

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF REGION III  
October 12, 2017

The attendees were as follows:

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

Frederick Brown, MRB Chair, OEDO  
Marc Dapas, MRB Member, NMSS  
Mary Spencer, MRB Member, OGC

Lisa Dimmick, NMSS  
Lance Rakovan, NMSS  
Paul Michalak, NMSS

By videoconference:

Scott Morris, MRB Member, Region IV  
Cynthia Pederson, Region III  
John Miller, Team Member, Region I  
Jim Lynch, Region III/RSAO

John Giessner, Region III  
Christine Lipa, Region III

By telephone:

David Walter, MRB Member, AL, OAS  
Brian Goretzki, Team Member, AZ  
Lizette Roldan-Otera, Team Member, NMSS

Kathy Modes, NMSS  
Joseph O'Hara, NMSS

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. Region III IMPEP Review. Ms. Lisa Dimmick, Team Leader, led the presentation of the Region III Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results to the MRB. She summarized the review and the team's findings for the five indicators reviewed. The review was conducted during the period of July 17–21, 2017, by a team composed of technical staff members from the NRC and the States of Arizona and New Jersey. A draft of this report was issued to Region III on August 18, 2017, for factual comment. Region III responded to the findings and conclusions of the review by electronic mail dated September 5, 2017. Ms. Dimmick reported that the team found the Region III materials program satisfactory for all performance indicators reviewed.
3. Common Performance Indicators.
  - a) Mr. Brian Goretzki 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 Regional representatives discussed the turnover rate in the Region. Ms. Cynthia Pederson discussed the reasons that a number of currently vacant positions will not be filled.

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

- b.) Mr. Goretzki 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 Region III's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

- c.) Mr. John Miller 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 Region III's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

- d.) Ms. Nancy Stanley 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 team found Region III's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and after a brief discussion involving bankruptcies, the MRB agreed.

- e.) Ms. Lizette Roldan-Otero 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 team found Region III's 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 Region III materials program is 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 five years with a periodic meeting mid-cycle. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML17289A092.
- 5. Precedents/Lessons Learned. None applicable to this review
- 6. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:35 p.m. (ET)