



Science Applications International Corporation

WBS 1.2.9.1.1
QA

September 15, 1989

Carl P. Gertz, Project Manager
Yucca Mountain Project Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Nevada Operations Office
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT MANAGER-TECHNICAL PROJECT OFFICER
(PM-TPO) MEETING, CONTRACT #DE-ACO8-87NV10576

Enclosed for your information are the minutes, with attachments, of the
subject meeting, which was held August 31, 1989, in Las Vegas, Nevada. If you
have comments or corrections to the minutes, they will be discussed at the
October PM-TPO meeting, scheduled for October 6, 1989, in Las Vegas.

John H. Nelson, Project Manager
Technical and Management
Support Services

JHN:MLH:mlh:L89-011

Enclosure:
PM-TPO Meeting Minutes
w/6 attach.

8909250059 890915
PDR WASTE
WM-11

PDC

101 Convention Center Dr., Ste. 407, Las Vegas, NV 89109 (702) 794-7000

Other SAIC Offices: Albuquerque, Ann Arbor, Arlington, Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Huntsville, La Jolla, Los Angeles, McLean, Orlando, Santa Barbara, Sunnyvale, and Tucson

FULL TEXT ASCII SCAN

ADD: K. Hooks

102
WM-11
N/A03

cc w/encl:

L. E. Jardine, LLNL, Livermore, CA
T. O. Hunter, SNL, 6310, Albuquerque, NM
R. J. Herbst, LANL, Los Alamos, NM
L. R. Hayes, USGS, Las Vegas, NV
R. L. Bullock, FSN, Las Vegas, NV
J. C. Calovini, H&N, Las Vegas, NV
R. F. Pritchett, REECO, Las Vegas, NV
A. M. Sastry, MACTEC, Las Vegas, NV
Steven Frishman, NWPO, Carson City, NV
P. R. Prestholt, NRC, Las Vegas, NV
A. R. Veloso, NTSO
E. L. Wilmot, YMP, NV
M. B. Blanchard, YMP, NV
W. R. Dixon, YMP, NV
L. E. Little, YMP, NV
J. H. Nelson, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-04
W. F. Thomas, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-40
R. D. Crisp, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-17
M. L. Hamner, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-01

cc w/encl. 1 and attach. 1 only:

Robert Craig, USGS, Las Vegas, NV
Tony Buono, USGS, Las Vegas, NV
G. L. Shideler, USGS, Denver, CO
H. N. Kalia, LANL, Las Vegas, NV
~~Ken Hooks, NRC, Washington, DC~~
W. A. Wilson, YMP, NV
R. V. Barton, YMP, NV
E. C. Rehkop, YMP, NV
J. K. Robson, YMP, NV
U. S. Clanton, YMP, NV
M. R. Diaz, YMP, NV
R. J. Bahorich, W, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-37
W. V. Macnabb, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-04
J. S. Treadwell, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-17
M. D. Voegele, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-03
W. B. Devlin, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-28
J. E. Shaler, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-15
S. M. Volek, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-18
J. D. Waddell, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-21
I. M. Reinhardt, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-01
K. W. Moore, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV, 517/T-28

I. INTRODUCTION

These minutes constitute a record of the August Project Manager-Technical Project Officer (PM-TPO) meeting, held in Las Vegas, NV on August 31, 1989. Any additions or corrections will be published in the minutes of the October meeting. A copy of the agenda (Attachment 1), which reflects the actual sequence of events, is enclosed as an informal table of contents to the minutes.

II. MEETING PARTICIPANTS

A. TECHNICAL PROJECT OFFICERS

Leslie Jardine, LLNL
Joe Calovini, H&N
Dick Bullock, FSN
Bob Pritchett, REEC0
Tom Hunter, SNL
Dick Herbst, Los Alamos
Larry Hayes, USGS
John Nelson, SAIC
Addanki Sastry, MACTEC

C. NON-DOE RESOURCE CONTRIBUTORS

Melissa Hamner, SAIC (recorder)

B. PROJECT OFFICE, DOE/NV, DOE/HQ

Robert Barton, YMP
Winn Wilson, YMP
John Robson, YMP
Carl Gertz, YMP
Ed Wilmot, YMP
Leo Little, YMP
Uel Clanton, YMP
Mario Diaz, YMP
Carol Rehkop, YMP

D. OBSERVERS

Steve Frishman, State of Nevada
Robert Craig, USGS
Tony Buono, USGS
Ken Hooks, NRC/HQ
Paul Prestholt, NRC
Gerald Shideler, USGS
Rocky Crisp, SAIC
Hemendra Kalia, Los Alamos

III. INTRODUCTIONS/ROLES/OUTCOMES

Carl Gertz opened by asking the meeting participants to introduce themselves.

IV. APPROVE MINUTES

The minutes of the July meeting were approved by the meeting participants.

V. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON AGENDA ITEMS

A. REVIEW AGENDA AND OUTCOMES

The participants agreed to the agenda (Attachment 1).

B. FYIs

Carl Gertz

Management and Operations (M&O) contract: Judge Gibson's 88-page opinion was released August 30, stating that the M&O contract could not be awarded to Bechtel under the original 1987 request for proposals. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has several options:

1. Award the contract to TRW.
2. Write a new contract.
3. Have the participants do the work.
4. Appeal the decision.

The judge's decision revolved around the role of Sam Rousso in the awarding of the contract to Bechtel, whose bid included Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), Rousso's former employer, as a subcontractor. If an appeal is filed, it will have to be no later than October 23. In addition, the Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) subcontracts for repository design studies expire at the end of September, so a decision about the contract will have to be made soon. Until a decision is reached, the Project will focus on site characterization activities.

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NWTRB): The NWTRB held a conference in Albuquerque, NM, to discuss transportation and waste package design. The DOE had problems addressing some of the issues raised by the NWTRB, which said some of the presentations were too general. Board members questioned why the DOE hasn't considered risk perception more seriously. They also questioned the use of RADTRANS as the primary code for transportation and risk analysis, since there are no plans to verify the code. However, the NWTRB was supportive of the materials selection process. The Project will probably have monthly interactions with the Board from now on. There will be a meeting in November on volcanics, and the NWTRB would like to take a tour of volcanic sites.

Budget: The budget for fiscal year (FY) 1990 is still uncertain. The high figure is approximately \$420 million, the low \$350 million. Each figure has different stipulations attached. \$10 million of the budget is automatically slated to go to the University of Nevada system for a supercomputer.

Upcoming interactions: The Semiannual Progress Report should be issued soon. The Site Characterization Plan/Consultation Draft comments from the State, Edison Electric Institute, and the USGS are being responded to; the NRC comments have already been responded to. The comment response package will consist of separate packages that answer each question.

The next series of update meetings has been scheduled for Sept. 26 in Pahrump, Sept. 27 in Henderson, and Sept. 28 in Carson City. Topics expected to be raised include the endangered species status of the desert tortoise, the NRC Site Characterization Analysis, the railway transport study, and how the court decision on the M&O contract will affect the Project.

The Las Vegas Information Office is scheduled to open in early January 1990.

Robert Barton

NRC representatives visited the drilling site near Milford, Utah.

The status of the SCP study plans is: 16 are in internal review, 8 are in a post-review (i.e., revision and audit) cycle, 1 is waiting for an NRC review, and 7 are being reviewed by the NRC. The problems encountered earlier were programmatic; the NRC has no problems at all with the plans' technical content.

All papers for Focus '89 are due to the ANS September 1. However, if papers are sent to the Project Office before Sept. 8, they should still be eligible.

Les Jardine

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) is in the process of revising its planning documents to new Quality Assurance (QA) requirements, and should be finished this month. Also, all upper-tier Scientific Investigation Plans are being revised.

A more detailed activities plan is being prepared.

Three readiness reviews will be conducted, since LLNL is starting QA Level I work to new requirements.

The LLNL Software Quality Assurance Plan (SQAP) was submitted to the Project Office this week, and should be approved by mid-September.

The Performance Assessment group is being enlarged, and will be used to integrate waste package program activities. LLNL is cooperating with SNL in this effort.

Joe Calovini

H&N has concluded an internal audit of its field support organization. A number of Corrective Action Reports (CARs) were written, so more resources will be dedicated to this effort.

H&N underwent a Project Office surveillance of the design process. It was found to be sound, with two potential items to be corrected in the procedures.

Title II design on the early work package (topsoil storage pad, access road, borrow area) and the Main Pad continues.

H&N conducted a management review of the General Arrangement (GA) drawings for the surface Exploratory Shaft Facility (ESF). Problems with the design were gathered in formal comments and are being addressed at this time.

The H&N Internal Design Input Control document has been signed, completing the last main readiness review item required before design can be started.

Design input continues to be a problem. H&N will have to use assumptions on some parameters to continue. This is a critical area that needs attention.

Field work support continues in G-tunnel and on the Administration and Engineering (A&E) building, as does support of mapping and other work in Area 25 of the Nevada Test Site and on Yucca Mountain. H&N is also supporting the permitting work.

In the area of interface control, the details of the informational interfaces are being worked out in a memorandum of understanding. Physical interfaces are being put on System Interface Drawings, which are nearing completion.

H&N is supporting the Planning and Control System (PACS) effort. The first submittal was on time, but there may be a problem making the subsequent submittals punctually.

Dick Bullock

Fenix & Scisson of Nevada (FSN) continued working on ESF Title II design. 36 GA drawings, numerous design calculations supporting the GAs, and 21 draft Specifications are in progress.

The FSN portion of the draft Preliminary Safety Analysis Report, based on Title I design, has been completed.

All Project Office comments have been incorporated into the FSN Basis for Design document, Rev. 0.

FSN held a three-day workshop on controlled drilling and blasting that was received well by the participants.

An internal QA audit was completed on the ESF design, and a DOE surveillance is in progress. No results have been reported yet.

FSN drilling engineers and a drilling specialist supported the prototype drilling in Utah.

FSN continued to support prototype testing in G-tunnel.

Four extended abstracts were submitted to the DOE for approval for submittal to the ANS for the 1990 high-level nuclear waste conference.

The DOE approved the FSN SQAP, and FSN is now working on the implementing procedures.

Bob Pritchett

Reynolds Electrical & Engineering Co. is reviewing and commenting on administrative procedures.

The A&E building is now scheduled to be completed near the end of December.

Tom Hunter

The fifth revision of the SNL Quality Assurance Program Plan (QAPP), which responds to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) comments, has been submitted for DOE review. Procedures have been updated and training completed.

Some Standard Deficiency Reports (SDRs) on SNL still have to be closed out by the Project Office.

The SNL Local Records Center (LRC) has been expanded and refurbished.

SNL is preparing the planning documents necessary to begin FY 90 work.

Joe Tillerson has been moved to the Waste Isolation Pilot Program, and his replacement has not yet been named. Tom Hunter is acting for now.

Dick Herbst

Los Alamos is concentrating on preparations for their upcoming QA audit.

Eight Los Alamos scientists will present papers at the Focus '89 conference.

The Los Alamos QAPP is being revised to respond to NRC comments, and several SDRs have been closed out.

The Los Alamos legal department has rendered an opinion on Privacy Act conflicts: it believes the records can legally be made available for audits.

The GAO audited Los Alamos, chiefly to assess the management of subcontracts. Tom Hunter mentioned that SNL has received no word on the GAO audit conducted there in July.

The ESF Test Manager's Office has been supporting and coordinating the prototype testing in Utah.

There will be a readiness review of EG&G in September on their ability to start Title II design work.

All Los Alamos study plans are at the Project Office for review.

An organization chart for the Los Alamos reorganization announced at last month's PM-TPO meeting is enclosed with this month's minutes (Attachment 3).

Larry Hayes

A Project Office audit team determined the USGS QA program is in place and adequate. The program was accepted on all criteria except Criterion 2.0, which could not be audited because of Privacy Act restrictions. The USGS will work with the DOE at the headquarters level to resolve problems stemming from the Privacy Act. Four SDRs were issued, the most significant in the study plan process. The USGS is currently resolving a few remaining difficulties in the development of study plans. The State expressed concerns about the selection of the audit team, believing there may be a conflict of interest. However, the Observation will be directed at the Project Office, not at the USGS.

The USGS plans to expedite moving QA functions under the TPO, into line management. The only groups left in QA would be audits and surveillances.

The USGS Las Vegas office hosted the last Exploratory Shaft Test Committee meeting. The response to the scientific presentations was good.

Leo Little

The first of the DOE-NRC technical interchange meetings was held; although the meetings are supposed to be limited to 10-12 people, 37 attended. Nevertheless, most of the participants thought the meeting accomplished its purpose of exchanging purely technical information, without addressing any policy issues.

A surveillance of the ESF design control process is underway. The organizations involved are the Project Office, FSN, H&N, and SNL. There have been three minor findings concerning Project Office procedures.

The designs for the first three packages are on schedule. The first notification of reviews of these procedures should be issued in early November, and the NRC will be invited to participate.

The interface control procedures are being revised. Most of the pertinent points have already been identified by the TPOs. Little requested that any reviewers who have not yet sent their comments to the Project Office do so as quickly as possible, so work on the details can begin.

John Nelson

SAIC has been supporting the Project Office, focusing on QA.

SAIC is preparing for a surveillance of the technical activities for which it has the lead.

At the request of the Project Office, SAIC has assembled a team of three senior-level staff to examine the current document structure. The team submitted a proposal to close gaps in higher-level documents, and believes a number of procedures need to be changed. SAIC will initiate a significant effort to address these problems soon.

Ed Wilmot

There have been few problems with the State's participation in the design control surveillances, which are examining compliance only.

SNL will undergo a management assessment beginning September 6 and an audit the next week (September 11).

The QA organization has turned its focus inwards to address a number of concerns. Gertz is reviewing suggestions for improvements of the program.

Don Horton, formerly with the Tennessee Valley Authority, has been selected as the new head of the Quality Assurance Division. He will replace Wilmot on September 16.

Winn Wilson

The new motor pool should be ready before the end of September. It will consist of 37 Chevrolet Celebrities, which will be available for use on an ad hoc basis. These vehicles can be used for travel to and from the Nevada Test Site (NTS), but not within the NTS.

Carl Gertz

Since it appears the Project will not be going into the field soon, staff should concentrate on writing procedures and implementing audits.

The Project Office Site Investigations Branch recently hired Roy Long from SAIC and Tim Sullivan from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamations.

The Project Office issued a letter requesting the TPOs to provide input for revisions to the Project QA Plan (NNWSI/88-9), and Gertz asked that they give the matter serious consideration.

C. PROJECT OFFICE INPUT TO THE SEMIANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT (SPR)

Tom Bjerstedt gave a presentation on the Project Office input to the SPR (Attachment 4). The Project Office will supply information on field and laboratory progress on the site characterization program at the Site characterization Plan activity level. The strategy for SPR input will require modification of draft AP-2.4, which will revise the discontinued requirement for a quarterly technical report into one for a Biannual Status Report (BSR). The input will be tailored to established DOE/Headquarters guidance and format for the SPR, sent as a letter report that will become a referenceable DOE/Nevada Operations Office document. Also included in Attachment 3 is a copy of AP-2.4, Participant Input to the Semiannual Progress Report on Site Characterization.

D. PROJECT-LEVEL STATUS REPORTS

Barbara McKinnon gave a presentation on Project-level status reports (Attachment 5) in response to a concern raised by Larry Hayes in the July PM-TPO meeting. The question was whether a separate BSR was really needed, or if current reports could provide the required input. After comparing the purpose, scope, WBS level, frequency, and degree of management review of the three Project-level reports, it was concluded that they cannot be substituted for the BSR. The BSR will be more technical in nature than the existing Project management reports, which do not collect the degree of detail it needs.

E. PREVIEW OF DATA MANAGEMENT PRESENTATION FOR THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR WASTE (ACNW)

Robert Levich presented a summary of the planned presentation to the ACNW this month. The presentation focuses on an overview of the current technical data management system, the sources of Project technical data, and the access of outside parties to Project data. From past problems, the Project Office learned that there is a need for a managed data flow and distribution process, an expanded data catalog, and centralized data archives. The presentation then details the efforts that are underway to meet these needs, e.g., the Project QA Plan, the Technical Data Management Plan, and several detailed procedures. Following this, the three sources of data are delineated: raw data, reduced (interpreted) data, and published reports. The Project technical data base is then described, and the status of the various systems is given. The presentation concludes with a description of the ways in which non-Project parties can gain access to Project data and the requirements they must meet. The TPOs suggested changes to several graphic sketches included in the presentation, but were generally satisfied with its content.

F. STATUS OF PROTOTYPE DRILLING

Uel Clanton gave a presentation on the status of the prototype drilling and the LM-250 drill rig (Attachment 6). Four holes were drilled near Milford; three were abandoned because water was encountered at a depth significantly higher than expected. The fourth was shut down on August 23 because wet clay was encountered. From what drilling was done, the engineers gathered that diamond coring produced excellent results. The modified blown core system is a significant improvement over Phase 1A.

On the status of the LM-250 drill rig, a technical evaluation of the proposal submitted by Lang Drilling Co. is in progress. Drill rig delivery is scheduled for 6 months after the completion of the technical evaluation (i.e., April 1990).

VI. ACTION ITEMS

No action items were generated at this meeting.

VII. NEXT MEETING

The next PM-TPO meeting is tentatively scheduled for October 6, 1989.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT
PROJECT MANAGER-TECHNICAL PROJECT OFFICER MEETING
AGENDA

N-AD-028
1/89

Location: 101 Convention Center Drive , Room 450
 Las Vegas. NV 89109

REVISED

Page: 1 of 1
 Date: Aug. 31, 1989

TIME	WHAT	WHO	EXPECTED OUTCOME
9:00-9:15	Introduction/Roles Agenda/Outcome Review 7/27/89 Minutes Date for Next Meeting: 10/6/89	C. Gertz	Agree to Agenda/ Outcome Approve Minutes Agree to Date
9:15-9:45	Manager FYIs	C. Gertz	Understand FYI Items
9:45-10:45	FYIs	Division Directors/TPOs	Understand FYI Items
10:45-11:00	Break		
11:00-11:15	Project Office Input to SPR	T. Bjerstedt	Introduce Project Strategy for SPR2 Input
11:15-11:30	Project-Level Status Reports	B. McKinnon	Understand Scope, Schedule, and Audience
11:30-11:45	Preview of Data Management Presentation for ACNW	R. Levich	Understand Issues to be Discussed
11:45-12:00	Status of Prototype Drilling	U. Clanton	Understand Status
Noon	Adjourn		