

**From:** Mindy Landau  
**To:** Annette Vietti-Cook; Ashok Thadani; Debra Engel; Donald Hassell; Elizabeth Shelburne; Ellis Merschoff; Francine Goldberg; Frank Congel; Frederick Sturz; Gilbert Millman; Hubert J. Miller; Jim Dyer; Karen Cyr; Luis Reyes; Lynn Scattolini; Margie Kotzalas; Mark Delligatti; Martin Virgilio; Mary Pat Siemien; Michael Springer; Patricia Rathbun; Paul Lohaus; Richard Rosano; Richard Wessman; Samuel Collins; Stuart Reiter; W. Beecher; Wayne Burnside; William Reckley  
**Date:** 3/15/02 3:56PM  
**Subject:** Re: Withholding Sensitive Homeland Security Information

Annette,

You are correct. The working group believed that a comprehensive review of ADAMS was almost impossible from a resource standpoint. The documents that were deliberately removed from the web (before it shut down entirely) were also removed from ADAMS. Once the web came back up, there were still many documents available in ADAMS that had not been deliberately removed. We will be in a forward-looking posture for some time and giving newer documents priority, but once we have our reviews in place, we can start re-posting older documents, to the extent they are still of high public interest. Not all documents need to be posted on the web... that's why we have ADAMS. There may be some stray documents that staff come across in ADAMS that meet the criteria.. these will be pulled as we become aware of them. I think we are on the same wavelength....

>>> Annette Vietti-Cook 03/15/02 03:47PM >>>

Just to be clear on one point, as you know when we shut down the WEB many documents that were no longer available on the WEB could still be access through ADAMS (these same documents were never pulled out of ADAMS), am I to intrepret the guidance to say that documents that were on the NRC external web page, but were withdrawn in response to 9/11 events will be reviewed against the criteria before being posted to the web again, even though they have been available in ADAMS this whole time? Alternatively, if we decided they met a criteria, we would then pull the document from ADAMS even though it has been available through ADAMS the whole time. I believe this is the Commission's intent although it was not particularly clear in the SRM. The reason I ask is that we have the Commission's Activities page that has 6 years of SECY's, SRMs, Commission Voting Records, COM's, Commission Transcripts, and Orders that would require review. Once the guidance is approved, we will be working with the originators of the documents to make release determinations and treat items as a package as we do now (e.g., if the SECY/COM is sensitive and should not be released, we would treat the SRM and Voting Record the same way).

>>> Mindy Landau 03/14/02 02:39PM >>>

Attached is a draft memorandum to the Commission which responds to an SRM dated January 25, 2002 on this subject. Staff representing various offices directly impacted by this topic have participated in a working group which helped to develop the response and the revised guidance. We anticipate keeping the working group intact for a few months longer to assist in clarifying this guidance to other members of your staff who handle certain types of information. Because of the Commission's strong interest in this topic, please notify me by March 20 if you have any problems with the memo.

Thanks,

Mindy Landau  
OEDO  
415-8703

**CC:** David Gamberoni; Emile Julian; Ken Hart; Patricia Norry; Ramin Assa; Sandy Joosten

P-54