

May 26, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Martin J. Virgilio, Deputy Executive Director
for Materials, Research and State Programs

Paul H. Lohaus, Director
Office of State and Tribal Programs

Jack R. Strosnider , Director
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards

Karen D. Cyr, General Counsel

FROM: Lance J. Rakovan, IMPEP Project Manager */RA/*
Office of State and Tribal Programs

SUBJECT: PROPOSED CHANGES INVOLVING MANAGEMENT
REVIEW BOARD (MRB) MINUTES AND PERIODIC
MEETING DISCUSSIONS AT MRB MEETINGS

This memorandum transmits to the Management Review Board (MRB) two proposed changes, one involving the process of issuing MRB meeting minutes and one involving the discussions of periodic meeting results (see Attachments). STP intends to implement these changes with the issuance of the minutes of the MRB meeting held on May 13, 2004 to discuss the Tennessee IMPEP review, and intends to schedule a meeting to discuss periodic meetings within the next few months.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 415-2589.

Attachments:
As stated

cc: Ed Bailey, CA
Michael Broderick, OK
Clayton Bradt, NY
Steven Collins, IL
Thomas Conley, KS
Roland Fletcher, MD
Robert Greger, CA
Pearce O'Kelley, SC
Alice Rogers, TX
Jared Thompson, AR

Management Review Board

Distribution:

DIR RF
AMcCraw, STP
KSchneider, STP
JPiccone, STP
OSiurano, STP
ISchoenfeld, OEDO
CMiller, NMSS
RStuckmeyer, NMSS
STreby, OGC
IMPEP File

DCD (SP01) PDR (YES√)

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNETML041560244.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	LJRakovan:gd								
DATE	5/26/04								

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD (MRB) MEETING MINUTES PROPOSAL

Current Process:

- Two sets of minutes are issued: draft and final.
- Prior to issuance, draft minutes are shared with the IMPEP Project Manager, the IMPEP team leader, and management from the program under review.
- Draft minutes may be shared with additional meeting attendees, if necessary, to ensure precise wording on controversial or complex issues.
- There is no deadline for the issuance of draft minutes or final minutes.

Proposed Revised Process:

- Only one set of minutes will be required to be issued for each meeting. A deadline of 30 days after the meeting would be established as the milestone for issuing the minutes.
- Consistent with current policy, draft minutes would be circulated to the IMPEP Project Manager, the IMPEP team leader, and State or Regional program management for review and comment prior to issuance.
- Revised minutes would be issued if substantial comments were received from MRB members.

Reasoning For Proposed Change:

- Issuance of MRB meeting minutes have at times been delayed for extended periods due to higher priority work. There is currently no deadline for issuing minutes. In order to ensure minutes are issued while still pertinent, IMPEP management is proposing a deadline of 30 days for issuance of MRB meeting minutes.
- In the past, IMPEP management frequently received comments on MRB meeting minutes. Currently, however, comments are seldom received on draft minutes and final minutes are usually identical to draft minutes. Thus, efficiency can be improved by issuing a single set of minutes rather than issuing two sets of minutes for each MRB meeting. Under the proposed revised process, if comments are received on minutes once they have been issued, revised minutes will be issued. In this case, IMPEP management will ensure that there are no further comments on the minutes by polling MRB members, the IMPEP team, and the program under review.

PERIODIC MEETING SUMMARY DISCUSSION PROPOSAL

Current Process:

- Management Review Board (MRB) meetings are usually only held to discuss the findings of an IMPEP review.
- All periodic meeting results are presented at MRB meetings. These discussions are added to the agenda when an MRB meeting is set up to discuss the results of an IMPEP review.
- A Regional State Agreements Officer (RSAO) or Agreement State Project Officer (ASPO) leads the discussions. The State the periodic meeting was held with is invited to call in to participate, however a discussion may be held without State representation as long as the State gives authorization.

Proposed Revised Process:

- Separate meetings will be set up to discuss the results of periodic meetings. These meetings will take place only when sufficient periodic meetings have taken place to warrant a meeting (approximately four to six), if the results of a periodic meeting warrant action such as placing the State on monitoring or changing the frequency of an IMPEP review, or if sufficient time has elapsed that the results of a periodic meeting are becoming outdated.
- An RSAO or ASPO will continue to lead the discussions. The State the periodic meeting was held with will be invited to call in to participate, however a discussion may be held without State representation as long as the State gives authorization.
- Additional topics will be discussed as necessary.

Reasoning For Proposed Change:

- Since discussion of periodic meeting results take place after the discussion of an IMPEP review, efficient scheduling has been difficult. The RSAO or ASPO that leads the periodic meeting discussion and representatives from the State must either wait on the telephone bridge line or in their offices for the IMPEP review discussion to finish.
- Adding periodic meeting presentations and discussions of other topics during an MRB meeting can greatly add to the length of the meeting. For example, the discussion of the Tennessee IMPEP at the May 13, 2004 MRB meeting lasted over two hours. The additional periodic meeting discussions lead to a nearly three-hour meeting and additional agenda topics were not addressed due to the length of the meeting.
- Efficiency can be improved by scheduling separate MRB meetings specifically to discuss periodic meetings and any additional topics. This way, RSAOs, ASPOs, and State staff will not have to waste time waiting for the discussion of an IMPEP review to conclude. Also, scheduling separate meetings will allow greater flexibility to discuss additional topics such as proposed changes to the IMPEP process.