

From: Mindy Landau <sup>EDO</sup>  
 To: William Reckley <sup>NRR</sup>  
 Date: Tue, Oct 23, 2001 2:17 PM  
 Subject: Re: Yellow Announcement

<sup>EDO</sup> [ Jon was the NRR rep. Just let me know.

<sup>NRR release</sup> [ >>> William Reckley 10/23/01 02:04PM >>>  
 If you put NRR or me on concurrence, you can use this email as concurrence. If you specifically want Sam's or other senior NRR mgr on concurrence, I'll have to get back to you.

<sup>EDO</sup> [ >>> Mindy Landau 10/23/01 01:43PM >>>  
 Thanks Bill. Your strikeout takes out a specific element that the ET wanted to include when we discussed this last week (avoiding meetings at licensed sites), so I will leave that in. I'll assume this means I have NRR concurrence. Jon Johnson also forwarded me some comments earlier which I will incorporate.

<sup>NRR release</sup> [ >>> William Reckley 10/23/01 01:25PM >>>  
 I was to collect comments for NRR but having received none, I'll offer a few of mine in order to not delay the Yellow Announcement (if I receive any comments from NRR mgt, I'll forward them as soon as I get them). See attached for redline/strikeout for my suggestions. I have been involved only peripherally up to now and so I apologize if any of my comments were previously considered. I am meeting with OGC this afternoon to discuss how we and licensees may use the provisions of 10CFR 2.790 (or something similar) to withhold some info from public disclosure. If the meeting provides any insights, I'll give you a call.

<sup>EDO</sup> [ >>> Mindy Landau 10/22/01 04:34PM >>>  
 I'm not sure how we would limit remote access. Therefore, I think we would have to make the material non-public. I think that's consistent with our approach over the past few weeks. Recognize, also that this is just an interim policy. Margaret Federline is heading a task force that will decide on the longer term implications and policy decisions.

<sup>NRR release</sup> [ >>> William Reckley 10/22/01 04:09PM >>>  
 To make sure I understand the proposal, when you mention the PARS public library in ADAMS, is the proposal to only limit remote access through ADAMS or would we actually declare such a document as NON-PUBLIC? Under the assumption that we were changing the profile to NON-PUBLIC, an item that we are trying to nail down is in what context we and licensees withhold information from public disclosure (we have traditionally had only had a couple ways to withhold information and except for the criteria that might fall within a reasonable expansion of using "Safeguards Information," there are rules that actually require that licensing info be public records. ) OGC (Don Hassell's group) is working to provide us with an approach but we have not heard back from them yet.

DD-9