

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF MASSACHUSETTS
SEPTEMBER 13, 2018

The attendees were as follows:

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

Dan Dorman, MRB Chair, DEDM
Scott Moore, MRB Member, NMSS
Tison Campbell, MRB Member, OGC
Darren Piccirillo, Team Member, Region III

Sabrina Atack, NMSS
Paul Michalak, NMSS
Lance Rakovan, NMSS

By Skype:

Darrell Roberts, MRB Member, Region III
Randy Erickson, Team Leader, Region IV
John Miller, Team Member, Region I
Shawn Seeley, Team Member, Region I

Geoffrey Warren, Team Member, Region III
Christine Lipa, Region III

By telephone:

Augustinus Ong, MRB Member, NH, OAS
Lizette Roldan-Otero, NMSS
Jennifer Opila, CO
Stephen James, OH
Jeff Dauszat, LA

Jane Ferguson, MS
Jack Priest, MA
Joshua Daehler, MA
Robert Locke, MA
Ken Traegde, MA

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. Massachusetts IMPEP Review. Mr. Randy Erickson, Team Leader, led the presentation of the Massachusetts 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 Louisiana during the period of June 11-15, 2018. A draft report was issued to Massachusetts for factual comment on July 17, 2018. Massachusetts responded to the draft report by e-mail dated July 24, 2018, from John M. Priest Jr., Director, Radiation Control Program, Massachusetts Department of Public Health. Mr. Erickson noted that the team is recommending to the MRB that all indicators be found satisfactory.
3. Performance Indicators.
 - a) Mr. John Miller 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 the balance between inspection and licensing staff,

how long it takes to qualify staff members, and how the program would address a vacancy.

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

- b.) Mr. Darren Piccirillo assisted with the review of 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, team members, and State representatives discussed program's goals compared to the NRC's goals. The MRB directed that the report be clarified with respect to whether the program was meeting NRC's overdue inspection criteria or the program's.

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

- c.) Mr. Geoffrey Warren 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, team members, and State representatives discussed the actions the program has taken to address the deficiencies noted in the 2014 IMPEP report. The MRB directed that the report include language address these actions.

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

- d.) Mr. Shawn Seeley reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Technical Quality of Licensing Actions**. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, team members, and State representatives discussed signature authority, renewals, and the program's pre-licensing requirements.

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

- e.) Mr. Warren 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, team members, and State representatives discussed notification of incidents to the NRC's Headquarters Operations Officer (HOO) and protection of allegeders' identities. The MRB directed that the report be revised to include detail about the program's reporting of events to the HOO and the National Materials Event Database.

The team found Massachusetts' 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.

- f.) Mr. Erickson briefed the non-common performance indicator, **Compatibility Requirements**. His presentation corresponded to Section 4.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, team members, and State representatives discussed the time it took for the program to adopt regulations. The MRB directed that Section 4.1 of the final report include detail that the program did not consistently adopt regulations within 3 years under "Evaluation."

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

- g.) Mr. Erickson reviewed and briefed the non-common performance indicator, **Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program**, which was reviewed by James Pate. His presentation corresponded to Section 4.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, team members, and State representatives discussed sharing information involving a device failure.

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

4. MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the Massachusetts Agreement State Program come off Monitoring, and 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 4 years. The MRB directed that a periodic meeting be held in approximately 2 years. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML18260A311.
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 2:09 p.m. (ET)