

**ABILITY OF AGREEMENT STATES TO PROTECT ALLEGER'S
IDENTITY FROM PUBLIC DISCLOSURE**

| STATE | IS THE STATE ABLE TO PROTECT ALLEGER'S IDENTITY? | COMMENTS ON STATE'S ABILITY TO PROTECT ALLEGER'S IDENTITY |
|------------|--|--|
| Alabama | YES | |
| Arizona | NO | |
| Arkansas | NO | |
| California | YES | |
| Colorado | NO | |
| Florida | NO | |
| Georgia | NO | In a letter dated 2/6/02 from Thomas Hill, the State confirmed that this information is accurate. The letter indicated that if there is a Federal law requiring the allegor's identity to be protected then the State can protect the identity. If the protection of an allegor's identity is based on NRC policy, then Georgia cannot protect the allegor's identity. |
| Illinois | YES | In a letter dated 2/8/02 from Joe Klinger, the State confirmed that they can protect an allegor's identity in a manner equivalent to that described in MD 8.8. |
| Iowa | YES | In an email dated 2/7/02 from George Johns, the State confirmed that they can protect an allegor's identity. |
| Kansas | YES | In an email dated 7/19/02, the State confirmed that they will not disclose an allegor's identity except under a subpeona. |
| Kentucky | NO | No response received from State. Without a clear indication from the State that they can protect the allegor's identity, this information should not be released to the State. |
| Louisiana | NO | |
| Maine | NO | No response received from State. Without a clear indication from the State that they can protect the allegor's identity, this information should not be released to the State. |

| STATE | IS THE STATE ABLE TO PROTECT ALLEGER'S IDENTITY? | COMMENTS ON STATE'S ABILITY TO PROTECT ALLEGER'S IDENTITY |
|----------------|--|--|
| Maryland | NO | No response received from State. Without a clear indication from the State that they can protect the alleger's identity, this information should not be released to the State. |
| Massachusetts | YES | |
| Mississippi | NO | |
| Nebraska | YES | |
| Nevada | NO | |
| New Hampshire | NO | The information must be labeled confidential. |
| New Mexico | NO | |
| New York | NO | |
| North Carolina | YES | |
| North Dakota | YES | |
| Ohio | YES | |
| Oklahoma | YES | |
| Oregon | YES | |
| Rhode Island | NO | |
| South Carolina | YES | |
| Tennessee | NO | |
| Texas | NO | In a letter dated 02/15/02 from Richard Ratliff, the State indicated that if a complainant (allegor) requests anonymity, the State will disclose their identity only in response to an open records request. If an open records request is received, the identity will be disclosed if the investigation has been completed. The only way a complainant can be assured the State will not disclose their identity, is if the State does not have their identity. |
| Utah | YES | In a letter dated 02/07/02 from William Sinclair, the State indicated that State can protect an alleger's identity based on a discussion with the Utah Attorney General's Office after review of Utah Radiation Control rules, Division of Radiation Control Inspection Guidance Procedures 7.01 and State of Utah Government Records Access rules [UCA 63-2-304 (9)(d)]. |
| Washington | YES | |