

DISTRIBUTION:  
WMRP r/f  
DHedges & r/f  
JM-S/F 3405

JUN 8 1986

NOTE TO: Jim Kennedy

FROM: Dale Hedges *DH*

SUBJECT: NOTES ON THE APPENDIX 7 VISIT TO LAS VEGAS & LIVERMORE 6/23-28/86

The afternoon of the first day of the visit was spent talking to Paul Prestholt to discuss his views of what is going on. Paul did not have copies of the stop work orders yet and also did not have feedback on the recent SAI audit of F & S. We later got copies of the stop work orders. The second day Paul and I met with Carl Johnson (State of Nevada) for general discussion. I asked Carl if the State intended to have on site reps. He said they had been discussing this and do plan to have on site QA but plan to send in teams of varying technical expertise from time to time rather than have a full time rep for technical work. Both Paul and I got the feeling that the State is beginning to be very active in its perceived role. They have the funding for preparation of a State QA program and will be started on that task by August 1, 1986. Paul questioned Carl as to what the State expected from the meeting they had requested. Paul relayed this information back to NRC Washington by phone.

The State will request a formal NRC review of their QA plans and procedures.

We traveled to Livermore the afternoon of the second day. We were joined by Jim Blaylock. Jim seemed very open and shared his thoughts about Headquarters, the contractors and the project in general. Headquarters is still a problem to the project as perceived by Jim and later by Larry Ramspott. It appears that Headquarters asks for more written material and varies the directions more often than NNWSI personnel believe is necessary. Jim believes Sandia is his biggest problem at the moment. There does not appear to be an acceptance by Sandia that the Project QA requirements must be implemented.

All stop work orders have been issued except for REECO. There was disagreement within DOE as to the use of harsh language. The order is being rewritten. This re-enforces our concern that Vieth cannot control contractors. I brought back copies of the stop work orders. Jim said that planned audits of Sandia and Los Alamos have been post-poned.

The visit at Livermore was very informative. Bob Shock spoke briefly and then Larry Ramspott talked in general about QA before introducing John Dronkers. John gave a very detailed description of the program that is being developed. He also stated he now has stop work authority. We were given a tour of non-secured labs by Virginia Oversby. My impressions were that the scientists are very sincere in their dedication to perform and document their work in

8609150310 860630  
PDR WASTE PDR  
WM-11

86100107(F)(H) 1027

WM Record File

102

WM Project 11

Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_

PDR

LPDR

Distribution:

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

68

accordance with good scientific methods. The work performed in the labs was identified as "experiments" and thus is given a QA level 3 designation. No equipment in the labs is under a formal calibration program. Virginia stated that the equipment is all calibrated by the scientist or technician before use. A more careful review will need to be made to be certain that this is true for each piece of equipment. I suggested to Jim Blaylock and to Larry Ramspott that a formal calibration program permits the identification of equipment to be "calibrated before use", "calibrated in system use", or "used for indication only-no calibration required". I stated I doubted that "every" piece of equipment in use could be calibrated by the user and that they would be prudent to recheck this as well as provide proper labels to prevent repeated questioning from others about the calibration of lab equipment. Whether I can agree that all experiments are level 3 will require further review of the work to be performed and how the data are to be used. I believe we need a technical staff review of selected examples of work being classified as levels 2 and 3 for the purpose of taking an early staff position on this subject. Again, both Paul and I cautioned that the use of level 3 has high potential of problems later. We both stated that the QA as described for experiments could very easily be a graded level 1 and acceptable for licensing. We cautioned that performing the work as level 3 could cause them to have to repeat work later if they decide to use the data in support of licensing.

I believe the LLNL program as described by Ramspott and Dronkers will provide an adequate program. I have concerns about the QA levels but this is an overall project concern.

Dronkers stated that they are rewording the 18 criteria and adding to the 18 where they see a need for better understanding. Both Paul and I supported the approach.

The fourth day Paul and I met with Steve Metta and Forrest Peters to listen to a presentation of their plans for revised policy and procedures for handling geotechnical work. Forrest has considerable technical experience as well as QA experience. SAI is fortunate to have him during this formative stage of the policy. His concept provides for needed reviews and audits starting at the planning stage through the closeout of the activity. It will provide for needed assurance and ensure that necessary documentation becomes a record package.

On the fifth day Paul and I met with John Rinaldi to discuss his plans for an audit of the NNWSI work. We encouraged him to expand the scope to include technical work of the participants and to be certain he has the proper technical expertise on the audit team. We suggested that he not be too limiting in the time allotted such that a properly executed audit was not

accomplished. This will likely be a combined Headquarters/Nevada Operations audit.

As usual in my visits to NNWSI, I was impressed by the capability and professional approach demonstrated by Paul Prestholt in the conduct of his day to day activities. He represents NRC extremely well and has the highest respect of DOE, the State and DOE's participants. His is not an easy job but he does it well.