



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

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

August 18, 1988

TO: Distribution

FROM: Susan W. Zimmerman *SWZ*
NWPO Quality Assurance Manager

SUBJECT: State of Nevada Observations of WMPO Audit 88-06,
Sandia National Lab, Albuquerque, New Mexico

On July 25-29 and August 1-3, 1988, I attended the WMPO Quality Assurance audit, 88-06, of Sandia National Laboratory in Albuquerque, New Mexico as the State of Nevada observer. Jim Grubb and Frank Kendorski also attended as State of Nevada technical observers for the first week.

Comments on the Audit Process

Given the large number of people on the audit team and the Sandia security requirements, the audit progressed rather well. All participants on both the audit team and the Sandia staff did all in their power to ensure that nothing impeded the progress of the audit.

The State observations on the conduct of the audit are as follows:

- 1) Some of the technical auditors did not seem to understand the job they were supposed to be performing. There did not seem to have been enough pre-audit preparation and training for the technical auditors.
- 2) In some instances with both technical auditors and programmatic auditors, possible problems or deficiencies were not investigated as thoroughly as expected. For example, a value was used in error in a technical report. This error was not investigated to determine if it had any impact on

8808250128 880818
PDR WASTE PDC
WM-11

*102.7
WM-11
NH03 1/1*

other work, nor was it investigated to determine the reason the value was used in the first place. It appeared that if the information was not readily accessible, then not much effort was put into checking things out.

In a programmatic area, parts of the checklist were not adequately investigated. In one case, when this was brought to the attention of the auditor, the status of a checklist item was affected.

Comments on the Sandia QA Program

The most notable concern regarding the Sandia QA Program was the fact that Sandia had not brought their QA program into compliance with NVO-196-17, Rev. 5, even though this revision has been out since March, 1987. In fact, the Sandia staff did not appear to have any idea that they were supposed to be in compliance with Revision 5.

The data that Sandia is currently using in its work is almost solely Quality Level III data or non-qualified data. This has resulted in the lack of sufficient quality assurance being applied to important activities, such as the use of computer codes in the design. Sandia staff stated during the audit that they do not consider themselves to be in the design phase of the project and therefore do not need a more rigorous quality assurance program.