

Department of Energy

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office P.O. Box 98608 Las Vegas, NV 89193-8608

QA: L

SEP 1 5 1994

L. Dale Foust Technical Project Officer for Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project TRW Environmental Safety Systems, Inc. Bank of America Center, Suite P-110 101 Convention Center Drive Las Vegas, NV 89109

EVALUATION OF RESPONSE TO CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) YM-94-072 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION (YMQAD) AUDIT YMP-94-01 OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTOR (SCPB: N/A)

The YMQAD staff has evaluated the response to CAR YM-94-072. The response has been determined to be satisfactory. Verification of completion of the corrective action will be performed after the effective date provided. Any extension to this date must be requested in writing, with appropriate justification, prior to the date. Please send a copy of extension requests to Deborah Sult, YMQAD/QATSS, 101 Convention Center Drive, Suite 640, Las Vegas, Nevada 89109.

If you have any questions, please contact either Robert B. Constable at 794-7945 or Richard E. Powe at 794-7749.

louda

YMOAD: RBC-5064

Richard E. Spence, Acting Director Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

Enclosure: CAR YM-94-072

cc w/encl: T. A. Wood, HQ (RW-14) FORS R. L. Johnson, NRC, Washington, DC S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV R. L. Robertson, M&O/TRW, Vienna, VA R. P. Ruth, M&O/TRW, Las Vegas, NV Richard Jiu, M&O/Duke, Las Vegas, NV

cc w/o encl: W. L. Belke, NRC, Las Vegas, NV D. G. Sult, YMQAD/QATSS, Las Vegas, NV

200051 YMP-5 9409200382 940915 PDR WASTE PDR WM-11

		CRIGINAL THIS IS A RED STAN
OF RADIOACT U.S. DEI	FICE OF CIVILIAN IVE WASTE MANAGEMI PARTMENT OF ENERGY ASHINGTON, D.C.	40
CORREC	TIVE ACTION REQUES	T
1 Controlling Document OCRWM QARD, DOE/RW-0333P, Revision 01	1	2 Related Report No. YMP-94-01
3 Responsible Organization	4 Discussed With	
5 Requirement:	J. Pye/S. Bonabien	
 QARD, Section 3.2.1.B states: "De approved on a timely basis and to the design work to be carried out consistent basis for making design verification, and evaluating design 	in a correct manner that pro	ovides a
6 Adverse Condition:		<u></u>
A lack of documentation exists describ and selecting data.	ing the rationale for making	assumptions
Discussion:		
Examples of the lack of documentation a	are:	
Structure Steel Sets Analysis, BABEABO	00-01717-0200-0002, Revision	00:
- No rationale for selection of a compage I-1.	nservative "rock raveling" v	alue in Attachment I,
 No rationale for the selection of Attachment 1, Table 3. 	conservative "Rock Condition:	s" as presented in
- No rationale for selecting conserv (0.37) as presented in Attachment	ative seismic mean peak hori: II, Table 1.	zontal acceleration
Adverse to Quality exist? Yes Nox Y	oes a stop work condition exist? es No_x_; If Yes - Attach cop Yes, Check One: □A □B	
 ¹¹ Required Actions: X Remedial X Extent 12 Recommended Actions: Revise the Structural Steel Sets Analy selection of appropriate conservative 	sis to document the rational	
7 Initiator William R. Sublette MR Aub	-3-94 QADD	Date 89.94
15 Response Accepted	12/94 16 Response Accept QADD 4 DU	
17 Amended Response Accepted	18 Amended Respon	
QAR Date	QADD	Date
19 Corrective Actions Verified	20 Closure Approved	i by:
OAR Date	CADD	Date

•

.

	01-			
OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON, D.C.	8 CAR NO.: <u>YH-94-072</u> PAGE: <u>2</u> OF <u>2</u> QA			
CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CONTINUATION PAGE)				
5 Requirements (continued)				
 QARD, Section 3.2.2G states: "Design documents shall be sufficiently detailed as to purpose, method, assumptions, design input, reference units such that a person technically qualified in the subject can understand the documents and verify their adequacy without recourse originator." (Also see M&O QAP-3-9, Revision 3, Attachment I, Parag 10) 	to the graph			
• • •				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

~~~~

•

.

.

ĉ

## **RESPONSE TO CAR NO. YM-94-072**

#### Remedial Action:

Structural Steel Sets Analysis, BABEA0000-01717-0200-00002, Revision 00 will be revised and checked to ensure explanations supporting the engineering judgment used in the preparation of the analysis are present.

No deficiency exists for Item 3. The ESFDR contains the 0.37g as a requirement for ESF Design.

#### Extent of Deficiency:

The investigative actions performed by J. Pye and S. Bonabian and the conclusions reached regarding Structural Steel Sets Analysis for response to CAR YM-94-072 are as follows:

- Item 1: Engineering judgment was used to reduce the in situ bulk density from 137 lbs/cu ft to 120 lbs/cu ft as a result of the effects of disturbance during tunneling which is a reasonable assumption and consistent with typical published ranges of bulk densities. This was explained in the analysis as a 12% reduction in bulk density.
- Item 2: A load factor was identified from a standard classical reference "Rock Tunneling with Steel Supports", 1946 by Proctor and White, published by Commercial Shearing Inc., by the Geotechnical LDE as indicated in Attachment 1 of the Structural Steel Sets Analysis BABEAB000-01717-0200-00002.

The load factor of 0.25B with the corresponding description, "Massive moderately jointed" with a propensity for loads to change erratically from point to point were selected on the basis of engineering judgment and field inspection of trench NRT-1, taking into account the geomechanical properties of the Pre-Rainier Mesa material, method of excavation, excavation rate and support installation capabilities of the TBM. Also taken into consideration was the fact that the referenced material is based on 50 year old tunneling technology and practice and as such is not representative of the rapid excavation and support technology employed by the YMP TBM system. The Structural Steel Sets Analysis BABEAB000-01717-0200-00002, Attachment I has been revised to include an explanation based on the above.

Item 3: The use of 0.37g is consistent with the ESFDR seismic design criteria. No deficiency exists.

. . .

# Page 2 of 2

Review indicates that the deficiency does not extend to the 2C Early Release products.

### Corrective Action to Preclude Recurrence:

Assumptions and data used as input to design analyses based on engineering judgment will be explained in sufficient detail to clarify any subjective assessments, to the extent that a person technically qualified in the subject can understand the documents and verify their adequacy without recourse to the originator.

A documented training session will be conducted for all subsurface designers that are or will be involved in the preparation of analysis stressing the importance of providing the basis for assumptions and selecting data. Refer to QAP-3-9 Attachment I Item 7 requirements.

Responsible Individual: Date of Completion: Bob Saunders 9/30/94

. .

Alden M. Segrest, Manager MGDS Development

<u> 8/31/94</u> Data

 $\mathbf{x}$ 

|      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | CAR NO. 11-094-049     |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
|      | OFFICE OF CIVILIAN<br>RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAG<br>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENE<br>WASHINGTON, D.C.                                                                                                                                                                   |                        |
|      | CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (Con                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | tinuation Page)        |
| 1. A | MENDED CORRECTIVE ACTION RESPONSE F                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | OR CAR NO. YM-94049    |
| Α.   | <u>REMEDIAL ACTION:</u> The Quality Assurance Management Information Reports generated under revision 3 of QMP-16.03, prior to the modification discussed under Corrective Actions to Prevent Recurrence, will be amended as necessary. The amendments will:  |                        |
|      | o Discuss any differences in approach used in th<br>specified in the modified QMP-16.03.                                                                                                                                                                      |                        |
|      | <ul> <li>o Clearly identify any trends (using the criteria in during those time periods, and</li> <li>o State what actions are being taken in regards t compliance with the procedure as modified).</li> </ul>                                                |                        |
| B.   | <b>EXTENT OF DEFICIENCY:</b> There have been three quarterly Quality Assurance Management Information Reports produced under QMP-16.03, R3 prior to modification                                                                                              |                        |
| С.   | ROOT CAUSE DETERMINATION: Not required.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                        |
| D.   | <u>CORRECTIVE ACTION TO PREVENT RECURRENCE</u> : YMP-USGS QMP-<br>16.03, R3 will be modified to include qualitative criteria for trend identification and to<br>change the definition of "condition adverse to quality" to become insistent with the<br>QARD. |                        |
| 2.   | For each action above, identify the name of the individual assigned responsil<br>for completion of the action and the anticipated (or actual, if complete) comp<br>date.                                                                                      |                        |
|      | 1.A. N.R. Karas<br>1.D. N.R. Karas                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 10/15/94<br>10/03/94   |
| 3.   | RESPONSE APPROVED:<br>Thomas H. Chaney<br>YMP-USGS Qaulity Assurance Manager                                                                                                                                                                                  | <u>8/25/77</u><br>Date |
|      | Lange 1mg                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 8/2-3/4-<br>Date       |