

**From:** Christopher Grimes > NPI  
**To:** William Reckley  
**Date:** Fri, Nov 30, 2001 2:02 PM  
**Subject:** Redaction Project

Bill Reckley: Promptly upon your return to the office on Monday, we need your assistance in a project to support Bill Kane's readiness to explain redaction criteria and impacts to the Commission. In a meeting on Friday morning, he requested that the staff provide Mindy Landau with (1) an expanded version of Chet's "sensitive information criteria" that would add examples of reactor products (SERs, FESs, etc) to the PFS examples, (2) a review of the document list in MD 3.4 to provide the DCD with guidance on the redaction of incoming documents, and (3) a summary impact assessment of the redaction process. Bill will also get IRO to provide the related security advisories to determine the extent to which licensees may be redacting information differently.

I'll provide an impact assessment that focuses on the license renewal program, which Mr. Kane believes will be of significant interest to the Commission. I'd like you to work with Chet to develop joint "sensitive information criteria" and TJ to check the MD 3.4 document list for potentially sensitive incoming documents [note that we're holding the St Lucie renewal application until Monday so we and OGC can develop guidance for the DCD on redacting the application to produce a publically accessible version in ADAMS]. I'd also like you to review the impact summary to determine whether there are other impacts in the reactor arena that are noteworthy. If you need assistance, let me know and I'll try to arrange for assistance. Thanks

**CC:** Brian Sheron; Bruce Boger; Chester Poslusny; David Skeen; Diane Case; Frank Gillespie; Janice Moore; John Zwolinski; Jon Johnson; Joseph Shea; Leslie Barnett; Rajender Auluck; Richard Borchardt; Robert Perch; Stephen Hoffman; Stephen Koenick; Suzanne Black

L-61