



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

WBS 1.2.9.3  
 QA

DEC 20 1990

Carl P. Gertz, Project Manager, YMP, NV

ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSE AND CLOSURE OF CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR)  
 YM-91-010 RESULTING FROM THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION  
 (YMQAD) AUDIT 90-I-01

The YMQAD staff has evaluated and accepted your response to CAR YM-91-010,  
 generated as a result of YMQAD Audit 90-I-01.

The CAR has been closed based on satisfactory verification of completed  
 corrective action.

If you have any questions, please contact either Catherine E. Hampton  
 at 794-7973 or Stephen R. Dana of Science Applications International  
 Corporation at 794-7176.

*Catherine E. Hampton*  
 Donald G. Horton, Director  
 Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMQAD:CEH-1306

Enclosure:  
 CAR YM-91-010

cc w/encl:  
 K. R. Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC  
 S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV  
 N. J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-08

cc w/o encl:  
 J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV

9101080391 901220  
 PDR WASTE PDR  
 WM-11

YMP-5

030039

FULL TEXT ASCII SCAN

ADD: KHooks

102.7  
 WM-11  
 1/10/93

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

14 CAR NO.: YM-91-010  
DATE: 11/09/90  
SHEET: 1 OF 1  
QA  
WBS No.: 1.2.9.3

**CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST**

1 Controlling Document <u>QMP-06-04, Revision 1</u>	2 Related Report No. <u>Audit No. 90-I-01</u>
--	--

3 Responsible Organization <u>Engineering &amp; Development Division</u>	4 Discussed With <u>G. Dymmel</u>
---	--------------------------------------

10 Response Due <u>11/29/90</u>	11 Responsibility for Corrective Action <u>E. Petrie</u>	12 Stop Work Order Y or N <u>N</u>
------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------

5 Requirement:  
QMP-06-04, Rev. 1, states in part, "...that documents will be processed in accordance with QMP-03-09.

6 Adverse Condition:  
Contrary to the above, at the time Rev. 1 of Technical Requirements for the Yucca Mountain Project (YMP/CM-0007) was completed and processed, QMP-03-09 was not issued for implementation. It is unclear as to what controls were applied to processing YMP/CM-0007.

7 Recommended Action(s):  
Identify the remedial actions to be taken to correct the deficiencies noted in Block 6. Identify the cause of the condition and the planned corrective action to prevent recurrence.

8 Initiator <u>Art Spooner</u>	Date: <u>10/26/90</u>	9 Severity Level - 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/>	13 Approved By: <u>OQA James Blaylock for</u>	Date: <u>11/9/90</u>
-----------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--	-------------------------

15 Verification of Corrective Action:  
See Attachments I & II to CAR response. Verified QMP-06-04, Revision 1, has been revised to reflect AP-3.39, instead of QMP-03-09. sp 12/7/90

16 Corrective Action Completed and Accepted: <u>OAR S. Davis</u> Date <u>12/7/90</u>	17 Closure Approved By: <u>OQA [Signature]</u> <u>12/10/90</u>
---	---

Enclosure

Corrective Action for CAR YM-91-010:

**ROOT CAUSE:**

The root cause of this CAR was the inability to provide the auditor who identified the condition the objective evidence provided as Attachments 1 and 2 as evidence of remedial and corrective actions, during the YMPO Gold Star Audit in October, 1990.

**REMEDIAL ACTION:**

As stated in Attachment 2, the remedial action was to revise QMP-06-04 to Revision 1, an action that occurred effective 10/17/90. Revision 1 of QMP-06-04 correctly hands off to AP-3.3Q.

**CORRECTIVE ACTION TO PREVENT RECURRENCE:**

QMP-06-04, Revision 1, has corrected this procedural oversight by referring to AP-3.3Q as the entry point into the CCB, which still evaluates under QMP-03-09, Revision 0. The error was in the Revision 0 of QMP-06-04, which prematurely and incorrectly identified the wrong procedural hand-off.

Since the use of AP-3.3Q, Revision 1 was the correct and valid choice at that time, and since the the CCB evaluation process outlined in AP-3.3Q, Revision 1 was then and is today identical with the CCB evaluation process in QMP-03-09, Revision 0, the process whereby the subject document entered the YMP baseline has not changed. (AP-3.3Q, Revision 2, effective 10/17/90, eliminates the CCB process within itself by handing off to QMP-03-09. Consequently, the entire suite of procedures is now consistent and not overlapping.)

Based on the above, the appropriate and historically-confirmed process was followed to ensure the the Midway Valley Requirements Document entered the baseline with the appropriate CCB evaluation. Therefore, no compromise in quality of the document's entry into the YMP baseline occurred. No further actions are warranted.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Responsible Manager  
For Maxwell Blanchard

12/6/90  
Date

Accept Response:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
QAR

12/7/90  
Date

Accept Response:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
OQA

12-10-90  
Date

TO: G.D. Dymel, Systems Engineering Branch Chief

FROM: J.M. Davenport, Systems Engineering Integrator *J.M.D.*

DATE: October 26, 1990

SUBJECT: Submittal of the "Technical Requirements Document for the Yucca Mountain Project (Midway Valley Trenching and Calcite/Silica Activities)" to the Yucca Mountain Project Change Control Board

On October 3, 1990, a Change Request (CR) titled "Request for document change in the YMP Technical Baseline: Technical Requirements Document for the Yucca Mountain Project (Midway Valley Trenching and Calcite/Silica Activities (YMP/CM-0007), Rev. 0" was submitted to the Yucca Mountain Project Change Control Board. (This CR was subsequently assigned the number: 91/003.) This submittal was not accomplished in accordance with QMP-03-09, Project Change Control Board Process, as required by QMP-06-04, Project Office Document Development, Review, Approval and Revision Process, Rev. 0, Step 24.a. At the time of submittal of this CR, QMP-03-09 did not exist. The manager of the T&MSS Configuration Management Department requested that the CR be submitted in accordance with AP-3.3Q, Change Control Process, Rev. 1 and this was done.

Attached to this memo is a memo from the manager concurring with above events and stating that in no way does this deviation from QMP-06-04 effect the quality of the document.

  
Vincent F. Iorri

*Ref. 10/27/90*  
*[Signature]*  
11/29/90  
DATE

DATE: October 26, 1990  
 TO: J. M. Davenport  
 FROM: S. C. Matthews, Mgr. CMD and CCB Secretary   
 SUBJECT: Midway Valley Requirements Document

This is to document discussions held in the past regarding the proper procedural vehicle to be used for submission of the subject document to the YMPO Change Control Board (CCB) for entry into the YMP Baseline.

QMP-06-04, Revision 0, which was in effect at the time that both Revision 0 and Revision 1 were submitted to the CCB, required that this submission be performed in accordance with QMP-03-09, which at that time had not been approved. I was asked about this by both you and E. H. Petrie, and I indicated that the proper procedure was in fact AP-3.3Q, Revision 1. It was the CCB's intention at that time to replace this AP, which was still in effect, with QMP-03-09, with no changes to the actual procedure. Subsequent decisions at YMP caused the continuation of the use of AP-3.3Q, in concert with QMP-03-09 as the board's evaluation process. QMP-06-04, Revision 1, has corrected this procedural oversight by referring to AP-3.3Q as the entry point into the CCB, which still evaluates under QMP-03-09, Revision 0. The error was in the Revision 0 of QMP-06-04, which prematurely and incorrectly identified the wrong procedural hand-off.

*SKM 10/26/90*

Since the use of AP-3.3Q, Revision 1 was the correct and valid choice at that time, and since the the CCB evaluation process outlined in AP-3.3Q, Revision 1 was then and is today identical with the CCB evaluation process in QMP-03-09, Revision 0, the process whereby the subject document entered the YMP baseline has not changed. (AP-3.3Q, Revision 2, effective 10/17/90, eliminates the CCB process within itself by handing off to QMP-03-09. Consequently, the entire suite of procedures is now consistent and not overlapping.)

Based on the above, I believe that the correct process was followed to ensure the the MVRD entered the baseline with the appropriate CCB evaluation. Therefore it is my belief that no compromise in quality of the document's entry into the YMP baseline occurred, and no deficiency should be warranted.

*Approved 10/27/90*  
