

From: Ray Gallucci } NR
To: Eva Brown }
Date: Tuesday, November 04, 2003 8:15AM
Subject: RECOMMENDATION Re: Manual Action Public Meeting Notice Accession Numbers

I presume Renee is referring to either the two slides in Sunil's presentation on the SRM or else Dick's Schedule slides, since there are no slides that are otherwise specifically related to the interim enforcement discretion policy. I would assume OE would want to present that portion. The SRM slides merely quote the words from the SRM (with "policy" replacing "interpretation"). There should be no surprises in the Feasibility Criteria slides in my presentation, as these merely restate the existing criteria.

I think the term Feasibility will stay for historic purposes, since ACRS' reasoning regarding the use of the term seemed muddled.

>>> Eva Brown 11/03/03 03:24PM >>> NR
Renee,

Whatever Sunil tells me to call it, that's what I'll do.

I recognize the ACRS recommendation and we'll see whether NRR decides to incorporate that one. I think there is a perception issue with "acceptance criteria." Since the rule has not been issued using "acceptable" in any form seems to be ill-advised as the condition is still a non-compliance. In my mind, "feasible" relates to what can be reasonable accomplished vice what can be regulatorily achieved, and is more consistent with the status of the rulemaking. Just a thought.

As for the slides, we do not intend to post these publicly before the meeting, so there is time for revision. Will OE have any slides? Are you going to need an overhead?

Let me or Dick know.

Eva

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions 5
FOIA- 2004-277

15
DDD-12

✓ >>> Eva Brown 10/31/03 12:58PM >>> *1/11*
Folks,

Attached is the latest and greatest. Feel free to make any corrections or additions. We need to issue this Monday.

Thanks.

Eva
x2315

CC: Sunil Weerakkody