March 5, 1984

Note to M. Thadani

SUBJECT: DUANE ARNOLD - VEGETATION IN VICINITY OF COOLING TOWERS (OELD # 842 807)

You have a much better reason than the one you use for no significant hazards. Its not that this position was imposed to check something out which is now bkay. The main reason why this particular kind of thing involves no significant hazards is that it doesn't relate to radiological health and safety. The no significant hazards consideration determination relates to radiological health and safety, not to environmental issues. So its a perfectly good answer to simply assert in this that this requirement was imposed for environmental reasons and was not imposed for any consideration of radiological health and safety; consequently, the deletion of it has no radiological health and safety consequences at all; therefore, no significant hazards consideration.

Joe Scinto