From: Stephen Salomon
To: PHL
Date: 10/23/96 9:17am
Subject: Compatibility of CO Regs re Co equivalent of Part 36 -Reply -Reply

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Steve:

We need to discuss. Why haven't we provided a written set of comments to CO on the draft rule they submitted for comment??

It sounds like they are now giving us a revised draft rule based on the verbal comments you provided to Chuck.

My preference would be to close the earlier action based on the verbal comments you provided and then open a new action and establish a new due date for our review of the revised draft..

Paul
<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<
Because there were some clarifying issues that I wanted to discuss with Chuck Mattson before I wrote the comments. Dick Blanton concurred with me that it made more sense to talk to Chuck than to write down the comments first. As it turned out, most were clerical omissions. The one omission was corrected when I pointed it out to Chuck. It had to deal with referencing another part of the CO regs. He took care of making all the corrections that I pointed out and faxed me yesterday the corrected version. He tried to INTERNET me the copy last week but for some reason it never arrived. That is why I called him this week to ask where the copy was that he said he would send. We decided that fax was more reliable than INTERNET. I am reviewing the corrected version now. Blanton concurs with me that it is much unnecessary extra work to write up the first version than to write up the second version. Merging the two saves a lot of time. Chuck says it will save him much explanation at the hearing trying to explain the first letter. If they only have one letter that says the reg is compatible, it will be smooth sailing at the hearing.

Steve

CC: RLB

9611080243 961101
PDR STPRG ESGCO
PDR