



QA: QA

Douglas J. Weaver, Manager
Test Coordination Office
Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC (BSC)
1180 Town Center Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89144

BECHTEL SAIC COMPANY, LLC (BSC) QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) SURVEILLANCE REPORT BSCQA-02-S-28 FOR SAMPLE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES IN THE ENHANCED CHARACTERIZATION REPOSITORY BLOCK (ECRB)

Enclosed is the Surveillance Report BSCQA-02-S-28, conducted by the BSC QA Organization on June 10-17, 2002, at the Sample Management Facility (SMF) and the Exploratory Studies Facility at the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project (YMP) site.

The scope of the surveillance was to observe and evaluate SMF sample collection and drilling activities in the ECRB. The surveillance resulted in the issuance of Quality Observation (QO) BSC(B)-02-O-042 identifying a failure to uniquely identify procedure forms by sequential number and effective date as required by Administrative Procedure AP-5.1Q, *Plan and Procedure Preparation, Review, and Approval*.

This surveillance is considered complete and closed as of the date of this letter. A response to this surveillance report is not required.

If you have any questions, please contact either Richard L. Weeks (702) 295-0629 or John S. Martin at (702) 295-2832.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. T. Krishna'.

Donald T. Krishna, Manager
Quality Assurance

7/3/02
Date Signed

RLW:bw-0628023164

Enclosure:
Surveillance Report BSCQA-02-S-28

*Nms507
wm-11*

July 3, 2002

Page 2

cc w/encl:

G. K. Beall, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
James Blaylock, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
L. W. Bradshaw, Nye County, Pahrump, NV
David Chavez, Nye County, Tonopah, NV
Margaret Chu, DOE/HQ (RW-1) FORS
J. R. Dyer, DOE/YMSCO, Las Vegas, NV
Leonard Fiorenzi, Eureka County, Eureka, NV
Arlo Funk, Mineral County, Hawthorne, NV
Birdie Hamilton-Ray, DOE/YMSCO, Las Vegas, NV
R. F. Hartstern, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
K. G. Hess, BSC Las Vegas, NV
D. G. Horton, DOE/YMSCO, Las Vegas, NV
Alan Kalt, Churchill County, Fallon, NV
D. T. Krisha, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
Josie Larson, White Pine County, Ely, NV
Robert Latta, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
R. R. Loux, State of Nevada, Carson City, NV
S. W. Lynch, State of Nevada, Carson City, NV
George McCorkell, Esmeralda County, Goldfield, NV
S. P. Mellington, DOE/YMSCO, Las Vegas, NV
Mifflin and Associates, Las Vegas, NV
Ram Murthy, DOE/OQA, Las Vegas, NV
Irene Navis, Clark County, Las Vegas, NV
Andrew Remus, County of Inyo, Independence, CA
N. K. Stablein, NRC, Rockville, MD
Lola Stark, Lincoln County, Caliente, NV
N. H. Williams, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
B. L. Wilson, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
Mickey Yarbrow, Lander County, Battle Mountain, NV

cc w/encl:

J. K. Devers, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
C. C. Lewis, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
J. S. Martin, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
R. D. Oliver, BSC, Las Vegas, NV
R. L. Weeks, BSC, Las Vegas, NV

ORIGINAL
red

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE REPORT

QA: QA
Page 1 of 2

QA Surveillance Number:
BSCQA-02-S-28

Complete only applicable items.

1. Organization/Location Sample Management Facility (SMF)/ Exploratory Studies Facility	2. Subject Sample Collection Activities in the Enhanced Characterization Repository Block (ECRB)	3. Date(s) Performed 06/10-17/2002
4. Surveillance Scope Observe and evaluate SMF sample collection and drilling activities in the ECRB.		
5. Requirement(s) (Procedure, Specification, Drawing, etc.) a. LP-SMF-001Q-BSC, Revision 0, Field Drilling Support Activities, Sections 5.1, 5.2 & 5.3 b. LP-SMF-002Q-BSC, Revision 1, Field, Logging, Handling, and Documenting Borehole Samples, Sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, & 5.8 c. FWP-ESF-96-009, Revision 5, Consolidated Sampling in the ESF and Work Instruction, TCO-WI-0015r03, Field Drilling Engineering & Processing Borehole Core Samples at Underground Drill Hole Locations, Section 1.5		6. Originator <u>Richard L. Weeks</u> Team Members <u>John K. Devers</u>

SURVEILLANCE RESULTS

7. Description/Details
The purpose of this surveillance was to observe sample collection activities and verify effective implementation of specified requirements identified in procedures listed in Block 5 above. This activity is further described in Field Work Package (FWP) FWP-ESF-96-009, Revision 5. The rock core samples collected support the Active Fracture Model (AFM) Block studies.

A visit was made to the ECRB on 06/10/2002 for the purpose of observing implementation of requirements that govern sample collection activities. Borehole ECRB-AFM #6, located at approximately 17+06, was observed during drilling operations. Prior to beginning work, the Person in Charge conducted a Tool Box Safety Meeting.

a. The work activities observed during this surveillance were documented on the forms identified in the procedures listed in Block 5 above. The forms were complete and up-to-date. The Daily Operations Reports (DORs) being completed for the day of this surveillance provided appropriate information as the drilling activities proceeded throughout the work shift. The following information was documented on the form: borehole identification, type of drill rig, SMF personnel and driller performing work, time breakdown of work activities, and other information as appropriate. In addition to examination of the DORs being completed on the day of this surveillance, the DOR for 06/06/2002 was examined and found to be complete. The Drilling/Coring Data Sheet, dated 06/06/2002 was examined and found to be complete and up-to-date.
(Continued on Page 2)

8. Persons (and their organizations) Contacted Bobby Hungerford, BSC, Drill Foreman Gary Olson, BSC, Engineer/Scientist Easte Warnick, BSC, Geologist	9. CAQ/NCR/TE Issued <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Recommendation Issued <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	CAQ/NCR/TE Number(s): <u>QO BSC(B)-02-O-042</u> CIRS Number(s): <u>N/A</u>
--	---	---

10. Surveillance Conclusions SAT UNSAT

The sample collection and drilling support activities evaluated during this surveillance were performed in a satisfactory and effective manner. Documentation of drilling and sample collection activities were complete and in accordance with requirements identified in the documents listed in Block 5 above.

Quality Observation (QO) BSC(B)-02-O-042 was issued to address forms not being properly identified. AP-5.1Q, Revision 3, ICN 1, Plan and Procedure Preparation, Review and Approval, Attachment 6, Section 8, states: "Each form controlled by the procedure shall be uniquely identified with the procedure number and sequential number and be assigned an effective date." Contrary to this requirement, forms identified in procedure LP-SMF-002Q, Revision 1, were not uniquely identified and did not include sequential number and effective date. A random sample of other Project procedures was performed to determine if this condition was more prevalent. (Continued on Page 2)

11. Completed By (Originator) (Print Name) Richard L. Weeks	Signature 	Date 6-27-02
12. Reviewed By (Appropriate QA Manager) (Print Name) John S. Martin	Signature 	Date 6-28-02
13. Approved By (QVM) (Print Name) Robert F. Hartstern	Signature 	Date 6/28/02

ORIGINAL
red

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE REPORT

QA: QA
Page 2 of 2

QA Surveillance Number:
BSCQA-02-S-28

Complete only applicable items.

1. Organization/Location Sample Management Facility (SMF)/ Exploratory Studies Facility	2. Subject Sample Collection Activities in the Enhanced Characterization Repository Block (ECRB)	3. Date(s) Performed 06/10-17/2002
---	--	---------------------------------------

BLOCK 7 Description and Details (Continued):

The following information was documented on the form: borehole identification, type of drill rig, core bit manufacturer including size, type and serial number, drilling method, core/drill string data and run data, identification of geologic formation, and additional information as required.

b. It was verified that required information was being documented on the Geologic Log which was up-to-date at the time of this surveillance. Core run interval 5.0 ft. to 5.9 ft. was observed. The following information was documented on the Geologic Log: date drilled, depth, core piece length, rock type symbol, and description of rock material recovered. Collected core was properly marked when possible. The core that was broken-up and reduced to rubble was not marked. Small pieces and cuttings are placed in labeled, plastic bags. Core Run Markers were filled out as the core run was being completed. The Core Run Summary form was complete. The Field Video Log was completed and core run was video taped as required. There were no special packaging requirements and collected core was placed in labeled core boxes for shipment to the SMF.

c. Water considered lost in the hole was recorded on the DOR. The DOR on the day of this surveillance was not examined because work was not complete; however, DORs for 06/04/2002, 06/05/2002 and 06/06/2002 were examined and documentation of water lost in the hole was provided on the respective DOR forms.

BLOCK 10 Surveillance Conclusions (Continued):

One other procedure, LP-SMF-003Q, Revision 0, "Transport, Receipt, Admittance, and Processing of Borehole Samples for the Sample Management Facility", was found to be deficient for unique form identification. Since the condition adverse to quality (CAQ) was limited to two SMF procedures, this is considered an isolated condition. Due to the isolated nature of the CAQ, the issuance of a QO is justified.