

August 2, 2012

MEMORANDUM TO: Michael F. Weber  
Deputy Executive Director for Materials, Waste,  
Research, State, Tribal, and Compliance Programs  
Office of the Executive Director for Operations

Bradley W. Jones, Assistant General Counsel  
for Reactor and Materials Rulemaking  
Office of the General Counsel

Steven West, Acting Deputy Director  
Office of Federal and State Materials  
and Environmental Management Programs

Anne T. Boland, Director  
Division of Nuclear Material Safety  
Region III

FROM: Karen N. Meyer, IMPEP Administrative Coordinator */RA/*  
Division of Materials Safety and State Agreements  
Office of Federal and State Materials  
and Environmental Management Programs

SUBJECT: MINUTES: JULY 10, 2012 TENNESSEE  
MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD (MRB) MEETING

Enclosed are the minutes of the MRB meeting held on July 10, 2012. If you have comments or questions, please contact me at (301) 415-0113.

Enclosure: Cover Page and Minutes of the  
Management Review Board Meeting

cc w/encl.: Shari Meghreblian, Ph.D., Deputy Commissioner  
Department of Environment & Conservation

Bill Dundulis, Rhode Island  
Organization of Agreement States  
Liaison to the MRB

## Management Review Board Members

Distribution: DCD (SP01)

RidsEdoMailCenter

RidsOgcMailcenter

RidsFsmeDmssa

RidsFsmeOd

RidsRgn1MailCenter

RidsRgn3MailCenter

MSSA\_Technical\_Asst Resource

JLynch, RIII

LDimmick, FSME

DJanda, RI/RSOA

BUIrich, RI

SPoy, FSME

Smack, AR

MKotzalas, OEDO

DWhite, FSME

MBeardsley, FSME

DCollins, RI

PLouden, RIII

Debra Shults, TN

JWeil, OCA (2 copies)

ML12215A127

<b>OFC</b>	FSME/MSSA	
<b>NAME</b>	KMeyer	
<b>DATE</b>	08/02/12	

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

## MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF JULY10, 2012

The attendees were as follows:

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

Michael Weber, MRB Chair, DEDMRT  
Bradley Jones, MRB Member, OGC  
Duncan White, FSME  
Karen Meyer, FSME  
Michelle Beardsley, FSME

Steven West, MRB Member, FSME  
Chris Einberg, FSME  
Lisa Dimmick, FSME, Team Member  
Stephen Poy, Team Member, FSME

### By videoconference:

Jim Lynch, Team Leader, Region III  
Patty Pelke, RIII

Anne Boland, MRB Member, RIII

### By telephone:

Bill Dundulis, MRB Member, RI  
Steve Mack, Team Member, AR  
Anthony Hogan, TN  
Shawn Drake, TN  
Beth Shelton, TN  
Carolyn Sekoral, TN

Betsy Ullrich, Team Member, RI  
Debra Shults, TN  
Allen Grewe, TN  
Paula Richardson, TN  
Carolyn Williams, TN  
Chuck Johnson, TN

1. **Convention.** Ms. Michelle Beardsley convened the meeting at 1:00 p.m. (ET). She noted that this Management Review Board (MRB) meeting was open to the public; however, no members of the public participated in this meeting. Ms. Beardsley then transferred the lead to Mr. Michael Weber, Chair of the MRB. Introductions of the attendees were conducted.
2. **Tennessee IMPEP Review.** Mr. Jim Lynch, Team Leader, led the presentation of the Tennessee Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) review results to the MRB. He summarized the review and the team's findings for the seven indicators reviewed. The on-site review was conducted by a review team composed of technical staff members from NRC and the State of Arkansas during the period of April 23-27, 2012. Prior to the onsite review, the team conducted accompaniments of 11 inspectors. A draft report was issued to State for factual comment on May 25, 2012. The State responded to the review team's findings by letter dated June 18, 2012. The last IMPEP review for Tennessee was conducted in April 2008. The State was found adequate to protect public health and safety but needs improvement and compatible with the NRC's program. Three performance indicators, *Technical Staffing and Training*, *Compatibility Requirements* and *SS&D Evaluation Program*, were found satisfactory, but needs improvement and the team made four recommendations concerning these indicators. However, during the April 2012 IMPEP review the team recommended that these indicators be found satisfactory, and closed the four recommendations..

**Common Performance Indicators.** Mr. Lynch presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, *Technical Staffing and Training*. His presentation corresponded to Section 3.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found

Tennessee's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Tennessee's performance met the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Ms. Lisa Dimmick presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, *Status of Materials Inspection Program*. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Tennessee's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Tennessee's performance met the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Ms. Donna Janda presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, *Technical Quality of Inspections*. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Tennessee's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Tennessee's performance met the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Ms. Betsey Ullrich and Mr. Steve Mack presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, *Technical Quality of Licensing Actions*. Their presentation corresponded to Section 3.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Tennessee's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Tennessee's performance met the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Lynch, Ms. Janda and Mr. Stephen Poy presented the findings regarding the common performance indicator, *Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities*. Their presentation corresponded to Section 3.5 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Tennessee's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made one recommendation. The MRB questioned the intent of the recommendation as to whether the expected outcome was different from the overall indicator criteria expectation. The team agreed that the recommendation was a restatement of the overall expectation. The MRB directed that the recommendation be stricken from the report but that language should be kept in order for the next IMPEP team to review. The MRB agreed that Tennessee's performance met the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

3. **Non-Common Performance Indicators.** Ms. Dimmick presented the findings regarding the non-common performance indicator, *Compatibility Requirements*. Her presentation corresponded to Section 4.1 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Tennessee's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB requested that clarification be added to the report stating the number of regulation amendments that were submitted overdue. The MRB agreed that Tennessee's performance met the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

Mr. Poy presented the findings regarding the non-common performance indicator, *Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program (SS&D)*. His presentation corresponded

to Section 4.2 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The review team found Tennessee's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory" and made no recommendations. The MRB agreed that Tennessee's performance met the criteria for a "satisfactory" rating for this indicator.

4. **MRB Consultation/Comments on Issuance of Report.** The MRB found the Tennessee Agreement State Program "adequate to protect public health and safety" and "compatible with NRC's program." Based on the results of the current IMPEP review, the MRB agreed that the next IMPEP review of the Tennessee Agreement State Program should take place in approximately 4 years. Ms. Dimmick indicated that Tennessee's program includes a number of unique waste processor licenses which required the review team to include an additional member to focus on this special program. The MRB agreed and supported staff's discretion to appoint team members as needed for the special programs that each Agreement State might require.
5. **Precedents/Lessons Learned.** The MRB established no new precedents during this meeting.
6. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:20 p.m. (ET)