

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION
QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE REPORT
OF
THE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTOR
SURVEILLANCE YMP-SR-94-001
CONDUCTED IN LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
OCTOBER 11 THROUGH 14, 1993

ACTIVITIES SURVEILLED:

CLOSEOUT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS
IDENTIFIED IN THE DESIGN CONTROL IMPROVEMENT PLAN, REVISION 1,
DATED SEPTEMBER 15, 1993, OF THE ITEMS IDENTIFIED BY THE
MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTOR AS CLOSED

Prepared By: Stephen R. Maslar Date: 10/14/93
Stephen R. Maslar
Surveillance Team Leader
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

Approved By: Donald G. Horton Date: 10/15/93
Donald G. Horton
Director
Office of Quality Assurance

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This surveillance was conducted to verify the closeout and implementation of the action items identified by the Management and Operating (M&O) contractor in their Design Control Improvement Plan, Revision 1, dated September 15, 1993. Based on the review of the objective evidence provided by the M&O, it was determined that they have indeed closed out the action items as described in the status reports transmitted to-date to the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Quality Assurance (QA) on a weekly basis. No deficiencies were identified during the review. Observations were made which are documented in Section 5.0 of this report, and recommendations for each observation are included in Section 6.0. All M&O personnel contacted were very helpful and well-prepared to answer all questions that were generated.

2.0 SCOPE

Surveillance 94-001 was conducted at the M&O facilities in Las Vegas, Nevada on October 11 through 14, 1993, to verify closeout and implementation of the action items identified by the M&O in their Design Control Improvement Plan, Revision 1, dated September 15, 1993. The surveillance reviewed objective evidence and supporting documentation to verify the implementation and closeout of each action item that was identified as complete and closed by the M&O as of this surveillance.

3.0 SURVEILLANCE TEAM

Stephen R. Maslar, Surveillance Team Leader, Quality Assurance Technical Support Services

4.0 PERSONNEL CONTACTED

Peter Hastings, Monitored Geological Disposal System (MGDS) Determination of Importance Evaluation Manager, M&O

Thomas C. Geer, MGDS Systems Engineering Manager, M&O

Philip G. Jones, MGDS Development Staff, M&O

Ronald P. Ruth, Quality Assurance Construction Manager, M&O (Temporarily assigned to MGDS Development Manager)

J. W. Keifer, MGDS Subsurface Design Engineer, M&O

5.0 SURVEILLANCE RESULTS

During this surveillance, each action item shown on the latest schedule as being completed, was reviewed in conjunction with the Progress Update Sheet for the item. The review consisted of an evaluation of the objective evidence supporting closure of the action item. Progress Update Sheets had not been issued for action items G-3, L-4, and J-4 which were shown to be closed on the latest status schedule. New sheets were prepared and provided per letter LV.SED.PSH.10/93-054 to show the action taken in closing out the item. These were reviewed and found to be acceptable. Progress Update Sheets for action items C-3, L-1, and M-2 were in need of revision based on the review of the supporting documentation and discussions held during the surveillance. These revised Progress Update Sheets were also provided by letter LV.SED.PSH.10/93-054. A review of these revised sheets show them to be complete and acceptable to close out the action item.

Action items that required the preparation and issuance of a new procedure, were reviewed to determine if the procedure had been implemented. Procedures NLP-3-13 through NLP-3-17 were generated based on identified action items. Procedures NLP-3-13, NLP-3-16, and NLP-3-17 have objective evidence available to show that they have been implemented. The surveillance verified this implementation. The remaining new procedures have not yet been implemented since work has not progressed to the point when these procedures would be applicable. The observations and recommendations contained herein are all related to the review and updating of drawings to make corrections found during the M&O's review of the drawings to identify any needed changes.

5.1 DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED

1. Internal memo LV.MG.RMS.8/93-126, dated 8/3/93
2. Working Group Charter, Revision 0, approved on 9/27/93
3. Letter LV.SED.PSH.9/93-041, dated 9/15/93
4. Internal memo LV.SES.BGC.8/9/93-729, dated 8/13/93
5. Internal Working Procedures - New
 - NLP-3-13, dated 8/4/93
 - NLP-3-14, dated 9/24/93
 - NLP-3-15, dated 7/30/93
 - NLP-3-16, dated 9/20/93
 - NLP-3-17, dated 10/1/93
6. RSN-BFD-001, Revision 3, Final Revised RSN-BFD, dated 10/8/93

7. Internal memo from Mike McGrath to Paul Pimentel, dated 8/3/93
8. Field Change Request (FCR)-93/251, dated 8/12/93 and Change Request CR-93/405, dated 8/12/93
9. Internal memo LV.ESSD.RDC.8/93-243, dated 8/12/93
10. Draft version of ACP-03-93
11. Internal memo LV.ESSD.MDC.8/93-250, dated 8/13/93
12. Internal memo LV.ESSB.EFF.8/93-188, dated 8/13/93
13. Letter LV.SED.PSH.10/93-054, dated 10/12/93
14. Internal memo LV.ESED.MDC.9/93-285, dated 9/28/93
15. Internal memo LV.SER.MSR.8/93-556, dated 8/12/93
16. Document B00000000-01717-2200-00044, Revision 01
17. Document BABA00000-01717-2200-00075, Revision 00
18. Document BAB000000-01717-2200-00081, Revision 00
19. Document B00000000-01717-2200-00034, Revision 00
20. Internal memo LV.MG.RMS.8/93-133, dated 8/13/93
21. Internal memo LV.MG.PAP.9/93-039, dated 9/29/93
22. Informal memo from B. G. Cruz to Bob Sandifer
23. Letter LV.SES.BGC.9/93-788, dated 9/28/93
24. Drawings

YMP-025-1-MING-MG142, Revision 2
YMP-025-1-MING-MG147, Revisions 1 and 2
YMP-025-1-MING-MG121, Revision 1
YMP-025-1-MING-MG122, Revision 1
YMP-025-1-MING-MG123, Revision 2
YMP-025-1-MING-MG124, Revision 2

25. Memo LV.ESSB.EFF.8/93-188, dated 8/13/93
26. FCR-93/503, approved 9/10/93
27. FCR (Unknown) not issued - Lost in the system

5.2 OBSERVATIONS

Observation 1

During a review of drawings against Job Package 92-20, per Action Item C-1, for needed changes regarding hand written information included on the controlled drawing and not picked up during CAD generation, internal memo LV.ESSB.EFF.8/93-188, dated August 13, 1993, was issued. The memo identified 24 drawings that should be updated to incorporate information differences between the electronic copies and the baselined drawings. There is no mechanism for tracking these changes other than the FCR posting process.

Observation 2

Based on the review conducted per Action Item C-1, internal memo LV.ESSB.EFF.8/93-188, dated August 13, 1993, was issued to define exactly what was to be changed on each of six drawings. FCR-93/503, approved on September 19, 1993, changed four drawings. The FCR stated that "TBV" and "Unverified" are to be reinstated on these drawings. Three of these drawings were changed as stated on the FCR; however, drawing YMP-025-1-MING-MG121 was not changed per the FCR, since "Unverified" was not added to the drawing. It should be noted that the internal memo did not require "Unverified" on this specific drawing. The change was correctly incorporated per the memo and the FCR is misleading.

Observation 3

In conjunction with the actions described in Observation 2, another FCR was generated to change two additional drawings. A draft copy of the FCR was available but a final approved copy could not be located. Apparently it was lost. The draft copy of the FCR stated that drawings YMP-025-1-MING-MG142, Revision 2 and YMP-025-1-MING-MG147, Revision 1 be changed by reinstating the notes to the drawings. The internal memo LV.ESSB.EFF.8/93-188, dated 8/13/93, described specific changes required for each drawing. The description in the FCR does not contain the same level of detail as found in the memo and the FCR does not refer to the memo.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Reference Observation 1

Since no mechanism exists for tracking required changes to drawings, there is the potential for the changes not to be made as needed. Consideration should be given to implementation of a tracking system to ensure these and other similar changes are ultimately incorporated into the electronic copy (CAD) of the drawings.

6.2 Reference Observations 2 and 3

Since only two FCRs were reviewed during this surveillance, and they were found to be either misleading or lacking sufficient detail to allow an outside reviewer to verify proper changes to drawings, it is recommended that the detail provided on FCRs be made explicit or refer to documents that contain specific information to properly incorporate drawing changes. This may be a generic problem within the M&O's design change process which should be thoroughly evaluated by the M&O as soon as possible.

6.3 Reference Observation 3

The FCR that was lost has been reinstated and placed in the system to obtain a final review and approval. It is recommended that the M&O provide assurance that this was an isolated occurrence. A review of the tracking system from inception of an FCR through final closeout should be undertaken.

7.0 ATTACHMENTS

None