

March 8, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:  
  
Carl J. Paperiello, EDO  
Karen D. Cyr, OGC  
Thomas H. Essig, NMSS  
Paul H. Lohaus, STP

FROM: Osiris Siurano, Health Physicist */RA/*  
Office of State and Tribal Programs

SUBJECT: FINAL MINUTES: DECEMBER 10, 2003 WASHINGTON  
MRB MEETING

Attached are the final minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on December 10, 2003. If you have comments or questions, please contact me at 415-2307.

Attachment:  
As stated

cc: Gary Robertson, WA  
Steve Collins, IL



## MINUTES MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF DECEMBER 10, 2003

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

Carl Paperiello, MRB Chair, OEDO  
Thomas Essig, MRB Member, NMSS  
Gary Robertson, WA  
John Zabko, Team Member, STP  
Josephine Piconne, STP  
Aaron McCraw, STP  
Richard Struckmeyer, NMSS  
Lloyd Bolling, STP

Karen Cyr, MRB Member, OGC  
Paul Lohaus, MRB Member, STP  
Terry Frazee, WA  
Boby Abu-Eid, Team Member, NMSS  
Lance Rakovan, STP  
Patricia Eng, STP  
Isabel Schoenfeld, EDO  
Osiris Siurano, STP

By Teleconference:

David Fogle, Team Member, TX  
Robert Walker, MA  
Kirksey Whatley, AL

Steve Collins, OAS Liaison, IL  
Aubrey Godwin, AZ

By Videoconference:

Duncan White, Team Leader, RI  
Louis Carson, Team Member, RIV

Vivian Campbell, Team Member, RIV

1. **Convention.** Carl Paperiello, Chair of the Management Review Board (MRB), convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. **New Business: Washington Review Introduction.** Mr. Duncan White, Region I, led the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) team for the Washington IMPEP review.

Mr. White summarized the review and noted the findings. Preliminary work included a review of Washington's response to the IMPEP questionnaire. The onsite review was conducted September 8-12, 2003. 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 October 9, 2003; received Washington's comment letter dated October 30, 2003; and submitted a proposed final report to the MRB on December 3, 2003. Mr. White noted that one recommendation from the previous IMPEP review was closed at this review. A new recommendation to the State was made during this review and the team identified two potential good practices.

**Common Performance Indicators.** Ms. Vivian Campbell presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Staffing and Training. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The review team recommended that Washington's outreach program for providing emergency response training for first responders, hospital staff and local governments for response to radiological events

be found a good practice. A short discussion on the good practice was held. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator and agreed on the review team's good practice recommendation.

Mr. White presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Status of Materials Inspection Program. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. White also presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Inspections. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. A short discussion on inspection files reviewed by the IMPEP team was held. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Fogle presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory." The team made one recommendation for the State to develop and implement a plan to adequately and consistently address the financial assurance for decommissioning portions of material license regulations. The State submitted a written plan and a short discussion was held. Mr. Frazee briefly discussed the main points of the plan and indicated that the plan has been implemented. The MRB directed that the report be updated to include language on the State's actions in response to the recommendation. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Zabko presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Response to Incidents and Allegations. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.5 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

**Non-Common Performance Indicators.** Mr. Zabko led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Legislation and Program Elements Required for Compatibility. His discussion corresponded to Section 4.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Washington's performance to be "satisfactory" for this indicator and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Fogle led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program. His discussion corresponded to Section 4.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Washington's performance to be

“satisfactory” for this indicator and made no recommendations. A discussion was held on comments in Appendix F of the proposed final report. The MRB encouraged the State to review such files and, if necessary, reissue the Sealed Source and Device sheets. The State committed to addressing those. The MRB agreed that Washington’s performance met the standard for a “satisfactory” rating for this indicator.

Mr. Abu-Eid led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program. His discussion corresponded to Section 4.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Washington’s performance to be “satisfactory” for this indicator and made no recommendations. A short discussion was held on the U.S. Ecology license renewal and completion of an Environmental Impact Statement detailing options for closing the site. The MRB agreed that Washington’s performance met the standard for a “satisfactory” rating for this indicator.

Mr. Carson led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Uranium Recovery Program. His discussion corresponded to Section 4.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Washington’s performance to be “satisfactory” for this indicator and made no recommendations. The review team recommended that the State’s use of a license condition requiring licensees to notify the State in writing 30 days prior to any changes in business structure be found a good practice. The MRB agreed that Washington’s performance met the standard for a “satisfactory” rating for this indicator and supported the review team’s good practice recommendation.

**MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report.** Mr. White concluded, based on the discussion and direction of the MRB, that Washington’s Program was rated “satisfactory” for all common and applicable non-common performance indicators. The MRB found the Washington Agreement State Program 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. Robertson thanked the MRB and the IMPEP team for their work and professionalism during the onsite review. He and Mr. Frazee also thanked Office of State and Tribal Programs staff for their cooperation and support through the years, which has helped their program to be a success. The MRB thanked the team and Washington for their efforts.

3. **Status of Current and Upcoming Reviews.** Recent periodic meetings were briefly discussed by Mr. White for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (ML033360503), Mr. McCraw for the State of Alabama (ML033360602), and Ms. Campbell for the State of Arizona (ML032760245). Mr. Rakovan briefly commented on upcoming reviews and MRB meetings.
4. **Precedents/Lessons Learned.** No precedents that will be applied to the IMPEP process in the future were established by the MRB during this review.
5. **Good Practices.** The IMPEP review team identified two Washington State’s good practices: an outreach program for providing emergency response training for first responders, hospital staff and local governments for response to radiological events,

and the use of a license condition requiring licensees to notify the State in writing 30 days prior to any changes in business structure. The MRB agreed that these are good practices.

6. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:20 p.m.