MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF OKLAHOMA NOVEMBER 20, 2018

The attendees were as follows:

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

Daniel Dorman, MRB Chair, OEDO Scott Moore, MRB Member, NMSS Tison Campbell, MRB Member, OGC Kevin Williams, NMSS Mike Broderick, OK Paul Michalak, NMSS Duncan White, NMSS John Miller, Team Member, Region I Jennifer Scro, OGC

By Skype:

David Lew, MRB Member, Region I James Trapp, Region I

Michelle Beardsley, NMSS Daichi Saitio, Region I

By telephone:

Steve Harrison, MRB Member, VA, OAS Bryan Parker, Team Leader, Region III Lizette Roldán-Otero, Team Member, NMSS Jackie Cook, Team Member, RIV Brandon Juran, Team Member, MN Troy Pruett, Region IV Christina England, OGC Robert Johnson, NMSS Michelle Brewer, OK Keisha Cornelius, OK Jennifer McAllister, OK Libby McCaskill, OK Kevin Sampson, OK

- Convention: Mr. Duncan White 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. Oklahoma IMPEP Review: Mr. Bryan Parker, Team Leader, led the presentation for the results of the Oklahoma IMPEP review to the MRB. He 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) and the State of Minnesota during the period of September 24-28, 2018. A draft report was issued to Oklahoma for factual comment on October 17, 2018. Mr. Parker reported that the team found Oklahoma's performance satisfactory for all indicators reviewed.

3. Performance Indicators:

a. Dr. Lizette Roldán-Otero 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 Oklahoma representatives discussed the State's regulation adoption process, including the timeliness of adopting regulations. The team found Oklahoma's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

b. Mr. Parker 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 Oklahoma representatives briefly discussed the status of technical staffing and training during the review period and the impact of vacancies on the Agreement State Program.

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

c. Mr. John Miller 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, the team, and Oklahoma representatives discussed timeliness of inspection documentation, and factors that may have contributed to delinquent inspection documentation during the review period. Also discussed, was the team's recommendation that Oklahoma develop a strategy to improve the timeliness of inspection documentation and assure that future inspection documentation is issued within 30 days.

The team found Oklahoma's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed. The MRB also agreed with the team's recommendation.

d. Mr. Miller also 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 MRB, the team, and Oklahoma representatives discussed the technical quality of Oklahoma's inspection program and the lack of any significant issues with technical quality.

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

e. Ms. Jackie Cook 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 MRB, the team, and Oklahoma representatives discussed the technical quality of the program's licensing actions and the Program's adoption of a peer review process to help ensure future renewals appropriately document inspection and enforcement history.

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

f. Mr. Brandon Juran reviewed and presented 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 Oklahoma representatives discussed the effectiveness of the Program's Incident and Allegation Activities, and the lack of any significant issues with the Program's Incident and Allegation Activities. Also discussed, was the team's recommendation to close the 2014 IMPEP recommendation to provide additional staff training to ensure consistent, timely, and accurate reporting and follow-up of incidents.

The team found Oklahoma's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed. The MRB also agreed with the team's recommendation to close the 2014 IMPEP recommendation.

- 4. MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report: The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the Oklahoma Agreement State Program be found adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with the NRC's program. Since this was the second consecutive review in which Oklahoma was found satisfactory for all performance indicators, the team recommended, and the MRB agreed, 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 ML18331A351.
- 5. Precedents/Lessons Learned: None
- 6. Comments from Members of the Public. None
- 7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:10 p.m. (ET)