



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

WBS 1.2.11

NOV 06 1992

Richard L. Bullock
 Technical Project Officer
 for Yucca Mountain
 Site Characterization Project
 Raytheon Services Nevada
 101 Convention Center Drive
 Phase II, Suite P-250
 Las Vegas, NV 89109

VERIFICATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND CLOSURE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST
 (CAR) YM-92-050 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION
 (YMQAD) AUDIT YMP-92-18 OF RAYTHEON SERVICES NEVADA

The YMQAD staff has verified the corrective action to CAR YM-92-050 and determined the results to be satisfactory. As a result, the CAR is considered closed.

If you have any questions, please contact either Robert B. Constable at 794-7945 or Donald J. Harris at 794-7356.

R. E. Spence

Richard E. Spence, Director
 Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMQAD:RBC-834

Enclosure:
 CAR YM-92-050

cc w/encl:

- ~~K. R. Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC~~
- S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
- M. J. Regenda, RSN, Las Vegas, NV
- J. H. Rusk, MACTEC, Las Vegas, NV
- W. B. Simecka, YMP, NV
- A. V. Gil, YMP, NV

cc w/o encl:

- J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
- N. J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-12

130051

*Add: K. Hooks Ar Encl
 102.7
 NH03/11
 Wm. H*

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

8 CAR NO.: YM-92-050
DATE: 6/26/92
SHEET: 1 OF 2
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

1 Controlling Document QAPD-002, Rev 0, Change Notice B; PP-03-03, Rev 0 PIC 1, 2, & 3	2 Related Report No. Audit YMP-92-18
---	---

3 Responsible Organization RSN	4 Discussed With B. Stanley, A. Ali
-----------------------------------	--

5 Requirement:

- QAPD Section 3, Paragraph 3.2.3-b, states in part; "Includes the following features; b- Sufficient detail as to purpose, method, assumptions, design input, references and units to enable an individual technically qualified in the subject to review and understand the analysis and verify adequacy of the results without recourse to the Originator."

PP-03-3, Rev. 0, PIC 1, 2 & 3 Analysis and Studies
- PP-03-03, Para, 6.5.5. states: "Assumptions - In order to complete the analysis, the Originator may have to make assumptions which are not clearly identified or controlled by the design inputs or other sources of information. These assumptions, along with the basis for the assumptions, must be clearly stated within the analysis. Those assumptions which require verification as the design proceeds must be identified. The assumptions used must be listed in

6 Adverse Condition:

Contrary to the stated requirements, inadequate justification was provided for how some design input rock mechanics properties were assumed. The Originator of Design Analysis ST-MN-209 (Highwall Stability Analysis) justified the selection of certain rock mechanics properties by stating their selection was based on "engineering experience."

Example of inadequately justified assumptions are as follows:

Design Analysis ST-MN-209, Rev. A, p. 8
 Rock Mass Tensile Strength = 10 MPa.
 Joint Cohesion = 1 MPa
 Joint Friction Angle = 30.96
 Joint Tensile Strength = 0.5 MPa
 Joint Angle = 80

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: Remedial Extent of Deficiency Preclude Recurrence Root Cause Determination

13 Recommended Actions:

7 Initiator D. Harris <i>D. Harris</i> Date <u>7-1-92</u>	14 Issuance Approved by: QADD <i>[Signature]</i> Date <u>7/6/92</u>
15 Response Accepted QAR <i>[Signature]</i> Date <u>10-5-92</u>	16 Response Accepted QADD _____ Date _____
17 Amended Response Accepted QAR <i>[Signature]</i> Date <u>10-5-92</u>	18 Amended Response Accepted QADD <i>[Signature]</i> Date <u>10/8/92</u>
19 Corrective Actions Verified QAR <i>[Signature]</i> Date <u>11/4/92</u>	20 Closure Approved by: QADD <i>[Signature]</i> Date <u>11/6/92</u>

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

8 CAR NO.: YM-92-050
DATE: 6/26/92
SHEET: 2 OF 2
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

5 Requirements (continued)

this section and the pages or paragraphs where the assumptions are located shall be annotated in this section."

6 Adverse Condition (continued)

Design Analysis ST-MN-217, Rev A, p. 2
Tensile Strength of the rock mass = 10 MPa

By simply stating that "engineering experience" was used to make design input assumptions does not provide a clear description of the basis for the assumption selection as described in EP-03-03, Section 6.5.5.

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

CAR NO. YM-92-050

DATE: 08-04-92

PAGE: 1 OF 1

QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

A. Remedial

For the analyses already performed and in place, RSN will not change the wording of "engineering judgement" as the basis for assumptions. Assumptions made in these analyses have been identified as needing to be verified prior to use for their intended purpose. Parameters used in stability analyses will be correlated with field data from final soils and rock investigative reports, and changed of necessary.

B. Extent of Deficiency

The RSN design department does not concur with the CAR finding as described in YM-92-050. The examples given are misleading in that not all values stated are assumptions, rather, some are calculated results from using an assumption. The issue remains whether the reason for choosing an assumed value given as "engineering experience" is an adequate basis for selection. The source for rock mechanics properties as shown in the CAR is the Reference Information Base (RIB) which gives a range of values for a given geologic unit. The design process should have values that are more location specific, such as for opening stability analysis of the ramp portal. These parameters are scheduled to be determined through a rock and soil program that derives the values from actual site specific pits and drill holes. The results from these investigations have not yet been supplied for use in the analyses. Until then, assumed values must be used and tagged for subsequent verification.

The term "engineering judgement" at this stage of investigation is deemed to be a valid and clearly stated basis for assumption. As noted in the referenced CAR, no significant adverse condition to quality exists. This is because the assumed values must be verified prior to use of a designed item for its intended purpose.

C. Preclude Recurrence

Since RSN believes that "engineering judgement" is an adequate statement for the basis of assumed values, no corrective action will be taken. RSN design process will continue to flag all assumptions according to internal procedure, and verify that the assumed values are reasonable and adequate.

Response Approved:

Bruce T. Stanley
Responsible Manager

Date: 8-4-92

AMENDED RESPONSE TO CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST YM-92-050, AUDIT YMP-92-18

A. REMEDIAL

For the analyses already performed and in place, RSN will supplement the wording of "engineering judgement" as the basis for assumptions. Additional backup will be given as to the nature of the "judgement", the source of supporting evidence, and/or further explanation as to whether the assumption is reasonable in the applied instance.

The above action will be completed by October 2, 1992.

B. EXTENT OF DEFICIENCY

The examples given are misleading in that not all values stated are assumptions, rather, some are calculated results from using an assumption. The source for rock mechanics properties as shown in the CAR is the Reference Information Base (RIB) which gives a range of values for a given geologic unit. The design process should have values that are more location specific, such as for opening stability analysis of the ramp portal. These parameters are scheduled to be determined through a rock and soil program that derives the values from actual site specific pits and drill holes. The results from these investigations have not been supplied for use in the analyses. Until then, assumed values must be used and tagged for subsequent verification.

C. PRECLUDE RECURRENCE

The RSN design process will continue to flag all assumptions according to internal procedures, and verify that the assumed values are reasonable and adequate.

Amended Response Approved:

Bruce T. Stanley
Responsible Manager

Date: 9-1-92

Ltr dtd 9/8/92 - RSN - YMP-622

AMENDED RESPONSE TO ITEM B OF CORRECTIVE ACTION
REQUEST YM-92-050 FROM AUDIT YMP-92-18

B. EXTENT OF DEFICIENCY

Not all values stated are direct assumptions, rather, some are calculated results from using an assumption. The source for rock mechanics properties as shown in the CAR is the Reference Information Base (RIB) which gives a range of values for a given geologic unit. The design process should have values that are more location specific, such as for opening stability analysis of the ramp portal. These parameters are scheduled to be determined through a rock and soil program that derives the values from actual site specific pits and drill holes. The results from these investigations have not been supplied for use in the analyses. Until then, assumed values must be used and tagged for subsequent verification.

Amended Response Approved:

Bruce T. Stanley
Responsible Manager

Date: 10-1-92

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

CAR NO.	_____
DATE:	_____
PAGE:	_____ OF _____
	QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

VERIFICATION OF CAR YM-92-050

BLOCK 19, Corrective Action Verification

a) Remedial Action

Verified RSN supplemented the wording "Engineering Judgment" as the basis for assumptions, to include engineering experience, bases for design document and related project documents. Design Analysis ST-MN-290, Revision B, Paragraph 5.0 assumption was incorporated into the Design Analysis. All data was listed, which requires final verification.

b) Extent of Deficiency

Design Analysis for ST-MN-214B, ST-MN-213C and ST-MN-209B, incorporated a paragraph 5.0 assumption. Verified the consistency of wording in each of the Design Analysis.

c) Action to Preclude Recurrence

RSN has committed in CAR YM-92-050 to flag all assumptions which require verification in their Design Analysis in accordance with PP-03-3 Analysis and Studies. This procedure was verified to meet the requirements of the QARD Section 3, Design Control.

Donald J. Harris
Donald J. Harris

11/4/92
Date