



Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

QA: L

FEB 07 1997

L. D. Foust, Technical Project Officer
for Yucca Mountain Site
Characterization Project
TRW Environmental Safety Systems, Inc.
1180 Town Center Drive, M/S 423
Las Vegas, NV 89134

EVALUATION OF RESPONSE TO AND CLOSURE OF DEFICIENCY REPORT (DR)
YM-97-D-017 RESULTING FROM OFFICE OF QUALITY ASSURANCE (OQA) SUPPLIER
AUDIT OQA-SA-97-005 OF WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORPORATION

The OQA staff has evaluated the response to DR YM-97-D-017 and determined the results to be satisfactory. Verification at this time is not required, as stated in the enclosed DR. As a result, the DR is considered closed.

If you have any questions, please contact either James Blaylock at (702) 794-1420 or Richard L. Maudlin at (702) 794-1302.

Donald G. Horton, Director
Office of Quality Assurance

OQA:JB-0826

Enclosure:
DR YM-97-D-017

cc w/encl:
T. A. Wood, DOE/HQ (RW-55) FORS
J. O. Thoma, NRC, Washington, DC
S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
B. R. Justice, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
R. A. Morgan, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
Records Processing Center = "8"

cc w/o encl:
W. L. Belke, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
R. L. Maudlin, OQA/QATSS, Las Vegas, NV
D. G. Sult, OQA/QATSS, Las Vegas, NV
R. W. Clark, DOE/OQA, Las Vegas, NV

9702190236 970207
PDR WASTE
NM-11 PDR

190043

Recip: NMSS/HLUR

102.7

1/1
NH33
NM-11



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

8 Performance Report
 Deficiency Report

NO. YM-97-D017

PAGE 1 OF 24
QA: L

PERFORMANCE/DEFICIENCY REPORT

1 Controlling Document

Westinghouse Electric Corp., Energy Services Div. QAM M65

2 Related Report No.

OQA-97-SA-005

3 Responsible Organization:

M&O/ Westinghouse Electric Corp.

4 Discussed With:

Greg Parker, John Janson, Gail Abend

5 Requirement/Measurement Criteria:

Westinghouse QAM, Section 13.01, paragraph 4.2.1 states in part: "Functional department personnel who discover nonconforming product shall identify the condition by tagging or marking the product. In addition, the nonconformance shall be brought to the attention of the...shop supervisor and documented in the applicable nonconformance system."

6 Description of Condition:

A review of Westinghouse purchase order LAE 587, dated January 10, 1996, revealed that equipment 5700A, SN 4930003 and 5725A, SN 5105013 was sent to Fluke Manufacturing in Everett, Washington, however, the equipment was actually calibrated by FLW in Costa Mesa, California, who was not a qualified Westinghouse supplier. No corrective action document was generated to document this nonconforming condition.

7 Initiator

D. Small

Date 12/06/96

9 Is condition an isolated occurrence?

Yes No Unknown; Must be Yes if PR

10 Recommended Action: (Not required for PR)

- A. Determine and document the impact on the quality of the service due to the use of an unqualified supplier.
- B. Investigate the cause as to why a nonconformance was not generated as required by the QA program. Evaluate the extent of the condition to determine if this is a recurring condition.
- C. Investigate and document why and how the condition occurred. Identify and document what action(s) have been or will be taken to prevent this condition from recurring.

11 QA Review:

QAR

D. Small

Date 12/06/96

12 Response Due Date

20 working days from issuance

13 Affected Organization QA Manager Issuance Approval: (QAR for PR)

Printed Name Donald G. Horton

Signature

James Blaylock

Date 12/19/96

22 Corrective Action Verified

QAR

N/A

Date

23 Closure Approved by (N/A for PR)

[Signature]

Date 1/2/97

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

PR/DR NO. YM-97-D017

PAGE 2 OF 84

QA: L

PERFORMANCE/DEFICIENCY REPORT RESPONSE

14 Remedial Actions:

The determination was made that no adverse impacts on quality existed. This was based upon a review of the quality audit performed and calibration print out readings provided with the Calibration Certificate. Vendor audit results also identified that calibration activities complied with QA program requirements approved by WEC/ESD prior to the ownership change.

15 Extent of Condition: (Not required for PR)

The extent of this condition limited to this one procurement vendor and is considered a on time occurrence.

16 Root Cause Determination: (Not required for PR)

Required Yes No

Interviews with Greg Parker of Westinghouse ESD identified that the root cause was determined to be Code 2Ad.

17 Action to Preclude Recurrence: (Not required for PR)

Required Yes No

See Continuation page 3 of 3. response is directed to respond to Block 10, Recommended Action.

18 Corrective Action Completion Due Date:

01/23/97

19 Response by: David Van Bibber

Initial
 Amended

Date 01/23/97

Phone (702)295-5073

20 Response Accepted

QAR

Date

01/29/97

21 Response Accepted (N/A for PR):

LAOQAM

Date

2/7/97

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

8 Performance Report
 Deficiency Report

NO. YM-97-D017
PAGE 3 OF 24 DS
QA: L

PR/DR CONTINUATION PAGE

YM-97-D017, Block 17 (continuation)

A. Determine and document the impact on the quality of the service due to the use of an unqualified supplier.

Response: The determination was made that no adverse impacts on quality existed. This was based upon a review of the quality audit performed and calibration print out readings provided with the Calibration Certificate. Vendor audit results also identified that calibration activities complied with QA program requirements approved by WEC/ESD prior to the ownership change.

B. Investigate the cause as to why a nonconformance was not generated as required by the QA program. Evaluate the extent of the condition to determine if this is a recurring condition.

Response: The QA manager determined, that even though the QA program requires that a nonconformance report is required for this type of condition, that performing a vendor audit to evaluate the extent of the issue would be more effective in resolving the issue. In addition, it was determined that the audit report would serve as documentation to resolve this issue. In that this approach was in violation of Westinghouse QA program requirements, the QA manager has determined that, should this type of condition recur, a nonconformance report will be issued, as required.

However, during the course of the audit of FLW, it was noticed that the QA program being implemented, appeared to be the same program as was implemented by Fluke. In this, it was noticed that FLW used the same procedures, personnel, equipment, and software. Therefore, no concern over the validity of test and calibration results was identified. Also, see attached memorandum from Greg Parker to David Van Bibber, dated January 15, 1997.

C. Investigate and document why and how the condition occurred. Identify and document what action(s) have been or will be taken to prevent this condition from recurring.

Response: Calibrated equipment was received from the service vendor prior to any notification to WEC/ESD indicating a change in ownership, company name, or management. The vendor name change was identified during receipt inspection document reviews. An audit was then scheduled and performed prior to placing the equipment into service, to determine the potential impacts due to this change. Based upon vendor audit results, determination was made that equipment in question was not impacted. The reasons for this determination was that the program, including procedures, methods, personnel, equipment, software, etc., had not changed.

This was considered to be a one time event.



^{B-3}
Page 4 of 4 85 112
DR YM-97-D-017

Westinghouse Electric Corporation

7341 Lincoln Way
Garden Grove, CA 92641
Tel: (714) 372-5600
Fax: (714) 372-5666

January 15, 1997

To: David Van Bibber CRWMS M&O

From: Greg Parker *GP*

Re: FLW Quality Audit

Dear David;

During the quality audit of FLW's facility in Costa Mesa, CA, it was determined that FLW was using the same people, equipment, procedures and software that had been used by the John Fluke Mfg. CO prior to being sold. Therefor, it was determined that there was no significant adverse effect on the quality of the calibrations performed for Westinghouse.

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

8 Performance Report
 Deficiency Report

NO. YM-97-D-017

PAGE ____ OF ____

QA: L

PR/DR CONTINUATION PAGE

EVALUATION AND CLOSURE OF DR YM-97-D-017

The response as provided does not require any actions to be taken. Future audit of Westinghouse Electric Corp. will verify compliance in this area, as it relates to the noted condition.

As a result, no further action is required in resolution to this DR. This DR is considered closed.



R.L. Maudlin, QAR

01/22/97

Date