

November 9, 1983

Note to Tom Novak

SUBJECT: SUSQUEHANNA RHR-SHUTDOWN COOLING VALVES ... ISOLATION SIGNAL  
... (OELD # 838 910)

The practice represented by this package just cannot continue. It is unacceptable to take this long between authorizing a change of technical specifications by phone and getting around to finishing the paper work. There is just no excuse for this. If it was that much of an emergency on October 7 and you were able to complete your analysis to conclude that it was safe and involved no significant hazards on October 7, there is no excuse for this taking virtually a month to get over to ELD. These are the packages, the only packages, that warrant treatment as an urgent package in ELD.

The practice represented by this package has to stop.

*amb*  
907 Joe Scinto


8502090308 840518  
PDR FOIA  
ADAT084-166 PDR

November 9, 1983

Note to Mike Wilcove

SUBJECT: TMI-2 TANKAGE USED TO STORE WASTE WATER (OELD # 838 774)

Mike, my problem with this package is - what are the facts? If Metropolitan Edison Company requested an amendment to the license governing TMI and requested an amendment which affects matters other than ownership characteristics (how the plant is operated), then my problem is I think we have an inadequate amendment request. In this docket, what is the organization that is authorized to submit license application amendments? I don't know. It should be a part of the license file. Who is authorized to submit request for modifications of the license? When we changed from Met Ed as the operator to GPU as the operator, what did the pieces of paper say about that? This is the question I have - who is the authorized communicator with this Agency? Met Ed? GPU ... ? My concern is not with the boiler plate words in the amendment - my concern is what it is that we're doing. Are we acting on the basis of a request submitted by the wrong organization? That's my problem.

  
Joe Scinto

Dupe of 850 209 0448