



Department of Energy

Nevada Operations Office
P. O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

WBS 1.2.9.3
QA

NOV 09 1989

John H. Nelson
Technical Project Officer for Yucca Mountain Project
Science Applications International Corporation
The Valley Bank Center, Suite 407
101 Convention Center Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89109

YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT OFFICE (PROJECT OFFICE) REJECTION OF STANDARD
DEFICIENCY REPORT (SDR) 392 RESPONSE (NN1-1990- 0445)

Please be advised that quality assurance (QA) has evaluated your response to SDR 392 and has determined it to be unacceptable for the following reasons. Your response addresses calibration requirements established by the equipment vendor, qualification of calibration sources, recalibration of equipment, and personnel training. However, the methodology for control of this equipment has not been delineated.

The requirements for establishing this methodology are found in the Project Office QA Program Plan, WMPO/88-1, Revision 1, Section XII, Control of Measuring and Test Equipment, paragraph 2.1 through 2.6.

Your response must specifically address how you intend to meet the aforementioned requirements. As these requirements are mandatory, our original recommendation to generate a generic measuring and test equipment procedure for control of calibrated equipment remains valid.

Your response is due not more than ten working days from the issue date of this letter.

Should you have any questions, please contact James Blaylock of my staff at 794-7913, or James R. Narron of Science Applications International Corporation at 794-7775.

James Blaylock
Donald G. Horton, Director
Quality Assurance Division
Yucca Mountain Project Office

YMP:JB-711

Enclosure:
SDR 392 Response

8911160300 891109
PDR WASTE
WM-11 PDC

FULL TEXT ASCII SCAN

WM-11
NA03
102.7

ORIGINAL
THIS IS A RED STAMP

YMPO STANDARD DEFICIENCY REPORT

N-QA-038
4/89

Completed by Originating QA Organization	1 Date July 17, 1989		2 Severity Level <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3		Page 1 of 2
	3 Discovered During YMP-SR-89-119		3a Identified By T. E. Rodgers		4 SDR No. 392 Rev. 0
	5 Organization SAIC		6 Person(s) Contacted M. Dussman		7 Response Due Date is 20 Working Days from Date of Transmittal
	8 Requirement (Audit Checklist Reference, if Applicable) Quality Assurance Program Plan, WMPO/88-1, Rev. 1, Section 1, Paragraph 6.1, states in part: "... Project Office quality related activities are performed in accordance with approved QMPs, BTPs, or				
Completed by Organization in Block 5	9 Deficiency An approved procedure does not currently exist which addresses the control and calibration of measuring and test equipment.				
	10 Recommended Action(s): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Remedial <input type="checkbox"/> Investigative <input type="checkbox"/> Corrective 1) Generate generic calibration procedure in accordance with the requirements of QMP-05-01.				
	11 QAE/Lead Auditor/Date <i>James R. Bryant 8-1-89</i>		12 Division Manager/Date <i>Robert J. Hayes 8-1-89</i>		13 Project Quality Mgr./Date <i>W. B. Marshall 8/14/89</i>
	14 Remedial/Investigative Action(s) See Attached				
Comp. by Org. QA Org.	15 Effective Date _____				
	16 Cause of the Condition & Corrective Action to Prevent Recurrence See Attached				
	17 Effective Date _____				
	18 Signature/Date <i>Morie M. Dussman 9/28/89</i>				
Comp. by Org. QA Org.	19 Response Accepted	QAE/Lead Auditor/Date	Division Manager/Date	Project Quality Mgr./Date	
	20 Corrective Action Verif. Satisfactory	QAE/Lead Auditor/Date	Division Manager/Date	Project Quality Mgr./Date	
	21 Remarks				
	22 QA CLOSURE	QAE/Lead Auditor/Date	Division Manager/Date	PQM/Date	

**YMPO STANDARD DEFICIENCY REPORT
CONTINUATION SHEET**

**N-QA-038
12/88**

SDR No. 392

Rev. 0

Page 2 of 2

8 Requirement (continued)

quality related APQs ..."

10 Recommended Actions (continued)

2) Train personnel as appropriate.

14. Remedial/Investigative Action

In the course of a surveillance of both the air quality and meteorological field monitoring programs, it was noted that various pieces of equipment were being calibrated by unapproved vendors. It was recommended that a generic calibration procedure be prepared in accordance with the requirements of QMP-05-01.

It is felt that the recommended action is not appropriate for the following reasons:

1. The calibration of each piece of equipment is dependent on and directed by the requirements of the vendor for that piece of equipment and is usually unique to that piece of equipment.
2. A list of calibration sources has been submitted to Quality Assurance for validation.
3. Upon validation, the equipment will be provided to the sources for re-calibration.
4. Personnel will then be trained in these approved calibration procedures.

16. Cause of the Condition and Corrective Action to Prevent Recurrence

The cause of the condition was the lack of a qualified calibration services vendors listing covering these vendors and calibration services. Actions have been taken to establish such a list. All items and equipment will be entered into a calibration recall system and will be calibrated at appropriate intervals using only qualified vendors in the future.

John H. Nelson

-2-

NOV 09 1989

cc w/encl:

Ralph Stein, HQ (RW-30) FORS
D. E. Shelor, HQ (RW-3) FORS
J. J. Brogan, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
G. R. Fehr, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
V. D. Hedges, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
W. V. Macnabb, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
J. H. Nelson, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
J. R. Narron, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
C. H. Prater, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
R. J. Bahorich, W, Las Vegas, NV
J. W. Gilray, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
J. E. Kennedy, NRC, Washington, DC
S. W. Zimmerman, NWPO, Carson City, NV

