NR_key_name:	6B8D17D39F91666A852563CA0067B136
SendTo:	CN=Tracy Shycoff/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:	CN=Cathy Rodriguez/O=ARRB @ ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:	
BlindCopyTo:	CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From:	CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:	
DisplayDate:	10/21/1996
DisplayDate_Time:	2:53:39 PM
ComposedDate:	10/21/1996
ComposedDate_Time:	2:52:36 PM
Subject:	Re: File Number
Body:	4.50 seems "cleaner" for a whole new type of file. I propose we use this, unless there is some problem. Please let me know, as I would like to announce this at the 3:00 meeting.To:Jeremy Gunn/ARRBcc:Cathy Rodriguez/ARRBFrom:Tracy Shycoff/ARRBDate:10/21/96 02:17:47 PMSubject: Re: File NumberI apologize for the hold up on this--it was me. I spoke with David about this because I thought that you had wanted to add a new series (like 11.0) and needed to check with him first. He thought, as did you apparently, that it should be added to the four series.4.35 is the next number available in the four series. If you have not objections, Cathy will add that number and make a file.I do think that when appropriate, the docs should be cross filed to the appropriate existing issue file. Do you think this is right?To:Tracy Shycoff/ARRB, Cathy Rodriguez/ARRBcc: From:Jeremy Gunn/ARRB Date:10/21/96 01:13:37 PMSubject:File NumberA few weeks ago we discussed having a file number for "wrap up" research memos. I don't see any number in the file plan. Is the number 4.50 acceptable?
recstat:	Record
DeliveryPriority:	N
DeliveryReport:	B
ReturnReceipt:	
Categories:	