

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF WASHINGTON
JULY 24, 2018

The attendees were as follows:

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

Dan Dorman, MRB Chair, OEDO
Scott Moore, MRB Member, NMSS
Tison Campbell, MRB Member, OGC
Monica Ford, Team Leader, Region I
Dave Esh Team Member, NMSS
Akio Hori

Dan Collins, MRB Member, NMSS
Sabrina Atack, NMSS
Paul Michalak, NMSS
Lance Rakovan, NMSS
Daichi Saito

By videoconference:

Randy Erickson, Team Member, Region IV
Todd Jackson, Team Member, Region I
Joe Nick, Region I

Linda Howell, Region IV
John Miller, Region I

By telephone:

Darrell Roberts, MRB Member, Region III
Rusty Lumberg, MRB Member, UT, OAS
Dan Samson, Team Member, NY
Shiya Wang, Team Member, CO
Muhammad Abbaszedah, Team Member, TX
Mikel Elsen, WA
Chris Williams, WA

Jennifer Dalzell, Team Member, Region III
Kathy Modes, Team Member, NMSS
Lizette Roldan-Otero, NMSS
Kimberly Steves, KS
Judee Walden, KS
Earl Fordham, WA
Kristen Schwab, WA

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. Washington IMPEP Review. Ms. Monica Ford, Team Leader, led the presentation of the Washington Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results to the MRB. She 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 States of Colorado, New York, and Texas during the period of April 30–May 4, 2018. A draft report was issued to Washington for factual comment on June 11, 2018. Washington responded to the team's findings by letter dated July 12, 2018. Ms. Ford reported that the team found Washington's performance was satisfactory for all indicators reviewed, except Technical Quality of Licensing Actions and Compatibility Requirements, which the team found satisfactory, but needs improvement. She noted that the team would be briefing Compatibility Requirements first because of its impact on multiple indicators.

3. Performance Indicators.

- a) Ms. Kathy Modes 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 Washington representatives discussed the compatibility of Washington's training and qualification program, as well as the impact of the lack of irradiator regulations. Attendees discussed not "double dinging" the program, orientation of new employees, and the status of the program's revision to its training and qualification program.

The team found Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory, but needs improvement" and the MRB agreed. The MRB also supported the recommendation made by the team.

- b) Mr. Dan Samson reviewed the non-common performance indicator, **Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program**. His presentation corresponded to Section 4.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Washington representatives discussed the training and qualification program for SS&D reviewers, and whether the recommendation from the previous review should be closed. The MRB directed that the language in the report involving the compatibility issue regarding this indicator be clarified.

The team found Washington'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.

- c) Ms. Monica Ford reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Technical Staffing and Training**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Washington representatives briefly discussed the status of the vacancies at the time of the review and how long the positions had been open.

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

- c) Mr. Todd Jackson 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 MRB, the team, and Washington representatives discussed the link between conducting reciprocity inspections and supervisory issues, the program's commitment to track reciprocity inspections, and other states assisting Washington by sharing best practices.

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

- d) Mr. Jackson 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 Washington representatives discussed the program's policy to review 10% of inspection reports and whether this should be considered a compatibility issue even though it was noted previously. Attendees discussed inspector accompaniments and the difference between peer and management review. Washington representatives noted that they will address this issue. The MRB directed that the sentence referring to the 2013 report on page 7 of the proposed final report be removed. The MRB also directed that additional language be included in the report involving 10 percent review issue, including a pointer to Section 4.1 of the final report.

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

- e) Ms. Jennifer Dalzell 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 Washington representatives discussed documentation and filing issues, pre-licensing guidance and hand delivery of licenses, and whether the issues identified by the team can be characterized as "chronic."

The team found Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory, but needs improvement" and the MRB agreed.

- f) Mr. Randy 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 Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed.

- g) Mr. Muhammad Abbaszedah and Mr. Dave Esh reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, **Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program**. Their presentation corresponded to Section 4.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB and the team discussed the consistency in handling LLRW programs in IMPEP. The MRB questioned the team and NRC staff as to how this indicator is handled in other States and directed that staff analyze the issue in order to address LLRW programs consistently. The MRB directed that language involving waste processing facilities should be removed from the recommendation made by the team.

The team found Washington's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and the MRB agreed. The MRB also supported the team's recommendation with the revision noted above.

- i) Ms. Shiya Wang reviewed and presented the non-common performance indicator, **Uranium Recovery Program**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 4.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Washington representatives briefly discussed NRC-sponsored training and when IMPEP should stop reviewing this indicator for a given program.

The team found Washington'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 Washington 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 4 years. The MRB directed that a periodic meeting be held in approximately 1 year. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML18208A461.
5. Precedents/Lessons Learned. The MRB directed that staff analyze the issue of how LLRW programs are reviewed in order to address LLRW programs consistently.
6. Comments from Members of the Public. None
7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 p.m. (ET)