

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

AI - 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

A/73

From: Alan Roecklein
To: TWP0(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.