



AGENCY FOR NUCLEAR PROJECTS
NUCLEAR WASTE PROJECT OFFICE

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

MEMORANDUM

TO: DISTRIBUTION

FROM: SUSAN W. ZIMMERMAN, QA MANAGER ^{SWZ}
NEVADA NUCLEAR WASTE PROJECT OFFICE

DATE: MAY 17, 1989

SUBJECT: STATE OF NEVADA OBSERVATIONS ON DOE/YMP QA AUDIT OF FENIX
& SCISSON (89-01) AND HOLMES & NARVER (89-02), APRIL,
1989

The purpose of this memo is to relate the State of Nevada Nuclear Waste Project Office observations and comments regarding the DOE/YMP Quality Assurance audits of Fenix & Scisson on April 10-14, 1989, and Holmes & Narver on April 24-28, 1989. Because Title II design of the ESF had not begun and there was little implementation of the QA programs for either contractor and numerous surveillances of both contractors had been performed prior to each audit, both audits could have been postponed until there was adequate implementation of the QA programs to make the audits mean something besides being "just the yearly audit as required by the DOE QA program". This would have saved time and resources for all parties involved.

Fenix & Scisson

The Audit Process

Given the above facts, the audit turned out to be well planned and performed. The audit team was well prepared. The technical portion of the audit was well performed. The interviews with the technical staff were beneficial.

DOE/HQ performed a surveillance of the audit process for this audit. One of the surveillance team appeared to overstep his bounds of surveilling by taking an active part in the audit itself,

sometimes going as far as helping some of the F&S technical staff in answering some questions. Actions such as this in future audits need to be curtailed.

The F&S QA Program

Overall, I saw nothing in the F&S QA program that could be considered a "show-stopper". It was discovered during the audit that the F&S QA program does not comply with DOE's 88-9, Rev. 2 in two areas: procurement and software QA, but DOE/YMP knew this already. These portions of the F&S program are actually waiting on the Project Office for action. These areas should be resolved as soon as possible to prevent impact on the Title II design or any other site characterization activities.

F&S does have a potential problem with their QA program in that the interface between the technical staff and the QA staff is weak. F&S has worked very hard, perhaps too hard, to keep the QA organization independent. This has led to some misunderstandings and miscommunications of roles and responsibilities. The implementation of the program will either alleviate this problem or aggravate it.

Holmes & Narver

The Audit Process

Again, given the previously mentioned facts of the audits, this audit was well performed. The same interview process for the technical staff was used in this audit as in the F&S audit. This interview process should be used in all the audits and should be expanded to include members of the QA organization of the contractors.

One suggestion was made to the audit team leader/lead auditor that could enhance future audit processes. At times, both last year and this year, during the daily briefings of the TPOs of the audited organization, the ATL did not appear to have a complete understanding of the deficiencies that were found by the auditors and this led, sometimes, to confusion on the part of the TPOs in understanding exactly what the problem was. During this audit, the ATL brought the auditor into the briefing to further explain the problem. This seemed to work much better and alleviated some of the confusion. The suggestion is made that, if there is a problem in relating the problems discovered during an audit to the TPOs, then the auditor that found the problem should be included in the briefing.

The H&N QA Program

Considering the organizational discrepancies in the H&N QA program, not to mention the typographical errors that completely changed

commitments, I wonder why the H&N QA program was approved by the Project Office. The inclusion of the Nevada Test Site Office (NTSO) and EG&G in the QA program without showing on the organizational charts should have been discovered by the Project Office review and corrected long before the audit. The role of NTSO has been a QA issue long enough to have been addressed by now. Hopefully, it will now be resolved. Given these problems, it appears that DOE is more concerned with meeting a schedule than ensuring that the QA programs are actually ready for implementation.

There is still an interface problem between the contractors involved in the design of the ESF. This problem has been raised at previous audits of other contractors and at H&N. It is still a problem and should be corrected prior to the start of actual design activities of the ESF or site prep.

Distribution

~~Brian Thomas, FOIA Project Manager~~
Division of High-Level Waste Management
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dwight Shelor
Director, Quality Assurance
U. S. Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20585

Carl Gertz, Project Manager
Yucca Mountain Project Office
U.S. DOE
Nevada Operations Office
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, Nevada 89193

Henry Caldwell
Manager of Auditing
SAIC
101 Convention Center Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89109