



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

OCT 13 1995

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

EVALUATION OF RESPONSES TO DEFICIENCY REPORTS (DR) YMQAD-95-D011
AND YMQAD-95-D013 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE
DIVISION'S (YMQAD) AUDIT YM-ARP-95-19 OF THE CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE
WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTOR
(SCPb: N/A)

The YMQAD staff has evaluated the responses to DRs YMQAD-95-D011
and YMQAD-95-D013. The responses have been determined to be
satisfactory. Verification of completion of the remedial actions
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 John F. Pelletier at 794-7538.

Richard E. Spence

Richard E. Spence, Director
Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMQAD:RBC-183

Enclosures:
CARs YMQAD-95-D011 and
YMQAD-95-D013

200014

YMP-5

9510240161 951013
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDR

102.7
WM-11
N403.1

Foust

-2-

OCT 13 1995

~~cc w/encl:~~

J. G. Spraul, NRC, Washington, DC
S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
T. A. Wood, HQ (RW-14) FORS
R. L. Strickler, M&O, Vienna, VA
Richard Jiu, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
R. P. Ruth, M&O, Las Vegas, NV

cc w/o encl:

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

ORIGINAL
THIS IS A RED STAMP

THIS IS A RED STAMP

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

8 ☐ Performance Report
☒ Deficiency Report

NO. YMQAD-95-D-011

PAGE 1 OF 23 WJR
QA: L 10/2/95

PERFORMANCE/DEFICIENCY REPORT

1 Controlling Document:
YAP-SIII.2Q, Revision 0

2 Related Report No.
YM-ARP-95-19

3 Responsible Organization:
M&O

4 Discussed With:
Alden Segrest

5 Requirement/Measurement Criteria:

Section 5.4.1, b) states, "To request or retrieve data from the YMP TDB, the Affected Organization:
b) submits a written request for information to the appropriate YMP TDB Administrator."

6 Description of Condition:

Contrary to the above requirement, there is no objective evidence that TDIF #303124 was retrieved from the TDB in accordance with the above referenced procedure. Specifically, there is no objective evidence that the M&O submitted a written request to the YMP TDB Administrator.

7 Initiator *John F. Pelletier* 8/31/95
John Pelletier Date 08/31/95

9 QA Review *John F. Pelletier* 8/31/95
QAR John Pelletier Date 08/31/95

10 Response Due Date
20 days after issuance

11 QA Issuance Approval
John F. Pelletier for
QAR (PRI/ADQAM (DR)) Date 9.5.95

12 Remedial Actions:

TDIF 303124, Rev. 1 will be requested through the YAP-SIII.2Q system. When the report is received through the YAP-SIII.2Q procedure, a comparison will be made with the Scoping Analysis to ensure that we used the correct data.

13 Remedial Action Response By: *[Signature]*
October 4, 1995
Date

14 Remedial Action Due Date
October 31, 1995
Date

15 Remedial Action Response Acceptance
QAR Date

16 PR Verification/Closure
QAR Date

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

8
DR NO: YmQAD-95-D-011
PAGE 2 OF 3
QA: L 10/3/95

DEFICIENCY REPORT

17 Recommended Actions:

- 1) Investigate to determine the extent of deficiency identified in Block 6.
- 2) Evaluate the impact of obtaining technical data without complying with YAP-SIII.2Q.
- 3) Provide a corrective action plan to ensure future acquisitions of data from the TDB are in accordance with YAP-SIII.2Q.

18 Investigative Actions:

SEE CONTINUATION PAGE 3 OF 3 JJB
10-4-95

19 Root Cause Determination:

20 Action to Preclude Recurrence:

SEE CONTINUATION PAGE 3 OF 3 JJB
10-4-95

<p>21 Response by: <i>[Signature]</i> Date <i>10/4/95</i></p>	<p>22 Corrective Action Completion Due Date: October 21, 1995</p>
<p>23 Response Accepted: QAR <i>[Signature]</i> Date <i>10/5/95</i></p>	<p>24 Response Accepted: AOQAM <i>[Signature]</i> Date <i>10-12-95</i></p>
<p>25 Amended Response Accepted: QAR _____ Date _____</p>	<p>26 Amended Response Accepted: AOQAM _____ Date _____</p>
<p>27 Corrective Actions Verified: QAR _____ Date _____</p>	<p>28 Closure Approved by: AOQAM _____ Date _____</p>

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

8 ☐ Performance Report
☒ Deficiency Report

NO. YMRAD-95-D-011

PAGE 3 OF 3

QA: L

PR/DR CONTINUATION PAGE

18. Investigative Actions:

The condition identified in Block 6 was not applicable to TDIF 303124. Data was needed to support the design support analysis for the TS North Ramp Ground Support Scoping Analysis. The needed data did not exist in the TDB at that time. In accordance with the established system for obtaining data from the laboratories, SNL was requested to provide a bounding analysis for thermal and seismic loading. This request was documented in a letter from R. Sandifer to L. Shepherd, dated October 25, 1993 (LV.ESSB.SB. 10/93-531).

The data used in the analysis was received from SNL under a cover letter from L. Shepherd to A. Segrest, dated January 18, 1994 (LV.ESSB.JHP.1/94-517). An M&O review of the information was made, some deficiencies to be corrected were noted, and these were transmitted to SNL.

YAP-SIII.2Q did not exist at the time. It became effective March 7, 1994, superseding AP-5.2Q. M&O QAP-3-12 existed, but it was not applicable to the Laboratories at that time. To acquire the needed data in a timely manner, a direct request was made to SNL.

20. Action to Preclude Recurrence:

A review will be made of current "Q" analyses to determine which TDIFs are used as inputs. Then a request will be made, through the YAP-SIII.2Q process, to obtain the inputs, and compare with the data in the analyses to ensure correctness (for those TDIFs available from the TDB). Additionally, the following primary TDIF users will complete documented training in YAP-SIII.2Q (if not already accomplished):

John Pye
Mary Woods
Bill Kennedy
Saeed Bonabian
Rick Nolting
Kal Bhattacharyya
Mal Taylor

These actions will be completed by October 21, 1995.

ORIGINAL

THIS IS A RED STAMP

THIS IS A RED STAMP
OFFICE OF CIVILIAN
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

8 ☐ Performance Report
☒ Deficiency Report

NO. YM-QAD-95-D-013

PAGE 1 OF 23

QA: L 10/3/95

PERFORMANCE/DEFICIENCY REPORT

1 Controlling Document:
QARD, Revision 4

2 Related Report No.
YM-ARP-95-19

3 Responsible Organization:
M&O

4 Discussed With:
John Pye

5 Requirement/Measurement Criteria:

Sect 3.2.1, A. states, "Design inputs should be identified and documented, and their selection reviewed and approved by those responsible for the design."

6 Description of Condition:

Data utilized as design input for the "TS North Ramp Ground Support Scoping Analysis" was not appropriately identified and documented as to its status (data utilized was "PRELIMINARY" and contained errors). Additionally, there is no objective evidence that the selection of design input from revision 1 of "Design Support Analyses: North Ramp Design Package 2C" was technically reviewed.

7 Initiator: *Richard D. Whelan for Frank Tsai*
Frank Tsai Date 08/31/95

9 QA Review: *John F. Pelletier*
QAR John Pelletier Date 08/31/95

10 Response Due Date
20 days after issuance

11 QA Issuance Approval
QAR (PR)/AOQAM (DR) *for* Date 9.5.95

12 Remedial Actions:

The TS North Ramp Ground Support Scoping Analysis has been combined into the ESF Ground Support Design Analysis, Rev. 00, which was approved on September 6, 1995. Objective evidence that the design input was technically reviewed exists. See the attached letter copy from L. Shepherd to YMSCO, stating that the document received technical, management, and QA review under the OCRWM-approved SNL QA program.

13 Remedial Action Response By: *[Signature]*
October 4, 1995
Date

14 Remedial Action Due Date
Completed.
Date

15 Remedial Action Response Acceptance
QAR
Date

16 PR Verification/Closure
QAR
Date

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

8
DR NO. YMQAD-95-0-013
PAGE 2 OF 23
QA: L

DEFICIENCY REPORT

17 Recommended Actions:

- 1) Investigate to determine the extent of deficiency identified in Block 6.
- 2) Determine the impact of using the PRELIMINARY, unreviewed data that was selected for design input.
- 3) Provide a corrective action plan to ensure technical reviews for the selection of data for design input is adequate.

18 Investigative Actions:

SEE CONTINUATION PAGE

19 Root Cause Determination:

20 Action to Preclude Recurrence:

SEE CONTINUATION PAGE

21 Response by: <i>[Signature]</i> Date <i>10/4/95</i>	22 Corrective Action Completion Due Date: October 4, 1995
23 Response Accepted QAR <i>John F. Bell</i> Date <i>10/5/95</i>	24 Response Accepted AOQAM <i>[Signature]</i> Date <i>10/12/95</i>
25 Amended Response Accepted QAR _____ Date _____	26 Amended Response Accepted AOQAM _____ Date _____
27 Corrective Actions Verified QAR _____ Date _____	28 Closure Approved by: AOQAM _____ Date _____

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

8 ☐ Performance Report
☒ Deficiency Report
NO. YUCAD-95-D-013
PAGE 3 OF 3
QA: L

PR/DR CONTINUATION PAGE

18. Investigative Actions:

The SNL Design Support Analyses: North Ramp Design Package 2C, Rev. 1 (TDIF 302273) was used only in the TS North Ramp Ground Support Scoping Analysis. The Scoping Analysis was corrected, consistent with the SNL analysis. An evaluation of the consequences of initially using preliminary data concluded that there was no impact on the results of the analysis.

20. Action to Preclude Recurrence:

(1) QAP-3-9 was revised February 5, 1995 to require identification of unqualified data (section 5.2.3 L).

(2) The checklist for design analyses includes the following questions: Are the design inputs correctly selected? Are the design inputs appropriate for use in the design (e.g., any assumptions, constraints, bounds, or limits of the input reflected in the design)? Do TBDs and/or TBVs match logs? Is unqualified data, assumptions based on preliminary data, or data requiring requalification noted "TBV" or for "REFERENCE ONLY"?

Corrective Action Completion Due: October 4, 1995