

December 22, 1983

Note to Hazel Smith

SUBJECT: GINNA STAFF WORKING HOURS & REPORTING REQUIREMENTS (840 295)

Hazel, the attempt in the cover letter to explain away the mutually agreed-to changes is fine but there has to be something in the SER which discusses them and explains why its no problem. I don't see anything in the SER. The next thing is, we didn't even notice the letter of August 12 at all. The SER on page 3 appears to discuss the August 12 letter indicating that the Licensee agreed to submit some changes to be made in the future. Consequently, it was modified and these are changes within the scope of the prenotice. That's a statement. You need some support for that assertion. We apparently told them that the information submitted in the one we noticed (April) was inadequate and we needed more information. That's what this thing appears to say - that the information submitted with the original request was inadequate. In that case we should have denied it. We cannot simply assert that the August submittal and the April application (which we noticed) are all the same. We need some support for that and I'm not sure there is any.

*amb*  
for Joe Scinto

8502090264 840518  
PDR FOIA  
ADAT084-166 PDR

122