

## **National Materials Program Working Group**

### **Minutes**

The National Materials Program Working Group (WG) held its first meeting March 6-8, 2000 at NRC headquarters in Rockville, MD. Carl Pappariello and Paul Lohaus addressed the WG, and OAS and CRCPD representatives described their perspectives regarding a National Materials Program. There were several discussions about the SRM and the task assigned to the WG. NRC's Strategic Plan was introduced and briefly discussed.

The WG drafted and approved a Charter (attached). This Charter will be sent to the Steering Committee for information.

The WG discussed several different options for accomplishing its mission. Approaches included defining a National Materials Program, and working our way down to the foundation. Unfortunately, no clear vision emerged. Instead, the group found it more appropriate to define the elements of a national program and work toward building and defining a national program.

The WG started a list of elements needed for a national materials program, using the CRCPD and IMPEP listings of program elements as a basis. Each of those program elements will eventually be broken down and evaluated. During this particular meeting, the WG looked at licensing and inspection guidance and reciprocity in detail.

For the elements reviewed in detail, the following process was established:

1. Identify current method of accomplishing goal and use this as the basis for evaluations.
2. Brainstorm different methods or options for implementing or meeting the needs for the particular program element being considered.
3. Options that do not ensure protection of public health & safety and the environment are removed from consideration.
4. Create a matrix for evaluating or screening the remaining options. Each option is evaluated using the philosophy of the WG as defined in the Charter:
  - A. Does the option optimize resources of federal, state, professional and industrial organizations?
  - B. Does the option account for individual agency needs and abilities?
  - C. Does the option promote consensus on regulatory priorities?
  - D. Does the option promote consistent exchange of information?
  - E. Does the option harmonize regulatory approaches?
  - F. Does the option recognize state and federal needs for flexibility?

5. Evaluate each option against criteria on matrix, using current system as the standard. (Does each option do more or less than the current system to embody the philosophies identified in the Charter?)
6. After evaluating pros and cons for various options, develop an option that would be most beneficial to a national program.

This describes the brainstorming and primary screening process. Once all of the program elements have been screened, they will be run through more screens. The WG determined that the second screening process would look at how the option relates to NRC's Strategic Plan, IMPEP, costs and impact on licensees. The third screen would look at implementation issues, possible statute or other regulatory changes, and needs for MOUs or equivalent.

The WG also began looking at what the final product would look like. The Commission paper should include a brief history of how we got to where we are now, and the need for the WG and review of the existing program. The WG realizes that other federal agencies may like this approach or may need to go through a similar process, therefore the methodology should be documented. The paper will include a discussion related to non-AEA material and maybe even machine radiation.

Various WG members were assigned tasks to accomplish before the next meeting. Because this group really seemed to be moving quickly and was fairly productive, we decided to schedule future meetings in rapid succession in order to continue the momentum. Tentative dates and locations for upcoming meetings are listed below:

- April 10-12, 2000 at NRC's Region 4 in Dallas, TX
- Briefing of CRCPD at their annual meeting in May
- June 5-7, 2000 in Denver
- Steering Committee briefing at same time as OAS/CRCPD Commission briefing (June 13-14? Or June 20-21)
- September at NRC's Region III in Lisle, IL
- Briefing of OAS at their annual meeting in October
- Possible additional meeting in October

The WG agreed that all meetings would be open to the public, and that the WG would accept comments from the public when offered. The WG also decided not to require formal submission of comments during the working phase, and will not formally document and provide written disposition of comments received. The WG believes this will foster greater communication between all interested parties.