



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

QA: L

SEP 18 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

ISSUANCE OF SURVEILLANCE RECORD K/PB-SR-97-063 RESULTING FROM THE OFFICE OF QUALITY ASSURANCE (OQA) SURVEILLANCE OF KIEWIT/PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF (K/PB)

Enclosed is the record of surveillance K/PB-SR-97-063 conducted by the OQA of K/PB's Summerlin Office facility, August 7, 1997.

The purpose of the surveillance was to further evaluate record issues documented by Surveillance Record K/PB-SR-97-024 and review additional objective evidence, provided by K/PB, supporting the adequacy of records and the record review process.

Based on additional information provided by K/PB, the record packages which document quality affecting construction are satisfactory, with the exceptions documented by DR YM-97-D-050. Record review considerations are not included in this evaluation; however, Recommendation 3 from the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Audit K/PB-ARP-97-11, concerning coordinating and formalizing the record review process, is re-emphasized here.

This surveillance is considered completed and closed as of the date of this letter. A response to this surveillance record and any documented recommendations is not required.

If you have any questions, please contact either James Blaylock at (702) 794-1420 or Wesley C. Pugmire at (702) 295-4285.

R. W. C. C. P.
for Donald G. Horton, Director
Office of Quality Assurance

OQA:JB-2358

Enclosure:
Surveillance Record K/PB-SR-97-063

9709240183 970918
PDR WASTE PDR
WM-3

000094

Rec'd: nmss/PAHL



NH 33
1/1
WM-3
1027

cc w/encl:

L. H. Barrett, DOE/HQ (RW-1) FORS
R. A. Milner, DOE/HQ (RW-2) FORS
T. A. Wood, DOE/HQ (RW-55) FORS
J. O. Thoma, NRC, Washington, DC
W. L. Belke, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
R. R. Loux, NWPO, Carson City, NV
S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
Jim Regan, Churchill County Commission, Fallon, NV
D. A. Bechtel, Clark County, Las Vegas, NV
Susan Dudley, Esmeralda County, Goldfield, NV
Sandy Green, Eureka County, Eureka, NV
Tammy Manzini, Lander County, Austin, NV
Kim Packard, Mineral County, Hawthorne, NV
P. A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Nye County, Chantilly, VA
Wayne Cameron, White Pine County, Ely, NV
B. R. Mettam, County of Inyo, Independence, CA
Mifflin and Associates, Las Vegas, NV
T. H. Chaney, USGS, Denver, CO
M. J. Clevenger, M&O/LANL, Los Alamos, NM
D. C. Mangold, M&O/LBNL, Berkeley, CA
G. S. Bodvarsson, M&O/LBNL, Berkeley, CA
J. M. Ziemba, OQA/LBNL, Berkeley, CA
R. E. Monks, M&O/LLNL, Livermore, CA
F. J. Schelling, M&O/SNL, Albuquerque, NM, M/S 1325
L. R. Hayes, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
H. R. Cox, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
R. A. Morgan, M&O, Las Vegas, NV
R. W. Clark, DOE/OQA, Las Vegas, NV

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

Surveillance No. K/PB-SR-97-063

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE RECORD

SURVEILLANCE DATA

1. ORGANIZATION/LOCATION: Kiewit/Parsons Brinckerhoff (K/PB) / Summerlin Office	2. SUBJECT: K/PB Records	3. DATE: 08/07/97
4. SURVEILLANCE OBJECTIVE: To further evaluate record issues documented by Surveillance Record K/PB-SR-97-024 and review additional objective evidence, provided by K/PB, supporting the adequacy of records and the record review process.		
5. SURVEILLANCE SCOPE: Validation of record issues identified during performance of K/PB-SR-97-024. Reassess the effectivity of the K/PB record review process and the status of Records, considering additional objective evidence provided by K/PB.		6. SURVEILLANCE TEAM: Team Leader: <u>W. C. Pugmire</u> Additional Team Members: <u>W. J. Glasser</u>
7. PREPARED BY: <u>W. C. Pugmire</u> Surveillance Team Leader	8. CONCURRENCE: <u>Donald G. Horton</u> Director, OQA	 <u>R.W. Cliff</u> for <u>9/10/97</u> Date

SURVEILLANCE RESULTS

9. BASIS OF EVALUATION/DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVATIONS: Surveillance K/PB-SR-97-024 was performed to determine the adequacy and effectiveness of K/PB records to serve as objective evidence of work accomplished. In addition, the record package review process was evaluated to determine if reviews were effective in identifying and resolving record discrepancies. Information for the surveillance was gathered primarily through review of completed records/record packages, discussion with K/PB personnel performing reviews, and discussion with K/PB line managers responsible for reviews. Due to the types of apparent deficiencies observed, and the frequency of occurrence, the adequacy and effectiveness of records and record reviews were initially concluded as unsatisfactory. Deficiency Report (DR) YM-97-D-050 was initiated to address deficiencies identified during the surveillance. K/PB Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Management was provided a preliminary draft of DR YM-97-D-050 as a courtesy prior to issuance. K/PB expressed a concern that the DR did not represent valid issues. A meeting between K/PB QA Management and the Surveillance team was arranged to discuss the examples from K/PB-SR-97-024 and proposed DR YM-97-D-050. The proposed DR cited twelve (12) examples to substantiate the records issue. K/PB QA Management initially took exception to all examples cited. After meeting on the issue, K/PB QA management and the surveillance team agreed that five (5) of the examples were valid record deficiencies and DR YM-97-D-050 was issued citing those examples. See Page 2...	
10. SURVEILLANCE CONCLUSIONS: Based on additional information provided by K/PB, the record packages, which document quality affecting construction, are satisfactory with the exceptions documented by DR YM-97-D-050. Record review considerations are not included in this evaluation; however, Recommendation 3 from the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Audit K/PB-ARP-97-11, concerning coordinating and formalizing the record review process, is re-emphasized here.	
11. COMPLETED BY: <u>W. C. Pugmire</u> Surveillance Team Leader	12. APPROVED BY: <u>R.W. Cliff</u> Director, OQA
<u>9/12/97</u> Date	<u>9/18/97</u> Date

Exhibit QAP-2.8.1

REV.03/14/97

ENCLOSURE

Block 9 (continued) BASIS FOR EVALUATION/DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVATIONS:

The other seven (7) examples cited in the initial surveillance, which were primarily technical issues not directly related to record requirements, may be further evaluated as the subject of future surveillance activities, assessing the adequacy and effectiveness of contractor record reviews.