



FSME Procedure Approval

Reviewing the Common Performance Indicator, Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities

SA-105

Issue Date:

Review Date:

Janet R. Schlueter
Director, DMSSA

Date:

A. Duncan White
Branch Chief, DMSSA

Date:

Aaron T. McCraw
Procedure Contact, DMSSA

Date:

NOTE

These procedures were formerly issued by the Office of State and Tribal Programs (STP). Any changes to the procedure will be the responsibility of the FSME Procedure Contact as of October 1, 2006. Copies of FSME procedures will be available through the NRC website.



Procedure Title:
*Reviewing the Common Performance Indicator,
Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities*
Procedure Number: SA-105

Page: 1 of

Issue Date:

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. This document describes the procedures for conducting reviews of **U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)** Regional offices and Agreement States **radioactive materials programs** using **the Common Performance Indicator #5, Response Technical Quality of Incidents and Allegations Activities** [NRC Management Directive (MD) 5.6, *Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP)*].
- B. As used in this procedure, the term "incident" applies to an event that may have caused, or threatens to cause, conditions described in 10 CFR 20.2202 through 20.2204, 10 CFR 30.50, **10 CFR 31.51**, 10 CFR 34.24, ~~10 CFR 34.30~~**101**, 10 CFR 35.33**67**, **10 CFR 35.3045**, **10 CFR 35.3047**, 10 CFR 36.83, 10 CFR 39.77, 10 CFR 40.60, 10 CFR 70.50, **10 CFR 71.95**, or the equivalent **Agreement** State regulations. If an **Agreement** State defines this term in a different fashion, this should be noted during the course of the review.
- C. As used in this procedure, the term "allegation" means a declaration, statement, or assertion of impropriety or inadequacy associated with regulated activities, the validity of which has not been established. This term includes all concerns identified by sources such as the media, individuals, or organizations. Excluded from this definition are matters being handled by more formal processes, such as 10 CFR 2.206 petitions, hearing boards, and appeal boards, ~~for example~~. If an **Agreement** State defines this term in a different fashion, this should be noted during the course of the review.

II. OBJECTIVES

- A. To assure that actions taken in response to incidents or allegations are appropriate, well-coordinated, and timely.
- B. To verify that **NRC** Regions and Agreement States have ~~in place~~ appropriate incident and allegation response procedures **in place**.
- C. To confirm that corrective actions in response to incidents and allegations are adequately identified **by NRC Regions and Agreement States** and implemented by licensees and that appropriate follow-up measures are taken to ensure compliance.
- D. For incidents:
1. To assure that the level of effort in responding to an incident is commensurate with potential health and safety significance.

2. To confirm that follow-up inspections are scheduled and completed, if necessary.
 3. For Regional reviews, to confirm that notification to the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) ~~Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs (FSME)~~ and the NRC Headquarters Operations Center, as appropriate, is usually performed in a timely fashion.
 4. For Agreement State reviews, to confirm that notification to the NRC, as appropriate, is usually performed in accordance with the Handbook on Nuclear Material Event Reporting in the Agreement States (~~OSP~~ **STP** Procedure SA-300, *Reporting Material Events*).
 5. To verify that the information provided by the Agreement States on incidents ~~and events~~ for **inclusion in the** Nuclear Materials Events Database (NMED) is complete and accurate.
- E. For allegations:
1. To assure that the level of effort in responding to an allegation is commensurate with potential health and safety significance.
 2. To verify that Agreement States are properly handling all allegations referred to the State from the NRC (e.g., that safety issues are properly addressed, length of time to close an allegation is appropriate, **and** feedback is provided to ~~allegers, etc.~~), in addition to the general sampling of allegations involving 274b. **radioactive** materials.

III. BACKGROUND

The ~~quality~~ **effectiveness**, thoroughness, and timeliness of a regulator's response to incidents and allegations can have a direct ~~bearing~~ **impact** on public health and safety. A careful assessment of incident response and allegation investigation, including internal and external coordination and investigative and follow-up actions, is a significant indication of the overall quality of the program.

IV. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Team Leader:

~~The team leader for the Regional or State review will~~ **Determines** which team member(s) is assigned lead review responsibility for this performance indicator. ~~The principal reviewer should meet the appropriate requirements specified in~~

~~MD 5.10, Formal Qualifications for Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) Team Members.~~ In order to limit knowledge of alleged identities, only NRC staff ~~will~~ **should** review NRC Regional Office allegations.

B. Principal Reviewer:

- ~~The principal reviewer is responsible for r~~ **Reviewing** relevant documentation, conducting ~~s~~ staff discussions, and maintaining ~~s~~ a reference summary of all ~~licensing or inspection files~~ **casework** reviewed and ~~Regional or State~~ **any** personnel interviewed.
- Meets the appropriate requirements specified in MD 5.10, *Formal Qualifications for Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) Team Members.***

V. **GUIDANCE**

A. Scope:

- This procedure applies to all incident response and allegation activities centered primarily in the period of time since the last ~~Regional or State~~ **IMPEP** review. Incidents and allegations that began in periods prior to the review cycle should be included, ~~but only~~ if significant activity continued into the current review period.
- This procedure specifically excludes incident response and allegation activities with non-Atomic Energy Act material. Incident response or allegation follow-up actions conducted by or referred to NRC Headquarters personnel for decisions are also excluded from IMPEP reviews.

B. Evaluation Procedures

- The principal reviewer should refer to Part III, Evaluation Criteria, of MD 5.6; for specific evaluation criteria. ~~The Directive's Glossary defines~~ **definitions** of the terms "Incidents" and "Allegations." **can be found in the Directive's Glossary.**
- The reviewer should be familiar with; or have ~~available~~, access to copies of ~~NRC~~ MD 8.8, *Management of Allegations*, and the ~~Region's or State's~~ inspector field notes, report forms for inspections and investigations, and appropriate NRC/**Agreement** State regulations. In particular, the reviewer should be familiar with the contents of ~~OSPSTP~~ Procedure SA-300, *Reporting Material Events*, ~~OSPSTP~~ Procedure SA-400, *Management of*

Allegations, and related NRC Inspection Manual Chapter 2800, *Materials Inspection Program*. A printout of the NMED data should be obtained for each Region and State.

3. The reviewer should examine a representative number (approximately 10 each) of significant materials program incident response and allegation activities conducted by **the NRC** Regions or Agreement States. For Agreement States, priority should be given to evaluating in detail all allegations referred to the State **from** **by** the NRC ~~within the constraints of Section III. A. and B., above.~~
4. For Agreement States, the reviewer will need to consult with the State **as to** **on** the existence of confidentiality agreements (or other similar mechanisms) in place that may limit the review of specific files. The State may have to remove certain information from documents to protect the identity of allegeders.
5. For Regions, the latest audit conducted by the NRC's Agency Allegation Advisor (AAA) should be obtained in preparation for the review. ~~Normally, the annual AAA review will~~ **audit may** be conducted at the same time as the IMPEP review for a particular Region. ~~In order to increase flexibility and efficiency~~ **appropriate cases**, the principal reviewer may, ~~in appropriate cases~~, adopt a portion of the AAA audit to augment the IMPEP report ~~for the Regions~~; **however, the principal reviewer must perform his/her own independent review of the NRC Region's response to allegations.**

C. Review Guidelines

1. The responses generated by the **NRC** Regions or **Agreement** States **radioactive materials program** to relevant questions in the IMPEP questionnaire should be used to focus the review.
2. For Regional reviews, ~~the Materials Safety Branch in the NMSS' Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety~~ **FSME's Medical Safety and Event Assessment Branch and Intergovernmental Liaison Branch** should be contacted for lists of incidents or allegations to be included in the review. NRC's Offices of Enforcement and ~~HO~~ **the Headquarters Operations Center** are also potential sources for this information.
3. A detailed printout of all State NMED data for the review period should be obtained.
4. For ~~the~~ **Agreement** States, the principal reviewer should work with the Regional State Agreements Officer **into** ~~obtaining~~ the listing of allegations

transferred to the State from by the NRC to the Agreement State for response in selecting the appropriate files for review.

5. Any incidents or allegations identified for follow-up from the last any periodic meetings held during the review period should be selected for reviewed.

D. Review Details

1. The review of each file should be made in conjunction with the reference and resource materials specified in Paragraph E., below.

2. For incident response, the principal reviewer should evaluate the following:

- a. **Timeliness of reporting** “Significant” events reported within 24 hours or less;
- b. Promptness of inquiries made to evaluate the need for on-site inspections investigations;
- c. Promptness of on-site inspections investigations of incidents requiring reporting to the Agency in less than 30 days;
- d. Appropriate follow up of incidents during the next scheduled inspection, including ensuring the adequacy, accuracy, and completeness of licensee-provided information;
- e. Inclusion of in-depth reviews of incidents during inspections on a high-priority basis, as warranted. When appropriate, follow-up activities should include re-enactments and time-study measurements. Inspection results should be documented and enforcement action taken in accordance with NRC or State policy and procedures;
- f. Pertinent information about incidents which that could be relevant to other licensed operations (e.g., equipment failure, improper operating procedures) is provided to licensees, the NRC (for Agreement States), and/or Agreement States (for NRC Regions or Agreement States, as appropriate);
- g. Information on incidents involving equipment failure (including make, model, and serial number) is provided to the regulatory agency responsible for evaluation of the device for an assessment of possible generic design deficiency;

- h. Determination that the number, type of event reports, and technical quality of information recorded in NMED and the number, type of event reports, and technical quality of information on record at an NRC Region or Agreement State are consistent;
- i. Information obtained during the NRC Region's or Agreement State's review investigation is compared with other information obtained from the licensee to identify and resolve any differences; and,
- j. Whether or not the public is provided access to NRC/Agreement State and licensee records on the review incident, as permitted within the constraints of laws for protection of personal, private, and proprietary information;

~~k. Appendix A, IMPEP Incident Reviewer Guidance, was developed to assist the principal reviewer in reviewing completed incident casework. However, the principal reviewer should not feel compelled to address every item in the guidance.~~

32. For allegations, the reviewer should evaluate the following:

- a. Priority given to allegations with potential safety significance;
- b. Receipt of an allegation is acknowledged to the alleger;
- c. Discussions The allegation is discussed with the alleger, if any known, conducted to obtain additional information;
- d. In accordance with State rules and policy; relating to allegers' identities are successfully protected;
- e. Adequate evaluation/inspection of the allegation to assess its validity and whether licensee health and safety issues are present;
- f. Appropriate regulatory action taken;

~~g. Notification to allegers that the allegation is closed, and that allegers are informed of the progress of unresolved allegations consistent with the State's or Region's policy;~~

hg. Appropriate length of time to close Timeliness of closure of allegations;

ih. When concerns are raised regarding Agreement State performance

with respect to allegations, that the State's procedures for handling allegations compare to guidance in Management Directive 8.8, documenting any significant differences and determining if the State's procedures are equally as effective as NRC's; and,

ji. For Agreement State reviews, whether the program for processing allegations encourages those with safety concerns to express those concerns to the Agreement State program;

~~k. Appendix B, IMPEP Allegation Reviewer Guidance, was developed to assist the principal reviewer in reviewing completed allegation casework. However, the principal reviewer should not feel compelled to address every item in the guidance.~~

43. In addition to other items mentioned above, the reviewer should determine, for incidents and allegations, that:

- a. Appropriate regulatory action was taken for items of noncompliance;
- b. Letters to licensees are written in appropriate regulatory language; and that they specify the time period for licensee response indicating corrective actions and actions taken to prevent recurrence;
- c. The licensee's response was reviewed for adequacy and/or what subsequent action was taken by compliance supervision.

E. Review Information Summary:

1. At a minimum, the principal reviewer should retain the following information of all ~~licensing/inspection files for incidents or allegation files reviewed~~ casework evaluated during the ~~IMPEP site visit~~ on-site review:

~~1a.~~ Licensee's name, city, and state;

~~2.~~ Licensee address;

~~3b.~~ A numerical file reference (such as license number, or inspection report number, or NMED number);

~~4.~~ Inspection priority of the license;

~~5c.~~ The lead inspector's initials (if any on-site investigation was conducted);

d. Date of incident;

~~6e.~~ Type of inspection incident (i.e., reactive, closeouts, announced, unannounced, team, other, etc. such as medical event, transportation, loss of control, etc.);

- 7f. Date of inspection ~~investigation~~;
- 8. ~~Date inspection or allegation report issued;~~
- 9g. Type of license operation ~~investigation~~ (program code or license category ~~such as inspection, telephone, licensee report, etc.~~).

~~This information should be prepared in a sanitized fashion, if necessary, in order not to compromise the confidentiality of allegers, or others. (Note: The information for incidents will be part of the IMPEP report, however, the information from the allegation reviews will not be part of the IMPEP review report.)~~

- 2. ~~Appendix A, Incident Casework Review Summary Sheet, provides a template for recording the necessary information that should be maintained by the principal reviewer. The principal reviewer should not feel obligated to use Appendix A, but may find it as a useful means of recording the necessary information.~~
 - a. ~~Due to the NRC policies on sensitive information, not all the information maintained in the reviewer's summary will appear in the list of incident casework review in the IMPEP report's appendix. Please contact the IMPEP Project Manager for the current guidance and format on the report's incident casework appendix.~~
 - b. ~~Comments in regard to incident casework that will appear in the report's appendix should be factual, concise, and concentrate on casework deficiencies and their root cause(s).~~
- 3. ~~Appendix B, Allegation Casework Review Summary Sheet, provides a template for recording information specific to allegation casework reviews. Information on allegation casework reviews is not published in IMPEP reports.~~

F. Discussion of Findings with ~~NRC Regions~~ or ~~Agreement States~~:

~~The reviewer should follow the guidance given in ~~OSPFSME~~ Procedure SA-100, *Implementation of the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP)*, for discussing technical findings with ~~reviewers~~ ~~staff~~, supervisors, and management.~~

VI. APPENDICES

- Appendix A - ~~IMPEP~~ Incident ~~Casework Reviewer Guidance~~ Summary Sheet
- Appendix B - ~~IMPEP~~ Allegation ~~Casework Reviewer Guidance~~ Summary Sheet

VII. REFERENCES

1. FSME Procedure SA-100, *Implementation of the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP)*.
2. NRC Inspection Manual Chapter 2800, *Materials Inspection Program*.
- ~~13.~~ NRC Management Directive 5.6, *Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program*.
24. NRC Management Directive 5.10, *Formal Qualifications for Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) Team Members*.
5. NRC Management Directive 8.8, *Management of Allegations*.
- ~~3.~~ Inspection Manual Chapter 2800, *Materials Inspection Program*.
- ~~4.~~ FSME OSP Procedure SA-100, *Implementation of the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP)*.
56. OSPSTP Procedure SA-300, *Reporting Material Events*.
67. OSPSTP Procedure SA-400, *Management of Allegations*.
- ~~7.~~ NRC Management Directive 8.8, *Management of Allegations*.

VIII. ADAMS REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

For knowledge management purposes, listed below are all the previous revisions of this procedure, as well as associated correspondence with stakeholders, that have been entered into the NRC’s Agencywide Document Access Management System (ADAMS).

No.	Date	Document Title/Description	Accession Number
1	12/15/06	STP-06-112, Opportunity to Comment on Draft Revisions to FSME Procedure SA-105	ML063480642
2	12/15/06	FSME Procedure SA-105, Draft Revision	ML063480651

Appendix A

IMPEP-INCIDENT CASEWORK REVIEWER GUIDANCE SUMMARY SHEET

NRC REVIEW BY: _____ DATE: _____ A/S OR REGION: _____

STATE INCIDENT NUMBER OR OTHER FILE IDENTIFICATION: _____	
LICENSEE: _____	LICENSE # _____
LOCATION OR SITE OF EVENT: _____	
DATE OF 1ST CONTACT: _____	DATE OF INCIDENT: _____
DATE OF INVESTIGATION: _____	INVESTIGATION TYPE: SITE <input type="checkbox"/> PHONE <input type="checkbox"/> NEXT INSP <input type="checkbox"/> NONE <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> OVEREXPOSURE	<input type="checkbox"/> DAMAGE TO EQUIPMENT OR FACILITY
<input type="checkbox"/> RELEASE OF RAM	<input type="checkbox"/> EQUIPMENT OR PROCEDURE FAILURE
<input type="checkbox"/> LOST/STOLEN/ABANDONED RAM	<input type="checkbox"/> LEAKING SOURCE
<input type="checkbox"/> CONTAMINATION EVENT	<input type="checkbox"/> TRANSPORTATION
<input type="checkbox"/> LOSS OF CONTROL	<input type="checkbox"/> MEDICAL EVENT
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER: _____	

BRIEF SUMMARY OF INCIDENT _____

EVENT MET AO REPORTING REQUIREMENTS? Y N POSSIBLE GENERIC PROBLEM? Y N

STATE'S ACTION: _____

FINAL DISPOSITION: _____

NO.	COMMENTS FOR REPORT APPENDIX

INVESTIGATOR _____

SUPERVISORY REVIEW BY: _____ DATE: _____

FINDINGS DISCUSSED WITH _____ ON: _____

Appendix B

HMPEP-ALLEGATION CASEWORK REVIEWER GUIDANCE SUMMARY SHEET

NRC REVIEW BY: _____ DATE: _____ A/S OR REGION: _____

STATE INCIDENT NUMBER OR OTHER FILE IDENTIFICATION: _____	
LICENSEE: _____	LICENSE # _____
LOCATION: _____	
DATE OF 1ST CONTACT: _____	DATE OF ALLEGED EVENT: _____
DATE OF INVESTIGATION: _____	INVESTIGATION TYPE: SITE <input type="checkbox"/> PHONE <input type="checkbox"/> NEXT INSP <input type="checkbox"/> NONE <input type="checkbox"/>
ALLEGATION PERTAINING TO POSSIBLE:	
<input type="checkbox"/> UNREPORTED OVEREXPOSURE	<input type="checkbox"/> FAULTY EQUIPMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> UNREPORTED RELEASE OF RAM	<input type="checkbox"/> FALSE STATEMENTS OR RECORDS
<input type="checkbox"/> UNQUALIFIED USERS OR INADEQUATE TRAINING	<input type="checkbox"/> DELIBERATE VIOLATION
<input type="checkbox"/> INADEQUATE PROCEDURES OR POSTINGS	<input type="checkbox"/> DISCRIMINATION
<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER: _____	

BRIEF SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION _____

RULE OR LICENSE CONDITION ALLEGEDLY VIOLATED: _____

STATE'S ACTION: _____

FINAL DISPOSITION: _____

NO.	COMMENTS FOR REPORT

INVESTIGATOR _____

SUPERVISORY REVIEW BY: _____ DATE: _____

FINDINGS DISCUSSED WITH _____ ON: _____

Appendix B (Continued)

ITEM	O.K.	COMMENTS	
INITIAL RESPONSE			
ALLEGATION HANDLED PROFESSIONALLY			
PROMPTNESS (PRIORITY GIVEN TO SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS)			
APPROPRIATE TYPE OF RESPONSE (ON-SITE, TELCON, NEXT INSPECTION, ETC.)			
DOCUMENTATION OF ALLEGATION			
DETAILS OF ALLEGATION (WHAT, WHERE, WHEN, WHO?)			
CONFIDENTIALITY OF ALLEGER PRESERVED			
INVESTIGATION			
DEPTH OF INVESTIGATION			
DOCUMENTATION OF INVESTIGATION REPORTS, TELCON DOCUMENTATION, ETC)			
DESCRIPTION OF EVIDENCE EXAMINED			
REGULATORY ACTIONS (CITATIONS, LICENSE RESTRICTIONS, CORRECTIVE REQUIREMENTS)			
SUPERVISORY OVERSIGHT OF INVESTIGATION			
FOLLOW THROUGH AND CLOSE OUT			
ALLEGER PROVIDED WITH RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION			
INVESTIGATION ENTERED AND CLOSED OUT IN STATE'S TRACKING SYSTEM			
LICENSEE'S REPORTS AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS REVIEWED AND/OR VERIFIED			
CLOSE-OUT DOCUMENTATION COMPLETE WITH DATE AND SIGNATURE			
SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATION REVIEWED AT NEXT INSPECTION			
ALLEGATION OR INCIDENT REPORT CROSS REFERENCED TO LICENSE/COMPLIANCE FILE			
MEDIA HANDLING			
INCIDENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS MET			
OTHER:			
QUESTIONS FOR INVESTIGATOR OR SUPERVISOR:			

Appendix C

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

- Q. What is the Nuclear Material Events Database (NMED)?
- A. NMED is a historical collection of information on the occurrence, description, and resolution of events involving radioactive material in the United States. NMED accommodates the sharing of material event data submitted by Agreement and non-Agreement States and the NRC. The data includes information on material events from January 1990 through the present. The database is maintained by the NRC's Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs through a contractor, Idaho National Laboratory (INL).
- Q. Where is the NMED data located and how is it accessed?
- A. The data is located at the NMED homepage (<https://nmed.inl.gov>). A password is required for access and can be obtained by an e-mail request to NMED@inl.gov or to the NRC NMED Project Manager (NMEDNRC@nrc.gov).
- Q. Should the principal reviewer assigned this indicator obtain the NMED printout for the NRC Region or Agreement State prior to the IMPEP review?
- A. Yes, a printout of NMED data for the review period for the respective program should be obtained prior to the on-site portion of the IMPEP.
- Q. Does a Potential "P" classification shown for a specific event on the NMED report mean that a Abnormal Occurrence (AO) event has occurred in the State?
- A. The Agreement States support the NRC in their effort to keep Congress apprised of any significant events that may directly affect public health or safety by providing information to the NRC on potential AOs that have occurred in their State. Any events identified as potential AOs should be reported to NRC and will show up on the NMED report once they have been reported. The Commission makes the final determination of whether or not an AO occurred and all potential AOs are in fact potential until such a determination is made by the Commission. As such, a *potential* classification does not necessarily mean an AO actually occurred.
- Q. Is the Agency's event notifications (ENs) system received and maintained by the Headquarters Operations Center a potential source of information specific to events?
- A. Yes, the Agency's EN system is accessible through the NRC's public website and could be used as a source of information for events for a particular program. The EN system contains reports of significant events received from Agreement States reported by phone to a Headquarters Operations Officer. NMED should be used as the primary means for

obtaining incident data for a particular program. The NMED report, used in conjunction with the EN system, will provide the greatest amount of event information in preparation for an IMPEP review.

- Q. What processes does the Agency use to evaluate Agreement State performance relative to allegations?
- A. The Agency has established two tools relative to the handling of Agreement State allegations – IMPEP, which is dictated by Management Directive 5.6 and other associated implementing procedures; Management Directive 8.8; and STP Procedure SA 400, *Management of Allegations*.
- Q. Is it appropriate to discuss the merits of an allegation during a Management Review Board (MRB) meeting for an IMPEP review?
- A. Although the MRB meeting provides a senior-level review of the IMPEP team's findings and recommendations, it is not appropriate to discuss the merits of an allegation during the MRB. The Allegation Review Board (ARB) is a more appropriate forum for discussing allegations. One reason is that the MRB is a public meeting. The ARB is not a public meeting and includes discussions regarding allegations that may or may not be proven to be true.