

**From:** Ronald Bellamy  
**To:** John Minns  
**Date:** Wed, Nov 3, 1999 3:49 PM  
**Subject:** Re: IP1 letter

This version is different from what has previously been prepared for our review:

1. The answer to Q1 gets lost in the FHBs and SFPs. This needs to be simplified and be consistent. Aren't they the same?

2. When you say reduce water levels in the SFP, it begs the question of which one.

3. Response to Q3, next to last line should be examination, not the plural.

4. Response to Q4 is not responsive. You refer to Q3, which doesn't clearly say they can fix the leak.

5. Response to Q5 ignores IP3, which they ask about.

6. Response to Q6 talks about "the condition". What condition? Also, "Federal Expressed" is not a good expression.

7. Switch the second and third paragraphs from the end of the letter.

Since I just got this for review, this is what I see in a quick review as you indicated this is due imminently (like tomorrow).

>>> John Minns 11/03 3:24 PM >>>

**CC:** Michael Masnik

6103375200