



**AGENCY FOR NUCLEAR PROJECTS  
NUCLEAR WASTE PROJECT OFFICE**

Capitol Complex  
Carson City, Nevada 89710  
(702) 885-3744

November 7, 1989

James Kennedy  
Quality Assurance Section Leader  
Division of High-Level Waste Management  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Kennedy:

Please find enclosed the revisions to the NWPO Quality Assurance Program relative to the NRC comments. I am also enclosing a marked-up copy of Revision 0 of the program to facilitate in locating the revised portions of the document. Revised copies of the QA implementing procedures will follow shortly.

During this revision, I also made so editorial changes and did some wordsmithing. As you will notice, there is now an overall QA program that consists of the plan, implementing QA procedures and the technical procedures instead of a QA program, QA procedures and technical procedures.

Three areas of the plan received the most revisions. These areas are Sections 4, 10, and 18. Section 4, Procurement Document Control, was revised to reflect how this Agency and the State of Nevada actually do procurements. The majority of the requirements in Section 4 that were deleted are actually in the QA program itself. Since there is a contractual requirement for all contractors and subcontractors to comply with the QA program, not just certain sections, these requirements will still be met.

Section 10, Inspection, Surveillance, and Monitoring was changed to Inspection and Monitoring. I am reserving surveillances as a QA activity, not for overseeing DOE activities by NWPO contractors. I believe that this will alleviate any confusion that could have been caused by using surveillance in the previous context.

Section 18 was changed to incorporate surveillances. Surveillances will now be a QA function that augments the audit schedule.

8911080472 891107  
PDR WASTE  
WM-11

PDC

FULL TEXT ASCII SCAN

102.7  
M403  
WM-11

I attempted to remove some of the redundancy in the document. At times, I think too much detail was given that did not really add to the usefulness of the document. All in all, I do not think that these changes affected the Acceptance Evaluation that you did on the Revision 0 of this document. Mainly, this Revision 1 incorporated the agreed upon changes from your comments.

If you have any questions, please give me a call. As we discussed earlier, I would like to meet with you after the December QA meeting in Rockville to discuss any questions you might have.

Sincerely,



Susan W. Zimmerman  
QA Manager

Enclosures