

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF NORTH CAROLINA
JUNE 7, 2018

The attendees were as follows:

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

Dan Dorman, MRB Chair, OEDO	Lance Rakovan, Team Leader, NMSS
Andrea Kock, MRB Member, NMSS	Paul Michalak, NMSS
Tison Campbell, MRB Member, OGC	Andrea Silvia, OGC
Lee Cox, NC	David Crowley, NC
Celimar Valentin-Rodriguez, Team Member, NMSS	

By videoconference:

Darrell Roberts, MRB Member, Region III	Darren Piccirillo, Region III
Randy Erickson, Team Member, Region IV	Binesh Tharakan, Region IV
Monica Ford, Team Member, Region I	Joe Nick, Region I

By telephone:

Jay Hyland, MRB Member, ME, OAS	Lizette Roldan-Otero, NMSS
Jimmy Uhlemeyer, Team Member, KS	Joe O'Hara, NMSS
Louis Brayboy, NC	Travis Cartoski, NC
Francis O'Neil, VT	

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. North Carolina IMPEP Review. Mr. Lance Rakovan, Team Leader, led the presentation of the North Carolina Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results 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 Kansas during the period of March 5-9, 2018. A draft report was issued to North Carolina for factual comment on April 4, 2018. The State responded to the draft report by letter from Lee Cox dated May 1, 2018. Mr. Rakovan reported that the team found North Carolina's performance was satisfactory for all indicators reviewed, except for the indicator Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program, which the team found satisfactory, but needs improvement.
3. Performance Indicators.
 - a) Mr. Rakovan 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 North Carolina representatives briefly discussed the reorganization of the North Carolina Agreement State Program, the increase in FTE over the review period, and knowledge management. North Carolina representatives provided additional

detail about the new organization, as well as its impact on the program. The MRB directed the team to review the discussion about the program's organization in the report to ensure it was still accurate.

The team found North Carolina'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 should be closed.

- b) Ms. Monica Ford 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 North Carolina representatives briefly discussed procedures the program implemented just prior to the review, issues with Web-Based Licensing (WBL), and reciprocity inspections. Mr. Crowley stated that tracking of inspections is a priority for him. The MRB asked for clarification for the statement involving "200 data entry errors" in Section 2.0 of the proposed final report. Attendees discussed the program's use and experiences with WBL.

The team found North Carolina'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 should be closed.

- c) Mr. Jimmy Uhlemeyer 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 North Carolina representatives discussed the sharing of information between groups and any inspection trends.

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

- d) 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 North Carolina representatives discussed eligibility criteria for license extension, implementation of Part 37, and details on final status surveys.

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

- e) Ms. Ford reviewed and presented 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 North Carolina representatives briefly discussed the importance of incident and allegation response and follow-up.

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

- f) 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, the team, and North Carolina representatives discussed the status of regulation reviews and challenges with adoption of regulations. Attendees also discussed why the State chose not to adopt 10A NCAC 15.0117 and the impact of not doing so.

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

- g) Ms. Celimar Valentin-Rodriguez reviewed the non-common performance indicator, **Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 4.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB and the team discussed the details of the weaknesses identified by the team and the possibility of an "unsatisfactory" rating for this indicator. North Carolina representatives noted that, given the small amount of work involving SS&Ds, other aspects of the program were prioritized over the SS&D program since the previous review. Attendees discussed the significance of the weaknesses and the program's ability to address them. North Carolina representatives stated that they are taking steps to improve the program and would seek additional assistance, if necessary. The MRB and the team discussed the closing of the previous recommendation and the wording of the current recommendation and directed that the report be revised to reflect that the current recommendation subsumed some of the deficiencies noted in the previous report. The MRB noted that the language in the report involving this indicator was more aligned with an "unsatisfactory" rating. The MRB noted that the mitigation circumstances discussed at the MRB meeting were not included in the report, and directed that the team revise the report to include additional information, and share the revised section with the MRB for approval before issuing the final report.

The team found North Carolina's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory, but needs improvement" and the MRB agreed. The MRB also agreed to close the recommendation from the previous review.

- 4. MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report. The team recommended, and the MRB agreed, that the North Carolina Agreement State Program be found adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with the NRC's program. The team recommended that the next IMPEP review take place in approximately 4 years with a periodic meeting in approximately 2 years. The MRB and North Carolina representatives discussed the timing of the periodic meeting, and the MRB directed that a periodic meeting be held in approximately 1. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML18164A259.

5. Precedents/Lessons Learned. Mr. Rakovan noted that he would be reaching out to North Carolina representatives to collect lessons learned involving conducting IMPEP reviews for “fully electronic” programs.
6. Comments from Members of the Public. None
7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:13 p.m. (ET)