

From: Michael Johnson *NRR*
To: Reckley, William
Date: Fri, Nov 16, 2001 7:31 AM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Sensitive Info Team

Bill,

I happened to see a copy of draft (i hope) criteria for evaluatin information in NRC SE's and EIS as candidates for redacting from publically available versions. If these criteria are to be applied to oversight, as I would certainly think they would, I have the following concerns regarding the following criteria:

- "Accident Analysis" . . off normal events & accidents
- "Identified uncorrected weaknesses and vulnerabilities"

Both are vague and could have potentially sweeping impacts on the ROP. I would argue that withholding information on issues that were *merely precursors* based on a change in the annualized CDF *should the condition persist* is irrational. Similarly, withholding information on off normal events that are only representative of a precursor that resulted from an alignment of conditions (i.e., at a particular time) but did not result in core damage (or anything close to it) would be of very very limited assistance to a potential adversary. What it would do is undermine public confidence.

In the event of an accident, the agency will certainly be expected to provide information to external stakeholders and will be foolhardy to attempt to do otherwise.

Without involvement, I see this headed in the wrong direction.

>>> Bruce Boger 11/16/01 06:53AM >>>

NRR
I don't know whether the guidance embedded in these emails will help you do your jobs of screening sensitive information. I know there are concerns on PIs, inspection report details and "colors," and the like. We don't have anyone on the teams, so I'm asking you to make sure your interests are being covered. If not, let's figure out to take care of them.

CC: Dean, William

L-45