

September 27, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:

Paul H. Lohaus, STP  
Martin J. Virgilio, NMSS  
Karen D. Cyr, OGC  
Frederick C. Combs, STP

FROM: Lance J. Rakovan, Health Physicist */RA/*  
Office of State and Tribal Programs

SUBJECT: DRAFT MINUTES: MISSISSIPPI MRB MEETING

Attached are the draft minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on August 16, 2001. We plan to finalize these minutes at the New Mexico MRB meeting scheduled for September 18, 2001. If you have comments or questions, please contact me at 415-2589.

Attachment:  
As stated

cc: B. Goff, MS  
P. O'Kelley, SC  
T. Hill, GA

Management Review Board Members

September 27, 2001

Distribution:

DIR RF	RWoodruff, RII	DCD (SP01) PDR (YES)
SDroggitis, STP	BHamrick, CA	
CMaupin, STP	JPapadimitrakis, OGC	
SSalomon, STP	GDeegan, NMSS	
ACampbell, EDO	KSchneider, STP	
Mississippi File	CPaperiello, EDO	

**DOCUMENT NAME: C:\Program Files\Adobe\Acrobat 4.0\PDF Output\2001 Draft Mississippi MRB ~.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	LRakovan:pc								
DATE	9/27/01								

STP-AG-15

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF AUGUST 16, 2001

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, STP  
Martin Virgilio, MRB Member, NMSS  
Cardelia Maupin, Team Leader, STP  
Barbara Hamrick, Team Member, CA  
John Hickey, NMSS  
Lance Rakovan, STP

Frederick Combs, MRB Member, STP  
Karen Cyr, MRB Member, OGC  
Stephen Salomon, Team Member, STP  
Robert Goff, MS  
Kathleen Schneider, STP

By video conference:  
Richard Woodruff, Team Member, RII

By teleconference:  
Pearce O'Kelley, OAS Liaison, SC  
Robert Nelson, MS  
Tom Hill, GA

BJ Smith, MS  
Josh Grisham, MS

1. **Convention.** Paul Lohaus, Chair of the Management Review Board (MRB) convened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. **New Business. Mississippi Review Introduction.** Ms. Cardelia Maupin, STP, led the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) team for the Mississippi review.

Ms. Maupin summarized the review and noted the findings. Preliminary work included a review of Mississippi's response to the IMPEP questionnaire. The onsite review was conducted May 21-25, 2001. 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 June 22, 2001; received Mississippi's comment letter dated July 9, 2001; and submitted a proposed final report to the MRB on August 3, 2001.

Ms. Maupin noted that all of the recommendations from the previous review were closed during this review. The MRB commented that there appeared to be a discrepancy in the report between Sections 2.0 and 3.1 involving the State's policy of when initial inspections are conducted. Ms. Schneider and Ms. Maupin promised to clarify this issue in the report.

**Common Performance Indicators.** Ms. Hamrick reviewed the common performance indicator, Status of the Materials Inspection Program. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the IMPEP report. The review team found Mississippi's performance with respect to this indicator "satisfactory," and made no recommendations. The MRB and the review team discussed the number of overdue inspections conducted over the review period, management handling of the inspection backlog, and the reasons the team supported a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator as opposed to an "unsatisfactory." The MRB directed that additional language should be added to the

report to fully describe the team's rationale for the rating. The MRB complimented Mr. Goff for the actions taken by the State in response to the inspection backlog. The MRB agreed that Mississippi's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Ms. Hamrick also reviewed the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Inspections. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.2 of the report. The team found that Mississippi's performance was "satisfactory" for this indicator and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Mississippi's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Ms. Maupin presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Staffing and Training. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the IMPEP report. The team found that Mississippi's performance with respect to this indicator was "satisfactory," and made one recommendation involving filling the vacant HP Senior position. The MRB and Mr. Goff discussed the challenges in bringing in a number of staff members at the same time. The MRB and Mr. Goff discussed the steps the State is taking to fill the vacant position. The MRB agreed that Mississippi's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Woodruff presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions. He summarized the findings in Section 3.4 of the report. The team found Mississippi's performance to be "satisfactory" for this indicator and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Mississippi's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Woodruff also 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 Mississippi's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. Mr. Woodruff noted various revisions that were necessary to Appendix E of the report. The MRB and the State discussed the use of NMED including any problems the State was experiencing with NMED software. Mr. Goff indicated that he was not experiencing any problems and shared what he felt was a positive experience utilizing NMED. Mr. Goff indicated that a gauge listed two years previously in another state was identified through the NMED system. The MRB agreed that Mississippi's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

**Non-Common Performance Indicators.** Dr. Salomon 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 originally found Mississippi's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory with recommendations for improvement," and made one recommendation involving not delaying the adoption of regulations. Dr. Salomon noted that since the time of the on site review, the State had adopted 18 amendments, including all overdue regulations. Ms. Maupin noted that with the adoption of these regulations, the team supported a "satisfactory" finding for this indicator. Mr. Goff commented on the various obstacles to regulation adoption including loss of funds and staff. The MRB noted that the State

managed the various difficulties well. The MRB and Mr. Goff discussed the State's use of legally binding requirements. The MRB directed that staffing difficulties be addressed in the letter accompanying the final report and that language be added to the report documenting the steps taken by the State since the review in terms of regulation adoption. The MRB agreed that Mississippi's performance for this indicator met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating.

**MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report.** Ms. Maupin concluded, based on the discussion and direction of the MRB, that Mississippi's program was rated "satisfactory" for all performance indicators. The MRB found the Mississippi radiation control program was 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, as long as periodic meeting results reflected positive performance and were communicated to the MRB.

**Comments from the State of Mississippi.** Mr. Goff commented that the review team was professional and complimented Ms. Maupin for her role as team leader. He stressed the need for STP management to attend the team's exit meeting and noted that BJ Smith's participation in IMPEP has been very beneficial. He also complemented his staff for their performance.

3. **Results of Periodic and Orientation Meetings.** Ms. Schneider commented on recent periodic meetings and orientation meetings. She noted that the August 8, 2001 periodic meeting with Georgia revealed that the State has a strong program that is experiencing some SS&D backlog, but Mr. Hill is managing the backlog. She noted that the State has experienced some delays in regulation adoption, but Georgia management is aware and managing the impact. She also complimented the State for their participation on various working groups as well as the IMPEP program. The MRB asked that they receive an e-mail advising them on any major issues involving periodic meetings that will be addressed at upcoming MRB meetings.
4. **Status of Current and Upcoming Reviews.** Ms. Schneider briefly reported on the status of the current and upcoming IMPEP reviews and reports. She noted that the New Hampshire MRB meeting will be in September. She also related that due to the illness of a team member, the MD follow-up review team would have to return to the State in November.
5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:50 p.m.