

September 30, 1983

Note to Paul Leech

SUBJECT: MILLSTONE 2 INSPECTION OF INACCESSIBLE TUBES (OELD # 837 460)

I have no problems with this notice package. You can put it out as is. I just want to note that I think that the additional note on the table may cause more problems than it solves. If there are any inaccessible tubes other than the ones blocked by the machine, this phrasing of the new footnote looks like we're now telling them they have to inspect an inaccessible tube. I don't think that this is what was intended when we first wrote the package on inspection requirements. If there are any other inaccessible tubes, that footnote says they have to inspect them. I don't know how they are going to do that. It make sense for the 12 tubes which are in fact accessible - they just happened to be blocked by the use of the automatic equipment. I think the reasons given are perfectly okay to accept what the applicant wishes to do. But because we are going to characterize those kinds of tubes as "inaccessible" and because there are circumstances in which we want those 12 or so tubes inspected, we'll have to phrase something to accomplish that. However, the particular phrasing on the particular footnote looks like its going to say that they have to inspect a truly inaccessible tube. I don't know how they are going to do that.

I have no trouble with putting out this notice, I just wanted to say that when it comes around to actually amending this tech spec, someone has to give some careful attention of the wording of the footnote to the table. I think its not worded correctly to accomplish the end that's desired.

*amb*  
for Joe Scinto

B502090451 B40518  
PDR FOIA  
ADAT084-166 PDR