

MINUTES: MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF FLORDIA
SEPTEMBER 17, 2019

The meeting attendees were as follows:

Management Review Board

Steve West, OEDO
Robert Lewis, NMSS
Mary Spencer, OGC,

Jack Giessner, Region III
Sherrie Flaherty, OAS Representative

IMPEP Team

Lizette Roldan-Otero, NMSS/MSST
Celimar Valentin-Rodriguez, NMSS/MSST
Penny Lanzisera, Region I
John Miller, Region I RSAO

Jennifer Dalzell, Region III
Brian Goretzki, State of Arizona
Beth Schilke, Commonwealth of Virginia

State of Florida

Cynthia Becker
Kevin Kunder

Jorge Laguna
Mike Stephens
Joy Stephenson

Staff

Kevin Williams, NMSS/MSST
Paul Michalak, NMSS/MSST
Robert Johnson, NMSS/MSST
Duncan White, NMSS/MSST
Jazel Parks, NMSS/MSST

Stephen Poy, NMSS/MSST
Joe O'Hara, NMSS/MSST
John Thorp, NRC/OIG
Janelle Wiggs, NRC/OIG

Members of the Public

David Turberville, State of Alabama

Phil Peterson, State of Colorado

Topics discussed during the meeting included:

1. Convention. Mr. Robert Johnson 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. Florida IMPEP Review. Dr. Lizette Roldan-Otero, Team Leader, led the presentation of the Florida 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), the State of Arizona, and the Commonwealth of Virginia during the period of June 24-28, 2019. A draft report was issued to Florida for factual comment on July 31, 2019. Dr. Roldan-Otero reported that the team found Florida's performance was satisfactory for five out of the seven indicators reviewed; satisfactory, but needs improvement for Technical Quality of Licensing; and unsatisfactory for Compatibility Requirements.

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 Florida representatives briefly discussed the status of the staff hired during the review period and the impact of vacancies on the Agreement State Program.

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

- b) Mr. John Miller 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 Florida representatives briefly discussed inspection findings.

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

- c) Ms. Penny Lanzisera reviewed and presented the common performance indicator, **Technical Quality of Inspections**. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.3 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Florida representatives discussed the deficiencies identified during the performance of the inspection accompaniments with regards to health, safety, and security, as well as the actions the program had taken to address them. In addition, the MRB, the team, and Florida discussed the recommendation made by the team.

The team found Florida's performance with respect to this indicator to be "satisfactory, but need improvement" and the MRB agreed. The MRB also agreed with the team's recommendation.

- d) Ms. Jennifer Dalzell and Beth Schilke reviewed the common performance indicator, **Technical Quality of Licensing Actions**. Ms. Dalzell presented the teams findings. Her presentation corresponded to Section 3.4 of the proposed final IMPEP report. The MRB, the team, and Florida's representatives discussed the team's findings, as well as the actions the program had taken to address them. In addition, the MRB, the team, and Florida discussed the recommendation made by the team.

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

- e) Mr. Brian Goretzki 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, the team, and Florida representatives discussed incidents of "high risk" and protecting allegers' identities.

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

- f) Dr. Roldan-Otero 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 Florida representatives discussed the State's overdue regulations, and program elements, as well as the actions the program has taken to address them. In addition, the MRB, the team, and Florida discussed the recommendation made by the team.

The team found Florida's performance with respect to this indicator to be "unsatisfactory" and the MRB agreed. The MRB also agreed with the team's recommendation.

- g) Dr. 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, the team, and Florida representatives discussed the training and qualification of staff, including the updating of the training qualification journal.

The team found Florida'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 Florida Agreement State Program be found adequate to protect public health and safety, but needs improvement and not 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. In addition, the team recommended that Florida enter a period of Monitoring. The MRB agreed with the team that the next IMPEP take place in 4 years. However, the MRB determined that a period of Monitoring was not warranted at this time, and instead decided that two periodic meetings should be held in approximately 1 year, and 3 years, respectively. The final report may be found in the ADAMS using the Accession Number ML19262D631.
- 5. Precedents/Lessons Learned. None
- 6. Comments from Members of the Public. None
- 7. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:55 p.m. (ET)

SUBJECT : SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 17, 2019 FLORIDA MRB MEETING

ADAMS ACCESSION NO: ML19273B273

OFFICE	MSST/SALB	MSST/SALB	MSST/SALB
NAME	JParks	LRoldan-Otero	RJohnson
DATE	10/ 10 /19	10/ 10 /19	10/ 10 /19

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY