



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

December 29, 2015

Rusty Lundberg, Deputy Director
Division of Waste Management
and Radiation Control
Utah Department of Environmental Quality
195 North 1950 West, P.O. Box 144810
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Dear Mr. Lundberg:

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 is the survey form which we encourage you to complete. Answer the questions based on your experience during the IMPEP review of your program in FY 2015. 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.

R. Lundberg

2

Please 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 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

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

R. Lundberg

2

Please 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 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

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

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

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

IMPEP VIEWPOINT SURVEY

IMPEP VIEWPOINT SURVEY

FY2015

Agreement State and NRC Materials Programs

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 Agreement State radiation control programs and NRC materials 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. Did you find the questionnaire helpful for preparing for the IMPEP on site review?

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

2. Were the review team's questions based on the requirements in Management Directive 5.6, *Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program*?

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

3. How would you rate the review team with regard to their preparation and knowledge in their respective technical areas?

Enclosure

Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being poor and 5 being outstanding: ____

4. Did the review look at the most important aspects of the program?

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

5. Did the review result in a report that was consistent with IMPEP criteria?

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

6. Did the report accurately reflect the strengths and areas for improvement of the program?

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

7. Did the Management Review Board (MRB) add value to the IMPEP review process and was it consistent with Management Directive 5.6?

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

8. Was the Team Leader effective in conducting a thorough and fair review of your program?

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

9. Is the format of the report useful?

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

10. Is the report an accurate record of the results of the review?

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

11. 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 process?

12. 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?

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

14. Additional comments you would like to add?