

July 20, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:  
  
Martin J. Virgilio, EDO  
Karen D. Cyr, OGC  
Margaret V. Federline, NMSS  
Josephine M. Piccone, STP

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

SUBJECT: MINUTES: JULY 1, 2004 REGION IV MRB MEETING

Attached are the minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on July 1, 2004. If you have comments or questions, please contact me at 415-2307.

Attachment:  
As stated

cc: Bruce S. Mallet, NRC Region IV  
Elmo C. Collins, NRC Region IV  
Jared Thompson, OAS Liaison, AR



MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF JULY 1, 2004

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

Martin Virgilio, MRB Chair, EDO  
Margaret Federline, MRB Member, NMSS  
Charles Cox, Team Leader, NMSS  
Aaron McCraw, Team Member,  
Lance Rakovan, STP  
Richard Struckmeyer, NMSS  
Jennifer Dixon-Herrity, EDO

Karen Cyr, MRB Member, OGC  
Josephine Piccone, MRB Member, STP  
Marissa Bailey, Team Member, NMSS  
Elaine Brummet, Team Member, NMSS  
Charles Miller, NMSS  
Patricia Holahan, NMSS  
Osiris Siurano, STP

By videoconference:

Cassandra Frazier, Team Member, Region III  
Elmo Collins, Region IV  
Jack Whitten, Region IV  
Bruce Mallet, Region IV

James Kottan, Team Member, Region I  
Chuck Cain, Region IV  
Mark Satorius, Region IV

By teleconference:

Michael Snee, Team Member, OH

Jared Thompson, OAS Liaison, AR

1. **Convention.** Martin Virgilio, Chair of the Management Review Board (MRB) convened the meeting at 1:08 p.m. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. **New Business: NRC Region IV Review Introduction.** Mr. Charles Cox, NMSS, led the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) team for the NRC Region IV IMPEP review.

Mr. Cox summarized the review and noted the findings. Preliminary work included a review of the Region IV response to the IMPEP questionnaire. The on-site review was conducted by an interoffice team during the period of March 22-25, 2004. The on-site 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. Inspector accompaniments were performed during the weeks of February 10 and March 8, 2004. The team issued a draft report on April 22, 2004; received Region IV's memorandum and e-mail dated May 12, 2004; and submitted a proposed final report to the MRB on May 24, 2004. He noted that four recommendations from the previous IMPEP review were all closed. He also noted that the Uranium Recovery program was reviewed after the on-site review due to the illness of a team member, and that the Region IV Fuel Cycle Inspection Program was not evaluated since the program was relocated to NRC Region II.

**Common Performance Indicators.** Mr. McCraw presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Staffing and Training. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Region IV's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no

recommendations. The MRB agreed that Region IV's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Snee 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 Region IV's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made one recommendation. The team recommended that guidelines be provided to the Regions on revising inspection frequencies for licensees who were extended due to good performance prior to Temporary Instruction (TI) 2800/033, dated December 31, 2002. A brief discussion on the team's recommendation was held. The MRB agreed that Region IV's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Snee 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 Region IV's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The team observed that Region IV keeps a database of sites where licensees may conduct field operations. Inspectors use the database to conduct unannounced field inspections when they are in the vicinity for a routine inspection. The review team recommended that the use of this database be found a good practice. The MRB agreed that Region IV's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator and endorsed the team's good practice.

Ms. Frazier presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Region IV's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The team reviewed Region IV's process for pre-screening licensing actions prior to assigning them to the license reviewers and observed that this process has increased the timeliness of licensing actions and reduced the need for lengthy deficiently correspondence. The review team recommended that this practice be found a good practice. The MRB, the review team, and Region IV management and staff discussed this practice. The MRB directed that the good practice reflect that although this practice may be useful in increasing efficiency, individual programs would have to adapt implementation of the practice to their own needs. A short discussion on the quality of licensing actions performed by work-at-home staff was held. The MRB agreed that Region IV's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator and endorsed the good practice as revised.

Ms. Bailey presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.5 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Region IV's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Region IV's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

**Non-Common Performance Indicators.** Ms. Brummet led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Uranium Recovery Program. Her discussion corresponded to Section 4.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Region IV's performance to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. A short discussion about primary and back-up inspectors, as well as cross-training of inspectors was held. The MRB agreed that Region IV's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Kottan led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Site Decommissioning Management Plan. His discussion corresponded to Section 4.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The team found Region IV's performance to be "satisfactory" for this indicator and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Region IV's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

**MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report.** Mr. Cox concluded, based on the discussion and direction of the MRB, that Region IV's Program was rated "satisfactory" for all common and applicable non-common performance indicators. The MRB found the Region IV Agreement State Program adequate to protect public health and safety. The IMPEP team recommended that the next IMPEP review be conducted in four years and the MRB agreed.

**Comments.** The MRB thanked the review team for their job and commitment to complete their task and commended Region IV for their efforts to keep their program at an outstanding level. Mr. Mallet thanked the review team for a thorough and high quality review and noted Region IV goals and achievements during the past and for the future. As the Agreement State IMPEP team member, Mr. Snee expressed thanks for the opportunity to participate on a review of an NRC Regional program and commended Region IV staff on their efforts.

3. **Status of Current and Upcoming Reviews.** Mr. Rakovan and Mr. McCraw briefly discussed the status of IMPEP reviews, as well as heightened oversight and monitoring activities. The MRB expressed interest in whether the periodic telephone discussions with the State of New Hampshire gave STP and the New Hampshire IMPEP team the information they needed to prepare for the June 2004 review of the New Hampshire program.
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.** Two good practices were identified during this review: a) the use of a database of sites where licensees may conduct field operations, currently used by inspectors in conducting unannounced field inspections, when they are in the vicinity for a routine inspection; and, b) pre-screening of materials licenses' requests to increase effectiveness and efficiency of license reviews provided that individual programs adapt implementation of this practice to their own needs and no additional burden is posed on program management.
6. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:48 p.m.