

memorandum

109

Docket No. _____

PDR

DATE: APR 09 1987

DOCKET CONTROL CENTER

Trojanski

REPLY TO ATTN OF: RW-223

'87 ABR 15 AIO:26

Distribution:

| | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|-------|
| REB | MSB | Parborn | Still |
| JOB | RDM | Tana | Young |

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

DKunihiko

SUBJECT: Commitments Status Report From the Quarterly Meeting of States and Indian Tribes Held in Spokane, Washington, February 12, 1987

TO: Distribution

The following status report is provided for Commitments 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 17 from the February 12, 1987, Spokane, Washington, Quarterly Meeting. We will report the status for Commitments 2, 4, 14, and 16 in the next couple of weeks.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Judy Leahy on (202) 586-8320.

Commitment

Status

1. DOE will inform the States and Indian Tribes of steps to ensure opportunities for meaningful participation of the States and Indian Tribes in the DOE/NAS technical meetings.

The States and Indian Tribes were invited to the most recent meeting of the NAS Board on March 26, 1987, at which the subject of State/Tribal participation was discussed. Future NAS Board meetings will also be open to the States and Indian Tribes. The attached handouts (see attachment 1) were discussed and comments were received from the States and Indian Tribes. DOE will continue to work with the NAS to help ensure that meaningful opportunities for involvement are provided. DOE understands that the next Board meeting, scheduled for July 14, 1987, in Seattle, Washington, will allow for significant input by the States and Indian Tribes regarding their technical concerns.

3. DOE will send a copy of the FY 88 budget request to the States and Indian Tribes.

Copy of "Fiscal Year 1988 Congressional Request Civilian Radioactive Waste Research and Development, Nuclear Waste Fund" was sent to State and Indian Tribe representatives February 17, 1987.

| | |
|------------|--------|
| B7050B0007 | B70409 |
| PDR WASTE | |
| WM-1 | PDR |

5. DOE is available to meet with the States and affected Indian Tribes to discuss the Mission Plan Amendment before the April 3 deadline for comments.

Conversations were held with each State and Indian Tribe representative regarding the draft Mission Plan Amendment. However, there were no requests for a meeting.
6. At the DOE/NRC Interagency Coordinating Committee meeting, DOE will discuss with the States and Indian Tribes the LSS and the negotiated rulemaking, pending the S. Kale conversation with procurement officials.

Because of the status of the procurement for the LSS, a meeting scheduled for March 25, 1987, was postponed (see attached letter dated March 5, 1987). In view of the NRC's planned establishment of an Advisory Committee, it may be best to have further discussions in this context. DOE would, however, be willing to have prior discussions if the States and Indian Tribes wish.
7. BWIP will meet during the week of February 17-20 with the State of Washington and the Indian Tribes to address technical scoping and how full-year funding can be awarded in an expeditious manner.

Completed. Meeting held February 18, 1987. Issue also discussed at ISCG Meeting March 10-12, 1987.
8. BWIP will provide to the State of Washington and the Indian Tribes the exact date for closure on their grants as soon as possible after the meeting referenced above.

Completed. Meeting held February 18, 1987. Issue also discussed at ISCG Meeting March 10-12, 1987. Washington Legislature and Indian Tribes grants awarded March 31, 1987; Washington Department of Ecology grant awarded March 24, 1987.
9. Each Project Office will continue to work with the States and Indian Tribes to come to agreement on full-year grants.

Completed. Issue discussed at ISCG Meeting March 10-12, 1987, (see attachment 3).
10. DOE will put on the ISCG agenda a discussion of grant problems and possible approaches to resolve problems.

Completed. Item added to March 12, 1987, ISCG Meeting (see attachment 3).

11. DOE/HQ and BWIP will contact the State of Washington and the Indian Tribes to discuss and resolve quality assurance issues. Completed. Issues discussed at the ISCG Meeting March 11, 1987.
12. DOE will provide a description at the ISCG of the format of SCP reference documents and of the locations where the documents will be provided, and DOE will provide all reference documents at the same time the SCPs are released. Completed. Description provided at the ISCG Meeting March 12, 1987, (see attachment 4).
13. NNWSI will provide the State of Nevada with letters regarding participation in the stop work orders, and will provide a briefing at the State's request. Completed. Letter sent to Bob Loux on March 24, 1987, (see attachment 5).
15. DOE/HQ and the Project Offices will:
a) continue to work on near-term funding issues, identify any recommendations for changes, and report at the next ISCG meeting; and
b) work on the near-term needs for urgent action to release funds. Completed. Progress report given at ISCG Meeting March 10-12, 1987, (see attachment 3).
17. DOE will poll the States and Indian Tribes on the proposal to hold the next quarterly meeting in Las Vegas and on the date for that meeting. Completed. Memorandum sent February 24, 1987, polling State and Indian Tribe representatives for the date and location of next meeting (see attachment 6). Next meeting scheduled for May 28, 1987, in Las Vegas, Nevada.

A. H. Kale

Stephen H. Kale
Associate Director for
Geologic Repositories
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management

Attachments

PROPOSED STATEMENT OF WORK

The general objective of this study is to conduct a continuing independent technical review and evaluation of certain portions, selected by the National Research Council, of the U. S. Department of Energy's program for the characterization of each of three candidate sites preliminary to the selection of one to be the first geologic repository for high level radioactive waste. The National Research Council, through its Board on Radioactive Waste Management, will conduct the study as follows:

1. The Chairman - National Research Council, upon recommendation from the Commission on Physical Sciences, Mathematics and Resources and its Board on Radioactive Waste Management (ERWM) will appoint three multidisciplinary panels of approximately twelve experts each in such fields as geological sciences, including rock mechanics, geochemistry and hydrology; environmental science; socio-economic sciences; radiobiology and health physics; public policy, including law and regulatory practices; systems analysis; and repository engineering (e.g., considerations of corrosion, chemical engineering, and thermo-hydraulic engineering).
2. The panel for each site will review the scientific and technical adequacy of documentation supporting portions of:
 - a. the program for site characterization including assessment of key elements of DOE's scientific analysis--particularly the identification of critical uncertainties and limitations in the analytic framework;
 - b. the performance assessment for the repository and the waste packages including, where necessary, appraisal of the scope and quality of technical judgments leading to major technical decisions;
 - c. the implementation of the experimental program and subsequent analysis including identification of important scientific and technical issues that deserve greater attention.

During the site characterization phase of the Radioactive Waste Repository Program, significant detailed scientific and technical questions associated with the candidate repository sites may arise. When comment from the National Research Council may be helpful, and is both within the competence of the assembled study group and appropriate for study and review by the Research Council, the panels will consider addressing such questions.

3. Reports including conclusions and recommendations will be prepared by the panels, reviewed in accordance with standing Academy procedures, and reproduced in sufficient quantity to ensure distribution to the sponsor, to committee members, and to other relevant parties in accordance with Academy policy. The reports will be made available to the public without restriction.

DRAFT OPERATING PROCEDURES

The following statements are indicative of the operating procedures the Board intends to set up for the site characterization panels requested by the Department of Energy

1. The Chairman of the National Research Council, ^{NAS/}(NRC) has agreed to a request by the Director of the Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management for scientific and technical advice during the site characterization phase of the national geological repository program.
2. Upon negotiation of an appropriate agreement, ^{NAS/}the NRC is prepared to establish three separate panels, one for each site to be characterized, to review the technical bases for portions of the DOE characterization programs.
3. The role of each panel will be to evaluate key technical aspects of the DOE site characterization program for completeness and accuracy, and to provide a mechanism by which valid technical concerns from outside the DOE program can be given appropriate and timely consideration.
4. Three panels, one for each site to be characterized, will be established with members selected in accordance with current NAS/NRC procedures and appointed for an initial term of three years. Although there will generally be separate members for each panel, some members may serve on more than one panel where the material under review is similar.
5. The Board on Radioactive Waste Management (BRWM) will provide continuing oversight to each panel as well as a cross-cutting function between panels.
6. Meetings will generally be held at the sites being characterized or in Washington D.C., and their frequency will depend upon the rate at which technical material of interest to each panel is generated.

7. Advance notice of each meeting, with a preliminary agenda and an invitation to attend, will be sent to the designated technical representative of each affected State and Indian tribe.
8. It is intended that the first meeting of each panel and, as deemed desirable, subsequent meetings from time to time will be held in conjunction with a meeting of the Board on Radioactive Waste Management, and that public attendance will be encouraged during the open portion of the meetings.
9. Subsequent panel meetings will usually include both open and executive sessions. The open sessions may consist of technical presentations by DOE, DOE contractors, panel consultants, or invited guests having technical information to present and, consistent with space limitations, will be open to interested observers. Any document submitted as input to a panel will be accepted and considered only if the supplier of the document is willing to make it available without restriction to other interested parties. The executive sessions will be restricted to panel members, members of the Board on Radioactive Waste Management, and Research Council consultants and staff.
10. Invited guests will be scheduled on the agenda at the discretion of the Chairman on specific topics of concern to panel members or, failing such specific scheduling, will be given an opportunity to make brief technical remarks to the panel at each meeting. If an invited guest desires more of the panel's consideration than the brief remark period will permit, he or she should submit the concern, in writing, to the panel staff at least two weeks prior to the meeting.
11. The panels are not intended to provide fora for polemics, nor can they redress wrongs, real or imaginary. Panel chairmen will, therefore, limit both presentations to the panels and the work of the panel members to technical matters. Panels will, however, seek written comment on technical matters from, and will strive to maintain active contact with and

- participation of, the technical representative or review organization set up by each first round repository State or Indian tribe. Invited technical representatives will be encouraged to participate in all open sessions of the panels, to comment on materials presented to the panels, and to provide written and oral comments on panel reports once they are reviewed in the Academy's normal procedure and released to the public.
12. Interested parties, other than invited guests of a panel, will be admitted to the open sessions as observers on a first-come, first-served basis limited by the capacity of the meeting room. Observers may not ask questions or speak or otherwise participate in the meeting and may be asked to leave (on a last in, first out basis) to make room for arriving invited guests.
 13. Although the formal product of each panel will be a sequence of written reports, provision will be made in open sessions for panel members to discuss issues and to question informally the invited representatives of DOE, its contractors, and other agencies, organizations or interested parties on technical matters.
 14. Panel reports will be prepared from time to time at the panel's initiative and as the panel deems appropriate. The reports will be based upon technical material including documented personal communications provided by DOE or otherwise obtained by the panel. No report will be prepared on material presented to a panel that is not also available to other interested parties upon request, although any such material presented during the open session portion of a panel meeting may be the subject of comment by individual panel members. Panel reports will be reviewed under existing Academy procedures, and prepared in sufficient quantity to ensure their distribution to the sponsor, to committee members, and to other relevant parties in accordance with Academy policy. They will be available to the public without restriction.
 15. The results of the panels' efforts are expected to be reports that will assess the technical basis for portions of the DOE Site Characterization Program and, when necessary, indicate a need and rationale to consider

additional factors. The reports will review and should clarify selected important technical aspects underlying the process for characterizing sites, should illuminate residual uncertainties. The reports will not consider non-technical aspects of site characterization. The results will not, however, provide independent verification of the accuracy of raw data, assess overall program adequacy, or evaluate site adequacy for repository use.

**Department of Energy**

Washington, DC 20585

March 5, 1987

Mr. Joseph O. Bunting, Chief
Policy and Program Control Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
7915 Eastern Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20555

Dear Mr. Bunting:

Charles Head of my staff and Phil Altomare of your staff have arranged for a meeting of the DOE/NRC Licensing Support System (LSS) Interagency Coordinating Committee (ICC) to be held on March 25, 1987. Unfortunately, this date occurs shortly prior to the date on which we expect to receive the responses to our request for proposals (RFP) for a contractor to carry out the design and implementation of the LSS.

I am confident that a number of parties interested in our procurement action would attend the LSS ICC meeting, and that both those parties and the representatives of the States and Indian Tribes will wish to ask questions concerning the RFP and/or DOE's plans for proceeding with the LSS, including the procurement process and the manner in which they will be involved in it or affected by it. However, DOE's procurement specialists have informed us that, to avoid potentially prejudicing the procurement process, we will be unable to answer questions that touch in any way on the RFP or the associated procurement process, or in any other manner discuss these matters.

This restriction places such a limitation on the meeting that I have decided that it should not be held at this time. Otherwise I am sure that we would greatly disappoint the non-DOE/NRC attendees by calling them in from all over the country and then refusing to answer their questions. Charles Head has already informed Phil Altomare and Chip Cameron of this decision, and has begun to contact representatives of the States and Tribes to inform them and determine a suitable, later, date on which to reschedule the meeting. We are expecting at least a five week delay to place us well beyond the proposal preparation period.

~~7703130137~~ 2pp.

I apologize for this abrupt change in our plans, but I believe that it is clearly in the best interests of our two agencies, and the other meeting participants, to delay the meeting as I am doing. Thank you for your understanding and cooperation.

Sincerely,



Ralph Stein, Director
Engineering and Geotechnology
Division
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management

Copy to:
Phil Altomare, NRC
Chip Cameron, NRC

United States Government

Department of Energy

memorandum

DATE: APR 01 1987

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: RW-223

SUBJECT: Grant Review Process

TO: J. Anttonen, BWIP
J. Neff, SRPO
D. Vieth, NNWSI

At the Institutional/Socioeconomic Coordination Group meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico, on March 12, 1987, a new grant review process was discussed and agreed to. The purpose of the revised process is to speed the review of grant applications and to be more responsive to the needs of the States and Indian Tribes.

By now your staff should have briefed you on the content of this process. If you have any questions, please contact Allen Benson.

The following process should now be in place for the review of grant applications:

GRANT REVIEW PROCEDURES

- POs survey eligible jurisdictions to develop three-year budget and program projections and annual updates as required. WPAS schedule should be followed.
- Grant applications submitted by States/Tribes to POs at least four months prior to expiration of current grant. POs send copies to HQ.
- POs immediately set schedule for 90-day review of applications and notify HQ of schedule.
- POs notify applicants of application receipt indicating review schedule.
- POs prepare analyses and recommendations for grant award and send within 30 days to HQ for concurrence.
- Proposals and PO analyses are distributed at HQ to OGR divisions, OGC, and Weston for 2-week review.
- Tiger Team composed of PO and HQ reviewers meets, if needed, to review applications to resolve outstanding issues.
- POs prepare award documents and send to HQ for concurrence.

- HQ concurs on award documents and forwards to POs.
- POs make grant award and develop schedule and plan to resolve outstanding issues. Grant award should specify activities that are justified and approved for funding, activities which are not approved for funding and the reason(s) why, and those activities for which additional information is required before a determination is made on funding. States and Indian Tribes are to be notified of the schedule and plan for resolving outstanding issues. Partial full-year awards will be made if all outstanding issues cannot be resolved.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- POs administer grants.
- POs have responsibility for the maintenance of the documentation and administrative record for grants activities.
- HQ maintains financial clearinghouse which includes copies of all grant applications, awards, modifications, amendments, and other grant related correspondence.
- HQ maintains computerized grant application tracking system.

S. H. Kale

Stephen H. Kale
Associate Director for
Geologic Repositories
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management

SCP REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

- TIMING:** References will be available at the time the SCP is released.
- LOCATION:** References will be sent to the usual State and Indian Tribe contacts (one set each).
- References will be available for inspection in the DOE Operations Office closest to the site (e.g., Nevada, Richland) and at the DOE Headquarters Reading Room in Washington, D.C.
- Additional requests will be handled on a case-by-case basis.
- FORMAT:** References will be available in either hard copy or microfiche (whichever DOE has).

**Department of Energy**

Nevada Operations Office

P. O. Box 14100

Las Vegas, NV 89114-4100

MAR 24 1987

Robert R. Loux, Jr., Executive Director
Nuclear Waste Project Office
State of Nevada
Evergreen Center
Suite 252
1802 North Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701

CLARIFICATION OF POINT RAISED AT QUARTERLY MEETING REGARDING STATE REVIEW OF STOP WORK ORDERS (SWO)

Dear Bob,

At the recent quarterly meeting in Spokane, Washington, Carl Johnson indicated that the state of Nevada may not have been given comparable treatment as the state of Washington and Indian Tribes with regard to access to information pertinent to SWOs. The point arose after the Basalt Waste Isolation Project (BWIP) Manager indicated that they had offered Washington State and Indian Tribes a briefing on the status of their SWOs. Carl subsequently indicated that the state of Nevada had requested a briefing and had been refused by my office.

At that point, I indicated the position Carl stated was inaccurate. We further pointed out that your request was to have a formal review of the corrective actions with your office and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission prior to resumption of work. It was noted that this proposal was rejected, but a detailed briefing, similar to the one offered by the BWIP, was extended to your office (see last paragraph of October 7, 1986, letter that is enclosed). Per the commitment made at the Spokane meeting, I am providing copies of your incoming letter and our response. I have checked our correspondence files with Jim Blaylock, and would like to note that there has not been any record of our offer being pursued.

There is one final point that I want to address with regard to the State's understanding of the status of the Nevada Nuclear Waste Storage Investigations Project Quality Assurance situation and SWO. The State routinely receives timely information through two channels. Both you and Carl Johnson receive copies of the Nevada Nuclear Waste Storage Investigations (NNWSI) Project Weekly Highlights Report. Since October 1986, the first topic covered by the report has been stop work status. Also, a member of your staff attends my monthly management meeting with my contractors. At these meetings in

Robert R. Loux, Jr.

-2-

MAR 24 1987

October, November, December, January, and February, we have had a detailed review of the status of the SVOs. We would hope that a balanced picture of the information available to the state of Nevada with regard to the SVOs would be presented.

Sincerely,


Donald L. Vieth, Director
Waste Management Project Office

WMPO:DLV-1180

Enclosures:

1. Ltr, Loux to Vieth, dtd 7/24/86
2. Ltr, Vieth to Loux, dtd 10/7/86

cc v/encls:

V. J. Cassella, HQ (RW-222) FORS
D. C. Newton, HQ (RW-24) FORS
A. B. Benson, HQ (RW-252) FORS
J. P. Knight, HQ (RW-24) FORS
Edward Regnier, HQ (RW-24) FORS
S. H. Klein, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
M. D. Voegele, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
R. V. Taft, AMES, NV
D. T. Schueler, DMGR, NV
M. P. Kunich, WMPO, NV
M. B. Blanchard, WMPO, NV
L. P. Skousen, WMPO, NV
W. R. Dixon, WMPO, NV
J. S. Szymanski, WMPO, NV



AGENCY FOR NUCLEAR PROJECTS
NUCLEAR WASTE PROJECT OFFICE

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

July 24, 1986

10-1949
ACTION Blaylock
CC: Vieth
CC: D. Vieth
CC: Balmer
CC: Smith
CC: DeWitt
CC: _____

REC'D IN WIMPO
7-30-86

ACTION WML
INFO _____
R.F. _____
AMA _____
AME & S _____
AMO _____

Dr. Donald Vieth
U.S. Department of Energy
Nevada Operations Office
Post Office Box 14100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89114-4100

Dear Dr. Vieth:

I am in receipt of your letter of July 14, 1986, transmitting the Nevada Nuclear Waste Storage Investigations (NNWSI) Project Suspension of Work Orders, and I appreciate receiving them. However, my concern is with the actions being taken by yourself and the various contractors to resolve the problems which resulted in the Stop Work Orders themselves. To that end, I am requesting that your Office provide me with a copy of all of the corrective action plans designed by the various contractors to alleviate the current quality assurance problems. Additionally, prior to any resumption of work, I would like to request a formal review of those plans with you and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in order that we may be able to evaluate on our own whether or not those plans are sufficient in terms of assuring the quality of the work to be conducted in characterizing Yucca Mountain as a potential high-level waste repository site. I believe that the issue of quality assurance, both in terms of future work as well as your plans to certify historic work which was not conducted under the auspices of a quality assurance program, needs to be thoroughly reviewed and evaluated in order to ascertain whether or not the historical data will be useable in a licensing proceeding, and to ensure that future work will, in fact, be admissible.

I look forward to discussing this matter with you and members of the NRC in greater detail, and I am hopeful that we can conduct this review in a timely fashion in order that it will not impact your schedule.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Robert R. Loux
Executive Director

RRL/gjb

cc: Mr. Robert Browning, Director, Waste Management Division,
Office of Material Safety & Safeguards, NRC
Mr. Grant Sawyer, Chairman, Nevada Commission on Nuclear
Projects

bcc:
WFO (M) (S)
WFO (M) (S)
MLR

OCT 07 1986

Robert R. Lour, Jr., Executive Director
Nuclear Waste Project Office
State of Nevada
Evergreen Center
Suite 252
1802 North Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701

STATUS OF STOP WORK ORDERS (SWOs)

We are in receipt of your letter of July 24, 1986, regarding the status of the SWOs issued to the Nevada Nuclear Waste Storage Investigations (NNWSI) Project participants. We regret the delay in responding to your letter, however, your letter raised a number of basic policy issues, and it has taken us some time to address the points you raised. With this letter, we hope to outline the Department's position with respect to these points.

Your first request was for the Department to provide you with all the corrective action plans designed by the various contractors. Enclosure 1 summarizes the basis for the SWOs and the corrective actions required. In many cases, the action and products to correct specific situations are fundamental and clear, and a "plan" to accomplish the objective is not required. We will internally review the results of the corrective effort when completed and approve or disapprove them. As a result of the SWOs for all contractors, only three "plans" were required. The "plans" were as follows: a revised USGS QAPP, a USGS staffing plan for QA resources, and a revised REECO QAPP. When they are complete, we will be pleased to forward you a copy of the approved plans.

Your second request may indicate a less than full understanding on your part of the regulatory process. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has no formal role in reviewing the Quality Assurance (QA) Programs for adequacy and compliance until the Department of Energy (DOE) submits a formal license application. This position has been clearly established in regulations and practice, and is expected to remain so until the regulations governing licensing are changed. Interaction with the NRC has been conducted in the spirit of consultation and cooperation as described by the Morgan-Davis Agreement. Hence, the NRC has had, to date, no formal involvement in the identification of QA audit and surveillance questions associated with the Nevada Nuclear Waste Storage Investigations (NNWSI) Project or in the issuance of SWOs.

Robert R. Lutz, Jr.

The DOE has voluntarily and prudently adopted the concepts outlined in the NRC Standard Review Plan, which is NRC staff guidance, for inclusion in the Project Offices' QA Programs. This is consistent with the role of the QA Program as a management tool to assure that work is being accomplished in a manner consistent with meeting requirements set forth by a regulatory body. The acceptance of the technical work is influenced, in part, by compliance with the QA requirements. One of the NRC Standard Review Plan requirements calls for identification of specific management positions having stop work responsibility and authority; within the NNWSI Project, the Director, WMPO, exercises this management responsibility.

This clearly establishes that the issuance of a SWO is a management prerogative of the Director, WMPO. The basis for issuing the existing SWOs was derived from audits and surveillances performed by WMPO during the execution of its QA responsibilities. The Director, WMPO, took the positive management action in issuing the SWOs to assure that procedures, plans, and practices required for a viable, active QA Program were firmly established prior to allowing the organizations to proceed with scientific investigations. Likewise, the ultimate responsibility for the corrective action proposed and implemented by those organizations under the SWO rests with the same management. To our knowledge, there is no precedent for involving interested parties in management actions executed in the process of lifting a SWO. To do so represents dilution of management responsibility, and is contrary to the practices necessary to achieve the control of quality.

We would further like to clarify a point with regard to the NRC. The Department has invited the NRC to evaluate the Department's QA Program. That review will look at the entire program. Although NRC has been extended this invitation, the NRC has no formal or legal authority or requirement for involvement at this time. In this case, NRC has no authority to issue SWOs for the NNWSI Project and they have no formal role in lifting them. While the State is assigned the responsibility to overview the program, like NRC it has not been delegated the authority to participate in direct management of the Project. Consequently, we believe that it is inappropriate for the State to participate in the evaluation of the QA Program requirements to assure that they are sufficient to assure quality, prior to resumption of work. However, we are prepared to provide you with our QA requirements, planning documents and technical results, for your independent evaluation. Having reviewed this material, you can establish your independent views concerning the data. At such time we would be prepared to discuss your findings.

Robert R. L... Jr.

-3-

OCT 07 1986

With regard to your desire to better understand the current situation, we are prepared to provide you or your staff a briefing on the reasons for the management action, the corrective actions required, and the status of the effort to correct the situation. If you so desire, please contact Jim Blaylock of my office to arrange the time for the briefing. Because of the workload on the QA group, we would hope that you would agree to have the briefing in Las Vegas.

Original Signed By
Donald L. Vieth

Donald L. Vieth, Director
Waste Management Project Office

WMPO:DLV-2281

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/o encl:

S. H. Klein, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
James Blaylock, WMPO, DOE/NV
V. J. Cassella, DOE/HQ (RW-221) FORS
D. C. Newton, DOE/HQ (RW-24) FORS
R. W. Taft, AMES, DOE/NV
D. T. Schueler, D/MGR, DOE/NV
M. P. Kunich, WMPO, DOE/NV
M. B. Blanchard, WMPO, DOE/NV
L. P. Skousen, WMPO, DOE/NV
W. R. Dixon, WMPO, DOE/NV
J. S. Szymanski, WMPO, DOE/NV
M. D. Voegele, SAIC, Las Vegas, NV
A. B. Benson, DOE/HQ (RW-252) FORS
J. P. Knight, DOE/HQ (RW-24) FORS
Edward Regnier, DOE/HQ (RW-24) FORS

Record Note: Letter was faxed to Jim Knight for comment on 9/26/86.
D. L. Vieth received comments from Carl Newton on 9/30/86.

STOP WORK ORDERS

| <u>ORGANIZATION</u> | <u>BASIS</u> | <u>CORRECTIVE ACTION</u> |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| USGS | Audit 86-2a | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respond to Audit Findings 2. Revise USGS QA Manual 3. Approval of SIPs and QALAS 4. Indoctrination and Training of Personnel 5. Adequate QA staff |
| Los Alamos | Surveillance 86-025 | WMPO approval of SIPs and QALAS |
| SAIC | Surveillance 86-026 | WMPO approval of SIPs and QALAS |
| LNL | Surveillance 86-021 | WMPO approval of SIPs and QALAS |
| SNL | Surveillance 86-024 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WMPO approval of SNL QAPP 2. WMPO approval of SIPs and QALAS |
| REECe | Audit 86-3 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respond to Audit Findings 2. Revise REECe QAPP 3. Indoctrination and Training of personnel |

United States Government

Department of Energy

memorandum

DATE: FEB 24 1987

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: RW-223

SUBJECT: Date and Location of Next Quarterly Meeting

TO: Distribution

Commitment Number 17 from the Quarterly Meeting of States and Indian Tribes in Spokane, Washington, calls for DOE to poll the States and Indian Tribes on their suggestions for the date and location of the next Quarterly Meeting. In Spokane, DOE proposed that the next Quarterly Meeting be held in Las Vegas, Nevada, in mid-May. In accordance with the above commitment, we are requesting your comments on this proposal.

Please forward to me by March 20 any comments or suggestions you may have on the location and date of the next Quarterly Meeting.



Judy Leahy
Economic and Intergovernmental
Analysis Branch
Office of Civilian Radioactive
Waste Management

cc: S. Kale, RW-20
T. Isaacs, RW-22
J. Bresee, RW-22
B. Gale, RW-223
R. Gale, RW-40
J. Anttonen, BWIP
J. Neff, SRPO
D. Vieth, NNWSI

Distribution:

Harold Aronson, Yakima Indian Nation
Hall Bohlinger, Louisiana
William H. Burke, Umatilla Indian Reservation
Louie Dick, Umatilla Indian Reservation
Wendy Dixon, NNWSI
Steve Frishman, Texas
John Green, Mississippi
Ron Halfmoon, Nez Perce
Terry Husseman, Washington
Russell Jim, Yakima Indian Nation
Robert Loux, Jr., Nevada
Linda McClain, SRPO
Elwood H. Patawa, Umatilla Indian Reservation
Max Powell, BWIP
Max S. Power, Washington
J. Herman Reuben, Nez Perce
Melvin R. Sampson, Yakima Nation
Patrick Spurgin, Utah
David Stewart-Smith, Oregon Dept. of Energy