

NR_key_name: 08878071CA2A91F58525667E001C2437

SendTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Laura Denk/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 09/13/1998

DisplayDate_Time: 1:09:16 AM

ComposedDate: 09/13/1998

ComposedDate_Time: 1:07:23 AM

Subject: Re: acknowledgements section revised

Of course you are right about not making judgments about who the most helpful people were. And, anyway, if we make those kinds of calls about members of the public, wouldn't we then be going down a slippery slope so that we should make them about former staff, too? (Just kidding.)Thanks.To: Laura Denk/ARRBcc: Eileen Sullivan/ARRB Date: 09/12/98 04:28:52 PMSubject: acknowledgements section revisedLaura:I inserted former staff members and interns, expert conference participants, and alphabetized the hearing witnesses. The lists are both vertical and horizontal -- I don't know which way you want it. Let me know and I will make it consistent.I noted in the "Others" section that I am not sure about including members of the public because we may forget someone, and we also appear to be making a judgment about who was helpful/more legitimate than others. What do you think?here it is

Body:

recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: