

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP Date: May 31, 1996

MEMORANDUM TO: Bill M. Morris, Director, DRA
THRU: John Glenn, Chief, RPHEB
FROM: Alan Roecklein, RPHEB
SUBJECT: REQUEST TO INCREMENTALLY FUND A PROJECT
(NO CHANGE IN SCOPE)

Initials Date

_____	*	_____	*
1. A. Roecklein	*	<i>AR</i>	* 6/3/96
2. J. Glenn	*	<i>JG</i>	* 6/4/96
3. B. Morris	*	<i>Bm</i>	* 6/14/96
_____	*	_____	*
_____	*	_____	*
_____	*	_____	*

REMARKS: FROM: RPHEB/DRA/RES

FROM: R. Gordon Room No.: T9C24 Phone: 415-6187

A172

From: Alan Roecklein
 To: TWPO (MMR)
 Date: 6/25/96 11:16am
 Subject: NCRP GRANT 95-086 -Reply

1. Ncrp provided a list of committee members in the first quarterly report. The list was reviewed by myself, S. Yaniv, and V. Holerhan. We believe that the members provide a good crosssection of the disciplines needed to review the data available on the linear no-threshold concept. The committee includes:

Upton, A.C., M.D.
 Adelstein, S.J., Nuclear Med.
 Brenner, D., Physicist
 Clifton, K.H., Rad. Bio.
 Finch, S.C., M.D.
 Hall, E.J., Physicist, Cellular Bio.
 Liber, H., Molecular Bio.
 Painter, R.B., Molecular Bio.
 Preston, R.J., Genetics
 Shore, R., Epidemiologist
 Kronenberg, Molecular Bio.
 Beckner, W.M., Med Nuclear Physicist.

2. Ncrp provided the first report May 1996. The next report is expected end of June and will include the detailed outline of the report.

3. It is important that we continue this work. NCRP is chartered by Congress to provide consensus technical advice to federal regulatory agencies on radiation issues. The NCRP report will be the authoritative scientific opinion on the issue. Also, the NRC and others funded numerous studies on cellular and molecule effects which have not been summarized yet. This will be the focus of the NCRP report and is expected to be important. NCRP should finish well before the new BEIR committee, and we should try to resolve this controversy as soon as possible so that either we can confirm the NRC position as published in RG 8.29, or change it.

From: Marianne Riggs
To: TWP9.AKR
Date: 6/24/96 7:38pm
Subject: NCRP GRANT 95-086

Al - since the FAB wanted to review this grant before the option is exercised, and since, I believe, that the FAB no longer exists (I'm checking), it would behoove us to give a little report to Robin Teichman, OGC, at the very least concerning those areas of the grant that we were focussed upon. Therefore, please answer the following questions (in sentence format, please):

1. Did the NCRP provide the NRC with a list of committee members of Scientific Committee 1.6? Are these members an appropriate mix to evaluate the critical evaluation of the linear-no threshold assumption? Please provide a copy of that list to me.
2. Has the NCRP been providing quarterly progress reports? Do you have the 3rd quarterly report? If so, may I have a copy of it?
3. Since this is such a controversial subject, is it still pertinent that this evaluation be continued? Please provide more than a "yes" "no" answer to this question.
4. Is there anything else you wish to say about this issue?

Please get back to me as soon as you can so that I can give Robin time to review and comment. Thanks!

CC: TWP9.BAS1

MEETING NOTES FOR THE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BOARD'S REVIEW OF THE NCRP GRANT

The FAB, consisting of Robin Teichman, OGC, Shirley Crampton, DC/ADM, Lars Solander, OC, and Marianne Riggs, Chair, RES, met on August 15, 1995, at 1:30 p.m. to consider placing NCRP's unsolicited proposal as a grant. Charleen Raddatz, DRA, presented the proposal to the Board. Although it was agreed that this proposal fit within the parameters of a grant, some salient questions could not be answered in the meeting and it was agreed that Shirley Crampton would approach NCRP for answers and the FAB would reconvene to further consider the proposal.

The questions were focussed on what NCRP was going to do with the \$75K for the first year in particular, as well as the other years, and what sort of schedule was planned. Since the proposal itself was only 3 pages in length, the OGC member was concerned that the funding would go towards NCRP getting its act together rather than actual work. Also, Charleen Raddatz emphasized that in order for this grant to be worthwhile, the NCRP had to provide: a list of the members of the Scientific Committee to assure that the full range of views concerning the linear - no threshold assumption was being represented; present a draft outline of the final report after the first year; and assure that the final report was a full voting report and not just a commentary.

NCRP provided a budget breakdown for each of the three years and gave a projected schedule and agreed to give the NRC a list of the committee membership. Based upon this further information, the FAB met on August 17, 1995, at 2 p.m. and unanimously agreed to approve a one-year grant for \$75K and to reconvene in a year to approve/disapprove the two-year option at \$75K/year.

The FAB further agreed that if NCRP did not provide legal assurances that the three conditions mentioned in paragraph three above would be met, the FAB would withdraw their approval of the grant.