

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF ARKANSAS
FEBRUARY 13, 2018

The attendees were as follows:

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

Dan Dorman, MRB Chair, OEDO
Marc Dapas, MRB Member, NMSS
Tison Campbell, MRB Member, OGC
Connie Melton, AR
Renee Mallory, AR
Jared Thompson, AR
Laura Shrum, OGC

Lizette Roldán-Otero, Team Leader, NMSS
Jennifer Bishop, Team Member, Region III
Mark Shaffer, Region IV
Lance Rakovan, NMSS
Paul Michalak, NMSS
Kevin Williams, NMSS
Darren Piccirillo, Region III

By videoconference:

Darrell Roberts, MRB Member, Region III
Bernadette Baca, Region IV
David Esh, NMSS
Lisa Forney, PA
Edward Harvey, Region III
Joshua Meyers, PA
Leonardo Wardrobe, Region I
Kathy Modes, NMSS

Randy Erickson, Team Member, Region IV
Binesh Tharakan, Region IV
Nichole Fields, Region III
Robert Gallagher, Region I
Mohanned Kawasmi, TX
Darren Piccirillo, Region III
Ann DeFrancisco, Region I

By telephone:

David Walter, MRB Member, AL, OAS
Beth Schilke, Team Member, VA
Angela Hall, AR
Bernard Bevill, AR
Steve Mack, AR
Angela Minded, AR

Kathy Modes, NMSS
Joe O'Hara, NMSS
Sherry Davidson, AR
Robert Dansereau, NY
Wendy Krause, AR

1. Convention. Mr. Lance Rakovan 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. Arkansas IMPEP Review. Dr. Lizette Roldán-Otero, Team Leader, led the presentation of the Arkansas Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results to the MRB. She summarized the review and the team's findings for the six 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 Commonwealth of Virginia during the period of November 27 – December 1, 2017. A draft report was issued to Arkansas for factual comment on January 2, 2018. Arkansas responded to the team's findings by letter dated January 31, 2018. Dr. Roldán-Otero reported that the team found Arkansas's performance was satisfactory for five indicators and unsatisfactory for indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions.

3. Performance Indicators.

- a) Mr. Randy Erickson 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 Arkansas representatives discussed staffing levels, balance between inspection and licensing staff, and the time it takes to qualify staff. Attendees discussed filling the frozen position and concerns surrounding the expected influx of licensing actions, as well as the licensing deficiencies noted in Section 3.4 of the report. The MRB directed that the language involving a “better opportunity” be removed from the report.

The team found Arkansas’s performance with respect to this indicator to be “satisfactory” and the MRB agreed. The MRB also agreed that the recommendation from the previous review be closed.

- b) Dr. Roldán-Otero 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 Arkansas representatives briefly discussed inspection findings. The team found Arkansas’s performance with respect to this indicator to be “satisfactory” and the MRB agreed.

- c) Ms. Beth Schilke reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Technical Quality of Inspections**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Arkansas representatives discussed supervisory accompaniments.

The team found Arkansas’s performance with respect to this indicator to be “satisfactory” and the MRB agreed.

- d) Mr. Erickson 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 team found Arkansas’s performance with respect to this indicator to be “satisfactory” and the MRB agreed. The MRB also agreed to close the recommendation from the previous review.

- e) Dr. 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 Arkansas representatives discussed the State’s process for rule adoption, including the impact of substantive public comments.

The team found Arkansas’s performance with respect to this indicator to be “satisfactory” and the MRB agreed.

- f) Ms. Jennifer Bishop 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 Arkansas representatives discussed the deficiencies identified by the team, as well as the actions the program is taking to address them. Attendees discussed the recommendation involving pre-licensing guidance. The MRB directed that the language in the report be refined to better explain pre-licensing guidance. The MRB questioned the team and Arkansas representatives about financial assurance, the safety impact of the deficiencies identified by the team, and the State re-looking at medical licenses. Arkansas representatives requested a “satisfactory, but needs improvement” rating for this indicator emphasizing actions taken since the review.

The team found Arkansas’s performance with respect to this indicator to be “unsatisfactory.” The MRB discussed the criteria in NRC Management Directive 5.6 for this indicator, including whether the weaknesses identified by the team could be considered “chronic.” The MRB voted on the rating for this indicator, and ultimately directed that Arkansas’s performance with respect to this indicator to be “unsatisfactory.” The MRB also agreed that the recommendation from the previous review should be closed and supported the team’s four recommendations involving this indicator.

4. MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the Arkansas Agreement State Program is adequate to protect public health and safety, but needs improvement; and, compatible with the NRC's program. The team also recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the Arkansas Agreement State Program be placed on monitoring, which will facilitate Arkansas taking the necessary steps to rectify the licensing issues identified during the review. The team recommended that a followup IMPEP review take place in approximately 2 years to review the Technical Quality of Licensing Actions indicator. However, the MRB directed that a followup IMPEP review take place in 18 months instead of 2 years. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML18054A662.
5. Precedents/Lessons Learned. None applicable to this review
6. Comments from Members of the Public. None
7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:35 p.m. (ET)