



**Department of Energy**

Yucca Mountain Project Office

P. O. Box 98608

Las Vegas, NV 89193-8608

WBS 1.2.9.3

QA

NOV 20 1997

Thomas E. Blejwas  
Technical Project Officer  
for Yucca Mountain Project  
Sandia National Laboratories  
P.O. Box 5800  
Organization 6310  
Albuquerque, NM 87185

EVALUATION OF RESPONSE TO STANDARD DEFICIENCY REPORT (SDR) 574, REVISION 0,  
RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT OFFICE (PROJECT OFFICE) QUALITY  
ASSURANCE (QA) AUDIT 90-04 OF SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES

The Project Office QA staff has evaluated your response to SDR 574,  
Revision 0, and has determined that it is unsatisfactory. This determination  
is based on the following:

The finding was addressed to subcontractor procedures; however,  
the response addresses only RE/SPEC subcontractor. There is no  
mention of any effort being made to verify whether a similar  
condition exists with other subcontractors. This shall be part  
of the investigative portion of the SDR as well as the corrective  
portion.

An amended response to this SDR is required to be submitted to this office  
within ten working days of the date of this letter. Any extension to this date  
must be requested in writing with appropriate justification prior to the due  
date. Please send the original of your response to Nita J. Brogan, Science  
Applications International Corporation, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89109.

If you have any questions, please contact either Catherine E. Hampton at  
(702) 794-7973 or FTS 544-7973, or Mario R. Diaz at (702) 794-7974 or  
FTS 544-7974 of the Yucca Mountain Project QA staff.

Donald G. Horton, Director  
Quality Assurance  
Yucca Mountain Project Office

QA:CEH-736

Enclosure:  
SDR 574, Revision 0

9011290353 901120  
PDR WASTE  
WM-11 PDC

YMP-5  
112

FULL TEXT ASCII SCAN

ADD: KHOOKS

11  
102.7  
WM-11  
NH03

**YMPO STANDARD DEFICIENCY REPORT**

N-QA-038  
4/89

Completed by Originating QA Organization	1 Date 8/22/90		2 Severity Level <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3		Page 1 of 2
	3 Discovered During Audit 90-04		3a Identified By M.R. Diaz		4 SDR No. 574 Rev. 0
	5 Organization SNL		6 Person(s) Contacted G. Smit/D. Brockman		7 Response Due Date is 20 Working Days from Date of Transmittal
	8 Requirement (Audit Checklist Reference, if Applicable) Checklists 4.2.2, 7.2.2, and 7.4.1 SNL-NWRT-QAPP, Revision E, Para. 7.2.9.2 states in part, "Nonconformances to the procurement requirements or SNL-approved documents that consist of one or				
Completed by Originating QA Organization	9 Deficiency Some subcontractor procedures dealing with nonconformances do not contain the requirements described in Block 8 above, i.e., RE/SPEC procedure QAP-14, Revision 0, "Identification, Control, and Corrective Action of				
	10 Recommended Action(s): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remedial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Investigative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corrective Identify the remedial actions to be taken to correct the deficiencies noted in Block 9. Investigate the program, process, activities, or documentation				
	11 QAE/Lead Auditor/Date <i>Walter Lee</i> 9/4/90		12 Division Manager/Date N/A		13 Project Quality Mgr./Date <i>Catherine...</i> 9/5/90
Completed by Organization in Block 5	14 Remedial/Investigative Action(s) RE/SPEC had the requirements specifically stated in their Quality Assurance Plan that nonconformances would be sent to SNL for review and approval. However in the RE/SPEC procedure QAP-14, Revision 0, they stated that the nonconformance would be sent to the customer for review. Their intent was that if SNL reviewed and did not agree with the response, SNL would let them know. The deletion of the approval requirement. (Continued)				
	15 Effective Date Complete				
	16 Cause of the Condition & Corrective Action to Prevent Recurrence Cause: Because of oversight due to the nonconformance procedure being generic and applying to several other customers. RE/SPEC did not transfer the approval requirement from their QA Plan to their nonconformance procedure. A letter instructing RE/SPEC to change their procedure to include the (Continued)				
Completed by Organization in Block 5	17 Effective Date 9-17-90				
	18 Signature/Date <i>Thomas E. Hegura</i> 10-12-90 <i>[Signature]</i> 10-11-90				
Comp. by Org. QA Org.	19 Response Accepted		QAE/Lead Auditor/Date	Division Manager/Date	Project Quality Mgr./Date
	20 Corrective Action Verif. Satisfactory		QAE/Lead Auditor/Date	Division Manager/Date	Project Quality Mgr./Date
	21 Remarks				
	22 QA CLOSURE		QAE/Lead Auditor/Date	Division Manager/Date	PQM/Date

YMPO STANDARD DEFICIENCY REPORT  
CONTINUATION SHEET

N-QA-038  
2/89

SDR No. 574

Page 2 of 2

8 Requirement ( continued )

more of the following shall be submitted to this organization for approval of recommended disposition:

- o Technical or material requirement is violated.
- o Requirement in supplier documents, which has been approved by the purchaser, is violated.
- o Nonconformance cannot be corrected by continuation of the original process or by rework.
- o The item does not conform to the original requirement even though the item can be restored to a condition such that the capability of the item to function is unimpaired."

9 Deficiency ( continued )

Nonconformances."

A contributing factor to this deficiency could be the fact that the SNL implementing procedure for these requirements was not written with the same mandatory language as the QAPP (Ref. DOP 4-1, Revision C, Para. 4.2.1).

10 Recommended Actions ( continued )

to determine the extent and depth of similar deficient conditions to those listed on the SDR. Identify these deficiencies and provide the measures required to correct them. Identify the cause of the condition and the planned corrective action to prevent recurrence.

Block 14 Remedial Actions (Continued):

resulted when RE/SPEC wrote the procedure to satisfy numerous contract customers.

Block 16 Corrective Actions (Continued):

approval requirement was sent by the Contract Monitor on 8-24-90 (atch'd). DOP 4-1, Revision C, was rewritten into QAIP 4-1, Revision 00, with an effective date of 9-6-90. ICN 01 to QAIP 4-1 was published with an effective date of 9-17-90 to ensure all nonconformance requirements were specifically stated (atch'd).

**Sandia National Laboratories**

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185

AUG 24 1990

WBS: 124212  
QA: N/A

**QA RECEIVED**

OCT 18 1990

Duane Labreche  
RE/SPEC Inc.  
4775 Indian School Rd NE  
Suite 300  
Albuquerque, NM 87110

Dear Duane:

Subject: Inclusion Of NCR Plan Requirements Into Your QAP-14 Procedure


A Yucca Mountain Project audit was conducted at SNL from August 20 through August 24, 1990. During the audit, it was brought to our attention that there is a discrepancy between your QAPP and your QAP-14. Your QAPP states that RE/SPEC will report all nonconformance reports to SNL for review. Although this has been the case in a review of the last three nonconformance reports, the requirement is not stated in your QAP-14.

Please change your QAP-14 to include the SNL reporting requirements. Also review all your other procedures to ensure all other Yucca Mountain and SNL requirements have been included.

Please submit a letter stating you have completed a review of all your procedures for inclusion of all Yucca Mountain requirements along with a copy of your SNL reporting process change to QAP-14 by September 28, 1990.

Thank you for your help in closing out this discrepancy.

Sincerely yours,



S. J. Bauer, Contract Monitor  
Division 6314  
Geomechanics Analysis & Testing

GASmit:6319:gs

- Copy to:
- 6310 T. O. Hunter
- 6319 R. R. Richards
- 6314 S. J. Bauer
- 6310 22/124212/23-9583/1.2/QA
- 6310 YMP CRF

*Handwritten initials*

DIA NATIONAL LABORATORY  
NUCLEAR WASTE REPOSITORY TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT 6310  
INTERIM CHANGE NOTICE

ICN NUMBER: 01 DATE: 8/27/90 PAGE 1 OF 1

DOCUMENT TYPE AND NUMBER: QAIP 4-1 CURRENT REVISION: 00

TITLE: Procurement

DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE FOR CHANGE:

Page 23, Appendix C, Nonconformance (Items), 2nd Paragraph

Change to read:

If the item is not in conformance with SNL specified requirements, the contractor shall submit the condition, and the suggested disposition, to SNL for review and approval.

Rationale: Change required as corrective action for YMP #90-04.

(Identify the ICN by number next to the affected procedure paragraph, insert change, if desired, and file ICN with the affected procedure.)

APPROVALS:

AUTHOR: [Signature] DATE: 8-27-90

DIVISION SUPERVISOR: [Signature] DATE: 8-27-90

QA DIVISION SUPERVISOR: [Signature] DATE: 8/27/90

DEPARTMENT MANAGER: [Signature] DATE: 8/27/90

EFFECTIVE DATE: 9-17-90

SNL DEPARTMENT 6310  
CONTROLLED DOCUMENT  
(If Numbered in Red Ink)

000060

Copy Number \_\_\_\_\_

Thomas E. Blejwas

-2-

NOV 20 1990

cc w/encl:

R. R. Richards, SNL, 6310, Albuquerque, NM  
S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV  
K. R. Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC  
N. J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-08

cc w/o encl:

J. H. Hines, OGD, AL  
J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV