

MEMORANDUM TO:

Management Review Board Members:

JUL 10 1998

Hugh L. Thompson, EDO  
Richard L. Bangart, OSP  
Carl J. Paperiello, NMSS  
Karen D. Cyr, OGC  
Richard J. Barrett, AEOD

FROM:

Lance J. Rakovan, Health Physicist  
Office of State Programs

SUBJECT:

FINAL MINUTES: ARIZONA APRIL 28, 1998 MRB MEETING

Attached are the final minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on April 28, 1998. If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-2589.

Attachment:  
As stated

cc: Aubrey Godwin, AZ  
Roland Fletcher, MD

Distribution:

DIR RF  
SDroggitis  
KSchneider  
BJSmith, MS  
LMcLean, RIV  
TMartin, AEOD  
LSmith, EDO  
Arizona File

JMyers, OSP  
TTaylor, NMSS  
JHornor, WCFO  
DCool, NMSS  
HNewsome, OGC  
FCameron, OGC

DCD (SP01)  
PDR (YES✓)

170019

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\IMPEP\AZFNLMIN.WPD

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         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NAME   | LRakovan:gd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DATE   | 07/10/98    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

9807170247 980710  
PDR STPRG ESGAZ  
PDR

OSP FILE CODE: SP-AG-2

NRC FILE CENTER COPY



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

July 10, 1998

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:

Hugh L. Thompson, EDO  
Richard L. Bangart, OSP  
Carl J. Paperiello, NMSS  
Karen D. Cyr, OGC  
Richard J. Barrett, AEOD

FROM: Lance J. Rakovan, Health Physicist  
Office of State Programs

SUBJECT: FINAL MINUTES: ARIZONA APRIL 28, 1998 MRB MEETING

*Kathleen N. Schmitt*

Attached are the final minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on April 28, 1998. If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-2589.

Attachment:  
As stated

cc: Aubrey Godwin, AZ  
Roland Fletcher, MD

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 28, 1998

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

Richard Bangart, MRB Member, OSP  
Carl Paperiello, MRB Member, NMSS  
Roland Fletcher, Agreement State Liaison, MD  
Linda McLean, Team Member, RIV  
Linda Smith, EDO  
Steve Baggett, NMSS  
Lance Rakovan, OSP

Richard Barrett, MRB Member, AEOD  
Karen Cyr, MRB Member, OGC  
James Myers, Team Leader, OSP  
Aubrey Godwin, AZ  
Don Cool, NMSS  
Dennis Sollenberger, OSP

By telephone:

B. J. Smith, Team Member, MS  
Torre Taylor, Team Member, NMSS  
William Wright, AZ

Jack Hornor, Team Member, RIV/WCFO  
Geoffrey Short, AZ

1. **Convention.** Richard Bangart, Acting Chair of the Management Review Board (MRB), convened the meeting at 2:30 p.m. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. **New Business. Arizona Review Introduction.** Mr. James Myers, OSP, led the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) team for the Arizona review.

Mr. Myers discussed how the review was conducted. Preliminary work included a review of Arizona's response to the IMPEP questionnaire. The onsite review was conducted February 9-13, 1998. The onsite review included an entrance interview, detailed audits of a representative sample of completed licensing actions and inspections, and follow-up discussions with staff and management. The onsite portion of the review concluded with exit briefings with Arizona management. The informal results were also discussed with the Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency Director, Mr. Aubrey Godwin and a representative of the Governor's office, Mr. Stuart Goodman, on February 24, 1998. Following the review, the team issued a draft report on March 19, 1998; received Arizona's comment letter dated April 2, 1998; and submitted a proposed final report to the MRB on April 17, 1998.

**Common Performance Indicators.** Mr. Smith discussed the findings for the common performance indicator, Status of the Materials Inspection Program. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the IMPEP report. The review team found Arizona's performance with respect to this indicator "satisfactory," and made no recommendations or suggestions. After a brief discussion involving reciprocity inspections, the MRB agreed that Arizona's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.



Mr. Smith discussed the findings for the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Inspections, which are summarized in Section 3.2 of the report. The team found that Arizona's performance on this indicator was "satisfactory," and made one recommendation and one suggestion as documented in the report. He stated that the suggestion involving the State's inspection report forms for high dose rate (HDR) afterloaders was for the State to consider including all HDR safety features and checks in the form. The MRB and the State discussed problems involved with completing field inspections of radiographers. The MRB reached consensus that Arizona's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Myers presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Staffing and Training. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the IMPEP report. The team found that Arizona's performance with respect to this indicator was "satisfactory," and made no recommendations or suggestions. The MRB, the team, and the State discussed the use of alternative sources of training, and the State's laboratory. The MRB agreed that Arizona's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Ms. Taylor presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions. She summarized the findings in Section 3.4 of the report, where the review team found Arizona's licensing actions to be generally thorough, complete, consistent, and of acceptable quality with health and safety issues properly addressed. The IMPEP team found Arizona's performance to be "satisfactory" for this indicator, and made two recommendations and one suggestion as documented in the report. The MRB and the State discussed telephone deficiencies and the State's new law requiring all licensing actions to be completed within a specified time period. The MRB agreed that Arizona's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

The common performance indicator, Response to Incidents and Allegations, was the final common performance indicator discussed. Mr. Hornor led the discussion in this area. As discussed in Section 3.5 of the report, the team found Arizona's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made two recommendations and two suggestions. The MRB questioned the review team and the State as to specific problems involving the Nuclear Materials Event Database (NMED) system. The team stated that it is still not possible to electronically put information directly into the system. The State commented that they are having problems both running the system and locating events on the system. The State and the MRB briefly discussed the State's handling of routine events. The MRB agreed that Arizona's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

**Non-Common Performance Indicators.** Mr. Myers led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Legislation and Program Elements Required for Compatibility, which is summarized in Section 4.1 of the report. The team found Arizona's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory," and made no recommendations or suggestions. Mr. Myers commented that the State uses legally binding requirements to enforce regulations that have not been adopted by the State. The State and the MRB discussed the review of Arizona regulations to remove "archaic

language." The MRB agreed that Arizona's performance for this indicator met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating.

Mr. Hornor led the discussion of the non-common performance indicator, Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program. The findings for this indicator are summarized in Section 4.2 of the report. The team found Arizona's performance to be "satisfactory," and made two recommendations, as stated in the report. Mr. Hornor commented that the State remains committed to keeping the SS&D evaluation program and keeping their people properly trained. The MRB questioned the review team on the team suggesting a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator. The review team commented that the errors in the AZ244D101S SS&D certificate were administrative and did not demonstrate a technical weakness on the part of the State. The MRB discussed with the team and the State the lack of information on certificate AZ244D101S. The State, the review team and Mr. Steve Baggett, NMSS, discussed the steps being taken to ensure that all parties are brought up to date on this device. Following this discussion, the MRB agreed that Arizona's performance for this indicator met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating.

**MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report.** Mr. Myers concluded, based on the discussion and direction of the MRB, that Arizona's program was rated "satisfactory" on the five common performance indicators and both non-common performance indicators. The MRB found the Arizona program to be adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible. The IMPEP team and MRB agreed that the next IMPEP review for Arizona be conducted in four years.

**Comments from IMPEP Team Agreement State Member.** BJ Smith stated that it was a privilege to work on the Arizona IMPEP.

**Comments from the Commonwealth of Arizona.** Mr. Godwin commented that Arizona staff was impressed with the manner in which the IMPEP team conducted themselves. He stated that IMPEP is a good process and gives States the ability to see different perspectives.

3. **Old Business. Approval of the Massachusetts MRB Minutes.** The minutes from the April 6, 1998 Massachusetts MRB meeting were offered for approval. The minutes were approved and finalized without revision.

**Handling of the New York IMPEP.** The MRB discussed the handling of the New York IMPEP, including the April 9, 1998 memorandum from Hugh Thompson to the MRB. Mr. Dennis Sollenberger, Team Leader for the New York IMPEP, stated that he has been discussing the handling of ratings and an overall finding for the State with each individual agency. The MRB and Mr. Sollenberger discussed possible options in the case of one agency having performance problems. Mr. Sollenberger described the general form of New York's IMPEP report. The MRB approved the proposed approach of giving a rating to each individual agency for each indicator, not giving a rating for each indicator for the New York program as a whole, and then giving an overall finding of adequacy and compatibility.

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 3:45 p.m.