September 2, 2010

Dear Dr. Moody and Mr. Sharif:

On July 27, 2010, the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) received the Final Audit Report of the Hanford/Central Characterization Project (Hanford/CCP) Audit Number A-10-07 (Audit Report), from the Department of Energy’s Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO). CBFO and Washington TRU Solutions LLC (the Permittees) were required to submit this Audit Report under the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Hazardous Waste Facility Permit as specified in Permit Condition II.C.2.c. The intended scope of this initial certification audit was to ensure the adequacy, implementation, and effectiveness of the Hanford/CCP TRU waste characterization processes for retrievably stored Summary Category Group S5000 debris contact handled (CH) waste relative to the requirements of the WIPP Permit. The final Audit Report consisted of the following items:

- A narrative report (hardcopy and electronic)
- Completed copies of relevant Permit Attachment B6 checklists (hardcopy and electronic)
- Final Hanford/CCP standard operating procedures (hardcopy and electronic)
- Corrective action reports and item corrected during the audit
- Objective evidence examined during the audit
  - General information
  - Acceptable knowledge

RE: NMED APPROVAL OF THE HANFORD/CENTRAL CHARACTERIZATION PROJECT FINAL AUDIT REPORT, AUDIT A-10-07
WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PLANT
EPA I.D. NUMBER NM4890139088
NMED representatives observed the Hanford/CCP audit on April 6-8, 2010. NMED has examined the Audit Report for evidence of compliance with the requirements of Permit Conditions II.C.2 (Audit and Surveillance Program) and II.C.1 (Waste Analysis Plan [WAP]). The Audit Report indicates there were

- Three WAP-related conditions adverse to quality requiring the issuance of CBFO corrective action reports that were corrected prior to submittal of the Audit Report;
- One deficiency requiring only remedial action that was corrected during the audit;
- One observation identifying a condition that, if not controlled, could result in a condition adverse to quality; and
- One recommendation identifying an opportunity for improvement.

Attached are NMED’s general comments based upon observation of the Hanford/CCP audit and review of the Audit Report. These are provided to guide future audit report preparation and to assist the Permittees in understanding NMED’s concerns. NMED requests that the Permittees correct the items listed in the attachment and return them, indicating revisions to any text in the Audit Report and checklists with redline/strikeout annotation. This will ensure the administrative record contains a complete and accurate Audit Report.

NMED concludes that this Audit Report demonstrates that Hanford/CCP has implemented the applicable characterization requirements of the WAP. Therefore, NMED approves the Permittees’ Final Audit Report for Hanford/CCP for the initial certification of S5000 debris CH waste.

This Audit Report approval is of the broad programmatic implementation of waste characterization requirements at the generator/storage site, and does not constitute approval of individual waste characterization procedures, nor condone inappropriate applications of those procedures. This approval does not relieve the Permittees of their obligation to comply with the requirements of the permit or other applicable laws and regulations.
If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Steve Zappe at (505) 476-6051.

Sincerely,

James P. Bearzi
Chief
Hazardous Waste Bureau
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Attachment

cc: Marcy Leavitt, NMED WWMD
    Steve Zappe, NMED HWB
    Chuck Noble, NMED OGC
    Thomas Kesterson, NMED DOEOB
    Ted Sturdevant, WSDE
    Laurie King, EPA Region 6
    Tom Peake, EPA ORIA
    Connie Walker, Trinity Engineering
    Don Hancock, SRIC
    Joni Arends, CCNS
    File: Red WIPP '10
NMED COMMENTS ON THE
HANFORD/CENTRAL CHARACTERIZATION PROJECT (HANFORD/CCP)
FINAL AUDIT REPORT A-10-07

NMED’s review indicated that the body of the Audit Report and the B6 checklists generally appear to address the applicable elements. NMED provides the following comment for the Permittees consideration:

1. In Question 314 of the B6 Checklist, CCP-TP-113 is cited as meeting the VE QAOs for Accuracy, Completeness, and Precision, but not for Comparability; instead, the CCP Training Program (CCP-PO-001 and CCP-QP-002) is cited as meeting the QAO for Comparability. Upon further discussion with CBFO, NMED acknowledges that Questions 2 and 22 of Attachment 3 in CCP-TP-113 (ITR Checklist) do address the Comparability QAO, albeit indirectly. The Permittees should eliminate the following comment for Question 314 because it is incorrect: “Precision, accuracy, and completeness are verified during ITR review per CCP-TP-113. Comparability is assured via the training program described in CCP-PO-001 and CCP-QP-002.”

2. In question 313 of the B6 Checklist, there is no basis in Revision 13 of CCP-TP-113 (included in the audit report) for the following statement in the Comments column: “Although this approach is allowed by the Permit for non-transparent containers, CCP would conservatively reject such a container as not containing as little residual liquid as is reasonably achievable.” This is, however, addressed in Revision 14. The Permittees must revise this comment or cite (and submit) Revision 14 as the implementing procedure.

3. CBFO CAR 10-019 was written to address the following Condition Adverse to Quality (CAQ): “During visual examination (VE) in the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), the CCP VE operators record their field observations on sheets of note paper. These are surveyed out of the PFP and the data are transferred to the VE Operational Log Book, and in turn to VE data sheets for the output container. The original field record is destroyed after the data are entered in the VE Operational Log Book or VE data sheets. Therefore, the ITR does not have an opportunity to verify the data have been properly transferred and reduced from the field records.”

Section B3-10a(1) of CCP-PO-001 is cited as a requirement that was violated. Section B3-10a(1) of CCP-PO-001 and the Permit require that the independent technical reviewer ensure that “QAOs have been met according to the methods outlined in Sections B3-2 through B3-9.”

A requirement of the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) was that CCP-TP-113 be revised to require that field records (raw data) be included in the BDR. Question 314 of the B6 Checklist, which corresponds to Permit Section B3-4b (VE QAOs), includes the following statement in the Comments column: “Precision, accuracy, and completeness are verified during ITR review per CCP-TP-113.” However, Revision 13 of CCP-TP-113 (included in the Audit Report) does not include the requirement that the raw data is included in the BDR, and therefore the above statement is not supported because the ITR cannot “verify the data have been properly transferred and reduced from the field records,” and therefore cannot meet the Precision QAO. The Permittees must revise the comment to note that CAR 10-019 was written to address the requirement and cite (and submit) Revision 14 of CCP-TP-113 as the implementing procedure.