



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

WBS 1.2.11
QA: N/A

JAN 06 1993

Carl P. Gertz, Project Manager, YMP, NV

EVALUATION OF AMENDED RESPONSES TO CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CAR) YM-93-001 AND YM-93-002 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION (YMQAD) AUDIT YMP-92-24

The YMQAD staff has evaluated the amended responses to CARs YM-93-001 and YM-93-002. The responses have been determined to be satisfactory. Verification of completion of the corrective actions will be performed after the effective dates provided. Any extension to these dates 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 Sam H. Horton at 794-7399.

Richard E. Spence, Director
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMQAD:RBC-1749

Enclosures:

1. CAR YM-93-001
2. CAR YM-93-002

cc w/encls:

K. R. Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC
S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
S. D. Johnson, PSDO/REECO, Las Vegas, NV
J. W. Estella, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
Phillip Jones, M&O/TRW, Las Vegas, NV
R. L. Maudlin, MACTEC, Las Vegas, NV
A. V. Gil, YMP, NV
B. J. Verna, YMP, NV

cc w/o encl:

J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
N. J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
S. H. Horton, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV

120013

9301140098 930106
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDR

Add: K. R. Hooks
NH03-11
102.7
WM-11

ORIGINAL
THIS IS A RED STAMP

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

8 CAR NO.: YM-93-001
DATE: 10/6/92
SHEET: 1 OF 1
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

1 Controlling Document AP-3.5Q, Revision 1	2 Related Report No. YMP-92-24
---	-----------------------------------

3 Responsible Organization YMPO	4 Discussed With C. Gertz/W. Wilson/B. Cruz
------------------------------------	--

5 Requirement:
AP-3.5Q, Revision 1, Paragraph 4.0, Step 4 (A), requires that if a change is scientific, design or quality-affecting, that a technical evaluation be performed by the affected participant (i.e., YMPO or other participant) per the participants' procedure or the requirements identified within Attachment 4 of AP-3.5Q.

6 Adverse Condition:
Contrary to the above, during Audit YMP-92-24, no objective evidence could be produced to show that the technical evaluations had been performed for the following Field Change Requests (FCRs):

FCR 92/089	FCR 92/092
FCR 92/058	FCR 92/061

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 Working days from issuance
---	---	--

12 Required Actions: Remedial Extent of Deficiency Preclude Recurrence Root Cause Determination

13 Recommended Actions:
Identify the remedial actions to be taken to correct the deficiencies note in Block 6. Investigate the program processes, activities or documentation to determine the extent and depth of similar conditions as noted in Block 6. Identify these deficiencies and provide the measures to correct them.

7 Initiator Sam H. Horton <i>Sam Horton</i> Date <u>10/06/92</u>	14 Issuance Approved by: QADD <i>[Signature]</i> Date <u>10/8/92</u>
---	---

15 Response Accepted QAR Date	16 Response Accepted QADD Date
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

17 Amended Response Accepted QAR <i>Sam Horton</i> Date <u>12/30/92</u>	18 Amended Response Accepted QADD <i>[Signature]</i> Date <u>1/5/93</u>
--	--

19 Corrective Actions Verified QAR Date	20 Closure Approved by: QADD Date
--	--------------------------------------

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

CAR NO. YM-93-001
DATE: _____
PAGE: _____ OF _____
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR # YM-93-001

A. Remedial Action

For remedial purposes, an FCR Processing Checklist, as shown in Attachment 1, has been implemented to assure that the technical evaluation required in Step 4 of AP-3-5Q is included, if appropriate.

B. Investigative Action

Investigation was made of all FCRs processed since July, 1991, and then reviewing those that involved scientific, design or quality affecting changes. From this review, 15 FCRs lacking objective evidence of technical evaluation were identified. These 15 FCRs which include the four mentioned in this CAR are annotated in a copy of the Change Request Status Log Report, and is shown in Attachment 2. An analysis of these FCRs showed that: technical evaluations were performed for FCRs 92/089 and 92/092; technical evaluations were not found in the files for FCRs 92/058 and 92/061; and all of the FCRs annotated in Attachment 2 were of the urgent or minor nature and a technical evaluation was not applicable. Procedure AP-3.5Q was interpreted as not requiring a technical evaluation for FCRs of a minor or urgent nature.

C Root Cause Determination

Not Applicable

D. Corrective Action to Preclude Recurrence

The FCR Processing Checklist shown in Attachment 1 was implemented as an internal CM desk top instructions. To bring the FCRs noted in Attachment 2 into compliance, copies of technical evaluations were requested of the Participants to complete the files.

Itc dtj 11/9/92 - EDD:BDH-829

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

CAR NO. YM-93-001
DATE: _____
PAGE: _____ OF _____
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

CAR # YMP-93-001 (continuation)

2. Assigned Responsibility

Action	Individual	Completion
1.A	B. G. Cruz	Completed October 7, 1992
1.B	B. G. Cruz	Completed October 23, 1992
1.C	N/A	
1.D	B. G. Cruz	Completed October 30, 1992

3. Response Approved: Winifred A. Wilson Date: 11-4-92
W. A. Wilson

FCR Processing Checklist (REV. 0)

Processor _____ FCR # _____

Date received: _____

All document impacts are listed _____

Document to be changed is properly categorized _____

Correct Processing Priority _____

Correct Change impacts _____

If applicable, correct Cost/Schedule impacts _____

Correct TPO/DD signature obtained _____

Originators procedural training concurrence _____

If applicable, prepare and distribute CEs _____

If applicable, receipt of all CEs obtained _____

Correlation between section II and section III _____

Complete and/or disposition FCR _____

CDIA prepared _____

CM Document Receipt Acknowledgment complete and signed _____

Submit original package to DRC for distribution _____

Receive original package with DRCs concurrence for site file _____

Copy package for Las Vegas file _____

Complete FCR Transmittal form, initial and date _____

If applicable, attach FCCB meeting minutes and/or CEs
to FCR package for site file _____

Submit form to B. Cruz for initials,
receive form from B. Cruz and send to distribution _____

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

CAR NO. YM-93-001
DATE: _____
PAGE: _____ OF _____
CA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

Attachment 2
CAR YM-93-001

Annotated Change Request Status Log Report	32 pages
Copies of Related Technical Evaluations	36 pages

These documents are available for review in the YMP CM offices. Please make arrangements to see these by contacting B. G. Cruz at 794-1851



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

WBS 1.2.11
QA: N/A

DEC 11 1992

Carl P. Gertz, Project Manager, YMP, NV

EVALUATION OF RESPONSES TO CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CAR) YM-93-001, YM-93-002, AND YM-93-003 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION (YMQAD) AUDIT YMP-92-24

Reference: Ltr, Spence to Gertz, dtd 11/20/92

This letter supersedes the referenced letter.

The YMQAD staff has evaluated the responses to CARs YM-93-001 through YM-93-003. The responses have been determined to be unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR YM-93-001

- B. First line - Need to explain why investigations were made since July 1991 (i.e., explain the significance of that date).

Second sentence - Since there were only 15 Field Change Requests (FCR) identified, they should be specifically identified with a status matrix of each and this should be included in this CAR.

Next to last sentence - Need to clarify the difference between urgent and minor. Urgent FCRs do not necessarily waive the requirement for a technical evaluation.

- D. This section should state that the FCRs identified in Section B above will be technically evaluated. Copies of these evaluations shall be completed and maintained with the corresponding FCR. An impact of those implemented FCRs that had no technical evaluation will also be performed. If impacts exist, the extent and disposition of these impacts shall be identified in this CAR.

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR YM-93-002

- A. At the end of this paragraph, a statement should be made to provide an attachment to this CAR to show this action has been or will be completed.
- D. Fourth line, delete the phrase starting with the word "submits . . . baseline," and insert, "notifies the CCB in writing of document acceptance, (d) CCB updates the technical baseline. Also, in the old (d), delete the phrase "After CCB approval" and make the rest of the statement item (e).

DEC 11 1992

Note: The CCB should not be accepting technical documents. Its function is to update the technical baseline after acceptance by the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project Engineering & Development Division.

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR YM-93-003

- D. (b) A statement should be added to take into consideration what to do in case the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management does not agree.

The next to last sentence should be clarified as to where will schedule information be officially shown (proceduralized).

Amended responses are required to be submitted to this office within ten working days of the date of this letter. Send the original of your responses to Nita J. Brogan, Science Applications International Corporation, Las Vegas, Nevada. If an extension to the due date is necessary, it must be requested in writing, with appropriate justification, prior to that date.

If you have any questions, please contact either Robert B. Constable at 794-7945 or Sam H. Horton at 794-7399.



Richard E. Spence, Director
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMQAD:RBC-1326

Enclosures:

1. CAR YM-93-001
2. CAR YM-93-002
3. CAR YM-93-003

cc w/encls:

- K. R. Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC
- S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
- S. D. Johnson, PSDO/REECO, Las Vegas, NV
- J. W. Estella, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
- J. H. Rusk, MACTEC, Las Vegas, NV
- A. V. Gil, YMP, NV
- B. J. Verna, YMP, NV

cc w/o encls:

- J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
- N. J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
- S. H. Horton, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV

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

CAR NO. YMP-93-001
DATE: 12/15/92
PAGE: 1 OF 4
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR # YMP-93-001

A. Remedial Action

For remedial purposes, an FCR Processing Checklist, as shown in Attachment 1, has been implemented to assure that the technical evaluation required in Step 4 of AP-3-5Q is included, if appropriate.

B. Investigative Action

Investigation was made of all FCRs processed since July, 1991, and then reviewing those FCRs that involved scientific, design or quality affecting change. Investigation began in July 1991 because the FCCB was established on that date. From this review, 15 FCRs lacking objective evidence of technical evaluation were identified. Attachment 2 is a listing of the referenced 15 FCRs (technical evaluations are in the respective FCR files). These 15 FCRs which include the four mentioned in this CAR are shown in Attachment 2. An analysis of these FCRs showed that technical evaluations were performed for FCR 92/089 and 92/092; technical evaluation were not found in the files for FCRs 92/058 and 92/061; and all of the FCRs annotated in Attachment 2 now have technical evaluations. It was determined that there was no adverse impact from evaluations being performed subsequent to approval of referenced FCRs.

C. Root Cause Determination

Not Applicable

D. Corrective Action to Preclude Recurrence

The FCR Processing Checklist shown in Attachment 1 of this CAR will be implemented as an internal CM desk top instruction to preclude recurrence of conditions that led to CAR YM-93-001. To bring the FCRs noted in Attachment 2 into compliance, copies of technical evaluations were requested of and received from the Participants to complete the files.

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

CAR NO. YMP-93-001
DATE: 12/15/92
PAGE: 2 OF 4
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

Attachment 2

Listed below are the 15 Field Change Requests referenced in Section 1.0 (B) of CAR
YMP-93-001

FCR No.

91/082	92/061
91/088	92/063
92/043	92/072
92/046	92/073
92/053	92/080
92/058	92/089
92/059	92/092
92/060	

Technical evaluation for each FCR listed is available in respective file.

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

CAR NO. YM-93-001
DATE: 12/15/92
PAGE: 3 OF 4
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

CAR # YM-93-001 (continuation)

2. Assigned Responsibility

Action	Individual	Completion
1.A	B. G. Cruz	Completed October 7, 1992
1.B	B. G. Cruz	Completed October 23, 1992
1.C	N/A	
1.D	B. G. Cruz	Completed October 30, 1992

3. Response Approved: Winfred A. Wilson Date: 12/15/92
W. A. Wilson

FCR Processing Checklist (REV. 1)

Processor _____	FCR: _____
Date received: _____	
All document impacts are listed	_____
Document to be changed is properly categorized	_____
Correct Processing Priority	_____
Correct Change impacts	_____
If applicable, correct Cost/Schedule impacts	_____
Correct TPO/DD signature obtained	_____
Originators procedural training compliance	_____
If applicable, prepare and distribute CEs	_____
If applicable, receipt of all CEs obtained	_____
Correlation between section II and section III	_____
Complete and/or disposition FCR	_____
CDIA prepared	_____
CM Document Receipt Acknowledgment complete and signed	_____
Submit original FCR with CDIA to DRC for distribution	_____
Receive original FCR with DRCs concurrence for site file	_____
Copy FCR for Las Vegas file	_____
Complete FCR disposition Letter, initial and date	_____
If applicable, attach FCCB meeting minutes and/or CEs to FCR package for site file	_____
Submit info copy of FCR to CM analyst, recheck for completeness and create folder for Las Vegas file.	_____
Submit disposition to B. Cruz for initials, receive disposition from B. Cruz and send to distribution	_____

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

8 CAR NO.: YM-93-002
DATE: 10/6/92
SHEET: 1 OF 1
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

1 Controlling Document AP-5.24Q, Revision 0		2 Related Report No. YMP-92-24	
3 Responsible Organization YMPO		4 Discussed With C. Gertz/W. Wilson/B. Cruz	
5 Requirement: AP-5.24Q, Revision 0, Paragraph 4.0, Step 5 and Step 5 Note, require the submittal of as-built drawings and specifications from the affected participants to the CCB for incorporation into the technical baseline. In addition, the CCB is required to notify the Architect Engineer (A/E) of the CCB's acceptance of as-built drawings and specifications, and the CCB Secretary is required to send as-builts to the LRC and the DCC.			
6 Adverse Condition: Contrary to the above, during Audit YMP-92-24, the following deficient conditions were identified: 1. Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifications were submitted to the CCB but were not shown in the technical baseline as being as-built. 2. The CCB did not notify the A/E of the CCB's acceptance of Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifications. 3. The Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifications were not sent to the LRC (however, investigation has provided evidence that they were sent to the DCC).			
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 Working 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 type="checkbox"/> Root Cause Determination			
13 Recommended Actions: Identify the remedial actions to be taken to correct the deficiencies note in Block 6. Investigate the program processes, activities or documentation to determine the extent and depth of similar conditions as noted in Block 6. Identify these deficiencies and provide the measures to correct them.			
7 Initiator Sam H. Borton <i>Sam Borton</i> Date <u>10/06/92</u>		14 Issuance Approved by: QADD <i>R.C. Lopez</i> Date <u>10/8/92</u>	
15 Response Accepted QAR _____ Date _____		16 Response Accepted QADD _____ Date _____	
17 Amended Response Accepted QAR <i>Sam Borton</i> Date <u>10/30/92</u>		18 Amended Response Accepted QADD <i>R.C. Lopez</i> Date <u>1/5/93</u>	
19 Corrective Actions Verified QAR _____ Date _____		20 Closure Approved by: QADD _____ Date _____	

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

CAR NO. YM-93-002

DATE: _____

PAGE: _____ OF _____
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR # YM-93-002

A. Remedial Action

Remedial action will be taken regarding the Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifications. The CCB will handle these documents in accordance with AP-5.24Q, Preparation and Submittal of As-Built Drawings and Specifications, and notify the A/E of the CCB's acceptance of these documents.

B. Investigative Action

Investigation has shown that this has been a one-time occurrence. The Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifications were submitted to the CCB in June, 1992. Since there were no applicable CM procedures regarding these documents, they were sent to the FCCB. The FCCB submitted the documents to the DRC as additional records to the corresponding Job Package. Two procedures apply to as-built drawing: AP-5.24Q and AP-6.22. The AP-6.22Q, Job Package and Completion Records, requires as-built drawings and specifications to be submitted by the A/E to the DRC. AP-5.24Q is applicable to Participants and A/Es, and requires as-built drawings and specifications to be submitted to the CCB. These two procedures are not identified as CM procedures.

C. Root Cause Determination

Not Applicable

Site dtd 11/9/92 - EDD:BDH-829

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

CAR NO. YM-93-002
DATE: _____
PAGE: _____ OF _____
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

CAR # YM-93-002 (continuation)

D. Corrective Action to Preclude Recurrence

AP-5.24Q will be revised to replace the current text in Step 5 and the Step 5 Note with text that includes the following sequence: (a) A/E and Participants submit as-built documents to EDD/YMPO for acceptance; (b) EDD/YMPO notifies the A/E of document acceptance or rejection; (c) after EDD/YMPO acceptance of documents, A/E submits a change request for incorporation of documents into the technical baseline; (d) After CCB approval, A/E submits documents to DRC for distribution and the LRC for records turnover. Also, the current text in Step 9, AP-6.22Q will be revised to cite AP-5.24Q as the link to as-built drawings rather than AP-6.22Q.

2. Assigned Responsibility

Action	Individual	Completion
1.A	B. G. Cruz	By December 11, 1992
1.B	B. G. Cruz	Completed October 30, 1992
1.C	N/A	
1.D	J. T. Gardiner	DAR will be submitted by December 18, 1992

3. Response Approved: W. B. Simecka Date: 11/6/92
W. B. Simecka



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

WBS 1.2.11
QA: N/A

DEC 11 1992

Carl P. Gertz, Project Manager, YMP, NV

EVALUATION OF RESPONSES TO CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUESTS (CAR) YM-93-001, YM-93-002, AND YM-93-003 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION (YMQAD) AUDIT YMP-92-24

Reference: Ltr, Spence to Gertz, dtd 11/20/92

This letter supersedes the referenced letter.

The YMQAD staff has evaluated the responses to CARs YM-93-001 through YM-93-003. The responses have been determined to be unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR YM-93-001

- B. First line - Need to explain why investigations were made since July 1991 (i.e., explain the significance of that date).

Second sentence - Since there were only 15 Field Change Requests (FCR) identified, they should be specifically identified with a status matrix of each and this should be included in this CAR.

Next to last sentence - Need to clarify the difference between urgent and minor. Urgent FCRs do not necessarily waive the requirement for a technical evaluation.

- D. This section should state that the FCRs identified in Section B above will be technically evaluated. Copies of these evaluations shall be completed and maintained with the corresponding FCR. An impact of those implemented FCRs that had no technical evaluation will also be performed. If impacts exist, the extent and disposition of these impacts shall be identified in this CAR.

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR YM-93-002

- A. At the end of this paragraph, a statement should be made to provide an attachment to this CAR to show this action has been or will be completed.
- D. Fourth line, delete the phrase starting with the word "submits . . . baseline," and insert, "notifies the CCB in writing of document acceptance, (d) CCB updates the technical baseline. Also, in the old (d), delete the phrase "After CCB approval" and make the rest of the statement item (e).

DEC 11 1992

Note: The CCB should not be accepting technical documents. Its function is to update the technical baseline after acceptance by the Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project Engineering & Development Division.

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR YM-93-003

- D. (b) A statement should be added to take into consideration what to do in case the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management does not agree.

The next to last sentence should be clarified as to where will schedule information be officially shown (proceduralized).

Amended responses are required to be submitted to this office within ten working days of the date of this letter. Send the original of your responses to Nita J. Brogan, Science Applications International Corporation, Las Vegas, Nevada. If an extension to the due date is necessary, it must be requested in writing, with appropriate justification, prior to that date.

If you have any questions, please contact either Robert B. Constable at 794-7945 or Sam H. Horton at 794-7399.



Richard E. Spence, Director
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMQAD:RBC-1326

Enclosures:

1. CAR YM-93-001
2. CAR YM-93-002
3. CAR YM-93-003

cc w/encls:

- K. R. Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC
- S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
- S. D. Johnson, PSDO/RECo, Las Vegas, NV
- J. W. Estella, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
- J. H. Rusk, MACTEC, Las Vegas, NV
- A. V. Gil, YMP, NV
- B. J. Verna, YMP, NV

cc w/o encls:

- J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
- ~~Nita J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV~~
- S. H. Horton, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV

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

CAR NO. YMP-93-002
DATE: 12/15/92
PAGE: 1 OF 3
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

1.0 Corrective Action Response for CAR # YMP-93-002

A. Remedial Action

Remedial action will be taken regarding the Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifications. The CCB will handle these documents in accordance with AP-5.24Q, Preparation and Submittal of As-Built Drawings and Specifications, and notify the A/E of the CCB's acceptance of these documents. The CCB Register has been updated to reflect the current status of these As-Built Drawings and the A/E has been notified of the status. Aperture card range for these As-Built Drawings in the LRC is 9000008954 through 9000008961.

B. Investigative Action

Investigation has shown that this was a one-time occurrence. The Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifications were submitted to the CCB in June, 1992. Since there were no applicable CM procedures regarding these documents, they were sent to the FCCB. The FCCB submitted the documents to DRC as additional records to the corresponding Job Package. Two procedures apply to as-built drawing: AP-5.24Q and AP-6.22. The AP-6.22Q, Job Package and Completion Records, requires as-built drawings and specifications to be submitted by the A/E to the DRC. AP-5.24Q is applicable to Participants and A/Es, and requires as-built drawings and specifications to be submitted to the CCB. These two procedures are not currently identified as CM procedures.

C. Root Cause Determination

Not Applicable

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

CAR NO. YMP-93-002
DATE: 12/15/92
PAGE: 2 OF 3
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

CAR # YM-93-002 (continuation)

D. Corrective Action to Preclude Recurrence

CAR# YM-93-002 was written on 10/06/92 identifying deficient conditions relating to Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifications. The controlling document identified as AP-5.24Q Revision 0. Subsequently, AP-5.24Q Revision 1 was issued with an effective date of 11/16/92. This revision (Rev 1) removed the requirements for:

- a) **CCB acceptance of as-built drawings and specifications**
- b) **CCB notification to the A/E of acceptance of as-builts**
- c) **CCB forwarding as-built to LRC and DRC**

Thus no remedial action is necessary.

However, in order to identify how the Configuration Management Technical Baseline is updated, two additional steps, (8 & 9) will be added to Section 5.0 of AP-5.24Q, in which the Configuration Management Organization (CMO), is notified in writing of the document acceptance, and the Technical Baseline updated.

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

CAR NO. YMP-93-002
DATE: 12/15/92
PAGE: 3 OF 3
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

CAR #YM-93-002 (continuation)

AP-5.24Q will be submitted for revision to include the following revised text:

"A/E	Step 8	Notify CM Change Control Board Secretary, in writing, of document acceptance
CMO	Step 9	Modify Project Technical Baseline, by updating Change Request Status Report and CCB Register"
Action	Individual	Completion
1.A	B. G. Cruz	By December 11, 1992
1.B	B. G. Cruz	Completed October 30, 1992
1.C	N.A.	
1.D	J. T. Gardiner	DAR will be submitted by December 18, 1992.

3. Response Approved:

W.B. Simecka Date: 12/15/92
W. B. Simecka