

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE REPORT OF

INITIAL JOB PACKAGE RECORDS STATUS

SURVEILLANCE NO. YMP-SR-92-029

CONDUCTED AUGUST 18 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 2, 1992

ACTIVITIES SURVEILLED:

JOB PACKAGES 91-01 THROUGH 91-03, 91-05, AND 92-04

Prepared by: Gerard Heaney Date: 10-2-92  
Gerard Heaney  
Quality Assurance Engineer  
Surveillance Team Leader  
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

Prepared by: Cynthia H. Prater Date: 10/2/92  
Cynthia H. Prater  
Quality Assurance Specialist  
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

Approved by: D. G. Horton Date: 10/5/92  
Donald G. Horton  
Director  
Office of Quality Assurance

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This surveillance was conducted to status both quality-related and non-quality related record packages for initial Job Package (JP) Nos. 91-01 through 91-03, 91-05 and 92-04.

In general, the submittal of records and subsequent closure of JPs is untimely. Although several JP activities have been completed almost one year ago, there were no completed record packages or available documentation indicating that any JPs have been closed. The surveillance report contains some preliminary observations of potential record management procedural violations and reasons for subsequent rejection of the record packages by the Central Records Facility (CRF). These potential procedural violations were reviewed with the respective JP Record Coordinators. A Corrective Action Request was not issued at this time due to the fact that the assembly of the record packages (91-01, 91-02 and 92-04) was in process. The record packages were not yet authenticated. Section 6.0 of this report contains several recommendations that in the opinion of the surveillance team, could help the assembly process and CRF acceptance of JP record packages.

## 2.0 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this surveillance was to perform a status of JP record packages for initial JP Nos. 91-01 through 91-03, 91-05, and 92-04 located in the Document Records Center at the Field Operations Center (FOC). The surveillance was conducted at the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project FOC facility at the Nevada Test Site in Mercury, Nevada from August 18 through September 2, 1992, by a team from the Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division (YMQAD) of the Office of Quality Assurance in accordance with Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Quality Assurance Administrative Procedure QAAP 18.3, Revision 3.

## 3.0 SURVEILLANCE TEAM

Gerard Heaney, YMQAD, Surveillance Team Leader, Quality Assurance Engineer  
Cynthia H. Prater, YMQAD, Quality Assurance Specialist

## 4.0 PERSONNEL CONTACTED DURING THE SURVEILLANCE

E. M. Gardiner, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)  
Terry Grant, SAIC  
C. J. Houston, TRW/Management and Operating Contractor  
Kirt McClaskey, Raytheon Services Nevada (RSN)  
Michael Regenda, RSN  
Lee Watson, RSN

## 5.0 SURVEILLANCE RESULTS

- 5.1 The following Administrative Procedure (AP) was used in this surveillance:  
AP-1.18Q, Revision 0, "Records Management: Las Vegas Record Source Implementation."

A review of the following JP record packages was conducted. Record Package Nos. 91-01, 91-02 and 92-04 are quality-related as indicated on the grading reports referenced in each package. The packages will not be acceptable to the CRF as presently assembled for the following reasons:

1. Job Package 91-01, "Midway Valley Trenching"
  - a. Item 5, Field Change Control
    - Participant Evaluation form, needs to be part of the Field Change Request package. Field Change Control Board needs to get them from RSN.
  - b. Item 9, Inspection Reports
    - Field Verification Plan (FVP), Appendix A to Plan Nos. 001 and 002, Revision 0, did not list all specifications and drawings used to perform inspections as required by the FVP form.
  - c. Item 10, RSN Safety
    - Work Requests for Soils, Material Tests, etc., need to have all blanks completed or marked "N/A."
  - d. Item 11, RSN Dust/Water Control
    - RSN Transmittal of Shop Drawings, Equipment Data, Materials Samples, or Manufacturer's Certificates of Compliance form has blocks to be filled in. Several of the forms required the signature of the Technical Project Officer.
  - e. Item 12, As-Builts
    - The Survey Department provided information copies of two drawings entitled, "East End of Midway Valley Trench A-2 As Built" and "West End of Midway Valley Trench A-2 As Built"

drawings. These need to be stamped "Information Copy," or removed from the record package, since there is no identifier on either drawing.

- Some electronic survey data collection records do not have any signatures or identifications on them.
- f. Item 13, Water Control Records
- There are empty blocks on the records.
2. Job Package 91-02, "Trench 14"
- a. Item 11, RSN Dust/Water Control
- FVP 91-001, Revision 0, does not list all the drawings and specifications used to perform inspections on Appendix A.
- b. Item 13, Water Control Records
- There are empty blocks on the records.
- c. Item 14, As Built Drawings
- Some electronic survey data collection records do not have any signatures or identifications on them.
  - The Survey Department provided two information copies of drawings entitled "Calcite/Silica Trench No. 14 As-Built." These need to be stamped "Information Copy" if they are to be used as such or removed from the record package. There are two electronic field survey data collection records. One is attributed to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the other has no reference to the originating organization or compiler. There are no signatures on either record.
3. Job Package 92-04, "Drill Pad Construction for VSP Drillhole UZ-16"
- The following were missing from the JP record package:
- a. Construction Daily Reports

- b. As-Built Drawings
- c. Survey Data

The following JPs are non-quality related. Records generated as a result of the implementation of the JPs would have been submitted to the CRF in accordance with each respective participants' records management program as appropriate. A JP records package will not be generated for these JPs. The following is a status of JP Nos. 91-03 and 91-05:

4. Job Package 91-03, "Field Management Job Package"

This JP did not cover a specific earth disturbing activity. It covers management, facilities, equipment, and services that provide common support to two or more site characterization field elements (as described in the JP). As such, it does not meet today's definition of a JP as the JP process has changed over time. The JP states it covers activities from January 1991 through January 1992. The surveillance team could not obtain documentation closing this JP. It is suggested that a letter be generated to "officially" close this JP.

5. Job Package 91-05, "On Going Field Activities"

Like JP 91-03, this JP does not cover earth disturbing activities. The JP was generated to cover non-earth disturbing work performed by the USGS, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories and RSN at the site. The JP states that it covers "FY '91." Records generated, if any, should have been captured within each participant's records management program. The surveillance team could not obtain documentation closing this JP. It is suggested that a letter be generated to officially close this JP.

## 6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the JP Records Coordinator for each JP generate a memo to each participant who has submitted records to the packages and inform them that a representative of each organization will have to review the package in accordance with procedural requirements of AP-1.18Q. If the JP records are indicated as quality-related on the grading package for each activity, the records will have to be authenticated in accordance with AP-1.18Q. It is also recommended that a representative sampling of the types of problems that the surveillance team encountered be distributed to the affected organizations.

Additionally, participants should notify the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project Office of a firm schedule to submit all records for each JP, as applicable. It is recommended that the Quality Assurance groups of each organization review their sections of JP records packages for conformance to requirements.

Consideration should be given to revising appropriate procedures to require a JP closure letter issued by the Project Manager when all associated JP activities are completed.