

NR_key_name: EF2E69FF273BD5548525623F00806F7D
SendTo: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Chet Rhodes/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 09/22/1995
DisplayDate_Time: 7:23:08 PM
ComposedDate: 09/22/1995
ComposedDate_Time: 7:22:51 PM
Subject: Re: review track database
What do you think?To: Chet Rhodes/ARRBcc: Phil Golrick/ARRBFrom: Jeremy Gunn/ARRBDate: 09/11/95
02:53:06 PMSubject: Re: review track databaseChet--Please try to take care of this.To: Chet Rhodes/ARRBcc:
Jeremy Gunn/ARRB, David Marwell/ARRB, Kevin Tiernan/ARRB From: Phil Golrick/ARRB Date: 09/11/95
02:43:55 PMSubject: review track databasel think we've talked about this before . . . The Review Track
database needs more flexibility in pairing (or tripling, etc.) together multiple grounds for a single redaction. As
it is now, for example, a redaction taken on both confidential informant (Section 6(4)) and personal privacy
(Section 6(3)) grounds must be analyzed as separate postponements. This results in double-counting in the
number of "ARRB Releases" or "Sustained Postponements" stated in the automatically-generated draft notice
for the Federal Register. As we move toward high-volume postponement review, it will be increasingly
burdensome to identify and correct such discrepancies before sending the notice to the Federal Register for
publication.
Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: