

November 3, 1983

Note to George Rivenbard

SUBJECT: HATCH 2 ROD PATTERN ADJUSTMENTS (OELD # 838 641)

I do not understand what all the Unit 1 changes are doing in a Unit 2 amendment package and there is no explanation of it in the proposed notice. That needs to be explained at least to me. If we are in fact making a change in Unit 2, the justification that we've made of similarly changing Unit 1 is not sufficient. You have to go beyond that and indicate why its okay for Unit 2. But if its not a change for Unit 2 then I don't understand what its doing in this package.

*for Amb*  
for Joe Scinto

B502090208 B40518  
PDR FOIA  
ADAT084-166 PDR

67

Tom Wambach

838-990

Davis ~~to~~ Bese

11/3/83

On the face of the document there is not enough information to comply with Shelley. You set forth ① change in definition of "operable" and ② changes in power sources and aux systems.

You need to say either

(1) what the existing is so it is readily apparent that what is being done does not adversely affect safety

or

(2) set forth why what is proposed is safer - or does not adversely affect safety.

Chris Burt Nov 1 1983

11/1/83

Joe, while Charles is right that it could be more specific, I think there is enough (in this case) to let it go through.   
 J. Wambach

WAK  
OK  
I agree with you 4/1/80  
see your memo support for  
condition 502