

DEC - 8 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:

Carl J. Paperiello, EDO
 Frederick C. Combs, OSP
 Martin J. Virgilio, NMSS
 Karen D. Cyr, OGC

FROM: Kathleen N. Schneider, Senior Project Manager
 Office of State Programs

SUBJECT: DRAFT MINUTES: WASHINGTON NOVEMBER 16, 1999
 MRB MEETING

Original signed by:
K. N. Schneider

Attached for your review and comment are the draft minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on November 16, 1999. If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-2320.

Attachment:
As stated

cc: John Erickson, WA
David Snellings, AR

Distribution:

DIR RF	DCD (SP01) PDR (YES)
PLohaus	
SDroggitis	RWoodruff, RII
LRakovan	MShaffer, RIV
DSollenberger, ASPO	MStephens, FL
DCool, NMSS	MThaggard, NMSS
SMoore, NMSS	TJohnson, NMSS
GDeegan, NMSS	
STreby, OGC	
HNewsome, OGC	
Washington File	

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\IMPEP\wa99mrbin.dft.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	KSchneider:kk							
DATE	12/8/99							

OSP FILE CODE: SP-AG-29

STATE OF WASHINGTON

85

PDR STPLG



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

December 8, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: Management Review Board Members:

Carl J. Paperiello, EDO
Frederick C. Combs, OSP
Martin J. Virgilio, NMSS
Karen D. Cyr, OGC

FROM: Kathleen N. Schneider, Senior Project Manager
Office of State Programs

SUBJECT: DRAFT MINUTES: WASHINGTON NOVEMBER 16, 1999
MRB MEETING

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kathleen N. Schneider".

Attached for your review and comment are the draft minutes of the Management Review Board (MRB) meeting held on November 16, 1999. If you have any questions, please contact me at 415-2320.

Attachment:
As stated

cc: John Erickson, WA
David Snellings, AR

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF NOVEMBER 16, 1999

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

Carl Paperiello, MRB Chair, EDO
Martin Virgilio, MRB Member, NMSS
John Erickson, WA
Gary Robertson, WA
Mark Thaggard, Team member, NMSS
Lance Rakovan, Team member, OSP
Kathleen Schneider, OSP

Karen Cyr, MRB Member, OGC
Fred Combs, MRB, Member, OSP
Terry Frazee, WA
Richard Woodruff, Team Leader, RII
Ted Johnson, Team member, NMSS
Anthony Kirkwood, NMSS
Brenda Usilton, OSP

By video conference:

Mark Shaffer, Team Member, RIV
Dwight Chamberlain, RIV

Linda McLean, RIV

By telephone:

David Snellings, OAS Liaison, AR

Mike Stephens, Team Member, FL

1. **Convention.** Carl Paperiello, Chair of the Management Review Board (MRB), convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. **New Business. Washington Review Introduction.** Mr. Richard Woodruff, Region II, led the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) team for the Washington review.

Mr. Woodruff discussed how the review was conducted. Preliminary work included a review of Washington's response to the IMPEP questionnaire. The onsite review was conducted August 30-September 3, 1999. 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. Following the review, the team issued a draft report on October 8, 1999; received Washington's factual comments by electronic mail dated October 22, 1999; and submitted a proposed final report to the MRB on November 4, 1999.

Common Performance Indicators. Mr. Shaffer discussed 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 Washington's performance with respect to this indicator "satisfactory," and made no recommendations. The MRB discussed the Division's policy of hand delivering initial licenses and then completing two inspections over the next year and half. The MRB deemed this practice to be a good practice and directed that the report be revised to reflect this discussion. After this discussion, the MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Shaffer 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 Washington's performance with respect to this indicator was "satisfactory," and made no recommendations. The MRB, the team, and the State discussed the performance of the inspection program and inconsistencies noted by the team because of the lack of specific procedures for management expectations regarding minimum level of review and documentation required. The MRB directed the team to revise the second paragraph in Section 3.2 to reflect the program's overall performance for this indicator, including inspector accompaniments and interviews. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Rakovan 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 Washington's performance with respect to this indicator was "satisfactory," and made one recommendation on completion of the documentation for training in accordance to the new procedure. The review team discussed the comments provided by the State with the MRB on this section which the review team had not accepted. After discussion with the team and the State representatives on the Environmental Specialist, the MRB directed that the paragraph on the Environmental Specialist be deleted from the report. The MRB discussed the status of the training program and the training comments made on the low-level radioactive waste program and uranium recovery program. Mr. Frazee noted that the Radioactive Materials Section had completed documenting staff qualifications. Mr. Robertson noted that the Waste Management Section was in the process of revising their qualification procedures and completing the documentation of the staff qualification. Both Section Heads stated that they were dedicated to providing the necessary training to their staffs, which Mr. Erickson supports. The MRB directed that the final report be revised to reflect this discussion and that all three of the recommendations on training be removed from the report. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Stephens presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions. He summarized the findings in Section 3.4 of the report. The IMPEP team found Washington's performance to be "satisfactory" for this indicator, and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Woodruff presented the findings regarding the final common performance indicator, Response to Incidents and Allegations. As discussed in Section 3.5 of the report, the team found Washington's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory," and made one recommendation involving written notification to allegers. The MRB discussed the recommendation and Washington's comment which the team did not accept. Mr. Frazee noted that the revised procedures require written notification and that the one example noted by the team had occurred prior to the adoption of the new procedures. The MRB directed the team to delete this recommendation and to revise the report accordingly. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Non-Common Performance Indicators. Mr. Woodruff 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 Washington's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory," and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance for this indicator met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating.

Mr. Stephens presented the findings regarding the non-common performance indicator, Sealed Source and Device (SS&D) Evaluation Program. As discussed in Section 4.2 of the report, the team found Washington's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory," and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Thaggard presented the findings regarding the non-common performance indicator, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program. As discussed in Section 4.3 of the report, the team found Washington's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory," and made one recommendation on implementing the training program established for the Waste Management Section. As noted in the discussion for Section 3.3, the MRB directed the review team to delete this recommendation and revise the report to reflect the discussion held at the MRB meeting. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Johnson presented the findings regarding the non-common performance indicator, Uranium Recovery Program. As discussed in Section 4.4 of the report, the team found Washington's performance relative to this indicator to be "satisfactory," and made two recommendations on developing specific inspection procedures and on implementing the training program established for the Waste Management Section. As noted in the discussion for Section 3.3, the MRB directed the review team to delete the recommendation involving training and revise the report to reflect the discussion held at the MRB meeting. After the discussion with the State on inspection procedures, the MRB directed the team to revise the recommendation to reflect that the State should develop additional specialized inspection procedures. The MRB agreed that Washington's performance met the standard for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

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

Comments from the State of Washington. Mr. Erickson noted that this was Washington's first IMPEP and that he had been uncertain as to what to expect, but that the outcome was excellent. He noted that Washington had both an independent contractor and staff conduct IMPEP like self audits prior to the review team. Mr. Robertson noted that the IMPEP team found the same issues identified in the self audit and thanked the team. He also extended his appreciation for the training provided by Mr. Johnson in the uranium recovery program. Mr. Frazee, who participated on several past review teams, noted that IMPEP was a good process for evaluation.

3. **Status of Remaining Reviews.** Mrs. Schneider briefly reported on the status of the current and upcoming IMPEP reviews and reports.
4. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m.