

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF OHIO
MAY 16, 2019

THE MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING ATTENDEES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

Management Review Board

K. Steven West, MRB Chair, OEDO
Andrea Kock, MRB Member, NMSS
Mary Spencer, MRB Member, OGC

Ray Lorson, Region II
Eva Nair, OAS Liaison, MD

IMPEP Team

Monica Ford, Team Leader, Region IV
Farrah Gaskins, Region I
Jackie Cook, Team Lead in Training, Region IV

Darren Piccirillo, Region III
Kenath Traegde, Massachusetts
Ronald Parsons, Tennessee

Ohio

Gene Phillips, OH

Michael Snee, OH

Staff

Paul Michalak, NMSS/MSST
Lizette Roldan-Otero, NMSS/MSST
Duncan White, NMSS/MSST

Jack Giessner, Region III
Robert Johnson, NMSS/MSST
Kathy Modes, NMSS/MSST

TOPICS DISCUSSED DURING THE MEETING INCLUDED:

1. Convention. Mr. Robert Johnson convened the meeting at approximately 1:00 p.m. (ET). He noted that this Management Review Board (MRB) meeting was open to the public. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. Ohio IMPEP Review. Ms. Monica Ford led the presentation of the Ohio Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results to the MRB. She summarized the review and the team's findings for the indicators reviewed. The on-site review was conducted by a team composed of technical staff members from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), the State of Tennessee, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during the period of February 25 – March 1, 2019. A draft report was issued to Ohio for factual comment on March 29, 2019, and the responded with minor comment on April 18, 2019. Ms. Ford reported that the team found Ohio's performance was satisfactory on all indicators reviewed.
3. Performance Indicators.
 - a) Mr. Darren Piccirillo reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Technical Staffing and Training**. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Ohio representatives briefly discussed the status of the staff hired during the review period and the impact of vacancies on the Agreement State Program.

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

- b) Ms. Jackie Cook, Team Leader in Training, reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Status of Materials Inspection Program**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Ohio representatives briefly discussed inspection findings.

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

- c) Ms. Farrah Gaskins reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Technical Quality of Materials Inspections**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Ohio representatives briefly discussed the status of inspection actions.

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

- d) Mr. Kenath Traegde reviewed the common performance indicator, **Technical Quality of Licensing Actions**. Mr. Traegde presented the teams findings. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Ohio's representatives discussed the team's findings, as well as the actions the program had taken to address them.

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

- e) Ms. Monica Ford reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.5 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Ohio representatives discussed incidents of "high risk" and allegations identified during the review period.

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

- f) Ms. Jackie Cook reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, **Compatibility Requirements**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 4.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Ohio representatives discussed the State's regulations, and program elements, as well as the actions the program has taken to address them.

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

- g) Mr. Ronald Parsons reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, **Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program**. His presentation

corresponded to Section 4.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team and Ohio representatives discussed the State's Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program in regards to Technical Staffing and Training, Technical Quality of the Product Evaluation Program and, Evaluation of Defects and Incidents.

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

4. MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the Ohio Agreement State Program be found adequate to protect public health and compatible with the NRC's program. The team recommended that the next IMPEP review take place in approximately 5 years with a periodic meeting in approximately 2.5 years. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML19141A224.
5. Precedents/Lessons Learned. None
6. Comments from Members of the Public. None
7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:15 p.m. (ET)