MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SEPTEMBER 14, 2017

The attendees were as follows:

In person at U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Headquarters in Rockville, Maryland:

Fred Brown, MRB Chair, OEDO
Scott Moore, MRB Member, NMSS
Tison Campbell, MRB Member, OGC
Darrell Roberts, MRB Member, NSIR
Aaron Gantt, SC
Binesh Tharakan, Team Leader, Region IV
Lance Rakovan, NMSS
Paul Michalak, NMSS
Karen Meyer, NMSS
Dan Collins, NMSS
James Peterson, SC
Maria Arribas-Colon, Team Member, NMSS

By videoconference:

Michelle Simmons, Team Member, RegionIV
Dennis O'Dowd, Team Member, Region III
Monica Ford, Team Member, Region I

By telephone:

Mike Snee, MRB Member, OH, OAS
Phil Goble, Team Member, UT
Lizette Roldan-Otera, NMSS
Joe O'Hara, NMSS
Kathy Modes, NMSS

1. Convention. Mr. Lance Rakovan convened the meeting at approximately 2:30 p.m. (ET). He noted that this Management Review Board (MRB) meeting was open to the public. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.

2. South Carolina IMPEP Review. Mr. Binesh Tharakan, Team Leader, led the presentation of the South Carolina Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results to the MRB. He summarized the review and the team's findings for the eight indicators reviewed. The on-site review was conducted by a team composed of technical staff members from the NRC and the State of Utah during the period of June 19-23, 2017. A draft report was issued to South Carolina for factual comment on July 20, 2017. South Carolina responded to the team's findings by e-mail dated August 16, 2017. Mr. Tharakan reported that the team found the South Carolina Agreement State Program satisfactory for all eight performance indicators reviewed.

3. Common Performance Indicators.

    a) Ms. Monica Ford reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, ***Technical Staffing and Training*****.** Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and State representatives discussed the one-page sheet the Bureau of Radiological Health (the Bureau) uses for planning and tracking training. The MRB supported the team's recommendation that the Bureau update its training and qualification manual to incorporate the essential elements of NRC Inspection Manual Chapter

1248 and implement it for all staff to ensure continued effective and consistent training and development of its staff.

The team found South Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

b) Mr. Dennis O'Dowd reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, ***Status of Materials Inspection Program***. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, team members, and Bureau representatives discussed challenges involving reciprocity inspections.

The team found South Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

c) Mr. O'Dowd reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, ***Technical Quality of Inspections.*** His presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report.

The team found South Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

d) Ms. Michelle Simmons reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, ***Technical Quality of Licensing Actions***. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report.

The team found South Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

e) Mr. Tharakan reviewed and presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, ***Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities***. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.5 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Bureau representatives discussed whether incident response procedures accurately described current protocols for information exchange between NRC and Agreement States. The team indicated that written incident response procedures are Compatibility Category C and discussed the latest NRC guidance for incident response. The MRB noted that Agreement State Programs are not required to adopt NRC's incident response procedures. The MRB further noted that the State's procedures have been adequate for implementing their response program for several years as determined by previous IMPEP teams and the assessment of the current team as discussed in the report. The team made a formal recommendation for the State to update their incident response procedures using the latest guidance to ensure responses to incidents are suitable, timely, and effectively documented. The MRB members agreed to a modified version of the team's recommendation; however, the MRB Chairman disagreed with leaving a formal recommendation in the final report. Nevertheless, following substantial discussion with the team and the MRB, the State indicated that they planned to update their incident response

procedures. The MRB directed that the recommendation made by the team in the proposed final report be removed and replaced with a statement indicating the State would update their procedures.

The team found South Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

4. Non-Common Performance Indicators.

   a) Ms. Ford reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, ***Compatibility Requirements*.** Her presentation corresponded to Section 4.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report.

   The team found South Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

   b) Ms. Maria Arribas-Colon reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, ***Sealed Source and Device (SS&D) Evaluation Program***. Her presentation corresponded to Section 4.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report.

   The team found South Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

   c) Mr. Phil Goble reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, ***Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program***. His presentation corresponded to Section 4.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB asked for additional details about the "10 additional licenses" discussed in the report. The team and the Division provided information about what those licenses authorized.

   The team found South Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

5. MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the South Carolina Agreement State Program be found adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with the NRC's program. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, the next IMPEP review take place in approximately 5 years. The MRB directed that a periodic meeting be held in approximately 2.5 years. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML17271A272.

6. Precedents/Lessons Learned. None applicable to this review

7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:20 p.m. (ET)

SUBJECT: Summary of September 14, 2017 South Carolina MRB Meeting

ML18003A819

OFFICE	MSTR/ASPB	MSTR/ASPB
NAME	KMeyer	LRakovan
DATE	01/08/18	01/23/18

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY