

YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE REPORT

OF

REYNOLDS ELECTRICAL AND ENGINEERING COMPANY, INC.

SURVEILLANCE NUMBER YMP-SR-91-027

CONDUCTED SEPTEMBER 26, 1991

ACTIVITIES SURVEILLED:

CORRECTIVE ACTION AND AUDIT PROGRAMS

Prepared by: Donald J. Harris Date: 10/10/91
Donald J. Harris
Senior Quality Assurance Leader
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

Approved by: Richard E. Spence Date: 10/15/91
Richard E. Spence
Director
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report contains the results of the Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division (YMQAD) Surveillance YMP-SR-91-027 of Reynolds Electrical and Engineering Company, Inc. (REECO) conducted in Las Vegas, Nevada, on September 26, 1991, to verify compliance and effectiveness of implementation of selected implementing procedures.

2.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this surveillance was to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of REECO procedures associated with corrective action and audits.

The scope of the surveillance included the following criteria and their attendant procedures:

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Title</u>
XVI	Corrective Action REECO Quality Procedure QP 16.0, Revision 7, "Corrective Action"
XVIII	Audits REECO QP 18.0, Revision 7, QP and Change Notice (CN) 91-01, "Audits"

3.0 SURVEILLANCE PERSONNEL

Donald J. Harris, Surveillance Team Leader, Senior Quality Assurance Engineer, Harza Engineering Company/YMQAD

4.0 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The implementing procedures listed in Section 2.0 of this report were the source of questions used to conduct this surveillance. The procedures were marked up with a yellow marker to denote the checklist questions. The checklists from these documents were then used to determine procedural compliance and effectiveness of the program.

1. QP 16.2, Revision 7, "Corrective Action"

The surveillance team reviewed the Deficiency Notice Log and only one Deficiency Notice (DN) has been initiated, DN-91-001, which was initiated by J.A. Calozzi at the Midway Valley site. REECO Project Quality Assurance (PQA) performed an evaluation and documented the

adverse condition as non-significant and non-quality related. At this point, the procedure is deficient in that the remainder of the procedure only addresses significant conditions adverse to quality, which requires the initiation of a Corrective Action Request (CAR) and its subsequent processing of the CAR.

However, REECO PQA recognized the procedure deficiency on processing an adverse condition on the DN, and used the remaining portion of the procedure's CAR process to disposition and subsequently close the DN on September 5, 1991. The record package for the closed DN was assembled, validated, and authenticated on September 10, 1991.

REECO previously documented that there was a generic condition of inadequate procedures during Audit No. REECO-005-91 of Information Management Office. Audit Finding Report No. 3 addresses the noncompliance in development reviewing and approving procedures. REECO developed a plan and schedule to evaluate their procedure program, assign new designations, and reformat and rewrite the procedures to encompass all upper-tier matrix requirements. This activity is scheduled for completion by January 31, 1992.

2. QP 18.0, Revision 7, QP CN 91-01, "Audits"

The surveillance team reviewed the 1991 Audit Schedule, Revision 1, dated May 17, 1991. The schedule reflects the REECO organization and the appropriate criterion for each organization and the month that the audit is to be performed. The schedule only reflects the REECO organization due to REECO not having any qualified suppliers at this time.

Reviewed the audit plans for REECO-006-91, "Management Office" and REECO-007-91, "Human Resources Department and Checklists" which were reflective of the criteria subject to audit via the audit schedule. The checklist referenced the procedure and paragraphs from the procedure. The checklist contained the objective evidence of the documents reviewed.

Reviewed the Audit Reports (REECO-006-91 and REECO-007-91) for compliance to the guidelines contained in the audit procedure, for the audit report content. In addition, reviewed the reports for proper approval and distribution to the audit and auditing organizations.

Reviewed the follow-up for the Audit Finding Reports (AFRs), Nos. 1 and 2, for audit REECO-006-91 and the audit log which tracks the status of the audit and AFRs.

Reviewed the records package for audit package REECO-007-91. Audit REECO-006-91 is still open pending closure of AFR No. 2.

The overall results of the examination of this procedure were good.

5.0 PERSONNEL CONTACTED DURING THE COURSE OF THE SURVEILLANCE

W. J. Glasser, Senior Quality Assurance Specialist, REECO
D. A. Hackbert, Quality Assurance Manager, REECO

6.0 MEASURING AND TEST EQUIPMENT USED DURING THE SURVEILLANCE

There was no measuring and/or test equipment used during the course of the surveillance.

7.0 SURVEILLANCE TEAM EVALUATION

The surveillance team feels that procedure QP 18.0, "Audits," was implemented satisfactorily and the program is effective. The procedure QP 16.2, "Corrective Action," fails to address the disposition of DNs that were evaluated and found to be non-significant. Even though there is currently an AFR, No 3, REECO-005-91 for inadequate procedures (generic), and REECO took the appropriate measures in dispositioning the DN, the process is yet to be formally defined.

8.0 SYNOPSIS OF DEFICIENCIES

No CARs were issued.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommend that in those cases similar to QP 16.0, "Corrective Action," where the process is not defined or when the procedure is deficient, a QP CN be issued to provide the necessary instructions and a historical record of the process utilized.

10.0 REQUIRED ACTIONS

No actions are required of REECO based on the surveillance.