

From: Theodore Wingfield
 To: Gilbert Johnson
 Date: 12/29/03 12:34PM
 Subject: Re: Salem/HC Transcript Review

Yes, I think that format will work.

However, I too am only a reviewer ... we'll have to wait for feedback from Scott and/or Eileen to know if we've hit the mark.

-Ted

>>> Gilbert Johnson 12/29/03 12:29PM >>>

Please see attached, first page. Is this what you are expecting for each interview package?

>>> Theodore Wingfield 12/29/03 10:19AM >>>

Attached you will find updated copies of my review summary of 2 transcripts.

I intended to use the table at the beginning of each summary to address the questions/points that Scott detailed in his email sent on 12/24/03.

I also intend to be specific about page numbers going forward (as I did in the [REDACTED] review) as that will make reference at a later date easier.

-Ted

>>> Scott Barber 12/24/03 10:21AM >>>

Appended are the guidelines you should be using for review of transcripts. If you need guidance level of detail to include in your review, please see Eileen Neff in OI for an example.

Identified technical issues should be added to the master binning file (S:\Salem-HC Alleg Binning.wpd) in the appropriate category. A sample is included for your information.

If other transcripts (not Salem NEOs), then a new binning file will need to be created in the appropriate S:subdirectory.

CC: Eileen Neff; Scott Barber

Information in this record was deleted
 in accordance with the Freedom of Information
 Act, exemptions 7C
 FOIA- 2005-0194