF from one of their Appendix B-approved vendors, L&S, and the fabrication drawing furnished to the supplier as part of the purchase order for the leaf springs.

The inspectors noted that WNF plant management, in compliance with the governing WNF procedures, opted to evaluate this issue as an EPN rather than as a DDR, as would have been the routine prior to the procedure changes. After reviewing the flow of EPN-0082421A to assess if the issue had been adequately reviewed for applicability to Part 21 reporting requirements, it was decided that the EPN had received the appropriate departmental reviews, and had been entered into the WNF CAP program for further evaluation as a potential "deviation" as defined in CA-204. The issue was eventually dispositioned by WNF Engineering (Ref: SFAD-07-86) to be not nuclear safety significant.

c. Conclusions

The inspectors determined that WNF procedures [Ref: Procedure QA-617, "Processing an EPN (Electronic Problem Notice)," Revision 16] currently approved for use at the Columbia, SC facility, fails to include discrepancies related to design, fabrication and purchasing documentation as situations that would trigger entering the Corrective Action Program (Ref: step 6.2.1). Additionally, the EPN procedure does not contain sufficient instruction to assure that such issues would be captured on a DDR form, which would also engage the CAP program. Given the amount of subjectivity surrounding this key decision, it is possible this procedural process gap could prevent a Part 21 evaluation from being performed on some deviations. Although this condition is contrary to the requirements of Appendix B a nonconformance to Appendix B is not being cited because Violation 99900005/2007-201-01 was identified in this area, and WNF's corrective action should adequately address this issue.

3.2 REVIEW OF WNF QA PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

a. Inspection Scope

The NRC inspectors reviewed the implementation of WNF's QA program as it relates to the purchase of safety-related (S/R) materials and services.

b. Observations and Findings

The NRC inspectors reviewed WNF and WEC policy and procedures adopted to implement the provisions of Part 21 and Appendix B as they relate to Procurement Document Control. This included the review of several Purchase Orders (POs), Purchase Specification documents, and the Supplier Quality Assurance Requirement Summaries (SQARS) that were controlled in accordance with the WNF quality program.

The inspectors reviewed the purchase specification SQAR_1030 and the SQARS-1013135 for PO-1013135 to L& S Machine for Top and Bottom Nozzles and Top Nozzle Springs. Both the SQAR_1030 and SQARS-1013134 documents reference the Supplier Quality System Requirements document QCS-1/PF102.

The Design Control section of WNF Procedure QCS-1/PF102 states:

“Suppliers having design responsibility shall satisfy Basic Requirement 3 and the requirements of Supplement 3S-1 of ASME NQA-1, Part 1.

The inspectors found that contrary to the above discussed requirements, WNF did not assure that the applicable regulatory quality assurance requirements were imposed on the top nozzle leaf spring supplier. The inspectors also determined that WNF did not assure that its safety-related component document, QCS-1/PF102, referenced in the procurement document “SQAR-1013135 Rev. 2” delineated a specific QA program. The document failed to identify the correct year and addendum for ASME NQA-1, Part 1 (i.e., not all versions of NQA-1 have been endorsed/approved by the NRC). Nonconformance 99900005/2007-201-02 was identified in this area.”

c. Conclusions

The inspectors determined that WNF Procedure QCS-1/PF102, failed to identify the correct year and addendum for the ASME NQA-1 Part I specification, as not all versions of NQA-1 have been endorsed/approved by the NRC. Notice of Nonconformance 99900005/2007-201-02 was identified in this area.

3.3 ENTRANCE AND EXIT MEETINGS

In the entrance meeting on August 27, 2007, the NRC Inspectors discussed the scope of the inspection, outlined the areas to be inspected, and established interfaces with WNF staff and management. In the exit meeting on August 29, 2007, the NRC Inspectors discussed their concerns and findings with WNF management and staff.

4.0 PERSONNEL CONTACTED

Cary D Alstadt	Plant Manager, Columbia S.C.	WNF	***
Rolf F. Ziesing	Director of Quality – Quality Programs	WNF	*
David S. Harris	Manager – Product Assurance	WNF	**
Kathy A. Merritt	Manager – Customer Quality & Product Records	WNF	**
Robert M. Maurer	Senior Manufacturing Engineer – Supplier Quality	WNF	
Donald M. Rowland	Product Technical Manager – VVER Fuel	WNF	
Grace A. Metzgar	Senior Buyer – Strategic Sourcing	WNF	
Terry McCue	Technical Trainer	WNF	
Ron Capps	Technical Trainer	WNF	

* Attended Entrance Meeting

** Attended Exit Meeting

*** Attended Entrance & Exit Meeting