

December 29, 1983

Note to George Rivenbark

SUBJECT: HATCH SDV VENT & DRAIN VALVES (OELD # 40 681)

The way you handle the December 14 letter is okay; that is, to sit back and say we need to review the December 14 in more detail so we are not going to handle it in this package. I have a problem with the substance of the cover letter. It seems to say that since we don't like 60 seconds and 120 seconds because they don't conform to the guidelines, we have put no provision for surveillance time in this package. If we have problems with having a surveillance time limit that is too long; that is, 60 seconds versus our 30 seconds, I cannot understand from the letter or from this package as a whole how we can okay this amendment having no surveillance time provisions whatsoever in it. It has to be worst than 60 seconds. The SER sounds like we've approved the package with the Applicant's September submittal with 30 seconds in it and we're going to consider, later, whether or not to change it to 60 seconds, etc. If that's what we mean, that's okay but the cover letter has to be changed to say that. If the cover letter is what we mean; that is, we put no surveillance provisions at all in this tech spec, then the SER needs to be changed to make that clearer and secondly, someone has to find a justification for that because I don't see a justification for how you can conclude that 60 seconds is a problem but no surveillance time at all is okay. There is no explanation for this at all. Something has to be done.

Joe Scinto
Joe Scinto