

Kay Flynn

place in  
000000-PU  
for filming  
**ORIGINAL**

**From:** Beth Keating  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 06, 2000 3:50 PM  
**To:** Kay Flynn  
**Subject:** RE: 930485- generic investigation into proper regulatory treatment of inside wire

Sounds good to me.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kay Flynn  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 06, 2000 3:31 PM  
**To:** Sally Simmons  
**Cc:** Beth Keating  
**Subject:** RE: 930485- generic investigation into proper regulatory treatment of inside wire

Normally, I ask for a memorandum but in the interest of expediency (since I have several other closed dockets to ask about), I will use this e-mail for purposes of returning the documents in this docket if both Legal and CMU agree they can be returned.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Sally Simmons  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 06, 2000 3:28 PM  
**To:** Beth Keating  
**Cc:** Kay Flynn  
**Subject:** RE: 930485- generic investigation into proper regulatory treatment of inside wire

If it is OK with Legal, it's OK with CMU -- we don't have any use for the info, and this old data can't possibly be confidential.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Beth Keating  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 06, 2000 3:16 PM  
**To:** Kay Flynn; Sally Simmons  
**Subject:** RE: 930485- generic investigation into proper regulatory treatment of inside wire

Per our previous conversations regarding this subject with Noreen, it is my understanding that even if documents were entered into the record, after the docket has closed and any opportunity for appeal has expired, we may still return the documents to the company if we no longer need them. Actually, I think we got into this conversation with regard to 931090. Anyway, seems like we decided that at some point we could just send the stuff back. In view of the fact that this docket has been closed for 5 years, and it is unlikely that information confidential in 1995 would still be confidential now---much less needed by staff, I believe we can send this information back. Sally, do you agree?

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kay Flynn  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 06, 2000 2:15 PM  
**To:** Beth Keating  
**Subject:** 930485- generic investigation into proper regulatory treatment of inside wire

- AFA \_\_\_\_\_
- APP \_\_\_\_\_
- CAF \_\_\_\_\_
- CMU \_\_\_\_\_
- CTR \_\_\_\_\_
- EAG \_\_\_\_\_
- LEG \_\_\_\_\_
- MAS \_\_\_\_\_
- OPC \_\_\_\_\_
- RRR \_\_\_\_\_
- SEC \_\_\_\_\_
- WAW \_\_\_\_\_
- OTH \_\_\_\_\_

These are the documents that never had a ruling before this docket closed in June of 1995:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
**04302 APR-68**  
Kay to Kay

05511-94, 06784-94, 06804-94, 07078-94, 09112-94, and 09853-94.

Staff assigned from CMU were Mike Reith, Joe Lombardi, and Chris Taylor, none of whom are still here. However, I had a memo from Sally in 1998 advising me to return all documents but these, which were entered in the record.

Kay