



Department of Energy

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

JUN 28 1995

Wesley E. Barnes, Project Manager, YMSCO, NV
ATTN: John W. Estella, M&O, Las Vegas, NV

ISSUANCE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) YM-95-048 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION'S (YMQAD) AUDIT YM-ARP-95-13 (SCP: N/A)

Enclosed is CAR YM-95-048 generated as a result of YMQAD Audit YM-ARP-95-13.

Please identify the corrective action to be taken and implemented to correct the deficiency. A CAR Continuation Sheet and instructions for completion have been provided. Send the original of your response to Deborah G. Sult, YMQAD/QATSS, 101 Convention Center Drive, Suite 640, Las Vegas, Nevada 89109. Response to the CAR is due 20 working days from the date of this letter. Any extension to the due date must be requested in writing, with appropriate justification, prior to the due date.

If you have any questions, please contact either Robert B. Constable at 794-7945 or Frank J. Kratzinger at 794-7163.

Richard E. Spence, Director
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMQAD:RBC-3755

Enclosures:

1. CAR YM-95-048
2. CAR Continuation Sheet
and Instructions

cc w/encl 1:

~~J. G. Spraul~~, NRC, Washington, DC
S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
T. L. Badredine, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
S. C. Stonebraker, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
D. S. White, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
D. E. Donovan, M&O, Las Vegas, NV

cc w/o encls:

W. L. Belke, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
D. G. Sult, YMQAD/QATSS, Las Vegas, NV

NH03 1/1
102.7
WM-11

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

8. CAR NO. YM-95-048
PAGE 1 OF 1
QA

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

1. CONTROLLING DOCUMENT: YAP 2.6Q		2. RELATED REPORT NO.: YM-ARP-95-13	
3. RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATION: YMSCO		4. DISCUSSED WITH: Bob Barton	

5. REQUIREMENT:
Para 5.1.1a, states in part, "The AM/Director assigns a preparer to develop Participant Planning Sheets (PPS) to include a Statement of Work, Determination of Quality Affecting work and application of QA Control (Grading); the identification of technical and QA requirements for work to be quality affecting..."

6. ADVERSE CONDITION:
Contrary to the above, PPSs issued to Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory (LBL) identify Quality Affecting scopes of work with QARD applicability. However, LBL is not on the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Qualified Suppliers List (QSL) and the intent is to perform work under memorandum of agreements (MOAs) using USGS, LANL, etc., approved QA Program/Procedures. Since the PPSs are issued directly to LBL, there is no documented objective evidence that directs LBL to perform QA affecting work under the existing MOAs for specific work scopes. Deliverables from LBL do not identify the QA Program used to perform work.

EXAMPLE PPSs REVIEWED:

- 1.2.3.11.2 LBL Surface-Based Geophysical Testing
- 1.2.3.3.1.2.8 LBL Fluid Flow in Unsaturated Zone Fractured Rock

LBL Letter of April 28, 1995 for deliverables for WBS 1.2.3.11.2, Milestones OBB02C and OBB03C, states LBL followed appropriate QA Procedures. However, the program/procedures followed is not discernible.

9. Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, Check One: <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C <input type="checkbox"/> D <input type="checkbox"/> E	10. Does a stop work condition exist? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No; If Yes, Attach copy of SWO If Yes, Check One: <input type="checkbox"/> A <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> C	13. Response Due Date: 20 working days from issuance
--	--	---

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

12. Recommended Actions:
1. The project office should initiate documentation that provides LBL direction regarding the applicable QA Program/Procedures to be followed until LBL's QA Program is approved.
2. Determine the QA Program used for deliverables received to date and evaluate any impact on the deliverable.

7. Initiator Walter R. Coutier <i>Walter R. Coutier</i> 4/26/95	14. Issuance Approved by QADD <i>[Signature]</i> Date 6-28-95
15. Response Accepted QAR _____ Date _____	16. Response Accepted QADD _____ Date _____
17. Amended Response Accepted QAR _____ Date _____	18. Amended Response Accepted QADD _____ Date _____
19. Corrective Actions Verified QAR _____ Date _____	20. Closure Approved by QADD _____ Date _____