

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION
QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE REPORT OF
THE READINESS REVIEW OF DRILLHOLE UE-25 VSP-2 (UZ-16)
SURVEILLANCE NO. YMP-SR-92-013
CONDUCTED MAY 18 THROUGH 27, 1992

ACTIVITIES SURVEILLED:

EXAMINED RECORDS GENERATED AS A RESULT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
QUALITY ASSURANCE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE QAAP 2.6

Prepared by: Richard L. Weeks Date: 6/4/92
Richard L. Weeks
Quality Assurance Scientist
Surveillance Team Leader
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

Approved by: D. G. Horton Date: 6/9/92
Donald G. Horton
Director
Office Quality Assurance

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report contains the results of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) Quality Assurance (QA) Surveillance No. YMP-SR-92-013 of the readiness review of drilling of Vertical Seismic Profiling (VSP) drillhole UE-25, VSP-2 (UZ-16). Records generated as a result of implementation of Quality Assurance Administrative Procedure (QAAP) 2.6, Revision 2, Readiness Review were examined to insure completeness and to insure procedural requirements were met. The surveillance was conducted in Las Vegas, Nevada at the Valley Bank Building by a member of the Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division (YMQAD) of the Office of Quality Assurance (OQA) in accordance with OCRWM Quality Assurance Administrative Procedure (QAAP) 18.3, Revision 3.

Based on a review of documentation and interviews with the Readiness Review Chairperson (RRC) and Readiness Review Secretary, the readiness review was found to be performed in accordance with the requirements of QAAP 2.6, and effective. The Readiness Review is still active as the RRC continues to track remaining open items.

There were no Corrective Action Requests (CARs) issued as a result of this surveillance. One remedial condition, addressing incomplete Readiness Review Open Item Report forms, was corrected during the surveillance.

2.0 SCOPE

Surveillance YMP-SR-92-013 was conducted to determine the adequacy of the readiness review of drilling of VSP Drillhole UE-25, VSP-2 (UZ-16).

3.0 SURVEILLANCE TEAM

Richard L. Weeks, Surveillance Team Leader, Quality Assurance Scientist, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)/YMQAD, Las Vegas, Nevada

4.0 PERSONNEL CONTACTED DURING THE SURVEILLANCE

Claudia M. Newbury, U.S. Department of Energy/Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project Office, Physical Scientist, Technical Analysis Branch, RRC

Greg Fehr, Senior Materials Engineer, SAIC, Readiness Review Secretary

5.0 SURVEILLANCE RESULTS

- 5.1 The purpose of this surveillance was to determine the adequacy of the readiness review that was conducted to determine preparedness to begin drilling of VSP Drillhole UE-25, VSP-2 (UZ-16). Specific requirements of the readiness review process, which were evaluated during the surveillance, were obtained from a marked-up copy of QAAP 2.6, Revision 2.
- 5.2 Compliance to procedural requirements of QAAP 2.6, including examination of generated records, were verified with the following results:
- o the need for a Readiness Review was documented by the appropriate level of management;
 - o the Readiness Review Plan was generated and addressed all required subjects;
 - o it was verified that all Readiness Review team members met minimal qualifications as established by the RRC;
 - o an Attribute List was developed;
 - o an Open Item Report was developed;
 - o a Readiness Review Report was prepared and approved by the responsible Director;
 - o the Readiness Review Report and attached Open Item Reports are distributed to affected organizations;
 - o remaining open items continue to be tracked by the RRC;
- 5.3 Conditions corrected during the surveillance:

The Readiness Review Open Item Report has a location for indicating "yes" or "no" if a Hold Point is required. Fourteen of the 29 report forms examined were not annotated to indicate a preference, but were corrected during the surveillance.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The RRC is required to review and approve the Attribute List (see paragraph 6.1.8). QAAP 2.6, Revision 2 does not describe the manner in which this approval is documented. This approval should be classified QA and submitted as a QA record.
2. The Readiness Review Attribute List provides a column for recording the open item number. For the examined readiness review, a number was not recorded in this column. Since all open items were easily traceable to the specific attribute listed on the Readiness Review Attribute List this does not present a problem; however, consideration should be given to eliminating the open item number and using the attribute number for tracking.