

October 7, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:

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

FROM: */RA/*
Andrew Mauer, Health Physicist
Office of State and Tribal Programs

SUBJECT: FINAL MINUTES: ALABAMA MRB MEETING

Attached are the final minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on June 24, 2002. If you have any questions, please contact me at 301-415-3384.

Attachment:
As stated

cc: K. Whatley, AL
W. Sinclair, UT

Management Review Board Members

Distribution:

DIR RF	RLeonardi, RIV	DCD (SP01) PDR (YES)
SDroggitis, STP	RWoodruff, RII	
OSiurano, STP	CPaperiello, EDO	
KHsueh, STP	SSeeley, ME	
LRakovan, STP	JLieberman, OGC	
ISchoenfeld, EDO	LPsyk, NMSS	
Alabama File		

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML023110190.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		STP						
NAME	AMauer:gd		KSchneider						
DATE	10/7/02		10/7/02						

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF JUNE 24, 2002

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

Paul Lohaus, Acting MRB Chair, STP
William Sinclair, MRB Member, UT
Kevin Hsueh, Team Leader, STP
Kathleen Schneider, STP
Lance Rakovan, STP
Linda Psyk, NMSS

Martin Virgilio, MRB Member, NMSS
Karen D. Cyr, MRB Member, OGC
Josephine Piccone, STP
Alvin Henry, STP
Cardelia Maupin, STP

By video conference:

Richard Woodruff, Team Member, RII

By teleconference:

Shawn Seeley, Team Member, ME
Kirksey Whatley, AL
Myron Riley, AL

David Walter, AL
David Turberville, AL
Bridget Stephens, AL

1. **Convention.** Paul Lohaus, Designated Chair of the Management Review Board (MRB) convened the meeting at 10:05 a.m. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. **New Business. Alabama Review Introduction.** Mr. Kevin Hsueh, STP, led the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) team for the Alabama review.

Mr. Hsueh summarized the review and noted the findings. Preliminary work included a review of Alabama's response to the IMPEP questionnaire. The onsite review was conducted April 8-12, 2002. 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 May 14, 2002; received Alabama's comment e-mail dated May 21, 2002; and submitted a proposed final report to the MRB on June 7, 2002. Mr. Hsueh noted that the recommendation from the previous review was closed.

Mr. Hsueh informed the MRB that the Alabama program is the first Agreement State to receive all "satisfactory" ratings with no recommendations for any of the performance indicators. Mr. Hsueh outlined five key factors that contributed to making such a finding. (1) The program has a low turnover rate which produces experienced and knowledgeable staff. (2) The State has established fees at 75% of NRC rates for material licenses. These fees directly fund program activities. (3) With senior management's support, the program was able to hire additional staff and provide training opportunities for new hires. Such support also allows the staff to actively participate in the Organization of Agreement States/Nuclear Regulatory Commission (OAS/NRC) working groups, and IMPEP activities. (4) All technical staff are equipped with a combination cell phone/two-way radio for communication. This enables the staff to be able to communicate with any other staff member during routine working

conditions and emergency situations. (5) Program management has a proactive succession staffing plan that has factored in the potential future needs of the program.

The MRB recognized the Alabama program as an excellent program and suggested that Alabama share their successes with the OAS.

Common Performance Indicators. Mr. Shawn Seeley reviewed the Status of the Materials Inspection Program. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the IMPEP report. The review team found Alabama's performance with respect to this indicator "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Alabama's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Seeley also presented the findings regarding Technical Quality of Inspections. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.2 of the report. The team found that Alabama's performance was "satisfactory" for this indicator and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Alabama's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Hsueh presented the findings regarding Technical Staffing and Training. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the IMPEP report. The team found that Alabama's performance with respect to this indicator was "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB and Mr. Whatley discussed budget allocations for training. The MRB agreed that Alabama'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 Alabama's performance to be "satisfactory" for this indicator and made no recommendations. The MRB recognized the high quality controls for license reviews. The MRB agreed that Alabama's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Hsueh, representing Mr. Richard Leonardi, also presented the findings regarding the final common performance indicator, Response to Incidents and Allegations. As discussed in Section 3.5 of the report, the team found Alabama's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB recognized that the program found the NMED training useful and the latest version of the NMED software very user-friendly. The MRB agreed that Alabama'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 Alabama's performance "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB congratulated the Alabama program for keeping their regulations consistent with NRC regulations. The MRB agreed that Alabama's performance for this indicator met the standard for a "satisfactory."

Mr. Hsueh noted that the review team did not evaluate sealed source and device (SS&D) evaluation program and low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) disposal indicators. The State did not perform any SS&D reviews and that there was no activity to establish a LLRW disposal site in the State.

MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. Mr. Hsueh concluded, based on the discussion and direction of the MRB, that Alabama's program was rated "satisfactory" for all performance indicators. The MRB found the Alabama 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.

Comments. Mr. Whatley noted that the character and quality of the Alabama staff is the key factor that makes the program a success. He thanked the IMPEP team for their work and professionalism and the MRB for recognizing the hard work of the Alabama program. Mr. Seeley thanked the State, NRC, and MRB for the opportunity to participate in IMPEP. Mr. Lohaus thanked the team and Alabama for their efforts.

3. **Results of Periodic and Orientation Meetings.** Mrs. Schneider reported on the California periodic meeting that took place on January 28, 2002 (ML021650245).
4. **Status of Current and Upcoming Reviews.** Mrs. Schneider briefly reported on the status of the current and upcoming IMPEP reviews and reports. She noted that the Massachusetts IMPEP review began this week. For the Kansas review, one accompaniment had been performed, however additional inspector accompaniments were scheduled for the Kansas program. Also, STP staff is reviewing the request from the Nevada program to re-evaluate a performance indicator's finding from their last IMPEP review.
5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:40 a.m.