

RECORD OF CORRESPONDENCE CONCURRENCE AND DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Report of Participation by Carl Newton in WMPO Audit of LANL March 30 - April 3, 1987

FROM: Carl Newton, RW-24

TO: James Knight, RW-24

PC CODE: CN99 (MARIE ADAMS' IBM)

ORIGINATOR: CARL NEWTON, 6-5059

WM Record File

102.7

WM Project 11

Docket No. _____

PDR ✓

LPDR N

Distribution:

STABLEIN

LINEMAN

ISL

Kennedy

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

DISTRIBUTION

QA FILE # 12
OCRWM CCRU, RW-13 (5)
OCRWM ARCHIVES (2)
ORIGINATOR'S CHRON: NEWTON
OGR READING FILE
S, L, & QA DIV CHRON

K. Sommer, RW-24
M. E. Langston, RW-40
H. Steinberg, RW-33
S. Echols, GC-11
R. Poe, EH-32
L. Barrett, RW-33

L. Skoblar, Weston
G. Faust, Weston
J. Kennedy, NRC

CONCURRENCES:

C. Newton 4/13/87
C. Newton, RW-24

87 APR 16 10:40

WM DOCKET CONTROL CENTER

8705190104 870413
PDR WASTE PDR
WM-11

United States Government

Department of Energy

memorandum

DATE: APR 13 1987

REPLY TO RW-24
ATTN OF:

SUBJECT: Report of Participation by Carl Newton in WMPO Audit of LANL
March 30 - April 3, 1987

TO:
James Knight, RW-24

Attached, as required by QIP 18.1 of the OGR QA Plan, is my report of the subject audit.

The audit itself was one of the best I have seen conducted - the audit team leader and team members were well-qualified and well-prepared.

The audit did not reveal any major programmatic deficiencies in the LANL QA program, nor any significant technical deficiencies. They are not perfect, but in my opinion are a good candidate for a mini-audit by NRC. These views were also echoed by the two NRC observers who participated in this audit.

I would be happy to discuss my report and recommendations with you.

Carl Newton

Carl Newton, QA Manager
Office of Geologic Repositories

cc w/att:

Steve Kale, RW-20
Tom Isaacs, RW-21
Ralph Stein, RW-23

John Estella, SAIC
Jim Blaylock, WMPO
Don Vieth, WMPO

Report of Participation by Carl Newton in
WMPO Audit of LANL, March 30 - April 3, 1987

1. AUDITING ORGANIZATION: Waste Management Project Office (WMPO),
Las Vegas, Nevada

2. AUDITED ORGANIZATION: Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)

3. SCOPE OF AUDIT: The following areas were audited:
 - o LANL QA Program Plan (QAPP)
 - o LANL QA Implementing Procedures
 - o Mineralogy and Petrology (WBS 1.2.3.4.2.A)
 - o Solubility Determination (WBS 1.2.3.4.1.4.A)
 - o Sorption and Precipitation (WBS 1.2.3.4.1.5.A)

The studies on Retardation Sensitivity Analysis (WBS 1.2.3.4.1.7.A), which were originally in the scope of the audit (see audit announcement, memo from Vieth to Oakley dated March 4, 1987), were deleted from the audit scope (see memo from Blaylock to Oakley dated March 25, 1987).

4. AUDIT TEAM:
 - John Estella, SAIC, Lead Auditor
 - Cathy Thompson, SAIC, Auditor
 - Walt Kazor, SAIC, Auditor
 - Jim Gromer, SAIC, Auditor
 - Jerry Heaney, SAIC, Auditor
 - Carl Newton, DOE, Auditor

Steve Mattson, SAIC, Technical Specialist

Dean Eppler, SAIC, Technical Specialist

Don Davidson, SAIC, Technical Specialist

Forrest Peters, SAIC, Auditor

Paul Prestholdt, NRC, Observer

Paul Bimbia, NRC, Observer

5. LANL QA PLAN & PROCEDURES

This auditor was responsible for auditing programmatic elements number 4, 7, and 13. I found the LANL QA Plan to be adequate, but some of the implementing procedures were in need of revision.

LANL Procedure TWS-MSTQA-QP-06, Revision 2, "NNWSI Procurement Procedures" needs extensive revision to clarify requirements for the procurement of commercial, off-the-shelf items so that vendor qualification need not be required. Also the interface responsibilities with LANL's Materials Management Division, who is responsible for issuing purchase orders, need to be classified and elaborated.

6. FINDINGS/OBSERVATIONS:

It is expected that WMPO will issue eleven Standard Deficiency Reports (SDR's) as a result of this audit. SDR's replace what used to be called "findings". SDR's are also issued separately from (and in a much more timely manner than) the audit report.

- (1) Lack of technical procedures for handling field samples.
- (2) Failure to perform quarterly peer reviews of lab notebooks.

- (3) Inadequate documentation of reviews of technical publications.
- (4) Failure to maintain traceability for calibration of balances.
- (5) Various minor document control deficiencies.
- (6) Failure to document reviews of procurement documents.
- (7) Procurement Orders issued without adequate QA requirements.
- (8) Equipment qualification not witnessed by QA representative.
- (9) Purchase orders not distributed as required.
- (10) Failure to follow procedure for NCR Statusing and Tracking.
- (11) Minor deficiencies in audit procedures.

It is also expected that ten observations and four recommendations will be issued.

7. SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS

There were no significant program-wide problems discovered during the audit that would indicate a need for program-wide corrective action.

8. CONDUCT OF AUDIT

- o The audit was performed in a very professional manner.
- o The auditor notebook was excellent - thorough and well organized.
- o The team meetings were effectively managed.
- o There was good use of the technical people on the audit.
- o The checklist was complete and easily understood.
- o The audit team members and team leader seemed exceptionally well-qualified.
- o The audit team leader did an outstanding job of conducting the audit.

Areas of Improvement:

- o The audit notebook and checklist were received by overnight mail at my home on March 29. It would have been useful to have them earlier.
- o A separate scoping meeting with LANL prior to the audit, or as part of the entrance meeting, would have been helpful to me. I was unfamiliar with the LANL work and a description of the activities underway, recent milestones met, recent reports published, and plans for future work would have been helpful.

Carl Newton
Prepared by Carl Newton

Date April 6, 1987