

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 2 2 1993

Carl P. Gertz, Project Manager, YMP, NV

VERIFICATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND CLOSURE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) YM-93-001 AND CAR YM-93-002 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN OUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION (YMOAD) AUDIT YMP-92-24

The YMQAD staff has verified the corrective actions to CARs YM-93-001 and YM-93-002 and determined the results to be satisfactory. As a result, the CARs are considered closed.

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

YMOAD:RBC-2123

Enclosure:

CARs YM-93-001 and YM-93-002

CC w/encl: 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

290030

Add: K.R. Hooks 11



OFFICE OF CIVILIAN

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

HADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT SHEET: 1 OF 1				
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			QA	
WASHINGTON, D.C.				
CORRECTIVI	E ACTION REQUE	ST		
1 Controlling Document		2 Related	Report No.	
AP-3.5Q, Revision 1		YMP-92	?-24	
3 Responsible Organization	4 Discussed With	<u> </u>		
YMPO .	C. Gertz/W. Wilson	n/B. Cruz		
5 Requirement:	<u> </u>			
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-92-2 show that the technical evaluations had been Requests (FCRs):	24, no objective evident performed for the formet formet for the formet formet for the formet formet formet for the formet formet formet formet for the formet formet formet formet for the formet formet formet formet formet formet for the formet formet formet formet formet formet for the formet formet formet formet for the formet formet for the formet formet for the formet formet for the formet formet formet for the formet formet for the formet formet formet for the formet formet formet formet for the formet formet formet formet for the formet formet formet formet formet formet for the formet for the formet fo	ence could ollowing F	be produced to ield Change	
FCR 92/089 FCR 92/092 FCR 92/058 FCR 92/061				
⁹ Does a significant condition 10 Does a	stop work condition exist?	, 	11 Response Due Date:	
¥	No x ; if Yes - Attach co		· '	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Circle One: A B C D		from issuance	
12 Required Actions: X Remedia! X Extent of Defi	ciency 🔯 Preclude Re	act IFFe DOG	Root Cause Determination	
12 Required Actions: Remedial Extent of Deficiency Preclude Recurrence Root Cause Determination				
7 Initiator	14 Issuance Appro	yed by:		
Sam H. Horton Sam Horton Date 10/06/		Long	Date 10/8/92	
15 Response Accepted	16 Response Acce	pred	-	
QAR Date	QADD		Date	
17 Amended Response Accepted	18 Amended Resp	onse Accep	1/2/00	
QAR Sum Horlon Date 139	92 QADD	MAM	A Date // S/	
19 Corrective Actions Verified OAR Saw Horton Date 1/9/	20 Closure Approv	Expy:	1/1/nx - Date //2// 93	
7.00.00			ENCLOSURE REV. 08/91	

CAR NO	YM-93-001
DATE:	
PAGE:	of
	QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page) 32:

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.

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

E 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: Wisher Wilson Date: 11-4-92

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	

OH RAD	YH-93-001
DATE:	
PAGE:	of
	QA

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 OA: N/A

DEC 1 1 1997

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 waiver 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).

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

R.C. Spince

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

CAR NO) <u> </u>	₽-93	-001
		15/92	
PAGE:	1	OF_	4
_		Q.	

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.

Lts detal 12/21/92 - EDD: BDH-1552

CAR NO.	YMP-93-001			
DATE:				
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

FCK 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		

ECR No.

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

CAR NO.	YH-93-001
	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: Willow 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 dispositon from B. Cruz and send to distribution		

CAR NO.	YM	-93	3-001
DATE:	1/19	7/9	3
PAGE:		_OF_	1
		QA	

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

QA VERIFICATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION by Sam Sorton

A sample of recent FCRs were reviewed to determine that a desk-top checklist was being used to ensure that technical evaluations are being performed. FCRs examined (FCRs 93/003; 93/036 and 93/085) had completed checklist in the files to ensure evaluations were performed.

In addition, a sample of 9 of the 15 FCRs dentified as not having technical evaluations were also reviewed. It was verified that each of the 9 FCRs now have technical evaluations in their respective FCR file. The FCR files reviewed were: 91/082; 92/043; 92/058; 92/061; 92/063; 92/072; 92/073; 92/089; and 92/092.

Based on the ventication of the actions taken, corrective action for this CAR is considered acceptable and adequate.

Saw Hoxton gav. 19, 1993



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

	RTMENT OF ENERGY HINGTON, D.C.	QA
CORRECTIV	/E ACTION REQUEST	
1 Controlling Document AP-5.24Q, Revision 0	2 Related YMP-92-	
3 Responsible Organization YMP0	4 Discussed With C. Gertz/W. Wilson/B. Cruz	
5 Requirement: AP-5.24Q, Revision 0, Paragraph 4.0, Step drawings and specifications from the affectinto the technical baseline. In addition, Engineer (A/E) of the CCB's acceptance of CCB Secretary is required to send as-built.	ted participants to the CCB for it the CCB is required to notify the	ncorporation e Architect
 6 Adverse Condition: Contrary to the above, during Audit YMP-92-identified: 1. Trench 14 as-built drawings and specifishown in the technical baseline as being 2. The CCB did not notify the A/E of the cand specifications. 3. The Trench 14 as-built drawings and specification has provided evidence the 	ications were submitted to the CC ng as-built. CCB's acceptance of Trench 14 as-	B but were not
•	a stop work condition exist? No x ; If Yes - Attach copy of SWO	11 Response Due Date: 20 Working days
If Yes, Circle One: A B C If Yes,	, Circle One: A B C D	from issuance
12 Required Actions: Recommended Actions: Identify the remedial actions to be taken in Investigate the program processes, activities and depth of similar conditions as noted in provide the measures to correct them.	to correct the deficiencies note ies or documentation to determine	the extent
Sam H. Horton Samu storton Date 10/6 15 Response Accepted	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Date 10/8/92
QAR Date	QADD	 Date
17 Amended Response Accepted	18 Amended Response Accepte	Date ed
OAR Saw Horton Date 120/	92 OADD KE Some	Date //5/97
19 Corrective Actions Verified OAR Saw Horton Date //9/	20 Closure Approved by	Date //2//93

CAR NO	YM-93-002
DATE:	
PAGE:	or
	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 occurence. 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

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

E CAR NO	TH-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:	Wh Simedy_	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 1 1 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 (YMOAD) 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 waiver 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).

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

R.C. Spince

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 Navitational Edic Las Vegas, NV

S. H. Horton, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV

ON RAD	Y	MP-9	3-002	
DATE:_				
PAGE:	1	OF	3	_
		a di		_

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 asbuilt 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

St. dtl 12/21/92 - EDD: BDH-1552

CAR NO.	Y)	1 P−93	-002	
DATE:				
PAGE:	2	_OF_	3	_
		QĀ		

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.

ON RAD	YM	P-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
СМО	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: Imuch Date: 12/15/92

CAR NO.	793-002
DATE:	1-15-93
PAGE:	/_OF_2
	QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

VERIFICATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION TO THE AMENDED RESPONSE
BY QUALITY ASSURANCE (Sam Aforton)

The Latest version of the CCB Register was checked against the below Listed Trench 14 design documents to reinfy their inclusion into the Register and the revisions noted were

accurate.	SPECIFICATIONS	RSN BRAWINGS
	0 2120 - Trev · 2	HN-025-MVT- C1.2- Rev. 2
	02110-Rev. 2	HN-025-MVT-C2.1-Rev. 1
	02 200-Rev. 1	HN-025-MVT-C4.1 - Rev. 1
	02222-Rev. 2	HN-025-MVT-T7-1- Rev.1
-	02223-Rev. 2	JS-025-CST-C1.1-Rev.1
	02224-Rev.2	
	02230-Rev.2	

The above noted and specs. were included in the CCB Register, and all revision numbers were accurate.

A copy of the Document Action Request (DAR) that requested changes to AP-5.24 Q, (to accommodate Section D of the CAR) was reviewed to determine its verbage reflected the verbage as stated in the CAR. It was aletermined the correct verbage is included in the DAR. In addition, it was verified that subitems a, b, & C of Section D of the CAR were removed from the procedure as noted by the CAR. (Rev. 1 of) sh 1/15/43

CAR NO. 93-002

DATE: 1-18-93

PAGE: 2 OF 2

QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Continuation Page)

REFERENCE DAR NO. 709, dtd. 12/9/92 for proposed revision.

In addition, it was verified the Change Control Board (CCB) did notify the Architect/Engineer (A/E) of CCBs acceptance of the Trench 14 Design Documents. The A/E was also notified of the status of these documents. Reference, Letter from L.D. Foust, Manager Nevacla Site, M fo to 5 Horton, dtd. 1/18/93, WBS. - 1.2.9.3.1

Sam Hoston Jan 18, 1993