

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF MISSISSIPPI
JULY 27, 2017

The attendees were as follows:

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

Fred Brown, MRB Chair, OEDO
Marc Dapas, MRB Member, NMSS
Tison Campbell, MRB Member, OGC
Darrell Roberts, MRB Member, NSIR
Orysia Masnyk-Bailey, Team Leader, RI
James Craig, MS

Lance Rakovan, NMSS
Paul Michalak, NMSS
Daniel Collins, NMSS
Lizette Roldan-Otera, NMSS
BJ Smith, MS

By videoconference:

James Trapp, MRB Member, Region III
Binesh Tharakan, Team Member, Region IV

Ryan Craffey, Team Member, Region III

By telephone:

Lee Cox, MRB Member, NC, OAS
Vanessa Danese, Team Member, TX
Karen Meyer, NMSS

Joe O'Hara, NMSS
Kathy Modes, NMSS

1. Convention. Mr. Lance Rakovan convened the meeting at approximately 1:30 p.m. (ET). He noted that this Management Review Board (MRB) meeting was open to the public. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.

Mississippi IMPEP Review. Ms. Orysia Masnyk-Bailey, Team Leader, led the presentation of the Mississippi Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results to the MRB. She summarized the review and the team's findings for the seven indicators reviewed. The on-site review was conducted by a team composed of technical staff members from the NRC and the State of Texas during the period of April 24-28, 2017. A draft report was issued to Mississippi for factual comment on June 1, 2017. Mississippi responded to the team's findings by letter dated July 11, 2017. Ms. Masnyk-Bailey reported that the team found the Mississippi Agreement State Program satisfactory for three indicators, Technical Staffing and Training, Status of Materials Inspection Program, and Technical Quality of Inspections, and satisfactory, but needs improvement, for the indicators Technical Quality of Licensing Actions, Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities, and Compatibility Requirements.

2. Common Performance Indicators.
 - a) Mr. Binesh Tharakan 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 State representatives discussed whether staff or contractors are responsible for reviewing regulations as noted in Section 4.1 of the report. The MRB directed that the passage describing the staff's industry experience and level of training

be removed from the report and that additional language be added to the report to better describe the relationship between documentation and performance. The MRB also directed that this Section of the report include references to issues discussed in Sections 3.4, 3.5, and 4.1.

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

- b) Mr. Ryan Craffey 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 team found Mississippi's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

- c) Mr. Craffey 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 team found Mississippi's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

- d) Ms. Vanessa Danese 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, team members, and State representatives discussed the lack of procedures and documentation issues. The MRB directed that, due to issues detailed in this Section and similar issues detailed in Section 3.5, the recommendation be expanded to say that the Program review its guidance (including licensing, incident, and allegation guidance) update it, as appropriate, and provide training to staff on the new procedures.

The team found Mississippi's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory, but needs improvement" and the MRB agreed.

- e) Ms. Masnyk-Bailey reviewed and presented the findings regarding 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 State representatives discussed the program's response to allegations and whether the language in the report was accurate. Ms. Masnyk-Bailey noted that certain language in the report was inaccurate. The MRB directed that the report be revised to more accurately reflect the documentation, as well as that the team could not confirm that alleged were gotten back to when appropriate. The MRB directed that the report be revised to include additional discussion of the documentation issues noted previously.

The team found Mississippi's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory, but needs improvement" and the MRB agreed.

3. Non-Common Performance Indicators.

Mr. Tharakan reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, **Compatibility Requirements**. His presentation corresponded to Section 4.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report.

The team found Mississippi's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory, but needs improvement" and the MRB agreed.

4. MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the Mississippi Agreement State Program was adequate to protect public health and safety, but needs improvement, and compatible with the NRC's program. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, the next IMPEP review take place in approximately 4 years.

The MRB and the team discussed whether to place the State on Monitoring. The State representatives noted that the "Monitoring" label was unnecessary. Three MRB members supported Monitoring, two did not, including the Organization of Agreement States Liaison to the MRB. The MRB directed that a period of Monitoring be initiated with Mississippi due to the fact that three out of six performance indicators were found to be satisfactory, but needs improvement. The MRB directed that a periodic meeting be held in approximately 1 year and noted that it intends to consider progress made by the State at the time of the periodic meeting and may then choose to remove the State from Monitoring. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML17214A458.

5. Precedents/Lessons Learned. None applicable to this review

6. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:20 p.m. (ET)