

Dear FOIA Requester:

The FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, which was enacted on June 30, 2016, made several changes to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Federal agencies must revise their FOIA regulations to reflect those changes by December 27, 2016. In addition to revising our regulations, we intend to update the Form 464, which we use to respond to FOIA requests.

In the interim, please see the comment box in Part I.C of the attached Form 464. The comment box includes information related to the recent changes to FOIA that is applicable to your FOIA request, including an updated time period for filing an administrative appeal with the NRC.

Sincerely yours,

Stephanie Blaney /S/

Stephanie Blaney
FOIA Officer

RESPONSE TO FREEDOM OF
INFORMATION ACT (FOIA) REQUEST

2017-0002

1

RESPONSE
TYPE

INTERIM



FINAL

REQUESTER:

Lawrence Criscione

DATE:

MAR 07 2017

DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED RECORDS:

Records corresponding to items 2 (ML16216A713) and 4 (ML16236A018) of your request, as further explained in the Comments Section, below.

PART I. -- INFORMATION RELEASED

- ☐ Agency records subject to the request are already available in public ADAMS or on microfiche in the NRC Public Document Room.
- ☒ Agency records subject to the request are enclosed.
- ☐ Records subject to the request that contain information originated by or of interest to another Federal agency have been referred to that agency (see comments section) for a disclosure determination and direct response to you.
- ☒ We are continuing to process your request.
- ☒ See Comments.

PART I.A -- FEES

AMOUNT*

\$

*See Comments for details

- ☐ You will be billed by NRC for the amount listed.
- ☒ None. Minimum fee threshold not met.
- ☐ You will receive a refund for the amount listed.
- ☐ Fees waived.

PART I.B -- INFORMATION NOT LOCATED OR WITHHELD FROM DISCLOSURE

- ☐ We did not locate any agency records responsive to your request. *Note:* Agencies may treat three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records as not subject to the FOIA ("exclusions"). 5 U.S.C. 552(c). This is a standard notification given to all requesters; it should not be taken to mean that any excluded records do, or do not, exist.
- ☒ We have withheld certain information pursuant to the FOIA exemptions described, and for the reasons stated, in Part II.
- ☒ Because this is an interim response to your request, you may not appeal at this time. We will notify you of your right to appeal any of the responses we have issued in response to your request when we issue our final determination.
- ☐ You may appeal this final determination within 30 calendar days of the date of this response by sending a letter or email to the FOIA Officer, at U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, or FOIA.Resource@nrc.gov. Please be sure to include on your letter or email that it is a "FOIA Appeal."

PART I.C COMMENTS (Use attached Comments continuation page if required)

In conformance with the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, the NRC is informing you that you have the right to seek assistance from the NRC's FOIA Public Liaison.

This interim response addresses two of the four records enumerated in your request. Since the date of your request, these records have been removed from ADAMS. However, because the NRC was able to locate them by the accession numbers when your request was received, we have processed the records.

[continued on next page]

SIGNATURE - FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT OFFICER

Stephanie A. Blaney 

2017-0002

1

**RESPONSE TO FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
ACT (FOIA) REQUEST Continued**

RESPONSE
TYPE



INTERIM



FINAL

REQUESTER:

Lawrence Criscione

DATE:

MAR 07 2017

PART I.C COMMENTS (Continued)

ML16216A713 is a copy of a FOIA request, FOIA-2013-0262, to which the requester attached a copy of a page from the Commission's 2d Quarter Operating Plan FY-2013 (which is ML13149A079). The 2d Quarter Operating Plan was the subject of prior FOIA requests, FOIA-2013-0261, and its appeal, FOIA-2013-0021A, and FOIA-2016-0117. The Plan was denied in full pursuant to FOIA exemption 5. A copy of the FOIA request letter is enclosed with this response; however, the one-page attachment from the 2d Quarter Operating Plan FY-2013 (ML 13149A079) continues to be withheld under FOIA exemption 5.

ML16236A018 is an email exchange between yourself and NRO staff, to which a red-lined draft of a "Style Sheet", including personal advice and recommendations about writing style by its author, was attached. This draft was not finalized, although it is similar to NUREG-1379 NRC Editorial Style Guide. It is also noted that the focus of the email exchange was a particular template NRO used to write reviews of post-Fukushima Recommendation 2.1 Flood Hazard Reevaluation Reports, which is different altogether from the red-lined draft you had attached to your email. A copy of the email exchange is enclosed.

**RESPONSE TO FREEDOM OF
INFORMATION ACT (FOIA) REQUEST**

2017-0002#1

DATE:

MAR 07 2017

PART II.A -- APPLICABLE EXEMPTIONS

Records subject to the request are being withheld in their entirety or in part under the FOIA exemption(s) as indicated below (5 U.S.C. 552(b)).

- ☐ Exemption 1: The withheld information is properly classified pursuant to an Executive Order protecting national security information.
- ☐ Exemption 2: The withheld information relates solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of NRC.
- ☐ Exemption 3: The withheld information is specifically exempted from public disclosure by the statute indicated.
- ☐ Sections 141-145 of the Atomic Energy Act, which prohibits the disclosure of Restricted Data or Formerly Restricted Data (42 U.S.C. 2161-2165).
- ☐ Section 147 of the Atomic Energy Act, which prohibits the disclosure of Unclassified Safeguards Information (42 U.S.C. 2167).
- ☐ 41 U.S.C. 4702(b), which prohibits the disclosure of contractor proposals, except when incorporated into the contract between the agency and the submitter of the proposal.
- ☐ Exemption 4: The withheld information is a trade secret or confidential commercial or financial information that is being withheld for the reason(s) indicated.
- ☐ The information is considered to be proprietary because it concerns a licensee's or applicant's physical protection or material control and accounting program for special nuclear material pursuant to 10 CFR 2.390(d)(1).
- ☐ The information is considered to be another type or confidential business (proprietary) information.
- ☐ The information was submitted by a foreign source and received in confidence pursuant to 10 CFR 2.390(d)(2).
- ☒ Exemption 5: The withheld information consists of interagency or intraagency records that are normally privileged in civil litigation.
- ☒ Deliberative process privilege.
- ☐ Attorney work product privilege.
- ☐ Attorney-client privilege.
- ☐ Exemption 6: The withheld information from a personnel, medical, or similar file, is exempted from public disclosure because its disclosure would result in a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
- ☐ Exemption 7: The withheld information consists of records compiled for law enforcement purposes and is being withheld for the reason(s) indicated.
- ☐ (A) Disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with an open enforcement proceeding.
- ☐ (C) Disclosure could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.
- ☐ (D) The information consists of names and other information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to reveal identities of confidential sources.
- ☐ (E) Disclosure would reveal techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions, or guidelines that could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law.
- ☐ (F) Disclosure could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of an individual.
- ☐ Other

PART II.B -- DENYING OFFICIALS**In accordance with 10 CFR 9.25(g) and 9.25(h) of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations, the official(s) listed below have made the determination to withhold certain information responsive to your request.**

DENYING OFFICIAL	TITLE/OFFICE	RECORDS DENIED	APPELLATE OFFICIAL	
			EDO	SECY
Stephanie A. Blaney	FOIA Officer	ML16236A018	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rochelle Bavol	Executive Assistant to SECY to the COMM	ML13149A079 (2d Q Operating Plan FY13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appeals must be made in writing within 30 calendar days of the date of this response by sending a letter or email to the FOIA Officer, at U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, or FOIA.Resource@nrc.gov. Please be sure to include on your letter or email that it is a "FOIA Appeal."

FOIA REQUEST

Case No: 2013-0262
Date Rec'd: 6/12/13
Specialist: HILGARD
Referral Code: 2013-0008

FOIA Resource

From: Lawrence Criscione <lcriscione@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2013 10:32 PM
To: Sealing, Donna; FOIA Resource
Cc: tomd@whistleblower.org; Billie Garde; sshepherd@cliffordgarde.com; Dave Lochbaum; Tom Zeller; jruch@peer.org; kdouglas@peer.org; Louis Clark; cmcmullen@osc.gov; clerner@osc.gov; Michal Freedhoff; Houlihan Bill
Subject: FOIA Request for November 15, 2012 submissions of FOIA 2013-0008/13 and January 25, 2013 "Referral Package" mentioned in ML13149A079

Ms. Sealing:

Please process this email as a Freedom of Information Act request.

ML13149A079, "Second Quarter Operating Plan FY-2013", contains a 23-page table which stretches from page 12 to page 34. The table does not have a title but appears to be a listing of all open FOIA requests in the offices of the Commission (although this might not be the case since FOIA request 2013-0127 and FOIA appeal 2013-010A are not on the list).

On page 25 of the table there are two entries for FOIA 2013-0008. One of the entries shows that FOIA 2013-0008 was received by the NRC on October 10, 2012 and provided to the SECY/Commission that same day. The entry further shows that the SECY completed the processing of FOIA 2013-0008 on October 26, 2012 and provided their final submittal to the FOIA office on November 15, 2012.

FOIA 2013-0008 is the tracking number which the NRC assigned to the October 9, 2012 (ML12283A329) FOIA request from Dave Lochbaum in which he requested one document:

Letter dated September 18, 2012, from NRC staffer Lawrence Criscione to NRC Chairman Alison Macfarlane about nuclear plant vulnerabilities to flooding.

I have not seen the acknowledgement letter which we provided to Mr. Lochbaum, but I assume that - like all our acknowledgement letters in the past two years - we took advantage of the March 11, 2011 earthquake and tsunami in Japan to allot ourselves an extra 10 working days to process Dave's FOIA. Note that the SECY completed the FOIA request by October 26, 2012 (12 working days after receiving it) so the legally mandated 20 working day window could have easily been met. But assuming we gave ourselves the extra 10 working days, the 30 day window for processing Dave's FOIA would have expired on November 21, 2012. Since the SECY submitted the requested document to the FOIA office by November 15, 2012, this should have allowed plenty of time to get Mr. Lochbaum his requested document within the legally required time frame prescribed in the Freedom of Information Act.

As with most FOIA's at the NRC, the 20 & 30 working day windows came and went without any documents being provided. Then, after waiting 17 weeks, on February 6, 2013 we provided Mr. Lochbaum a partial response to his FOIA request (ML13039A087). This "partial response" did not contain the one and only document requested by Mr. Lochbaum, but instead contained three documents which had been released by NRR under previous FOIA requests and two other NRR documents which had been sent to the Chairman in the same email that had transmitted the requested letter. Since the SECY had completed the processing of the

2012-09-18 letter to the Chairman on October 26, 2012, it is not understood why this letter was not included in the first partial response sent to Mr. Lochbaum.

On February 20, 2013 we sent Dave a second partial response ([ML13051A897](#)) and on April 9, 2013 we sent him a third ([ML13099A248](#)). As with the first partial response, the one and only document he had actually requested (i.e. the 2012-09-18 letter to the NRC Chairman) was not included despite it having been processed by the SECY by October 26, 2012. In fact, after nearly nine months (167 working days) we have still not provided Mr. Lochbaum the sole document he requested under FOIA 2013-0008.

On page 26 of the table in ML13149A079, there is an entry for FOIA 2013-0013 showing that it was received by the NRC on October 16, 2012 and provided to the Commission SECY that same day. The entry further shows that the SECY completed the processing of FOIA 2013-0013 on October 26, 2012 and provided their final submittal to the FOIA office on November 15, 2012.

FOIA 2013-0013 is the tracking number which the NRC assigned to the October 16, 2012 ([ML12290A070](#)) FOIA request by Tom Zeller in which he requested two documents:

The September 18, 2012 email and letter from Lawrence Criscione to Chairman Macfarlane regarding the Lake Jocassee Dam and the threat to Oconee Nuclear Station.

At the time, Mr. Zeller was working on an article regarding the NRC's handling of the flooding concerns which a catastrophic failure of the Lake Jocassee Dam poses to the three reactors of the Oconee Nuclear Station and he thusly requested expedited processing of his request. I am unaware of whether or not we formally denied Tom's request for expedited processing, but we certainly did not honor it. After 162 working days, we have still not provided Mr. Zeller the two documents for which he requested expedited processing.

On February 27, 2013 ([ML13064A211](#)) we provided Mr. Zeller a "partial response" which contained a listing of seven records which had already been released to others under separate FOIA requests. None of the documents provided had been specifically requested under FOIA 2012-0013 and the two documents which Mr. Zeller had requested were absent - despite having been provided to the NRC's FOIA office by the SECY on October 26, 2012.

On April 18, 2013 ([ML131060026](#)) we provided Mr. Zeller with a second partial response which again did not contain either of the two documents specifically requested under FOIA 2013-0013.

On page 25 of the table in ML13149A079, there is an entry showing that FOIA 2013-0008 was referred from the NRC FOIA Office back to the SECY on January 25, 2013. This was just over one week after my very confrontational January 17, 2013 interrogation by two special agents of the NRC's Office of the Inspector General regarding to whom in Congress I copied my 2012-09-18 letter and whether or not my actions constituted a federal felony under 18 USC § 1030. The entry further shows that the "Referral Package" was sent to the SECY/Commission on February 1, 2013, was due back to the FOIA office on February 8, 2013, but after having the referral over 18 weeks has yet to be processed by the Office of the Chairman.

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (5 USC § 552) and NRC regulations (10 CFR § 9.25) I request that within 20 working days the NRC either provide me the following documents or provide me an explanation as to what exemptions authorize their withholding:

1. Any and all correspondence, emails, memos and notes regarding the Office of the Chairman's November 15, 2012 submittal of FOIA package 2013-0008 and 2013-0013 to the NRC FOIA Office, including the versions of the 2012-09-18 email and letter which were submitted (please refer to the entries regarding incoming FOIA requests for 2013-0008 and 2013-0013 on pages 25 and 26 of ML13149A079).
2. Any and all correspondence, emails, memos and notes regarding the "Referral Package" of FOIA 2013-0008 which was received from the FOIA Office on January 25, 2013 and sent to the SECY/Commission on February 1, 2013 (please refer to the last entry on the table of p. 25 of ML13149A079).

Although expedited processing might be justified, I am not requesting any special treatment of this FOIA request. All I ask is that you follow federal law and our own NRC regulations and either provide me unredacted versions of the requested documents within 20 working days (i.e. by July 10, 2013) or provide me with an explanation as to why the requested documents cannot be provided. I realize that the NRC is blanketly extending all FOIA requests due to the March 11, 2011 earthquake and tsunami that occurred in Japan, but I hardly think that issue will legitimately prevent you from meeting the 20 working day allotment for this request.

I do not intend to pay any fees to obtain the documents above. I believe I have aptly described what I am seeking and your search time should be minimal. Additionally, the information requested pertains to three apparently high profile and contentious FOIA requests and at least one FOIA appeal and thus these documents should be readily obtained by the involved parties.

Describe the purpose for which you intend to use the requested information.

Like Mr. Lochbaum and Mr. Zeller, I too have an outstanding FOIA request for my 2012-09-18 email and letter to the NRC Chairman (FOIA 2013-0127). My request (February 13, 2013) is nearly four months old and the appeal of that request (FOIA 2013-010A submitted on March 29, 2013) is 51 working days old, yet I still have not received the two documents I requested. I need the documents requested in items 1 and 2 above so that I might use them in a law suit I am preparing concerning some of my overdue FOIA appeals and so that I might use them in filling out an OSC Form 12 regarding the NRC's blatant violation of the time commitments prescribed in the Freedom of Information Act.

Explain the extent to which you will extract and analyze the substantive content of the requested records.

I will thoroughly read every word of every document you provide me so that I might understand the NRC's rationale for not following its legally required time commitments under the FOIA and its own regulations with regard to its processing of FOIA 2013-0008, 2013-0013, 2013-0127 and 2013-010A.

Describe the nature of the specific activity or research in which you will use the requested records and the specific qualifications you possess to utilize information for the intended purpose in such a way that it will contribute to public understanding.

I hold a Professional Engineer's (PE) license in the State of Iowa in the Nuclear Engineering Branch. I am a former NRC licensed Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) and was formerly a Prospective Nuclear Engineer Officer (PNEO) in the US Navy's submarine force. I am a Risk Professional and current work as a Risk & Reliability Engineer in the NRC's Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES). I intend to use these documents to gain an understanding of what, if anything, is preventing the NRC from meeting its legally required time commitments for processing FOIA 2013-0008, 2013-0013, 2013-0127 and 2013-010A. I will share my findings with Mr. Lochbaum of the Union of Concerned Scientists, Mr. Zeller of the Huffington Post, Mr. Ruch of Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, Mr. Devine of the Government Accountability Project and with

any other member of the public, member of the press, or member of a public watchdog group who expresses interest in the matter.

Describe the likely impact on the public's understanding of the subject, compared to the level of public understanding of the subject before disclosure of the requested information.

I think that when the public realizes why the NRC is violating their Freedom of Information Act required time commitments, they will have a better understanding that the NRC's Office of the Chairman has been keeping important information from them in order to protect her image.

Describe the size and nature of the public segment whose understanding will be increased by disclosing the requested information.

Possibly a dozen individuals due to my efforts.

Describe the means by which you intend to disseminate the requested information to the general public.

I do not intend to directly disseminate the requested information to the general public. I intend file an OSC Form 12 and to file a lawsuit in FOIA court. I intend to share the documents pertaining to my OSC disclosure and lawsuit with Mr. Zeller, Mr. Lochbaum, and anyone else interested.

Indicate whether you will provide public access to the requested information free of charge or in return for an access or publication fee.

I do not intend to provide the public any access to the requested information either free or for a fee. I intend for the NRC to disseminate this information free of charge by making it publicly available in ADAMS.

Describe any commercial or private interest that you or any other party may have in the requested records.

I have no commercial interest in these records. My private interest is I am a believer in Open Government and am being harassed by the NRC's Office of the Inspector General for providing "Official Use Only - Security-Related Information" to Congressional staffers and the US Special Counsel.

There are some within the NRC who might claim this FOIA request contains "allegations". This email is merely a request for documents under the Freedom of Information Act. Although I believe the NRC Office of the Chairman has been stonewalling the release of my 2012-09-18 letter to the Chairman, the intent of this email is not to make that allegation. The purpose of this FOIA request is to obtain documents to refine my understanding of why my 2012-09-18 letter has not yet been released. Once I believe I have a sufficient understanding of why the NRC is disregarding the Freedom of Information Act time limits with regard to FOIA 2013-0008, 2013-0013, 2013-0127 and 2013-010A, I intend to make an allegation to the US Office of the Special Counsel via an OSC Form 12 disclosure. Please process this email as a request under the Freedom of Information Act and do not waste the taxpayers' money by submitting yet another allegation to the Office of the Inspector General.

I work in Rockville, MD and make it home to Illinois infrequently. Please correspond with me via email regarding this matter or call/text me at 573-230-3959. If there are documents you must provide to me as hardcopies, please contact me by phone or email and I will come by the FOIA desk to pick them up. I will pay whatever fees are required to obtain the requested document.

V/r,
Larry Criscione
573-230-3959

Page 1 of 1

Withheld pursuant to exemption

(b)(5)

of the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act

Criscione, Lawrence

From: Cook, Christopher
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 7:35 AM
To: Criscione, Lawrence; Salley, MarkHenry; Peters, Sean
Cc: Rivera-Varona, Aida; Harvey, Brad; Correia, Richard
Subject: RE: response: Style Sheet for JLD Flooding Review Documents
Attachments: R2.1_SA_Template_FINAL_ML13218A150.pdf

The 66-page redlined draft is withheld in full under ex5.

Larry,

The file you attached is a draft job aid that Mark McBride created (he called it a Style Sheet), but he did not finish it before he retired. No one has worked on the job aid since he retired.

Our staff assessment template is ML13218A150 (attached) and was completed in September 2013. Please note that the template is a non-public document in ADAMS.

Since 2014, we have issued approximately 22 staff assessments. Over the years, our staff assessments have evolved as a result of Commission direction and as we have tried to improve our products. For example, all staff assessments issued in 2016 were written after issuance of an Interim Staff Letter (ISR) to the licensee (for example, here's Salem Generating Station's ISR Letter: ML15244B266). In 2013 and when the template was finished, the concept of an ISR did not exist. Therefore, if you compare our most recent staff assessment to the template, you will see that our staff assessments generally follow the 2013 template. However, we also evolved as the process changed in response to Commission direction plus we're always trying to improve.

In summary, the best guidance I can provide is a reference to our most recent staff assessments plus the attached 2013 template.

Regards,
Chris

From: Criscione, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 12:56 PM
To: Cook, Christopher <Christopher.Cook@nrc.gov>; Salley, MarkHenry <MarkHenry.Salley@nrc.gov>; Peters, Sean <Sean.Peters@nrc.gov>
Cc: Rivera-Varona, Aida <Aida.Rivera-Varona@nrc.gov>; Harvey, Brad <Brad.Harvey@nrc.gov>; Correia, Richard <Richard.Correia@nrc.gov>
Subject: RE: response: Style Sheet for JLD Flooding Review Documents

Chris,

I got the document from an NRO colleague who received it from Mark McBride in 2015.

I'm reviewing the Chairman's response to the Office of Special Counsel's referral regarding my disclosure on the NRC's handling of flooding hazards.

The flooding reviews are being conducted as "staff assessments" vice as "safety evaluations". Safety evaluations are handled under LIC-101. I'm trying to determine what the guidance is for "staff assessments".

The purpose of my questions to you are two-fold:

1. To find out if the attached document is the only guidance there is for conducting staff assessments and, if there is other guidance, to find out where it is at so I can review it.

2. To find a clean copy of the attached document so that I can reference it in my comments on the Chairman's response to the Office of Special Counsel.

So, that being said:

- Do you know of any guidance your staff uses when conducting their staff assessments of the flooding reviews (other than the attached document)?
- Do you know if the attached version is in ADAMS and—if not—can you tell me who the current document owner is and where I can find the latest version of the document?

Thanks,
Larry
573-230-3959

From: Cook, Christopher
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 12:32 PM
To: Criscione, Lawrence <Lawrence.Criscione@nrc.gov>; Salley, MarkHenry <MarkHenry.Salley@nrc.gov>; Peters, Sean <Sean.Peters@nrc.gov>
Cc: Rivera-Varona, Aida <Aida.Rivera-Varona@nrc.gov>; Harvey, Brad <Brad.Harvey@nrc.gov>
Subject: response: Style Sheet for JLD Flooding Review Documents

Larry,
Where did you find this document? I think it was produced as a job aid for my branch and it lives out on the JLD SharePoint site, but I'm not sure. Can you also let me know the purpose for your question?

I'm also trying to understand the nexus between your 3 questions, our other DRA activities (primarily in DRA/FXHAB), and what you're trying to accomplish.

I've included Mark Salley and Sean Peters in case they prefer to respond instead.

Thanks,
Chris

Christopher B. Cook, Ph.D., P.E.
Chief, Hydrology and Meteorology Branch 1
US NRC, Office of New Reactors
(301) 415-6397
Christopher.Cook@nrc.gov

From: Criscione, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 11:47 AM
To: Cook, Christopher <Christopher.Cook@nrc.gov>
Cc: Rivera-Varona, Aida <Aida.Rivera-Varona@nrc.gov>; Harvey, Brad <Brad.Harvey@nrc.gov>
Subject: RE: Style Sheet for JLD Flooding Review Documents

Chris,

I was told Aida is out sick today and it looks like she is on vacation next week. Mark McBride has apparently retired.

I am attempting to find the guidance used by the NRC staff to conduct the "Staff Assessments" of the flooding reviews. I just spoke with Brad Harvey and he doesn't think we have any such guidance—other than the out-of-date style guide attached to this email.

Do you know of any guidance that your staff uses when conducting their staff assessments of the flooding reviews? Do you know if the attached document is in ADAMS? If not, can you tell me who the current document owner is and where I can find the latest version of the document?

Thank you,
Larry
Lawrence S. Criscione
573-230-3959

From: Criscione, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 11:18 AM
To: Rivera-Varona, Aida <Aida.Rivera-Varona@nrc.gov>
Subject: Style Sheet for JLD Flooding Review Documents

Aida,

The person listed as the owner of the attached document (Mark McBride) no longer works for the NRC but he was in your branch. Do you know where the attached document is located? Is it in ADAMS? Is it possible for me to get the most current revision (i.e. one without unaccepted changes)?

I am trying to find guidance on conducting Staff Assessments. Other than this document, where is the guidance for conducting a Staff Assessment?

Thanks,

Larry

Lawrence S. Criscione
Reliability & Risk Engineer
RES/DRA/HFRB
T10-B44
(573) 230-3959