

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF IOWA
OCTOBER 24, 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
Mary Spencer, MRB Member, OGC
Bryan Parker, Team Leader, Region III

Dan Collins, NMSS
Paul Michalak, NMSS
Jane Marshall, NRR
Lance Rakovan, Team Member, NMSS

By videoconference:

Scott Morris, MRB Member, Region IV
James Lynch, Team Member, Region III

Christine Lipa, Region III

By telephone:

Jennifer Opila, MRB Member, CO, OAS
Judee Walden, Team Member, KS
Ken Sharp, IA
Randy Dahlin, IA
Derek Elling, IA
Robert Dansereau, NY

Joe O'Hara, NMSS
Kathy Modes, NMSS
Angela Leek, IA
Stuart Jordan, IA
Binseh Tharakan, Region IV

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. Iowa IMPEP Review. Mr. Bryan Parker, Team Leader, led the presentation of the Iowa Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results to the MRB. He 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 NRC and the State of Kansas during the period of August 8-10, 2017. A draft report was issued to Iowa for factual comment on September 11, 2017. Iowa responded to the team's findings by e-mail dated September 12, 2017. Mr. Parker reported that the team found Iowa's performance satisfactory for all five common performance indicators and for the single applicable non-common performance indicator.
3. Common Performance Indicators.
 - a) Mr. Bryan 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, team members, and Iowa representatives discussed the Program's decision to not focus on reciprocity inspections during one year of the IMPEP period, as noted in the report, and the connection to staffing levels. The MRB commended the State for their performance given its staffing issues during the review period. The MRB directed that Section 3.1 of the final report note the reciprocity discussion in

Section 3.2. The State noted that a third inspector has been hired since the onsite review.

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

- b) Mr. James Lynch 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. He noted that Iowa did not have any overdue inspections during the review period and that Iowa also inspects a number of license categories more frequently than does NRC. In 2016, the State made a decision not to do any reciprocity inspections, due to reduced staffing resources and significant involvement in two nuclear reactor exercises. Reciprocity inspections were completed, as scheduled, in 2017.

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

- c) Mr. Lynch reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Technical Quality of Inspections**. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. In July 2017, a team member accompanied both of the inspectors with the program at that time. The quality of the inspections was excellent with performance based focus. The team noted that inspection findings were well-founded and the inspections were thorough.

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

- d) Ms. Judee Walden 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. Licensing actions were thorough, complete, consistent and of excellent quality. Security measures were addressed during pre-licensing visits and licensing actions.

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

- e) Mr. Rakovan reviewed and presented the findings regarding 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 directed the team to remove the sentence about importance and impact of procedures for small programs from the report.

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

4. Non-Common Performance Indicators.

Mr. Rakovan reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, **Compatibility Requirements**. His presentation corresponded to Section 4.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB noted that the State's rulemaking timeline taking six months to a year is exceptional.

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

5. MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the Iowa Agreement State Program be found adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with the NRC's program. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, the next IMPEP review take place in approximately 5 years. The MRB directed that a periodic meeting be held in approximately 2.5 years. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML17300A440

Fred Brown recognized that this was Mr. James Lynch's final IMPEP review and MRB meeting after over 25 years working with the Agreement State program and conducting State reviews.

6. Precedents/Lessons Learned. None applicable to this review
7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:42 p.m. (ET)