July 10, 2000

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:

Paul H. Lohaus, Acting DEDMRS/EDO
William F. Kane, NMSS
Karen Cyr, OGC
Kathleen Schneider, STP

/RA/

FROM: Richard L. Blanton, Project Manager
Office of State and Tribal Programs

SUBJECT: DRAFT MINUTES: GEORGIA MRB MEETING

Attached are the draft minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on June 27, 2000. If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-2322.

Attachment:
As stated

cc: Thomas Hill, GA
Stephen Collins, IL

Distribution:

DIR RF	MShaffer, RIV	DCD (SP01) PDR (YES)
SDroggitis	KHsueh, STP	
CMaupin, ASPO	RWoodruff, RII	
DCool, NMSS	WSilva, Texas	
GDeegan, NMSS	VCampbell, RIV	
STreby, OGC		
HNewsome, OGC		
Georgia File		

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\Georgia MRB minutes.wpd

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "**C**" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "**E**" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "**N**" = No copy

OFFICE	STP									
NAME	RLBlanton:gd									
DATE	07/10/2000									

STP-AG-7

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF JUNE 27, 2000

These minutes are presented in the same general order as the items were discussed in the meeting. The attendees were as follows:

Paul Lohaus, MRB Chair, EDO
William Kane, MRB Member, NMSS
Mark Schaffer, Team Leader, RIV
Kevin Hsueh, Team Member, STP
George Deegan, NMSS
Angela Williamson, NMSS
Brenda Usilton, STP
Kathleen Schneider, MRB Member, STP
Karen Cyr, MRB Member, OGC
Vivian Campbell, Team Member, RIV
Thomas Hill, Manager, GA DNR
Ron Ulich, NMSS
Richard Blanton, STP

By teleconference:
Richard Woodruff, Team Member, RII

By telephone:
Eric Jameson, GA DNR
Cynthia Sanders, GA DNR
Stephen Collins, MRB Liaison, IL
Cornelius Maryland, GA DNR
Liz Seale, GA DNR

1. **Convention.** Paul Lohaus, Chair of the Management Review Board (MRB) convened the meeting at 10:45 a.m. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.

2. **New Business. Georgia Review Introduction.** Mr. Mark Schaffer, RIV, Chief of the Nuclear Material Inspection Branch (former Regional State Agreements Officer), led the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) team for the Georgia review. One team member, Mr. William Silva of the Texas Department of Health, was unable to attend the meeting.

   Mr. Schaffer summarized the review and noted the findings. Preliminary work included a review of Georgia's response to the IMPEP questionnaire. The onsite review was conducted April 3 - 7, 2000. The onsite review included an entrance interview, detailed audits of a representative sample of completed licensing actions and inspections, and follow-up discussions with staff and management. Following the review, the team issued a draft report on April 22, 2000; received Georgia's comment letter dated May 24, 2000; and submitted a proposed final report to the MRB on June 9, 2000.

   Common Performance Indicators. Mr. Silva reviewed the common performance indicator, Status of the Materials Inspection Program. In his absence, Mr. Schaffer discussed the findings. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the IMPEP report. The review team found Georgia's performance with respect to this indicator "satisfactory," and made no recommendations. The Board and Mr. Hill briefly discussed the effect of previous recommendations on the Georgia program, and the resources for reciprocity inspections. The MRB agreed that Georgia's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

   Mr. Silva also reviewed the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Inspections. Again, the summarized findings were discussed by Mr. Schaffer. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.2 of the report. The team found that Georgia's

performance indicator was “satisfactory,” and made no recommendations. The Board suggested one change to the draft report regarding the frequency of the review of inspection reports by the program manager, and his review of reports by new inspectors. The MRB agreed that Georgia’s performance met the standard for a “satisfactory” rating for this indicator.

Mr. Woodruff presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Staffing and Training. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the IMPEP report. The team found that Georgia's performance with respect to this indicator was "satisfactory," and made no recommendations. Mr. Woodruff suggested one clarifying change to the draft report regarding the discussion of regional offices. The MRB agreed to the change, and agreed that Georgia's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Ms. Campbell presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions. She summarized the findings in Section 3.4 of the report. The team found Georgia’s performance to be "satisfactory" for this indicator and made one recommendation regarding implementation of the financial assurance requirements. The MRB discussed the team's recommendation, and noted that similar findings were reported in the Louisiana IMPEP review. The MRB directed staff to develop an All Agreement States letter informing the States of this trend. The MRB agreed that Georgia's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Hsueh presented findings regarding the final common performance indicator, Response to Incidents and Allegations. As discussed in Section 3.5 of the report, the team found Georgia's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB discussed the reporting requirements in STP Procedure SA-300, and noted that NRC staff is modifying SA-300 to clarify the timing requirements for reporting events to NRC. The Board directed a change to the draft report to reflect the modification of SA-300. The MRB agreed that Georgia's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Non-Common Performance Indicators. Mr. Hsueh led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Legislation and Program Elements Required for Compatibility, which is summarized in Section 4.1 of the report. The team found Georgia's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory," and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Georgia’s performance for this indicator met the standard for a “satisfactory” rating.

Mr. Woodruff led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Sealed Source and Device (SS&D) Evaluation Program, which is summarized in Section 4.2 of the report. The team found Georgia’s performance relative to this indicator to be “satisfactory” and made no recommendations for the State. The team recommended that the MRB consider Georgia's method of evaluating SS&D registrants' QA/QC programs a good practice. The MRB agreed to the good practice and that Georgia’s performance for this indicator met the standard for a “satisfactory” rating.

MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. Mr. Schaffer concluded, based on the discussion and direction of the MRB, that Georgia's program was rated "satisfactory" for all common and applicable non-common performance indicators. The MRB found the Georgia program to be adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's program. The IMPEP team recommended that the next IMPEP review be conducted in four years, and the MRB agreed. The MRB noted the improvements in the Georgia program, and the support of the Georgia program to IMPEP.

Comments from the State of Georgia. Mr. Hill noted that he appreciated the review. It is his intention to run the best program possible.

3. **Status of Remaining Reviews.** Mrs. Schneider briefly reported on the status of the current and upcoming IMPEP reviews and reports. Reviews of Kentucky and Maryland are forthcoming. The MRB desires to continue distribution of paper copies of the review reports in addition to the electronic distribution.

4. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:45 a.m.