



Department of Energy

Washington, DC 20585

OCT 29 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

**ISSUANCE OF SURVEILLANCE RECORD LANL-SR-97-060 RESULTING FROM THE
OFFICE OF QUALITY ASSURANCE (OQA) SURVEILLANCE OF THE CIVILIAN
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING
CONTRACTOR (CRWMS M&O)/LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY (LANL)**

Enclosed is the record of Surveillance LANL-SR-97-060 conducted by the OQA of CRWMS
M&O/LANL at the Records Processing Center (RPC) in Las Vegas, Nevada, September 15 -
October 1, 1997.

This surveillance was conducted as a follow-up to the OQA Audit LANL-ARC-97-19. The scope
of the surveillance included a review of a sample of completed Scientific Notebooks submitted to
the RPC by LANL.

There were no Corrective Action Requests, Deficiency Reports, or Performance Reports issued as a
result of the surveillance. Based on the results of the surveillance and on the reviews of the six
LANL Scientific Notebooks that were located at the RPC, the Surveillance Team Leader determined
that technical and technical assurance reviews had been conducted.

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

If you have any questions, please contact either James Blaylock at (702) 794-1420 or
Edward P. Opelski at (702) 794-1332.

James Blaylock
Donald G. Horton, Director
Office of Quality Assurance

OQA:JB-0224

Enclosure:
Surveillance Record LANL-SR-97-060

9711070051 971029
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDR

070018

Rec'd:

NMSS/JahL



Printed with soy ink on recycled paper



1/1
NH33
WM-11
102.7

OCT 29 1997

L. D. Foust

-2-

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
A. M. Whiteside, OQA/USGS, Denver, CO
D. J. Sinks, OQA/USGS, Denver, CO
L. A. Souza, OQA/LANL, Los Alamos, NM
J. M. Ziemba, OQA/LBNL, Berkeley, CA
J. F. Graff, OQA/SNL, Albuquerque, NM, M/S 1325
M. J. Clevenger, M&O/LANL, Los Alamos, NM
T. J. Hirons, M&O/LANL, Los Alamos, NM
D. C. Mangold, M&O/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: LANL-SR-97-060

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE RECORD**SURVEILLANCE DATA**

1. ORGANIZATION/LOCATION: Civilian Radioactive Waste Management System Management and Operating Contractor (CRWMS M&O)/Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), at the Records Processing Center (RPC) in Las Vegas, Nevada.	2. SUBJECT: Technical and Technical Assurance Reviews of LANL Completed Scientific Notebooks (SN).	3. DATE: September 15, 1997
4. SURVEILLANCE OBJECTIVE: To determine if technical and technical assurance reviews of SNs have been conducted in accordance with QP-03.5, Revision 8, Paragraphs 6.4.3 through 6.4.5, and 6.5.1 through 6.5.3, respectively.		
5. SURVEILLANCE SCOPE: This surveillance is being conducted as a follow-up to Office of Quality Assurance (OQA) Audit LANL-ARC-97-19. The scope of this surveillance will include a review of a sample of completed SNs submitted to the Records Processing Center (RPC) by LANL.		6. SURVEILLANCE TEAM: Team Leader: <u>Edward P. Opelski</u> Additional Team Members <u>N/A</u>
7. PREPARED BY: <u>Edward P. Opelski</u> Surveillance Team Leader	8. CONCURRENCE: <u>James B. Langlois</u> <u>Donald G. Horton</u> Director, OQA	09/09/97 Date
		9/10/97 Date

SURVEILLANCE RESULTS**9. BASIS OF EVALUATION/DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVATIONS:**

During the performance of OQA Audit LANL-ARC-97-19, a sample of 18 SNs from the monthly reports of the Technical Assurance Project Leader were selected for review to determine if technical and technical assurance reviews had been conducted in accordance with QP-03.5. However, when the auditors requested the SNs for review, they were informed that all 18 of the SNs requested had been shipped to the RPC in Las Vegas and that none were available for review at LANL. Consequently, this surveillance was conducted as a follow-up to the audit to ensure that SNs from LANL had been reviewed as required.

On September 22, 1997, the Surveillance Team Leader (STL) requested four of the 18 SNs from RPC retrieval personnel. Only one book of the four requested was found. RPC retrieval personnel could find no trace of the other three SNs at the RPC. The STL provided the RPC retrieval personnel with the entire list of 18 SNs and requested a search to determine the number of SNs that could be provided for review. In conjunction with this request, the STL contacted the Technical Assurance Project Leader (TAPL) and the OQA on-site representative at LANL to request a verification of the SN numbers and objective evidence to substantiate that they had been sent to the RPC.

See Pages 2 and 3...

10. SURVEILLANCE CONCLUSIONS:

Based on the reviews of the six LANL SNs that were located at the RPC, the STL determined that technical and technical assurance reviews had been conducted. However, with the exception of one SN that was initiated and closed in a nine-month period, none of the technical reviews were conducted annually as required by QP-03.5, Revision 8. Although this constitutes a deviation from the annual review requirements, a Deficiency Report was not initiated, since the SNs in this sample have had final technical and technical assurance reviews.

See Page 3...

11. COMPLETED BY: <u>Edward P. Opelski</u> Surveillance Team Leader	12. APPROVED BY: <u>James B. Langlois</u> Director, OQA
10/27/97 Date	10/29/97 Date

9. BASIS FOR EVALUATION/DESCRIPTION OF OBSERVATIONS: (Cont'd)

RPC retrieval personnel were able to locate six of the 18 SNs requested. On September 25, 1997, the LANL TAPL notified the STL that with the exception of the six SNs that were located at the RPC, the remainder of the SNs were verified to be in-process at LANL.

The STL reviewed the six LANL SNs at the RPC to determine if technical and technical assurance reviews had been conducted as specified in the following subsections of QP-03.5, Revision 8:

- Subsection 6.4.1, "...a technical review is performed on a notebook and its attachments and/or data, as applicable, annually, when a notebook is closed out, or when the activity or activities terminates, which ever occurs first." A note below this subsection states, "Because it may be time-consuming to conduct a technical notebook review annually, YMP personnel are encouraged to do this quarterly."
- Subsection 6.4.5, "...the technical reviewer enters a statement, such as the following, on the notebook page after the last entry reviewed or in a section designated for review. I have reviewed the entries on pages (*) through (*) and they meet the requirements described in subsection 6.4.3 and 6.4.4 of QP-03.5. All review comments noted have been corrected and/or resolved, followed by the reviewer's signature and date."
- Subsection 6.5.1, "After the last technical review of a notebook is completed, a technical assurance review is performed on the notebook, including its attachments and/or data, if applicable, to ensure the following conditions are met.
 - The entries are legible and the configuration of the notebook meets the requirements of this procedure.
 - Technical reviews were performed and documented according to subsection 6.4.5."
- Subsection 6.5.3, "Ensures that the technical assurance reviewer enter a statement, such as the following, on the notebook page after the last entry reviewed or in a section designated for review, I have reviewed the entries on pages (*) through (*) and they meet the requirements described in subsections 6.5.1 and 6.5.2 of QP-03.5. All review comments noted have been corrected and/or resolved, followed by the reviewer's signature and date." A note below this subsection states, "YMP personnel may have the review performed by the group's Technical Assurance Liaison or may contact the Technical Assurance Project Leader (TAPL) for assignment of the review. It is recommended that a technical assurance review be performed after each technical review."

The SNs reviewed by the STL along with the notebook start date, technical review date, technical assurance review date and comments are presented in a table format in the Documents Reviewed section of this Surveillance Report. The information presented in that table indicates that the technical assurance reviews were conducted in accordance with the requirements of QP-03.5, Revision 8, Subsection 6.5.1. However, with the exception of SN #TWS-CST-01-94-02, the frequency of the technical reviews is not in compliance with the requirements of QP-03.5, Revision 8, Subsection 6.4.1. A Deficiency Report was not initiated to document this lack of compliance since the SNs in this sample have been through a final technical and technical assurance review and the SNs have been accepted into the RPC.

PERSONNEL CONTACTED:

The Surveillance Team Leader contacted Terry L. Mueller, Records Service Supervisor; Kathleen Thompson and Kathleen Jerome, Records Retrieval personnel; Lawrence A. Souza, OQA site representative at LANL; and Michael J. Clevenger, LANL TAPL.

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED:

NOTEBOOK	START DATE	TECH REV. DATE	T. A. REV. DATE	COMMENTS
LA-CST-NBK-95-016	4-18-95	9-5-96	9-11-96	Entry dated 9-11-96 indicates an annual review was not done since the work was nearly completed and a final review was forthcoming. Another entry dated 9-11-96 indicates that since the data generated in this notebook were performed using a DRAFT DP, the data are considered unqualified for YMP purposes.
TWS-CST-01-94-02	1-6-94	8-2-94	10-3-94	Notebook closed on 8-2-94.
TWS-CST-02-94-02	2-16-94	5-26-95 8-29-96	8-29-96 9-26-96	Notebook closed on 8-14-96.
EES-13-LV-07-94-03	7-18-94	2-16-95	11-12-96 1-15-97	Notebook closed on 8-26-96.
LA-CST-07-94-001	7-18-94	9-24-96	9-25-96	Notebook closed on 8-20-96.
TWS-EES-1-11-91-1	11-1-91	4-15-93	2-2-93	Notebook closed on 11-9-92. The technical review entry on 2/2/93 indicates that the notebook is adequate with the exception of a final technical review, which was completed on 4/15/93.

10. SURVEILLANCE CONCLUSIONS: (Cont'd)

Recommendations: The CRWMS M&O at LANL should ensure that technical reviews of SNs are conducted annually in accordance with the requirements contained in QP-03.5, Revision 8, Subsection 6.4.1.

OQA should conduct a follow-up surveillance in 90 days to verify compliance with the annual technical review requirements of QP-035, Revision 8.