



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

December 29, 2015

Mr. Charles Coleman  
Radioactive Materials  
Virginia Department of Health  
James Madison Bldg, Room 736  
109 Governor Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

Mr. Mark Yeager  
Bureau of Radiological Health  
Department of Health & Environmental Control  
2600 Bull Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Sirs:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) is performing a voluntary satisfaction survey of its administration of the IMPEP. The satisfaction survey covers those IMPEP reviews of NRC materials programs and Agreement State radiation control programs performed during Fiscal Year (FY) 2015. The results of the satisfaction survey will be used as part of a self-assessment performed periodically by NMSS in accordance with NMSS Procedure SA-123 *Conducting Self-Assessments of the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP)*.

Enclosed with this letter is the survey form which we encourage you to complete. Answer the questions based on your experience during the IMPEP team review you took part in during FY 2015. You do not need to include information about IMPEP team reviews you may have taken part prior to before FY 2015. Indicate which team review you took part in, unless you would prefer that the information you provide remain anonymous. Feedback from the survey will not be used to judge a program and is only for self assessment of NRC's performance in FY 2015.

We encourage you to provide additional information related to any survey question, or of a general nature, in the space provided at the end of the list of questions. Additional clarification is always appreciated, and may be used to consider how NRC administration of IMPEP could be improved in order to provide a better experience for both the Agreement States and the NRC.

Return the completed survey to Paul Michalak, Acting Chief, Agreement State Programs Branch, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, by e-mail at [paul.michalak@nrc.gov](mailto:paul.michalak@nrc.gov) by January 30, 2016.

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Elizabeth Doolittle at 301-415-6424 or by e-mail at [Elizabeth.Doolittle@nrc.gov](mailto:Elizabeth.Doolittle@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Lisa Dimmick, Acting Branch Chief  
Agreement States Program Branch  
Division of Material Safety, State, Tribal  
and Rulemaking Programs  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety  
and Safeguards

Enclosure:  
IMPEP Viewpoint Survey 2015,  
Agreement States and Regions

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Elizabeth Doolittle at 301-415-6424 or by e-mail at [Elizabeth.Doolittle@nrc.gov](mailto:Elizabeth.Doolittle@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Lisa Dimmick, Acting Branch Chief  
Agreement States Program Branch  
Division of Material Safety, State, Tribal  
and Rulemaking Programs  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety  
and Safeguards

Enclosure:  
IMPEP Viewpoint Survey 2015,  
Agreement States and Regions

DISTRIBUTION:  
MSTR r/f

**ML15363A100**

<b>OFC</b>	NMSS/ASPB	NMSS/ASPB:BC
<b>NAME</b>	LDimmick for EDoolittle	LDimmick
<b>DATE</b>	12/29/15	12/29/15

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

## IMPEP VIEWPOINT SURVEY

FY2015  
Team Members

The NRC's Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards is performing a satisfaction survey of its administration of the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP). The satisfaction survey will cover those IMPEP reviews of NRC regional materials programs and Agreement State radiation control programs performed during fiscal year 2015.

Also, the satisfaction survey will provide useful information for management decision making regarding areas where NRC should dedicate more resources or management attention.

Please answer the following questions based on your involvement and experience during the IMPEP review you supported in FY2015.

1. Was the training you received in advance of the IMPEP review helpful in preparing for the onsite review?

1.  Not at all
2.  Sometimes
3.  Usually
4.  Frequently
5.  Almost Always
6.  Not Applicable

2. Did you receive all of the reference material you needed, including background information on the Agreement State program from the appropriate NRC Program Office?

1.  Not at all
2.  Sometimes
3.  Usually
4.  Frequently
5.  Almost Always
6.  Not Applicable

3. Did you receive adequate guidance from the IMPEP review Team Leader during the preparation, performance and reporting on the IMPEP review?

1.  Not at all
2.  Sometimes
3.  Usually
4.  Frequently
5.  Almost Always
6.  Not Applicable

Enclosure

4. Was there enough time spent on site to evaluate your indicators?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

5. Was the IMPEP review team able to reach consensus on its findings for each indicator as a result of the review?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

6. Was the template for the report easy to use?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

7. Were you able to document your review findings using the report template?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

8. Was the size of the IMPEP review team appropriate for the review?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always

6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

9. Did you feel comfortable raising issues and questions to the Team Leader?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

10. Did you receive adequate cooperation from the Agreement State or NRC Region representatives during the onsite review so that all planned activities could be completed?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

11. Did you feel that the Team Leader and/or the branch prepared you to present your input during the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

12. Did the MRB support your findings in the report?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

13. In coming to your conclusions, did you take into consideration how similar findings were presented in other IMPEP review reports?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

14. Based on the deliberations of the MRB, do you think the MRB reached fair conclusions on the performance of the Agreement State or NRC Region?

- 1. \_\_\_ Not at all
- 2. \_\_\_ Sometimes
- 3. \_\_\_ Usually
- 4. \_\_\_ Frequently
- 5. \_\_\_ Almost Always
- 6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable

15. What technology might have made the IMPEP review easier?

16. Please comment on any aspect of the IMPEP review process that you think worked well, and/or did not work well. Do you have any suggestions to improve the IMPEP review process?

17. Please comment on any aspect of the MRB evaluation that you think worked well, and/or did not work well. Do you have any suggestions to improve the MRB process?

18. Which IMPEP program reviews did you support, and what was your role in the review?

19. Additional comments you would like to add?