



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

APR 16 1997

QA: L

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

VERIFICATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND CLOSURE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION
REQUEST (CAR) YM-96-C-008 RESULTING FROM OFFICE OF QUALITY ASSURANCE
(OQA) AUDIT YM-ARP-96-C-008 OF THE CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTOR

The OQA staff has verified the corrective action to CAR YM-96-C-008 and determined the
results to be satisfactory. As a result, the CAR is considered closed.

If you have any questions, please contact either James Blaylock at (702) 794-1420 or
Franklin B. Smith at (702) 794-1329.

Donald G. Horton, Director
Office of Quality Assurance

OQA:JB-1379

Enclosure:
CAR YM-96-C-008

- cc w/encl:
- L. H. Barrett, DOE/HQ (RW-1) FORS
- 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

- cc w/o encl:
- W. L. Belke, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
- F. B. Smith, OQA/QATSS, Las Vegas, NV
- D. G. Sult, OQA/QATSS, Las Vegas, NV
- R. W. Clark, DOE/OQA, Las Vegas, NV
- W. E. Barnes, DOE/YMSCO, Las Vegas, NV

NH33
WM-11
1027

210007

Recip: nmss/HLUR

9704210080 970416
PDR WASTE
WM-11

PDR



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

8 CAR NO. YM-96-C-008
PAGE 1 OF 2
QA: L

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST

1 Controlling Document: YLP-2.1Q-YMSCO, Rev. 1, ICN 2 2 Related Report No.: Audit No. YM-ARP-96-08

3 Responsible Organization: CRWMS M&O 4 Discussed With: N/A

5 Requirement:
5.3.2 The Employee:
5.3.2c) completes Required Self-Study Assignment, or attends scheduled formal instruction, briefing, or OJT and completes associated documentation, as applicable, by the assigned completion date;
5.3.2d) transmits completed Required Self-Study Assignment to Training Department if completed by the effective date . . . ; or
5.3.2e) transmits completed Required Self-Study Assignment to Supervisor if completed after the effective date . . .
5.3.3 The Supervisor:
5.3.3c) transmits completed Required Self-Study Assignment to Training Officer.
5.3.4 The Training Officer:
files documentation indicating completion of training in training files.

6 Description of Condition:
Contrary to the above requirements, as of July 19, 1996, the records of training for the individuals on the attached lists do not include evidence of completion of Required Self-Study Assignment forms for the documents indicated. These individuals were identified as requiring maintenance of proficiency in the indicated procedures as identified on their respective Training Assignment form (YMP-027-R7).

This condition was identified during the conduct of the investigative actions required as a result of DR YMQAD-96-D047. The M&O Training Department reviewed all notifications sent out as of January 1, 1996, to determine if the condition identified in that DR existed in other areas. Of the 153 individuals who were delinquent, 108 (over 70 percent) were CRWMS M&O employees.

In a letter dated May 31, 1996, the CRWMS M&O was asked to (1) take immediate action to ensure the CRWMS M&O employees identified completed required training maintenance; (2) ensure each supervisor determined the impact to quality for each employee's work performance and submitted required documentation to the CRWMS M&O Training Department; (3) confirm in writing by June 21, 1996, that these requirements had been met; and (4) describe in that written response actions being taken to preclude recurrence of this situation. The CRWMS M&O has not completed the required actions.

7 Initiator: J. Russell Dyer Date 07/24/96 9. Does a stop work condition exist? Yes ___ No ; If Yes, Attach copy of SWO If Yes, Check One: A B C D

10. Recommended Actions:
1. For those individuals identified on the corrective action, complete post-effective date Required Self-Study Assignments for the procedures indicated. As an alternative, revise the individual's Training Assignment to delete the requirement to maintain proficiency in the applicable document if they no longer work to the affected procedure.
2. Determine the extent of this condition and provide an analysis of its impact.
3. Identify and document the root cause of this condition.
4. Indicate steps that have or will be taken to preclude the condition's recurrence in the future.

11 QA Review: OAR *Stan* by *Polo Smith* Date 7/25/96

12 Response Due Date: 20 working days from issuance

13 Affected Organization QA Manager Issuance Approval:
Printed Name Richard E. Spence Signature *R. E. Spence* Date 7/30/96

22 Corrective Actions Verified: OAR *Franklin B. Smith* Date 4/9/97

23 Closure Approved by: *Franklin B. Smith* Date 4/15/97

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

CAR NO. YM-96-C-008
PAGE 1 OF 1
QA: L

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST RESPONSE

14 Remedial Actions:

Evaluate the extent of the deficiency by identifying individuals that are delinquent in training completion, complete the required training, or alternatively identify deletion of training requirements for those individuals. This action to be completed by 9/13/96.

Complete impact analysis for affect on work accomplished by October 11, 1996

15 Extent of Condition and Impact:

16 Root Cause Determination prepared in accordance with AP-16.4Q is attached.

17 Action to Preclude Recurrence:

18 Corrective Action Completion Due Date:

10/11/96

19 Response by:

Initial

Amended

Date 8.28.96

Phon (702) 295-1804

20 Response Accepted

OAR

ST [Signature]

Date

9/6/96

21 Response Accepted

AOQAM

[Signature]

Date

9.6.96.

WMS M&O TRAINING DATABASE (TRID)
OUTSTANDING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS (SUBJECT CODE)

Report Generated: 19-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: QAP 1.1 *Organization* QA: Y REV/PCN: 3/0

<u>Employee Name</u>	<u>Assign Dt</u>	<u>Due Dt</u>	<u>Manager Name</u>
C.T. STATTON	03/01/96	03/31/96	L.D. FOUST
- D.W. GWYN	03/01/96	03/31/96	P.S. HASTINGS
- F. AFSHAR	03/01/96	03/31/96	R.D. SNELL
- H.A. BENTON	03/01/96	03/31/96	A.M. SEGREST
[REDACTED]	03/01/96	03/31/96	W.E. BARNES
- N.E. BIGGAR	03/01/96	03/31/96	C.T. STATTON
- P.S. HASTINGS	03/01/96	03/31/96	T.C. GEER
- R.G. MUSICK JR	03/01/96	03/31/96	K.J. LOBO
R.W. NELSON	03/01/96	03/31/96	R.L. ANDREWS
- S.E. LE ROY	03/01/96	03/31/96	J.L. YOUNKER
- T.W. DOERING	03/01/96	03/31/96	D. STAHL
[REDACTED]	03/01/96	03/31/96	W.E. BARNES

Report Generated: 19-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: QAP 5.1

QA: Y

REV/PCN: 7/0

Quality Assurance Program Procedures

<u>Employee Name</u>	<u>Assign Dt</u>	<u>Due Dt</u>	<u>Manager Name</u>
- C.D. POWERS	03/01/96	03/31/96	G.A. FASANO
- C.T. STATTON	03/01/96	03/31/96	L.D. FOUST
- G.K. BEALL	03/01/96	03/31/96	T.C. GEER
- J.M. WALKER	03/01/96	03/31/96	M.A. RODGERS
- K.J. LOBO	03/01/96	03/31/96	C.F. METZGER
- M.G. HANNIGAN	03/01/96	03/31/96	D.B. ABEL
- M.S. RINDSKOPF	03/01/96	03/31/96	T.C. GEER
- M.W. PENDLETON	03/01/96	03/31/96	J.L. YOUNKER
- N.J. CHAPPELL	03/01/96	03/31/96	K.M. CLINE
- R.C. MCDONALD	03/01/96	03/31/96	T.E. TOUCHSTONE
- R.N. DATTA	03/01/96	03/31/96	D.S. KESSEL
- R.P. MORISSETTE	03/01/96	03/31/96	P.S. HASTINGS
- R.W. NELSON	03/01/96	03/31/96	R.L. ANDREWS
- S.E. LE ROY	03/01/96	03/31/96	J.L. YOUNKER
- T.A. GRANT	03/01/96	03/31/96	R.E. SMITH
- T.F. MYETTE	03/01/96	03/31/96	G.K. BEALL
- T.W. DOERING	03/01/96	03/31/96	D. STAHL
- W.D. SCHUTT	03/01/96	03/31/96	L.D. FOUST

WMS M&O TRAINING DATABASE (TRID)
 OUTSTANDING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS (BY SUBJECT CODE)

Report Generated: 19-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: QAP 6.2
(MUNICIPAL REVIEW)

QA: Y

REV/PCN: 3/0

Employee Name	Assign Dt	Due Dt	Manager Name
- B.R. HURST	03/01/96	03/31/96	C.F. METZGER
- C.D. POWERS	03/01/96	03/31/96	G.A. FASANO
- D.T. HOXIE	03/01/96	03/31/96	C.T. STATTON
- F. AFSHAR	03/01/96	03/31/96	R.D. SNELL
- F.J. SCHELLING	03/01/96	03/31/96	D.T. HOXIE
- G.N. KIMURA	02/02/96	02/09/96	J.L. NAAF
- H. EBNER	03/01/96	03/31/96	J.W. FRANK
- H.E. ADKINS	03/01/96	03/31/96	C.F. METZGER
- J.K. MCCOY	03/01/96	03/31/96	H.A. BENTON
- J.L. ROBERTSON	03/01/96	03/31/96	T.C. GEER
- J.M. WALKER	03/01/96	03/31/96	M.A. RODGERS
- J.W. FRANK	03/01/96	03/31/96	C.F. METZGER
- K.J. LOBO	03/01/96	03/31/96	C.F. METZGER
- M.G. HANNIGAN	03/01/96	03/31/96	D.B. ABEL
- M.S. RINDSKOPF	03/01/96	03/31/96	T.C. GEER
- M.W. PENDLETON	03/01/96	03/31/96	J.L. YOUNKER
- N.W. HODGSON	03/01/96	03/31/96	W.D. SCHUTT
- R.C. MCDONALD	03/01/96	03/31/96	T.E. TOUCHSTONE
- R.P. MORISSETTE	03/01/96	03/31/96	P.S. HASTINGS
- R.W. NELSON	03/01/96	03/31/96	R.L. ANDREWS
- T.M. MESSETT	03/01/96	03/31/96	H.E. ADKINS
- T.W. DOERING	03/01/96	03/31/96	D. STAHL
- W.C. SMITH	03/01/96	03/31/96	T.L. MUELLER

MMS M&O TRAINING DATABASE (TRID)
OUTSTANDING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS (SUBJECT CODE)

Report Generated: 19-jul-1996

Page 2

Subject Code: QAP 6.2

QA: Y

REV/PCN: 3/0

Employee Name

Assign Dt

Due Dt

Manager Name

W.D. SCHUTT

03/01/96

03/31/96

L.D. FOUST

5

WMS M&O TRAINING DATABASE (RID)
OUTSTANDING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS (BY SUBJECT CODE)

Report Generated: 2-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: QAP 18.2 *Internal Audit Prq* · QA: Y REV/PCN: 7/0

<u>Employee Name</u>	<u>Assign Dt</u>	<u>Due Dt</u>	<u>Manager Name</u>
C.T. STATTON	03/01/96	03/31/96	L.D. FOUST
F. AFSHAR	03/01/96	03/31/96	R.D. SNELL
J.D. AGNEW	03/01/96	03/31/96	R.E. SMITH
L.J. OLGUIN	03/01/96	03/31/96	K.K. BHATTACHARYA
R.M. SANDIFER	03/01/96	03/31/96	L.D. FOUST
T.W. DOERING	03/01/96	03/31/96	D. STAHL

70934

1740
[Redacted]

WMS M&O TRAINING DATABASE (RID)
OUTSTANDING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS (BY SUBJECT CODE)

Report Generated: 19-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: YAP-2.60 QA: Y REV/PCN: 1/0
Participant Planning Sheet Process

<u>Employee Name</u>		<u>Assign Dt</u>	<u>Due Dt</u>	<u>Manager Name</u>
C.J. NESBITT	Rev1	03/22/96	04/21/96	R.M. SANDIFER
	ICN1	03/22/96	04/21/96	R.M. SANDIFER
[Redacted]	Rev1	09/19/95	10/19/95	W.E. BARNES
	ICN1	09/19/95	10/19/95	W.E. BARNES

Report Generated: 18-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: YAP-2.8Q

QA: Y

REV/PCN: 1/0

Tracers, Fluids, and Materials Data Reporting and Management

<u>Employee Name</u>	<u>Assign Dt</u>	<u>Due Dt</u>	<u>Manager Name</u>
C.L. PEARCE	01/05/96	02/04/96	W.R. KENNEDY
D.L. SEAMANS	01/05/96	02/04/96	P.S. HASTINGS
K.O. WIRTZ	01/05/96	02/04/96	G.A. FASANO
R.L. MORTON	01/05/96	02/04/96	E.W. MCCANN

WMS M&O TRAINING DATABASE (TRID)
OUTSTANDING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS (SUBJECT CODE)

Report Generated: 18-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: YAP-15.10

QA: Y

REV/PCN: 2/1

CONTROL OF PERFORMANCE

<u>Employee Name</u>	<u>Assign Dt</u>	<u>Due Dt</u>	<u>Manager Name</u>
C.L. GUITTARD	03/26/96	04/25/96	W.R. KENNEDY
D.A. MCCORMICK	03/26/96	04/25/96	J.J. SALCHAK
 <i>New assign.</i>	06/03/96	07/03/96	S.J. BROCOUM
L.R. MORRISON	03/26/96	04/25/96	W.R. KENNEDY
R.E. SMITH	03/26/96	04/25/96	C.T. STATTON
S.W. GOODIN	03/26/96	04/25/96	W.R. KENNEDY

MS M&O TRAINING DATABASE (RID)
OUTSTANDING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS (BY SUBJECT CODE)

Report Generated: 18-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: YAP-30.10

QA: N

REV/PCN: 2/0

Authorization to Use Regulated Hazardous Substances & Materials

Employee Name -----	Assign Dt -----	Due Dt -----	Manager Name -----
~ C.D. POWERS	01/16/96	02/15/96	G.A. FASANO
~ D.M. BRADFORD	01/16/96	02/15/96	J.S. FISHER
~ K.O. WIRTZ	01/16/96	02/15/96	G.A. FASANO
~ L.K. MOORE	01/16/96	02/15/96	H.C. STAFFORD
~ M.R. WESTCAMP	01/16/96	02/15/96	L.K. MOORE

Report Generated: 18-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: YAP-30.54 OA: N REV/PCN: 0/0

Collection Prevention Opportunity Assessment

<u>Employee Name</u>	<u>Assign Dt</u>	<u>Due Dt</u>	<u>Manager Name</u>
- C.D. POWERS	03/07/96	03/17/96	G.A. FASANO
- K.O. WIRTZ	03/07/96	03/17/96	G.A. FASANO
- M.A. RODGERS	03/07/96	03/17/96	D.B. ABEL
- M.J. STOVER	03/07/96	03/17/96	T.H. PYSTO
- S.C. SMITH	03/07/96	03/17/96	E.M GARDINER

MS M&O TRAINING DATABASE (RID)
OUTSTANDING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS (BY SUBJECT CODE)

Report Generated: 2-jul-1996

Page 1

Subject Code: YMP/91-35

QA: N

REV/PCN: 1/0

<u>Employee Name</u>	<u>Assign Dt</u>	<u>Due Dt</u>	<u>Manager Name</u>
J.J. LEFEVER	03/01/96	03/31/96	K.W. ROBERTS

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

8 Corrective Action
 Request

NO. YM-96-C-008
PAGE OF
QA: L

CAR/SWO CONTINUATION PAGE

Actions for responding to CAR-YM-96-C-008:

1. Formulate a team of senior management to oversee the closure efforts for this corrective action report.
2. Formulate an additional team of the M&O Managers to assure the completion or modification of training assignments.
3. Using the same team as established in the previous item, complete the necessary impact analyses. The team will determine what work was done and complete the necessary impact analyses; documentation of no impact should be required.
4. Formulate another team to complete the root cause analysis and develop the long-term, effective measures to preclude recurrence. Root cause analysis to be completed by 10/11/96. Long term measures to prevent recurrence will be completed and in place by December 31, 1996.

YM-96-C-08
Closure Activities

Remedial Actions

1. Individuals identified on the corrective action completed post-effective date required Self-Study Assignments for the procedures indicated. Evaluated the individual's baseline training requirements for applicability to current job tasks and revised as needed.
2. Performed an investigation to determine the impact to quality for delinquent or incomplete training.
3. Performed a root cause analysis for condition causal.
4. Identified actions to be taken to preclude recurrence.

Actions to Preclude Recurrence

1. Issued IOC dated 10/07/96 (LV.TRN.JBJ.10/96-176) to clarify M&O employees' responsibilities to document training via M&O QAP-2-1.
2. Developed and implemented a baseline verification plan to assure training baselines in database are correct and up to date.
3. Developed a plan to assign training liaisons to monitor training notification and documentation to line organizations.
4. Developed and presented a briefing to M&O management explaining the root cause analysis recommendations and vital improvements to the QAP-2-1 processes.

3/14/97 Horton to Forest

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

8 Corrective Action Request
 Stop Work Order

NO. YM-96-C008

PAGE 1 OF 1

QA: L

CAR/SWO CONTINUATION PAGE

Verified through spot check that individuals identified in Block 6 of this CAR have completed post-effective date required self-study assignments for the procedures indicated. In addition, verified that impact analyses have been performed and documented for the delinquent or incomplete training.

Verified that a Root Cause Determination, in accordance with AP-16.4Q, was performed and documented (see attached). Through discussions with Judy Justice and Mike Penovich, M&O, confirmed that a representative from the M&O Training Department is currently working with M&O line organizations to assist them in identification of tasks performed to provide information for development of new process oriented training programs.

Furthermore, determined that "Training Liaisons" have been assigned to monitor training notification and documentation of completion of assigned training. The Training Liaisons are considered as action to prevent recurrence of the condition cited on this CAR until the M&O Training Program is revamped.

The M&O is currently in the process of revamping their entire approach to training. This new approach to training is detailed in the "M&O Training Strategic Plan, FY97/FY98", and is expected to take two years to implement.

Based on the above, this CAR is considered closed.

Franklin B. Smith
4/9/97

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
ROOT CAUSE DETERMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 1 of 4

Refer to Subsection 5.2 and 5.3 of AP-16.4Q for amplification of information.

1. Identify the adverse condition.

PROBLEM 1: Incomplete training or outdated training maintenance as specified in accordance with procedure YLP-2.1Q-YMSCO.

PROBLEM 2: M&O action tracking process was ineffective for tracking completion of action necessary to promptly implement corrective action with DR-047.

2. Indicate *Where* the condition was found.

Problem 1 was discovered as part of YMQAD Audit YM-ARP-96-C-08 regarding completion of training for employees of both the DOE/YMP and the M&O. This deficiency was identified in DR YMQAD-96-D047.

Problem 2 was discovered as part of remedial action for M&O management to complete activities associated with DR YMQAD-96-D047.

3. Note *When* the condition was first found.

Problem 1 was discovered as part of YMQAD Audit YM-ARP-96-C-08 and identified in DR YMQAD-96-D047.

Problem 2 was discovered as part of activities for completion of remedial action associated with DR YMQAD-96-D047 and was found during the course of responding to the DOE as to the completion status.

4. Select which major program element(s) was affected. (Waste Acceptance, Storage, Transportation, or Repository.)

Not limited to one affected area. Random areas were affected by incomplete training requirements.

5. Denote the specific area(s) or discipline(s) of the major program element the condition occurred. (e.g., engineering, design, ES&H)

Problem 1 not limited to one affected area. Random areas were affected by incomplete training requirements.

Problem 2 was limited to the M&O action tracking process.

6. Determine if the condition is isolated or recurring.

Preliminary investigations show that conditions of incomplete training assignments is recurring. Investigation of the action tracking deficiency is isolated to this one event.

7. Determine if the condition is hardware (item) or programmatic (procedures, personnel) related or both.

Conditions identified in problem 1 is both procedure and personnel related. Conditions identified in problem 2 stem from personnel.

8. Denote what organizations are affected by this condition (M&O, USGS, Weston, OCRWM, etc.).

M&O

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
ROOT CAUSE DETERMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE

9 Document the changes that have taken place that could have caused the condition.

None

10. Determine the need for sketches or photographs.

No sketches or photographs required.

11. Determine the need for laboratory tests.

No laboratory tests required.

12. Identify the physical evidence examined.

No physical evidence examined.

13. Note the relevant documents reviewed.

Procedure YLP-2.1Q-YMSCO, DR-YM-96-D047

14. Document any other information that may be pertinent to supporting the selection of the correct root cause.

See attached Interview Questionnaire and Summary and RCD Team Meeting Minutes dated September 17, 1996

15. Interviews conducted: Yes No

If Yes, refer to page 3 of this attachment.

RI or designee: (Print)

JUDY JUSTICE

Signature:

Judy Justice

Date:

9-15-96

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
ROOT CAUSE DETERMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Page 3 of 4

TELEPHONE OR PERSONAL INTERVIEW RECORD

Person Interviewed: (Print)
See Attached

Title:

Organization/Location:

Telephone No.:

Date/Time:

CAR No./DR No.:
YM-96-C-008

Interview Details:

See attached information regarding interviews.

Interview team consisted of :

David VanBibber
Jan Statler
Fred Arth
Judy Justice


Interviewer

**OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT
ROOT CAUSE DETERMINATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

Root Cause Code:
Problem 1: 3Ab Problem 2: 2Aa

CAR No./DR No.:
YM-96-C-008

Root Cause:
Problem 1: The existing SPAC not descriptive enough to provide adequate job quality or work controls; leniency of SPAC allowed violation of its intent, if not the letter of the SPAC, and/or, standards, directives, or policies not communicated from management to the organization. Problem 2: Personnel, lack of attention to detail, carelessness.

Justification or Rationale for Selected Root Cause:

PROBLEM 1:

Interview data was evaluated and summarized by combining like topical concerns. The results of this activity identified the "general causes" as follows:

1. Process is too complex (utilizing two different procedure having three different forms on which to document training).
2. Lack of appropriate tools/support to monitor training (baseline issues).
3. Lack of consequences for not completing training.
4. Responsibilities not adequately communicated.
5. Timing and access (two procedure with three forms) in the notification process.

The general causes were evaluated and combined which resulted in the following "Basic General Causes".

1. Process is too complicated
2. Responsibilities are not adequately communicated.
3. Lack of appropriate tools.

General Cause Code 3: Management System

Basic Cause Code A: Standards, Policies, Administrative Controls (SPAC)

Root Cause Code b: Inadequate communication of SPAC.

1. The existing SPAC not descriptive enough to provide adequate job quality or work controls;
2. Leniency of SPAC allowed violation of its intent, if not the letter of the SPAC;
3. Standards, directives, or policies not communicated from management to the organization.

NOTE: Inadequate communication on SPAC means the SPAC were not understood because of failure to communicate the SPAC by formal means (training, directive, or oral communication) or failure to support SPAC through involvement, concern, example or vigor.

PROBLEM 2:

General Cause Code 2: Personnel

Basic Code A: Lack of attention to a task

Root Cause a: Carelessness

Interview data results showed that the M&O action item tracking system properly assigned and tracked the actions necessary to complete the M&O assigned remedial actions for DR-YM-96-D047. An error occurred when the individual reviewing the correspondence incorrectly identified the total number of employees required to complete their delinquent training. It was determined that this is an isolated event and that the root cause code is , 2Aa:carelessness.

Designee: (Print)	Signature:	Date:
RI: (Print) JUDY JUSTICE	Signature: <i>Judy Justice</i>	Date: 9-15-96

**Root Cause Determination Questionnaire (Supplement)
Telephone or Personal Interview Record
CAR-96-C-008**

Interview Details: All personnel are member of the CRWMS/Management & Operating staff located at Las Vegas, Nevada. Interviews were conducted during the period of September 9-13, 1996. Each interview lasted approximately one hour and the results are documented in the attached Interview Summary.

Person Interviewed	Title
R.G. Vawter	Deputy AGM Operations
L.R. Hayes	Mgr. Scientific Program Ops
E.W. McCann	Mgr. Environmental Programs
W.D. Schutt	Mgr. Contracts
J.L. Naaf	Mgr. ESF Design
B.J. Howe	ESF Design Administrative Support
P.S. Hastings	Mgr. MGDS Safety Assurance
J.N. Bailey	Engineering/Integration. Deputy
K.O. Wirtz	Engineer/Scientist Environmental Programs
C.B. Bartley	QA Technical Support Specialist
Fatimah Afshar	Engineer/Scientist Eng/Int Planning & Reporting
R.C. Quittmeyer	Mgr. Geology
A.M. Segrest	Mgr. MGDS Development
M.W. Pendleton	Team Lead - Technical Evaluation Regulatory Operations
R.E. Smith	Lead - SBT Coordination for Field Test Management
C.D. Powers	Engineer/Scientist Environmental Programs

**INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR YM-96-C-008
INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

INTERVIEWER:		INTERVIEWEE:	DATE: 9-9-96 - 9-13-96
Training Assignment Notification Process:			
Question	Question	Response	
#1	Please describe the process you follow upon receipt of a training notification.	Most people understood the electronic notification process but felt improvement could be made to the notice and the on-line procedure database. Some responses indicated that employees are "computer intimidated" and prefer paper notifications.	
#2	Is the training notification process helpful to you?	For the majority of interviewees, the response was "yes." Some confusion as to the instructions was expressed.	

INTERVIEWER:	INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
---------------------	---------------------	--------------

Training Assignment Notification Process:

Question	Question	Response
#3	Is the notification process via lotus notes helpful?	Notification via Lotus Notes was the preferred method.
#4	Do you perceive any problems with the current training assignment/notification system?	Employees indicated problems with instructions and accessing and using the on-line procedure database. Also, indication that too much time is given to complete assignments resulting in training not being a priority. Reminder notices are easily forgotten, hardcopy, colored reminders would be helpful. (See item #1) Several employees indicated that there are too many procedures and too many forms. This tends to confuse employees in baselining and rebaselining training.

INTERVIEWER:	INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
---------------------	---------------------	--------------

Training Assignment Notification Process:

Question	Question	Response
#5	Do employees receive late notices from the Training Department for which training has already been completed, documented, and documentation has been submitted?	For the most part, no occasions where documents passed in the mail. Most indicated the second notice prompted them to complete their training. However, some employees indicated that training documentation is submitted to a group or department secretary who did not (or did not understand priority) send it to training right away.

INTERVIEWER:		INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
Training Process:			
Question	Question	Response	
#1	Are the procedures available so reading assignments may be completed?	Overall employees felt the procedures were available, but on-line system seemed cumbersome to access and use.	
#2	Have any problems been identified and reported for training assignment notification? If so, please describe.	Yes. Organizations are not reflected in the training database, causing notifications to be sent out inaccurately to both the supervisor and the employee. No other problems or concerns were reported to the training organization.	

INTERVIEWER:	INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
---------------------	---------------------	--------------

Training Process:

Question	Question	Response
#3	Have training assignment problems been reported to the training organization? If so, was the problem resolved?	Yes, regarding unreceived training documentation. Most indicated problems were resolved. However, one response indicated that a problem was reported but nothing changed resulting in notices being ignored.
#4	Is the process for completing and documenting training assignments clear? If not, describe the problems which cause difficulty	Responses indicated that use of two different procedures for implementing training was confusing. Use of multiple forms added to the confusion causing employees to be frustrated with process.

INTERVIEWER:		INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
Training Process:			
Question	Question	Response	
#5	Do employees experience difficulty in returning training forms to the Training Department in a timely manner? If so, please describe.	General interview responses indicated that appropriate time for completing training was not built into the work schedule, therefore training became a low priority, and management follow-up was minimal. Several responses indicated that training forms are returned to employees for correction. It was also expressed that documentation forms are not always available in the training center.	
#6	Are the training forms readily available to complete your training?	Employees interviewed, related that it is frustrating having two procedures for training. This often led to misunderstanding as to which forms to use. Since the notification attached both, it was not always clear which form was meant to be used. Also, YLP 2.1Q not clear as to when a training assignment should be used versus a Required Self-Study Assignment (RSSA), and if a RSSA could be used for one time reading.	

INTERVIEWER:	INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
---------------------	---------------------	--------------

Training Process:

Question	Question	Response
#7	Would you like to see anything changed in the training process described in the procedure	Interview consensus was to merge the two procedures and have only one training procedure with one common form.

INTERVIEWER:		INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
Training Assignments:			
Question	Question	Response	
#1	(Supervisor) Are training assignments monitored from initial assignment to completion? If so, how do you monitor the completion of training by your staff?	Responses indicated that assignments were not monitored for completion or effectiveness of the training. Management or supervisory follow-up was expressed as "minimal."	
#2	Are employees notified of required training in a timely manner to complete the training by assigned due dates?	In most cases concerns were expressed that too much time was given allowing employees to procrastinate in completing the assignments. However, some employees indicated that they have received notifications late.	

INTERVIEWER:	INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
---------------------	---------------------	--------------

Continuing Training Requirements Evaluation:

Question	Question	Response
#1	Do you perform QA affecting work activities or other activities that require procedure training maintenance?	Responses indicated that there was a lack of understanding as to what was required for training supporting QA activities versus Training for non-QA. Several employees indicated they do not work to the QA program but have extensive training maintenance requirements.
#2	Has YLP-2.1Q training been completed?	All individuals indicated they had been trained to YLP 2.1Q. Questions regarding process implementation, however, indicated they understood the procedure.

INTERVIEWER:		INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
Continuing Training Requirements Evaluation:			
Question	Question	Response	
#3	Are you (or members of your staff) required to maintain training for any procedures?	All questioned indicated "yes."	
#4	Are procedures periodically reviewed or evaluated to determine if the employee should maintain proficiency with the procedure?	Training maintenance database files or documentation is not reviewed to identify current requirements. Old requirements are not being deleted; only new ones being added. Baselines are not reviewed periodically. Some managers indicated frustration with the process to delete training requirements.	

INTERVIEWER:

INTERVIEWEE:

DATE:

Continuing Training Requirements Evaluation:

Question	Question	Response
#5	Are employees currently required to maintain proficiency on a procedure for which there are no work assignments for implementation?	Yes. See # 4 above.
#6	Do you receive notifications that you (or members of your staff) need to complete maintenance training?	"Yes," in all cases.

INTERVIEWER:		INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
Supervisor and Employee Responsibilities and Communication:			
Question	Question	Response	
#1	(Employee) What is the perception of the management commitment to the value of initial and continuing training?	There appears to be different perceptions between management and employees. Management indicated training was important to the employee's work and that employees should be responsible in completing assigned training. Employees' indicated they were schedule driven and training was a low priority.	
#2	Does the supervisor follow up to see if training or training maintenance is completed?	Responses were inconsistent and that some managers stressed training in staff meetings while others heard nothing. Some supervisors indicated that this was too much to keep up with in all cases, however, there were no follow-ups for completion of training by supervisors.	

INTERVIEWER:	INTERVIEWEE:	DATE:
---------------------	---------------------	--------------

Supervisor and Employee Responsibilities and Communication:

Question	Question	Response
#3	Does the supervisor stress accurate and timely documentation of training?	Responses indicated that this is minimal and not performed at all levels. (See item #1)