



ENTERED

Department of Energy
Carlsbad Field Office
P. O. Box 3090
Carlsbad, New Mexico 88221



MAY 12 2011

Mr. Jon E. Hoff, Manager
Quality Assurance
Washington TRU Solutions, LLC
P.O. Box 2078
Carlsbad, NM 88221-2078

Subject: Transmittal of Audit Report for Audit A-11-09

Dear Mr. Hoff:

The Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO) performed Audit A-11-09 of the Washington TRU Solutions (WTS) Quality Assurance Program, Criteria 1-9 of the *Quality Assurance Program Requirements for Nuclear Facilities* (ASME NQA-1-1989 Edition) on April 12-14, 2011 at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant near Carlsbad, New Mexico. The audit team concluded that the overall status of the processes evaluated is adequate, satisfactorily implemented, and effective. One Corrective Action Report was generated as a result of the audit and has been transmitted under separate correspondence. The results of the audit and conclusions of the audit team are provided in detail in the enclosed report.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (575) 234-7442.

Sincerely,

M. Lea Chism
Quality Assurance Specialist

Enclosure

cc: w/enclosure
D. Gadbury, CBFO
M. Navarrete, CBFO
D. Miehl, CBFO
F. Sharif, WTS
M. A. Mullins, WTS
T. Peake, EPA
M. Eagle, EPA
E. Feltcorn, EPA
R. Joglekar, EPA
S. Ghose, EPA
R. Lee, EPA

* ED
ED

J. Kieling, NMED
S. Holmes, NMED
T. Hall, NMED
T. Kesterson, DOE OB WIPP NMED
D. Winters, DNFSB
N. Frank, CTAC
K. D. Martin, CTAC
WIPP Operating Record
CBFO QA File
CBFO M&RC
*ED denotes electronic distribution



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
CARLSBAD FIELD OFFICE**

AUDIT REPORT

OF

AUDIT NUMBER A-11-09

April 12 – 14, 2011

**WASHINGTON TRU SOLUTIONS (WTS)
QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM**

CARLSBAD, NEW MEXICO



Prepared by: _____

N. C. Frank
N. C. Frank, CTAC, for
H. Washington, CTAC
Audit Team Leader

Date: _____

5/9/11

Approved by: _____

R. Unger
Randy Unger, CBFO
Quality Assurance Director

Date: _____

12 May 11

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO) Audit A-11-09 was conducted April 12 – 14, 2011, to evaluate the adequacy, implementation, and effectiveness of quality assurance (QA) and technical activities related to the Quality Assurance Program at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). The activities were evaluated with respect to the requirements defined in DOE/CBFO-94-1012, *CBFO Quality Assurance Program Document (QAPD)*; WP 13-1, *Washington TRU Solutions, LLC, Quality Assurance Program Description*; and Washington TRU Solutions (WTS) implementing procedures.

The audit team concluded that overall, the WTS Quality Assurance Program, addressing NQA-1-1989 Criteria 1 through 9, was adequate in addressing applicable upper-tier requirements, satisfactorily implemented, and effective.

The audit team identified two conditions adverse to quality (CAQs) during this audit. Both were related to design control. One resulted in the issuance of a corrective action report (CAR). The second CAQ was corrected during the audit (CDA 1). The CAR and CDA are described in section 6.0.

No Observations or Recommendations were identified during the audit.

2.0 SCOPE

The audit evaluated the adequacy, implementation, and effectiveness of the WTS QA Program related to Criteria 1 through 9 of the *Quality Assurance Program Requirements for Nuclear Facilities (ASME NQA-1-1989 Edition)* and the corresponding sections of the *CBFO Quality Assurance Program Document (QAPD)*.

The audit team verified implementation and evaluated documentation of implementing procedures. Evaluation of WTS procedures for adequacy was based on the CBFO QAPD, Rev. 11.

3.0 AUDIT TEAM

L. Chism	QA Management Representative, CBFO
H. Washington	Audit Team Leader, CBFO Technical Assistance Contractor (CTAC)
N. Frank	Auditor, CTAC
G. Knox	Auditor, CTAC
R. Castillo	Auditor, CTAC
H. Kirschenmann	Auditor, CTAC
T. Bowden	Auditor, CTAC
R. Allen	Auditor, CTAC

4.0 AUDIT PARTICIPANTS

Individuals contacted during the audit are identified in Attachment 1. A preaudit conference was held in the WTS Support Building large conference room on April 12, 2011. The audit was concluded with a post-audit conference in the WTS Support Building large conference room on April 14, 2011.

5.0 SUMMARY OF AUDIT RESULTS

5.1 Program Adequacy, Implementation, and Effectiveness

The audit team evaluated the associated implementing procedures to verify the adequate flow-down of upper-tier requirements, conducted interviews with responsible personnel, examined storage locations, and reviewed randomly selected records to determine the degree to which the WTS records processing is implemented and the effectiveness of the overall program.

The audited areas are described below. Two concerns were noted and are described in the respective areas in which they were identified. Further details are contained in section 6.0. Except as noted, the WTS Quality Assurance Program was determined to be adequate, satisfactorily implemented, and effective.

Attachment 1 identifies the personnel contacted during the audit, Attachment 2 is a list of the procedures evaluated, and Attachment 3 is the summary of the audit results.

5.2 QA Program Audit Details

The audit included NQA-1-1989 criteria 1 through 9. WTS implementing procedures for each criterion were selected for audit. These are identified in Attachment 2. Each criterion is discussed in detail in the paragraphs below.

Criterion 1 – Organization, and Criterion 2 – Quality Assurance Program

These two criteria were evaluated by the assigned Audit Team Leader (ATL), who was unable to complete the audit. Discussions with the ATL during and after the audit confirmed that no CAQs, Observations, or Recommendations were identified for either Criterion 1 or Criterion 2. Although there were no concerns voiced during the audit, due to the lack of objective evidence for Criteria 1 and Criteria 2, these two Criteria will be re-evaluated during the performance of the scheduled October 2011 audit of WTS implementation of NQA-1 Criterion 10 through 18.

Criterion 3 – Design Control

The audit team evaluated objective evidence of new designs, revised designs, temporary modifications, and their associated documentation. All design actions are initiated through the engineering change proposal (ECP) process and completed using the engineering change order (ECO) process. The ECP packages evaluated included

evidence of reviews of as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) activities, the Hazardous Waste Facility Permit (HWFP), environmental compliance (EC), and unreviewed safety question (USQ) determinations.

Both open and closed ECPs and ECOs were evaluated covering subjects from a major hoist upgrade to small temporary modifications for underground ground control. Marked-up drawings associated with the ECOs were examined, along with the title blocks of the revised/approved/issued drawings. ECOs were also used to document changes to specifications and other design-related documentation.

Engineering calculations were included in the associated ECO for the work. Marked-up drawings, sketches, functional classification, and Computerized History and Maintenance Planning System (CHAMPS) entries, were evaluated.

One CAQ was corrected during the audit (see section 6.2) concerning a management assessment (MA) of inactive structures, systems, and components (SSC) numbers in the CHAMPS Equipment Module that was not scheduled or performed. This requirement had been added to procedure WP 09-CN3021, *Component Indices*, approximately a year prior to this audit. This specific MA was formally added to the WTS MA schedule for performance in April 2011.

Design verifications are performed as part of the ECO process. These design verifications primarily involved review by the cognizant manager, but when needed, personnel with other expertise are brought in to perform the design verification, and their review results and qualifications are included in the ECO. One CAR, 11-030, was issued as a result of the audit concerning the final report for the 100% Design Review of the UH00 Hoists Upgrade not containing the identity, disciplines, and qualifications of the Design Review Committee members (see section 6.0).

The audit team concluded that, with the exceptions noted, the WTS Design Control processes are adequate, satisfactorily implemented, and effective.

Criterion 4 – Procurement Document Control

The audit team reviewed procurement document control implementing documents, interviewed WTS personnel, and observed the functioning of the Quality Requirement Level and the Quality Supplier List databases. Specific processes evaluated are discussed below.

Proposal, Competition, Identification, Selection, Evaluation and Award

The audit team selected the Quality Level 1 (QL1) procurement of shield plugs, Subcontract (S/C) 409337, and the Quality Level 2 (QL2) procurement for WIPP South Access Road construction, S/C 412762 for this in-depth review. The Cross Functional Team for each solicitation included a representative from the QA organization. All comments from the Cross Functional Team were resolved and documented in the technical evaluation report for each solicitation, and signed by all team members. The

audit team verified that the S/Cs were awarded to companies on the Qualified Suppliers List (QSL). No issues were identified by the audit team for the Proposal, Competition, Identification, Selection, Evaluation and Award process.

Preparation of Purchase Requisitions

The audit team selected several purchase requisitions (PRs) that demonstrated compliance with the WTS procedures for evaluation. Appropriate quality requirements were included in each of the PRs. The appropriate quality level designator was properly identified on the PRs, and the suppliers were qualified in accordance with WTS procedures and were listed on the QSL.

The audit team also verified that inspection requirements were identified for each item to be received in the warehouse and that the inspection required block was checked in the Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS). QA had approved each of the QL1 and QL2 PRs.

The audit team did not identify any issues with the Preparation of Purchase Requisitions process.

Credit Card Purchases

The audit team reviewed credit card purchases made using the Purchase Card (P-Card). P-Card holders have been approved by the Procurement Services Manager and identified on the WTS Cardholder Listing by Hierarchy, along with a single procurement dollar limit and a maximum credit limit. The audit team verified the training and qualification of a sample of Authorizing Officials, P-Card holders, and current Quality Credit Card (Q-Card) holders.

Approved supplier lists are maintained by card holders. The audit team did not identify any purchases of QL1 or QL2 items with P-Cards.

The audit team reviewed a sample of Requests for Remittance (RFR) forms to verify that American Express (AMEX) credit card purchases comply with the list of acceptable and unacceptable items on Attachment 2 of PC3043. No inappropriate purchases were identified by accounting during the past year.

No concerns were identified related to the Credit Card Purchases process.

Quality Credit Card Purchases

There are currently two Q-Card holders. Both have been appointed by an approving official. The training records and qualification cards for the current Q-Card holders are up-to-date and satisfactorily completed. Each of the Q-Card holders is properly designated with single amount and total credit limits for purchases. All purchases made were placed with suppliers on the QSL and identified to an inspection plan. Receipt inspection results and approvals were identified on the completed inspection plans. No deficiencies requiring a nonconformance report (NCR) were identified for any of the

purchases. The process for control of quality credit card purchases was determined to be successfully implemented in accordance with the requirements of WTS procedures. No concerns were identified for Quality Credit Card Purchases process.

Approval/Variation Request

The audit team verified that technical reviews are performed and documented on Approval Request/Variation Request (AR/VR) forms. The audit team reviewed numerous AR/VR forms and the AR/VR Transmittal Register for PR/PO 404007-40 procuring 760 standard waste boxes, and verified that the AR/VR documents were approved and the document packages submitted to Records Management in the Skeen-Whitlock Building.

The audit team also verified sustaining corrective actions for CBFO CAR 10-023, initiated during the previous audit, A-10-21.

Overall, the audit team concluded that the Procurement Document Control processes were adequate, satisfactorily implemented, and effective.

Criterion 5 – Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings

Implementation of WTS procedure WP 10-WC3010, *Maintenance PM/MWI Controlled Document Processing*, was reviewed as part of this audit. Multiple Preventive Maintenance (PM) procedures and Maintenance Work Instructions (MWIs) pulled from the ECO process were reviewed for appropriate content and issuance. No concerns were identified during this audit. PMs and MWIs are included in the QMIS control software, which was used to verify current versions.

CAR 10-022, issued during the previous audit, A-10-21, was closed September 30, 2010, with the qualification from CBFO that, due to insufficient objective evidence of implementation of the change history process for the PM/MWI process, the process would be evaluated at a later date. The audit team observed three PMs and two MWIs that included the appropriate change history table. One procedure had been revised three times and had three entries in the change history table showing a history of compliance. As a result of this evaluation, the audit team deemed the corrective actions identified in CAR 10-022 to be sustaining and effective.

The audit team concluded that the WTS Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings processes are adequate, satisfactorily implemented, and effective.

Criterion 6 – Document Control

The audit team evaluated and assessed the WTS QA Program and procedures related to document control. The established implementing documents and procedures were determined to adequately address the CBFO QAPD requirements. The audit team verified implementation of the procedures relative to document control through interviews with appropriate personnel.

The document control processes for operational reviews, comment resolution, approvals, and issuance of program documents (WP 15-PC3041, *Approval/Variation Request Processing*, and 05-WH1710, *72-B RH Processing*) were reviewed to the requirements of WP 15-PS3002, *WTS Controlled Document Processing*. Program procedures were reviewed for format compliance for writing technical and management control procedures according to WP 15-PS.2, *Procedure Writer's Guide*. Additionally, audit team evaluations included a review of procedural section headings, step numbering, and reference of technical specification requirements in technical procedures 04-AU2002, *Moving Conexxes*, and 12-FP0025, *Sprinkler System Inspection and Testing*. The audit team also evaluated WP 15-PS3006, *Processing of WTS Forms and Electronic Attachments*, for compliance in controlling Washington TRU Solutions LLC (WTS) forms, attachments, and electronic attachments (EAs). It was determined that the current versions of forms and EAs were used and the electronic document control system replaced superseded or canceled forms and EAs, as required.

Procedure WP 15-PS3103, *Document Distribution*, was evaluated for distribution of operator handbooks (OHBs) and controlled documents to controlled document locations (CDLs). The audit team verified the cognizant manager oversees completion of OHBs, and checks of operator handbooks are being reviewed two times per month. The audit team determined OHB checks are in the form of assessments and reviewed the checks performed on 6/15/2010 and 9/15/2010. Additional audit team evaluations included reviews of the library files for controlled procedures WP 05-WH1025, Rev. 4 and WP 05-WH1083, Rev. 7 for CDL locations 3 and 10. The controlled procedures were found to meet procedural requirements. Further, completed distribution sheets (located in records files) for 50-WH1722, *10-160B RH Processing*, and 07-EU1301, *Manually Acquired Geomechanical Instrument Data*, were found to be compliant with procedural requirements.

The audit team determined that Document Control Processes and Procedures are adequate, satisfactorily implemented, and effective.

Criterion 7 – Control of Purchased Items and Services

The audit team evaluated the WTS QA Program and procedures related to control of purchased items and services. The established implementing documents and procedures were determined to adequately address the CBFO QAPD requirements. The stores inventory control process was determined to be adequately implemented per the requirements of 15-PM3517, *Stores Inventory Control*. The audit team reviewed several biennial review files (CTSs 36713, 36850, and 37388) of Stores Stock Requests (SSRs) and found parts and data for the systems to be correct and current. A sampling of parts in the warehouse determined that parts were properly located and present in the required quantities. SSRs 7568, 7569, 7570, and 7571 were reviewed to assure proper completion by the requestor and Inventory Control (IC).

The audit team confirmed that a monthly system inventory list is generated, sent by IC to the cognizant engineer (CE), and completed by the CE within the required 90 days.

IC generates a Nonusage Report for consumables and issues it to the cognizant managers annually; the last review report was issued on December 14, 2010. The audit team confirmed the annual inventory report is generated by IC and issued to WTS management. The report is then provided to CBFO via letter from WTS management as required. No concerns resulted from this review.

The WTS process for the evaluation and qualification of suppliers is satisfactorily implemented per the requirements of 13-QA3012, *Supplier Evaluation/Qualification*. A QSL identifies all procedural requirements of each supplier including the QSL request/evaluation update sheet number, the facility name, phone, fax, and address of the supplier, product or service for qualification, basis for qualification, procurement restrictions/limitations imposed, and expiration date. Supplier files are maintained electronically (via the IFMS, and in hard copy. The supplier hard copy files are placed in locked vertical files, and are retrievable by alphabetical order. The files contain the original supplier questionnaire and records of initial qualification, such as desk review or on site evaluation. Annual evaluations are also included in the files. Further, the audit team confirmed monthly reviews of the QSL database are being performed to identify suppliers with expiring qualifications. Qualification files for Vacuum Technologies, Peterson, Inc., Thermo Fisher Scientific, and Hittman Transportation Services were reviewed. These files demonstrated that suppliers are evaluated prior to placement on the QSL, annual evaluations are conducted, and adequate documentation is available to grant a supplier a three-month extension when required.

Pertinent to the WTS contracts and procurement program, WTS's management policy MP 1.34, *WTS Contracts and Procurement Program*, was evaluated. The audit team confirmed personnel instructions (CI 1010 and CI 1050) were used for the guidance of procurement activities. Audit team evaluations also included verification that centralized master files are maintained and contain associated procurement documentation as required by policy. Documentation reviewed for compliance and completeness included Performance Evaluation Management Plans (PEMPs), Prime Contract (#DE-AC29-01AL66444), general correspondence, and formal technical direction memos. It was determined by the audit team that WTS maintains a DOE-approved system to control affiliate procurement actions and borrowed personnel requests and participates in the DOE Balanced Scorecard Self-Assessment Program.

Overall, the audit team concluded that the Control of Purchased Items and Services process was adequate, satisfactorily implemented, and effective.

Criteria 8 – Identification and Control of Items, and 9 – Control of Processes

The audit team evaluated the adequacy of Central Characterization Project (CCP) Special Process procedures in comparison with the CBFO QAPD and NQA-1-1989 Criterion 8 and Criterion 9. The following CCP procedures were evaluated:

- WP 10-5, *WIPP Welding Guide*
- WP 13-QA.05, *Suspect Counterfeit Items Program*

- WP 13-QA.06, *NDT Qualification*
- WP 13-QA1001, *Liquid Penetrant Examination*
- WP 13-QA1002, *Visual Examination*
- WP 13-QA1004, *Magnetic Particle Examination*
- WP 13-QA1006, *QA Plant Inspections*
- WP 13-QA1007, *Dimensional Inspection*

It was determined that the procedures contain an adequate flow-down of upper-tier requirements. Because there was no ongoing work to observe, the audit team reviewed closed work packages and associated documentation. Qualification training records and eye examinations (as appropriate) were requested and reviewed for all individuals identified in the reviewed work orders. All were found to be current and acceptable for the work performed. Certification and calibration records for materials and equipment were reviewed and found current and compliant. The reviewed work packages provided adequate information for the identification of all materials and items and adequate controls were observed. Suspect counterfeit parts (SCP) inspection of incoming items is controlled by procurement documentation and performed by WTS inspection when identified on the purchase requisition. If SCP are identified during inspection of existing facilities, the items are marked, an NCR is written, and the item is dispositioned. No concerns were identified

Overall, WTS processes for Identification and Control of Items, and Control of Processes were determined to be adequate, satisfactorily implemented and effective.

The audit team concluded that, with the exceptions noted, the WTS Organization and Quality Assurance Program for Criteria 1 through 9 are adequate, satisfactorily implemented, and effective.

6.0 SUMMARY OF DEFICIENCIES

6.1 Corrective Action Reports

During the audit, the audit team may identify Conditions Adverse to Quality and document such conditions on Corrective Action Reports.

Condition Adverse to Quality (CAQ) – An all-inclusive term used in reference to any of the following: failures, malfunctions, deficiencies, defective items, nonconformances, and technical inadequacies.

Significant Condition Adverse to Quality (SCAQ) – A condition which, if uncorrected, could have a serious effect on safety, operability, waste confinement, TRU waste site certification, regulatory compliance demonstration, or the effective implementation of the QA program.

One CAR, described below, was initiated as a result of this audit. The CAR was transmitted to WTS under separate cover.

CAR 11-030

Requirement(s)

WP 09-CN3018, R11, paragraph 5.7, states:

“Design Review Committee secretary, prepare and compile the design review report to include the following:

- Documentation that identifies the committee members and their respective disciplines and qualifications for performing the design review.”

Condition

The design review report for the 100% Design Review of UH00 Hoist Upgrade (design verification review) could not be provided during the audit. Specifically, the identity of the committee members and their disciplines and qualifications were not included.

6.2 Deficiencies Corrected During the Audit (CDAs)

Corrected During the Audit (CDA) – Isolated deficiencies that do not require a root cause determination or actions to preclude recurrence, and where correction of the deficiency can be verified prior to the end of the audit. Examples include one or two minor changes required to correct a procedure (isolated), one or two forms not signed or dated (isolated), and one or two individuals who have not completed a reading assignment.

During the audit, the audit team may identify CAQs. The audit team members and the Audit Team Leader (ATL) evaluate the CAQs to determine if they are significant. Once a determination is made that the CAQ is not significant, the audit team member, in conjunction with the ATL, determines if the CAQ is isolated requiring only remedial action and therefore can be Corrected During the Audit (CDA). Deficiencies that can be classified as CDA are those isolated deficiencies that do not require a root cause determination or actions to preclude recurrence, and those for which correction of the deficiency can be verified prior to the end of the audit.

Upon determination that the CAQ is isolated, the audit team member, in conjunction with the ATL, evaluates/verifies any objective evidence/actions submitted or taken by the audited organization and determines if the condition was corrected in an acceptable manner. Once it has been determined that the CAQ has been corrected, the ATL categorizes the condition as a CDA.

One isolated deficiency, described below, was identified and corrected during the audit.

CDA 1

A management assessment of inactive SSC numbers in the CHAMPS Equipment Module has not been scheduled or performed.

Configuration Item personnel are periodically checking inactive equipment and taking appropriate actions, but have not documented performance or results of these checks. URS/WTS Inter-Office Correspondence [EN:11:00051] dated April 13, 2011, informed the URS/WTS General Manager that the specific management assessment was being appended to the existing schedule for performance in April 2011. The audit team verified that the schedule had been revised to include this management assessment and that it was scheduled for completion in April 2011. The revised schedule is available on the WTS website.

7.0 SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During the audit, the audit team may identify conditions that warrant input by the audit team to the audited organization regarding potential problems or suggestions for program improvement. The audit team members, in conjunction with the ATL, evaluate these conditions and classify them as observations or recommendations (using the following definitions). Once a determination is made, the audit team members, in conjunction with the ATL, categorize the conditions appropriately.

Observation – A condition that is determined not to be a violation of procedure or requirement at the time but, if not controlled or addressed, may result in a CAQ during future activities.

Recommendation – A suggestion that is directed toward identifying opportunities for improvement and enhancing methods of implementing requirements.

7.1 Observations

No Observations resulted from this audit.

7.2 Recommendations

No Recommendations resulted from this audit.

8.0 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Personnel Contacted During the Audit
- Attachment 2: WTS Implementing Procedures Evaluated
- Attachment 3: Summary Table of Audit Results

PERSONNEL CONTACTED DURING THE AUDIT				
NAME	ORGANIZATION/ DEPARTMENT	PREAUDIT MEETING	CONTACTED DURING AUDIT	POSTAUDIT MEETING
Allen, Bill	WTS QA Integration	X	X	X
Allen, Pete	WTS/ENG/CM		X	
Anderson, Joshua	WTS/ENG/Mine Engineering		X	
Aragon Leslie ,	WTS Finance & Accounting		X	
Ater, Ed	Oversight Programs (QA)	X	X	X
Beeman, Bob	WTS/ENG/CM	X	X	X
Bodily, Sarah	WTS Procurement		X	
Bostick, Leroy	Maintenance Operations	X	X	
Rashier, Keri	WTS/Acquisition Services		X	
Brown, Gail	WTS/Procurement		X	
Cullum, Bob	WTS/ENG/CM		X	
Cullum, Share	WTS Procurement		X	
Dumas, Elvin	BBWI/QA		X	
Edwards ,Mark	WTS Procurement		X	
Friend, Mark	WTS Contracts	X		
Garcia, John J.	WTS Engineering	X		X
Gonzales, M. P. (Marty)	WTS Contracts and Procurement		X	
Gonzalez, Jorge	WTS/ENG/Nuclear Safety		X	
Harrison, Rod	WTS/Procurement		X	
Hasten, Ken	L&M Tech, Doc SVCS	X		
Hayes, Jack	WTS CCP/RCT		X	
Hendrickson, Jennifer	WTS/Engineering	X		
Hoff, Jon E.	WTS/QA			X
Ito, Fran	WTS/PA		X	
Jones, S. B.	RES/SEC	X		
Keathley, Martin	WTS QA Programs	X	X	x
Kirby, Bob	WTS Operations	X	X	
Klein, Kit	QA Audit	X		x
Lichty, Tom	WTS/Training		X	

PERSONNEL CONTACTED DURING THE AUDIT				
NAME	ORGANIZATION/ DEPARTMENT	PREAUDIT MEETING	CONTACTED DURING AUDIT	POSTAUDIT MEETING
Meadors, Luke	WTS Maintenance		X	
Moffatt, Tamara	WTS/ENG/ME		X	
Mullins, Mary Ann	WTS QA	X	X	X
Nance, Wesley	Maintenance Operations		X	
Navarrette, Colleen	L&M Inventory Control		X	
Nesser, Catherine	WTS QA	X		
Pace, Berry	Navarro Research	X		X
Patterson, Terry	Surface Operations & Maintenance	X		
Sanders, Curt	QAIS		X	
Siepel, Norm	WTS/ENG/Mine Engineering		X	
Simonds, Jim	WTS Acquisition Services		X	
Smith, Tyrone	WTS CCP/RCT		X	
Tanner, Steve	QAIS	X	X	
Tidwell, Sherry	WTS/Maintenance		X	
Vandekraats, J. D.	WTS/Repository	X		
Vasquez, Joe N.	L&M Inventory Control	X		
Walker, Sherrie	WTS/Document Control		X	
Whiting, Lynn	WTS Procurement	X		

WTS Implementing Procedures Evaluated		
NQA Criteria	Doc. Number	Applicable WTS Document
1 – Organization		
	WP 13-QA.04	<i>Quality Assurance Department Administrative Program</i>
2 – Quality Assurance Program		
	WP 13-1	<i>Quality Assurance Program Description</i>
	14-TR.01	<i>WIPP Training Program</i>
3 – Design Control		
	WP 09-CN3007	<i>Engineering and Design Document Preparation and Change Control</i>
	WP 09-CN3018	<i>Design Verification</i>
	WP 09-CN3021	<i>Component Indices</i>
	WP 09-CN3023	<i>Functional Classification Determination for Design</i>
	WP 09-CN3024	<i>Configuration Management Board/Engineering Change Proposal</i>
	WP 09-CN3031	<i>Engineering Calculations</i>
4 – Procurement Document Control		
	WP 15-PC3041	<i>Approval/Variation Request Processing</i>
	WP 15-PC3042	<i>Credit Card Purchases</i>
	WP 15-PC3043	<i>Request for Remittance</i>
	WP 15-PC3044	<i>Quality Credit Card Purchases</i>
	WP 15-PC3605	<i>Proposal, Competition, Identification, Selection, Evaluation, and Award</i>
	WP 15-PC3609	<i>Preparation of Purchase Requisitions</i>
5 – Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings		
	WP 09-CN3007	<i>Engineering and Design Document Preparation and Change Control</i>
	WP 10-WC3010	<i>Maintenance PM/MWI Controlled Document Processing</i>
6 – Document Control		
	WP 15-PS.2	<i>Procedure Writer's Guide</i>

WTS Implementing Procedures Evaluated		
NQA Criteria	Doc. Number	Applicable WTS Document
	WP 15-PS3002	<i>WTS Controlled Document Processing</i>
	WP 15-PS3006	<i>Processing WTS Forms and Electronic Attachments</i>
	WP 15-PS3103	<i>Document Distribution</i>
7 – Control of Purchased Items and Services		
	MP 1.34	<i>WTS Contracts and Procurement Program</i>
	WP 15-PM3517	<i>Stores Inventory Control</i>
	WP 13-QA3012	<i>Supplier Evaluation/Qualification</i>
8 and 9 – Identification and Control of Items & Control of Processes		
	WP 10-5	<i>WIPP Welding Guide</i>
	WP 13QA1001	<i>Liquid Penetrant Examination</i>
	WP 13QA1002	<i>Visual Inspection</i>
	WP 13QA1004	<i>Magnetic Particle Examination</i>
	WP 13QA1006	<i>Quality Assurance Plant Inspections</i>
	WP 13QA1007	<i>Dimensional Inspection</i>
	WP 13QA.05	<i>Suspect/Counterfeit Items Program</i>
	WP 13-QA.06	<i>NDT Qualification</i>

Summary Table of Audit Results

Audit Elements NQA-1-1989	Concern Classification				QA Evaluation		
	CARs	CDAs	Obs	Rec	Adequacy	Implementation	Effectiveness
Criteria 1 – Organization					A	S	E
Criteria 2 – Quality Assurance Program					A	S	E
Criteria 3 – Design Control	1	1			A	S	E
Criteria 4 – Procurement Document Control					A	S	E
Criteria 5 – Instructions, Procedures, and Drawings					A	S	E
Criteria 6 – Document Control					A	S	E
Criteria 7 – Control of Purchased Items and Services					A	S	E
Criteria 8 – Identification and Control of Items					A	S	E
Criteria 9 – Control of Processes	0	0	0	0	A	S	E
TOTALS	1	1	0	0	A	S	E

Definitions

A = Adequate
I = Indeterminate
NA = Not Adequate
S = Satisfactory

E = Effective
M = Marginal
NE = Not Effective

CAR = Corrective Action Report
CDA = Corrected During Audit
Obs = Observation
Rec = Recommendation