

CRGR EFFORT REDUCTION MEASURES

BACKGROUND

On April 21, 1994, the EDO transmitted to the Commission SECY-94-109 proposing to reduce the basic scope of CRGR review to:

1. "review of 'high impact' and 'controversial' generic correspondence and rules before public comment,"
2. "review of items for which the staff has difficulty resolving issues after public comment,"
3. "review of emergency and urgent generic correspondence, and"
4. "review of significant proposals with highly expedited schedules."

On June 15, 1994 the Commission provided a staff requirements memorandum (SRM) directing that:

1. "... the scope of the CRGR Charter should not be reduced."
2. "... the staff should consider enlarging the scope of review of the CRGR to include proposed generic requirements in the nuclear materials area and recommend a course of action."
3. "The staff should look at measures which would lessen the time spent on CRGR reviews by individual CRGR members."

GUIDELINES

The CRGR has considered measures to lessen the time spent by individual members on CRGR reviews and adopted the following guidelines:

1. The Charter has not changed with regard to defining what categories of documents are subject to CRGR review.
2. It is appropriate to make more frequent use of a negative consent process. (In this process, the CRGR staff reviews a package submitted for CRGR review, summarizes the issues and the staff's responses to the issues and, if appropriate, recommends to the members that further review and discussion at a meeting are not needed. If the members agree, no further review is performed.) It is noted that more frequent use of negative consent (which, in essence, is an

abbreviated review) does not reduce the scope of CRGR review.

3. In conjunction with negative consent, it is appropriate to emphasize reducing the number of dual reviews (i.e., review at both the proposed and final stage). Specifically: