

January 8, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: Kathy Allen, Co-Chair, National Materials Program Working Group
James Myers, Co-Chair, National Materials Program Working Group

FROM: Carl J. Paperiello, Chair */RA/*
National Materials Program Steering Committee

SUBJECT: GUIDANCE AND AGREEMENTS RESULTING
FROM DECEMBER 5-6, 2000 MEETING

I want to take this opportunity to thank you and each member of the Working Group for your exceptional work and assistance during the December 5-6, 2000 joint meeting of the National Materials Program Working Group and Steering Committee. I believe the meeting served each of us well. It provided the Steering Committee with information on the scope of the Working Group's past and future activities, and provided an opportunity for the Steering Committee to interact with the Working Group on the range of issues which need to be addressed in development of a report presenting options for a National Materials Program.

I am attaching a final copy of a summary of guidance and agreements that reflects our collective discussion at the meeting. A draft of this document was circulated to members of the Steering Committee and to each of you on December 15th. The enclosed final version reflects comments received on the draft.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 301-415-1705 or Paul H. Lohaus at 301-415-3340.

Attachment:
As stated

cc: NMP Working Group
NMP Steering Committee

January 8, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: Kathy Allen, Co-Chair, National Materials Program Working Group
James Myers, Co-Chair, National Materials Program Working Group

FROM: Carl J. Paperiello, Chair */RA/*
National Materials Program Steering Committee

SUBJECT: GUIDANCE AND AGREEMENTS RESULTING
FROM DECEMBER 5-6, 2000 MEETING

I want to take this opportunity to thank you and each member of the Working Group for your exceptional work and assistance during the December 5-6, 2000 joint meeting of the National Materials Program Working Group and Steering Committee. I believe the meeting served each of us well. It provided the Steering Committee with information on the scope of the Working Group's past and future activities, and provided an opportunity for the Steering Committee to interact with the Working Group on the range of issues which need to be addressed in development of a report presenting options for a National Materials Program.

I am attaching a final copy of a summary of guidance and agreements that reflects our collective discussion at the meeting. A draft of this document was circulated to members of the Steering Committee and to each of you on December 15th. The enclosed final version reflects comments received on the draft.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 301-415-1705 or Paul H. Lohaus at 301-415-3340.

Attachment:
As stated

cc: NMP Working Group
NMP Steering Committee

Distribution:
DIR RF
SDroggitis
NMP File

DCD (SP02) PDR (YES)

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\NMP SC WG MEMO.WPD

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	STP:D		DEDMRS					
NAME	PHLohaus:kk		CJPaperiello					
DATE	1/02/2000		1/8/01					

STP-N-17

National Materials Program (NMP) Steering Committee and Working Group Guidance and Agreements Resulting from December 5-6, 2000 Meeting

1. The Working Group will ensure a uniform set of criteria are applied in the screening of options. The criteria developed by the Working Group will be reviewed and modified, if necessary, to ensure that all four NRC Strategic Plan Performance Goals are explicitly included in the criteria.
2. The Working Group will review the program elements' listing for completeness to check that all elements included in both State and NRC programs are addressed. Examples identified for consideration include:
 - Materials research program;
 - Technical Assistance provided to address unique technical issues or proposals;
 - Incident response;
 - Event evaluation for generic issues; and
 - Handling and response to allegations;
3. The process and criteria for establishing the "national priorities" for the NMP needs to be clearly articulated and documented. If the process is "consensus of the participants", how would "consensus" be defined?
4. Options Descriptions/Evaluations
 - The options descriptions should include a base case or minimum program description option, a range of options, and include one option where NRC would have a strong central role in the program.
 - The option descriptions should contain sufficient detailed descriptive information to enable decisions by the Commission on one or more options that could be subsequently characterized and developed in greater detail.
 - The descriptions should include, for example, information on: roles and responsibilities of the "entities" who would carry out major program activities under the option; descriptions of how those responsibilities would be carried out by each entity; estimated resource requirements for each entity to carry out their responsibilities; and how those resources would be budgeted. NRC's role and responsibility must be clear, (e.g. maintain national oversight and ensure "uniformity" in radiation protection standards and program).
 - The descriptions must also identify how current legislative requirements would continue to be met. They should reflect current statutory obligations and any constraints contained in that legislation. They should also identify need for any legislative changes.

- Resource estimates should be presented in three major categories: variable costs (e.g. costs that are directly related to the number of licensees); fixed costs (e.g. costs for development of necessary supporting regulations, guidance, research, etc. to provide for maintenance of the regulatory infrastructure for the option); and overhead costs.
 - The evaluation should include consideration of applying different structures to different functions, as opposed to a “one size fits all” approach. For example, a consensus approach may work for guidance development while an advisory structure may work better for defining and conducting materials research.
 - Some specific comments offered on the Alliance option
 - + Define roles, responsibilities, and resource requirements.
 - + Define the process(es) the Alliance would use in program development and budget formulation. (e.g. how would the Alliance forecast/plan workload, develop implementing programs descriptions, and then develop/budget resource needs).
 - + Define the process and bases that would be used to distribute the resource needs of the programs among the various members of the Alliance. (e.g. would the Alliance allocate an equal amount of the expected cost to each member, or would it allocate a variable amount based, for example, on the number of licensees).
 - + Accountability (e.g. who’s responsible, who speaks for the Alliance program, and how would effectiveness of Alliance products be assured).
 - + Does the Alliance option fit all and will all States “sign-up”?
 - + Identify/examine whether there are other Federal agency programs that may have similarity to the Alliance option.
 - The Working Group recognized that comprehensive State radiation control programs include regulation of NARM and will consider and reflect this, to the extent possible, in the options. The Working group will also assist, in consultation with NRC staff, as staff develops legislative proposals to expand NRC authority over: (1) the medical use of accelerator produced radioactive material; and (2) other broader uses of accelerator produced radioactive material.
5. Add “Executive Summary” to the report outline.
6. Stakeholder interactions
- Early information on the options, concepts, issues, and other areas being considered and analyzed by the Working Group should continue to be made available for early stakeholder review, comment and interaction. The text of the

Working Group report should, however, be considered and treated as a pre-decisional document.

- If the Working Group concludes that a draft of the Working Group report should be distributed to the States for comment, the Working Group Chairs should so inform Carl J. Paperiello to provide time for consultation with the Commission prior to distributing the draft report to the States for comment.
- The Working Group will hold one or more stakeholder meetings to provide opportunity for interaction/discussion among interested stakeholders.

7. Final Report and Schedule

The Steering Committee will review and comment on a draft of the Working Group report and will affirm/concur in the final report to be submitted to the Commission. A proposed schedule was discussed as follows:

- January 29, 2001 - Working Group completes preliminary draft of report and shares with the Steering Committee.
- February 14, 2001 - Consolidated comments from Steering Committee provided to the Working Group.
- February, 2001 - Additional stakeholder meeting(s).
- Week of March 5, 2001 - Revised draft final report provided to the Steering Committee for review.
- March 19-20, 2001 - Steering Committee meets to discuss report and develop consolidated Steering Committee comments.
- March 20-21, 2001 - Joint Steering Committee/Working Group meeting to discuss draft final report.
- March 21 or 22, 2001 - Briefing for Executive Council on draft report.
- Week of April 16, 2001 - Final report provided to the Steering Committee.
- May 31, 2001 - Final report to Commission.