

January 25, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: William D. Travers  
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Annette L. Vietti-Cook, Secretary /RA/

SUBJECT: STAFF REQUIREMENTS - COMSECY-01-0030 - GUIDANCE TO  
THE STAFF ON RELEASE OF INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

The Commission has disapproved the criteria presented in COMSECY-01-0030. The staff should revise the criteria as discussed below and provide the revised criteria for Commission approval.

(EDO)

(SECY Suspense:

3/4/02

4/2/02

General Comments

1. Information should be considered for withholding only if the release of the information could provide a clear and significant benefit to a terrorist in a potential attack. There needs to be a clear nexus to aiding a potential terrorist in any information we withhold, and that information has to be information that only we and our licensees control. Information of a general nature or that is of marginal relevance should not be withheld. *stop to provide samples?*
2. The NRC should not withhold information that is already currently widely available to the public. For example, information that had been previously placed in the physical PDRs or previously on the NRC web page should not necessarily be considered "currently widely available". However, information currently available to the public via ADAMS or the web may be considered widely available.
3. Any decision to withhold information should be guided by a balancing of the costs and benefits of withholding. Among the considerations, the staff should examine whether release is needed to meet our strategic goals, including efficiently communicating with and informing the public, other stakeholders, States, or Tribal or local communities. If the balancing is uncertain the information should be released.
4. Any withholding of information should be narrow.
5. Alternative means should be provided for the release of relevant information on important public subjects in a fashion that would not provide significant assistance to a terrorist. The staff should be prepared to redact details or to rewrite important

SECY NOTE: THIS PAPER CONTAINS SENSITIVE MATERIAL AND WILL BE  
LIMITED TO NRC UNLESS THE COMMISSION DETERMINES OTHERWISE.

B-54

documents to eliminate sensitive information.

6. The staff should develop a process that will involve management review of withholding decisions so as to ensure that the principles are applied in a uniform manner. The staff should identify a final decision maker if there is a difference of opinion as to whether something should be released to the public. The guidance should advise the staff to screen all incoming and outgoing documents for sensitivity for security reasons. Similarly, guidance should be developed as to how information that meets the stringent limits for non-disclosure is to be handled and protected. The staff should also develop a process for licensees to use to identify and submit documents that contain information that the staff would not release to the public under the guidelines. ADK  
OCIO  
DER/NHSS
7. In attempting to limit release of sensitive information, the staff should generally avoid providing information to one group of interested stakeholders, and not providing it to other interested stakeholders.
8. The staff must continue to comply with any obligation to release information that is required by law. For example, staff must release information that is subject to the Freedom of Information Act unless an exemption applies. The guidance does not alter the standards governing FOIA compliance. OGC
9. The staff should work with OGC to explore a potentially more expansive view of section 147 safeguards information. The staff should ensure that safeguards information is consistently identified and secured. ADK
10. In developing the revised criteria, the staff should ensure that it is consistent with any final guidance concerning the release of "sensitive homeland security information."
11. Although the guidance should be revised entirely in light of these general comments, observations on the specific proposed criteria are provided to illuminate the Commission's views on the application of these considerations to the specific proposals.

Criterion 1

12. Although it is possible that Emergency Plans might include information of interest to a terrorist, the need for such information by the public may require that it continue to be publicly accessible. Access to this type of information should not be unnecessarily restricted and Emergency Plan information that is restricted should be specifically justified and possibly reclassified as safeguards information.
13. Rather than withholding an entire Final Safety Analysis Report, it may be appropriate to hold back only certain sections containing information meeting the threshold for withholding.
14. The Commission is opposed to withholding physical protection and emergency planning performance indicators or inspection findings (except of course for the backup information on physical protection inspection findings which is safeguards information). Specifically, adverse OSRE findings that are promptly corrected, and a color finding in

SECY NOTE: THIS PAPER CONTAINS SENSITIVE MATERIAL AND WILL BE LIMITED TO NRC UNLESS THE COMMISSION DETERMINES OTHERWISE.

an OSRE, posted months after the OSRE, will make no plant more likely to be targeted.

15. In order to achieve the narrowing of the withholding, this criterion could be revised along the lines of "Plant-specific information, entirely in NRC's and our licensees' control, that would clearly aid in planning an assault on a facility. An example might be drawings depicting the location of vital equipment within plant buildings."

#### Criterion 2

16. There is no point in withholding information as to the specific location of a facility because this information is already widely known and is readily available from non-NRC sources. Attempting to withhold information that is known to the public would serve no purpose other than to breed suspicion.

#### Criterion 3

17. In order to achieve the narrowing of the withholding, this could be rewritten as "Physical vulnerabilities or weaknesses of nuclear facilities which would clearly be useful to terrorists, such as site specific security measures, access controls, or personnel clearance procedures.

#### Criterion 5

18. In order to achieve the narrowing of the withholding, this could be revised by changing "could" to "clearly would", and "any" to "key."

#### Criterion 6

19. Information such as to the quantities of nuclear material that are authorized to be possessed may be used for legitimate purposes and at the same time be of no use to a terrorist. For example, information concerning the types and quantities of material at a SDMP site may be of interest to the public, but pose no security concerns. Access to this type of information should not be unnecessarily restricted.
20. The amount of radioactive material authorized to a licensee is docketed information and generally appears on the license as a possession limit for most materials licensees. For nuclear power plants, one can calculate approximately how much material is in the reactor core and spent fuel pools.
21. The staff should consider classifying the amount of HEU present at category 1 fuel cycle facilities.

#### New Criterion

22. The staff should withhold information in any type of agency document (e.g., plant status report, press release) that provides the current status or configuration of systems and equipment that could be used to determine facility vulnerabilities if used by an

SECY NOTE: THIS PAPER CONTAINS SENSITIVE MATERIAL AND WILL BE LIMITED TO NRC UNLESS THE COMMISSION DETERMINES OTHERWISE.

adversary. This does not include general conditions such as 100 percent power or shutdown.

cc: Chairman Meserve  
Commissioner Dicus  
Commissioner Diaz  
Commissioner McGaffigan  
Commissioner Merrifield  
OGC  
CFO  
OCA  
OIG  
OPA

SECY NOTE: THIS PAPER CONTAINS SENSITIVE MATERIAL AND WILL BE  
LIMITED TO NRC UNLESS THE COMMISSION DETERMINES OTHERWISE.