

OCT 15 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:

Frank J. Miraglia, Jr. EDO  
 Paul H. Lohaus, OSP  
 Stuart A. Treby, OGC  
 Steven Collins, Illinois

FROM: Kathleen N. Schneider *Original signed by:*  
 Senior Program Manager *K. N. Schneider*  
 Office of State Programs

SUBJECT: FINAL MINUTES: NRC HEADQUARTERS SS&D  
 EVALUATION PROGRAM JULY 22, 1999 MRB  
 MEETING

Attached are the final minutes of the Management Review Board Meeting (MRB) meeting held on July 22, 1999. If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-2320.

Attachment:  
 As stated

cc: Martin Virgilio, NMSS  
 Donald Cool, NMSS

Distribution:  
 DIR RF  
 SDroggitis  
 FHamiter, TX  
 EJameson, GA  
 GVinson, IL  
 JHMyers, OSP  
 LRakovan, OSP  
 NMSS File  
 SS&D File

DCD (SP0)  
 PDR (YES✓)

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\KXS\ssdmrb.TXT

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	OSP <i>fps</i>								
NAME	KNSchneider:gd								
DATE	10/5/99								

OSP FILE CODE: SP-O-9 SP-S-2

9910210324 991015  
 PDR ORG NESC  
 PDR

*76*  
 NRC FILE CENTER COPY



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

October 15, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:

Frank J. Miraglia, Jr. EDO  
Paul H. Lohaus, OSP  
Stuart A. Treby, OGC  
Steven Collins, Illinois

FROM: Kathleen N. Schneider *Kathleen N. Schneider*  
Senior Program Manager  
Office of State Programs

SUBJECT: FINAL MINUTES: NRC HEADQUARTERS SS&D  
EVALUATION PROGRAM JULY 22, 1999 MRB  
MEETING

Attached are the final minutes of the Management Review Board Meeting (MRB) meeting held on July 22, 1999. If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-2320.

Attachment:  
As stated

cc: Martin Virgilio, NMSS  
Donald Cool, NMSS

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF JULY 22 1999

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

Frank Miraglia, MRB Chair, EDO  
Stuart Treby, MRB Member, OGC  
Floyd Hamiter, Team Leader, TX  
Eric Jameson, Team Member, GA  
Martin Virgilio, NMSS  
John Hickey, NMSS  
Charleen Raddatz, EDO  
Lance Rakovan, OSP

Paul Lohaus, MRB Member, OSP  
Steven Collins, MRB Member, IL  
Gibb Vinson, Team Member, IL  
James Myers, Team Member, OSP  
Don Cool, NMSS  
Michelle Burgess, NMSS  
Brenda Usilton, OSP  
James Reed, NOVOSTE

By telephone:

Kathy Allen, IL  
Mary Burkhart, IL  
Daren Ferrero, IL

Joe Klinger, IL  
Sandi Kessinger, IL  
Ted Henry, IL

1. **Convention.** Frank Miraglia, Chair of the Management Review Board (MRB), convened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. **New Business.** NRC SS&D Program Review Introduction. Mr. Floyd Hamiter, TX, led the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) team for the NRC Headquarters SS&D evaluation program review.

Mr. Hamiter discussed how the review was conducted. Preliminary work included a review of NRC's response to the IMPEP questionnaire. The onsite review was conducted April 26-30, 1999. The onsite review included an entrance interview, detailed audits of a representative sample of completed SS&D sheets, and follow-up discussions with staff and management. Following the review, the team issued a draft report on May 26, 1999; received NRC's comments by letter dated July 12, 1999; and submitted a proposed final report to the MRB on July 16, 1999. Mr. Hamiter stated that because of the limited amount of time afforded to the team in evaluating the response to the draft report, he used his authority as team leader to make changes to the report without team consent. Because of this, some differences in view on the report existed. Mr. Hamiter stated that these differences would be expressed by the team during the meeting.

**Non-Common Performance Indicator, Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program.** Mr. Vinson led the discussion of the sub-indicator, Technical Quality of Product Evaluation Program, which is summarized in Section 2.1.1 of the report. The team made three recommendations relating to NRC's SS&D program and three programmatic recommendations related to the IMPEP review criteria. The team also identified a good practice involving initial screening of applications. Mr. Vinson expressed three differences in view on the report as follows: (1) that the recommendation involving consultation with Agreement States to develop a process for identifying and resolving areas of mutual concern in the SS&D review process

should appear in the report; (2) that because NUREG-1556 is a consolidation of previous guidance, NRC's comment that several sheets reviewed by the team were before this document was issued is irrelevant; and (3) that NRC misunderstood comment (d) of File 17 in Appendix C of the draft report.

The NRC staff and Mr. Vinson discussed the guidance in NUREG-1556 involving updating sheets to current standards when the sheet is amended and NRC's process for identifying and resolving areas of mutual concern in the SS&D review process with Agreement States. NRC staff stated that there could be different interpretations to the language in NUREG-1556, and that the Agreement State programs and the NRC need to work out what is intended with this guidance. Mr. Vinson stated that in the interim, NRC should implement a policy for approving general deviations from the guidance (NUREG 1556, vol. 3) and for notifying the Agreement States of these policy decisions. The MRB agreed the language in NUREG-1556 did not appear to state that sheets should be updated when the sheet was amended. The MRB directed that this issue should be addressed by the BPR. The team stated that NRC had previously indicated that a more extensive review against current guidance should be completed. The team agreed that this issue was no longer a differing opinion and recommended that the original recommendation involving NRC's process for identifying and resolving areas of mutual concern with Agreement States be included in the final report. The MRB accepted this revision to the report.

The MRB, NRC staff, and Mr. Vinson discussed File 17 in Appendix C of the draft report. Mr. Vinson stated that there appeared to be some confusion on comment (d) in the draft report pertaining to the lack of a review involving the transportation of this device. NRC staff stated that they would address this issue, as well as comment (b) for File 10 in Appendix C of the proposed final report.

The MRB accepted the good practice noted by the team and the team's finding of "satisfactory with recommendations for improvement" for this sub-indicator.

Mr. Jameson presented the findings regarding the sub-indicator, Technical Staffing and Training. As discussed in Section 2.1.2 of the report, the team found NMSS's performance relative to this sub-indicator to be "satisfactory" and made one recommendation involving individuals with restricted signature authority signing as a second reviewer. Mr. Jameson stated that 10 sheets were completed in this manner. In their response to the draft report, NRC stated that three of these sheets had been re-evaluated. Mr. Jameson requested that the recommendation include direction to review the remaining seven sheets. The MRB, NRC staff, and the team discussed interim qualification and agreed that interim qualification can be justified and used on a case-by-case basis. They also agreed on the need to fully document when more than one reviewer is used to complete an SS&D review. The MRB agreed that the report should be revised to include language that NRC staff should re-evaluate the remaining seven sheets. The MRB agreed that NRC's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Myers led the discussion of the sub-indicator, Evaluation of Defects and Incidents Regarding SS&DS, which is summarized in Section 2.1.3 of the report. The team found NMSS's performance relative to this sub-indicator to be "satisfactory," and made no recommendations or suggestions. Mr. Myers and the MRB complimented NMSS on this aspect of the program. After a brief discussion involving communication between the NRC and Agreement States, the MRB agreed that NRC's performance for this sub-indicator met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating.

**MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report.** Mr. Hamiter concluded, based on the discussion and direction of the MRB, that NRC's SS&D evaluation program was rated "satisfactory" for the sub-indicators "Technical Staffing and Training" and "Evaluation of Defects and Incidents Regarding SS&Ds." He stated that the sub-indicator "Technical Quality of Product Evaluation Program" was rated "satisfactory with recommendations for improvement." The MRB found the NRC's SS&D evaluation program to be adequate to protect public health and safety.

The IMPEP team recommended and the MRB agreed that the next IMPEP review for NRC's SS&D evaluation program should be conducted in two years. The two year interval for the next review is consistent with the review cycle for Regional IMPEP reviews. It also provides opportunity to review the upcoming changes to NRC's program and reflects the leadership role expected of NRC with respect to the National Program.

**Comments from NMSS.** Dr. Cool commented on the need for state participation in working groups. He thanked the review team and stated that he was glad there were no performance issues included in the team's findings.

3. **Old Business.** The MRB approved the North Dakota MRB minutes and directed that the Maryland MRB minutes be finalized upon concurrence from Roland Fletcher.
4. **Status of Remaining Reviews.** Mr. Rakovan briefly reported on the status of the current and upcoming IMPEP reviews and reports.
5. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:50 a.m.