



Department of Energy
 Yucca Mountain Site Characterization
 Project Office
 P. O. Box 98608
 Las Vegas, NV 89193-8608

WBS 1.2.9.3

JUL 14 1992

Michael D. Voegele
 Technical Project Officer
 for Yucca Mountain
 Site Characterization Project
 Science Applications International Corporation
 The Valley Bank Center, Suite 407
 101 Convention Center Drive
 Las Vegas, NV 89109

EVALUATION OF RESPONSE TO CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) YM-92-041 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION (YMQAD) AUDIT YMP-92-16 OF SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

The YMQAD staff has evaluated the response to CAR YM-92-041. The response has been determined to be satisfactory. Verification of completion of the corrective action will be performed after the effective date provided. Any extension to this date must be requested in writing with appropriate justification prior to the date. Please send a copy of extension requests to Nita J. Brogan, Science Applications International Corporation, Las Vegas, Nevada.

If you have any questions, please contact either Robert B. Constable at 794-7945 or Charles C. Warren at 794-7248.

R. E. Spence

Richard E. Spence, Director
 Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMQAD:RBC-4425

Enclosure:
 CAR YM-92-041

cc w/encl:
 K. R. Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC
 S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
 D. K. Chandler, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-04
 J. R. Gonzales, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-28
 N. J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-12

cc w/o encl:
 J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV

9208050314 920714
 PDR WASTE
 WM-11 PDR

YMP-5

ADD: Ken Hooks

*102.7
 Wm-11
 NH03
 Wt. Encl.*

JUL 14 1992

Carl F. Gertz

-2-

cc w/encl:

J. W. Bartlett, HQ (RW-1) FORS
D. G. Horton, HQ (RW-3) FORS
J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
~~K. R. HOOKS~~, NRC, Washington, DC
R. R. Loux, NWPO, Carson City, NV
J. T. Regan, Churchill County Commission, Fallon, NV
D. A. Bechtel, Clark County Comprehensive, Las Vegas, NV
J. D. Hayes, Esmeralda County Commission, Goldfield, NV
Carol Bleuss, Eureka County Commission, Eureka, NV
Gloria Derby, Lander County Commission, Battle Mountain, NV
R. H. Williams, Jr., Lander County Commission, Austin, NV
M. L. Baughman, Lincoln County Commission, Fiskdale, MA
Jason Pitts, Lincoln County Commission, Pioche, NV
Judy Foremaster, Lincoln County Commission, Caliente, NV
V. E. Poe, Mineral County Commission, Hawthorne, NV
S. T. Bradhurst, Nye County Commission, Reno, NV
P. A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Nye County, Chantilly, VA
Florindo Mariani, White Pine County Commission, Ely, NV
Brad Mettam, Inyo County, Independence, CA
S. L. Bolivar, LANL, Los Alamos, NM
Dean Wolfe, LLNL, Livermore, CA
J. A. Jackson, M&O/TRW, Las Vegas, NV
J. H. Rusk, MACTEC, Las Vegas, NV
R. E. Harpster, MACTEC, Las Vegas, NV
W. J. Glasser, REECO, Las Vegas, NV
M. J. Regenda, RSN, Las Vegas, NV
R. R. Richards, SNL, 6310, Albuquerque, NM
S. R. Dippner, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-12
J. B. Harper, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-38
T. H. Chaney, USGS, Denver, CO
C. P. Gertz, YMP, NV

cc w/o encl:

Marie Hayes, Esmeralda County Commission, Goldfield, NV

**OFFICE OF CIVILIAN
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

8 CAR NO.: YM-92-041
DATE: 5/27/92
SHEET: 1 OF 1
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

1 Controlling Document SAIC QAPD, Revision 6		2 Related Report No. Audit Report YMP-92-16	
3 Responsible Organization SAIC		4 Discussed With J. W. Estella	
5 Requirement: Paragraph 17.4, Records Correction, states in part, "Provisions for correcting records (and documents that will become records) shall ensure that corrected records are reviewed and approved by the originating organization."			
6 Adverse Condition: Contrary to the above requirements, three REECo calibration reports for equipment serial numbers 9H1029, 269625, and 269614, were corrected prior to submittal to the LRC without review and approval by REECo.			
9 Does a significant condition adverse to quality exist? Yes ___ No <u>X</u> If Yes, Circle One: A B C		10 Does a stop work condition exist? Yes ___ No <u>X</u> ; if Yes - Attach copy of SWO If Yes, Circle One: A B C D	
11 Response Due Date: 20 Days From Issuance			
12 Required Actions: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remedial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extent of Deficiency <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preclude Recurrence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Root Cause Determination			
13 Recommended Actions: Training shall be initiated to assure all SAIC record sources and personnel handling records are aware of procedural requirements for correcting records.			
7 Initiator R. B. Constable <i>R. B. Constable</i> Date <u>5/27/92</u>		14 Issuance Approved by: QADD <i>R.C. Spence</i> Date <u>5/29/92</u>	
15 Response Accepted QAR <i>C.C. Williams Jr. R.B.C.</i> Date <u>7-8-92</u>		16 Response Accepted QADD <i>R.C. Spence</i> Date <u>7/13/92</u>	
17 Amended Response Accepted QAR _____ Date _____		18 Amended Response Accepted QADD _____ Date _____	
19 Corrective Actions Verified QAR _____ Date _____		20 Closure Approved by: QADD _____ Date _____	

1. Remedial Action

No remedial action is required. None of the REECO documents annotated by T&MSS entered the Records Management System. Only a working copy of the REECO provided documents were marked to show non-applicability of the Calibration Due Dates. Records corrections are not required.

The original REECO Certificates of Calibration were initially accepted because they contained the information requested by the procurement documents. However, they also contained extraneous information, i.e., the REECO assigned Calibration Due Dates, which have no official meaning in the T&MSS calibration control system.

REECO was asked during the audit to provide revised Certificates of Calibration showing the T&MSS assigned Calibration Due Dates. They were received by T&MSS during the audit and copies placed in the LRC. A copy of the new documents were provided to the DOE auditor prior to the close of the audit; therefore, no remedial action is required. (Please see Investigative Action and Root Cause Determination below.)

2. Investigative Action

The calibration due dates found on the original and revised REECO documents have no technical or QA records importance. This is because the related procurement documents did not request REECO to supply suggested calibration due dates or to track the use period. Further, calibration due dates need not be documented on supplier Certificates of Calibration. Therefore, that information has no technical importance to the establishment of re-calibration frequencies. The "official" due dates are those established and tracked by REFPD management as required by SP 2.4, "Control of Measuring and Test Equipment (M&TE) Used for Calibration and as Standards," Revision 5, Paragraph 5.5.

Notwithstanding, the actions taken by REFPD were in the interest of preventing future confusion over the difference between the official T&MSS Calibration Due Dates and those found on the original REECO certificates. Investigation found no other certificates were ever marked in the past, because no confusion existed in the past.

3. Root Cause Determination

During the conduct of audit YM-92-016 an auditor questioned the difference in Calibration Due Dates between that maintained in the REFPD Equipment History File and those dates contained on REECO provided Certificates of Calibration. T&MSS had resolved the difference in information by placing a memo of explanation in the working file and in the LRC. The auditor viewed this action as an attempt to change the official calibration frequency. In the interest of resolving the auditor's concern, a draft copy of the REECO supplied document was marked to indicate that it had no importance with respect to T&MSS M&TE program controls. Further processing of the marked up copy was interrupted by the decision to obtain a new certificate from REECO. This CAR resulted from the above described T&MSS actions during the DOE audit.

4. Corrective Action to Preclude Recurrence

This CAR addresses an isolated case of the appearance of a deviation from QA policy. No unique corrective action is required to prevent recurrence.

T&MSS will continue to conduct technical and quality reviews of supplier provided documentation during the receipt inspection/acceptance of services processes. At the judgment of the cognizant T&MSS technical manager, a memo of explanation may be attached to vendor supplied documentation found to be at variance with other documentation. Should a condition exist in the future where vendor supplied documentation is found to be deficient with respect to technical and/or QA specifications, a QFR or NCR will be initiated and the vendor will be requested to provide corrected documentation. This policy is currently clearly delineated in OCRWM and T&MSS procedures.

Prepared by

James E. Clark

Date

6/25/92

Management Approval

Michael W. Harris

Date

6/25/92