



Frank:

I have talked with Jim Conran twice in the last week or so to follow up with him on to your email last week (below) regarding the disparity in the minutes of CRGR Meeting #290 (50.54(f) letter on design basis). My last contact (Sept. 5) was to identify when the staff could expect to see a corrected version of the meeting minutes. I explained that we would prefer to base our required reply (reporting on our agreement or disagreement with the CRGR recommendations) on corrected minutes, instead of the current version with the disparity you identified. Jim tells me that it is necessary to have the Committee review the issue, and if corrected minutes are to be issued, make that a Committee decision. Since he has recently received requests for 3 more exigent meetings, however, he has not had an opportunity to focus on this issue and seek the necessary Committee action. PGEB plans to wait out the correction of the minutes before preparing the CRGR reply unless we receive contrary direction.

Jim had agreed during our first conversation that p. 5 of Att. 2B should not have the infamous item (g). I reviewed Att. 2B in its entirety and confirmed for him that with the exception of that error, Att. 2B represents the package NRR forwarded to the EDO's office as the staff's final product after the CRGR meeting. I sent him the correct p. 5 on August 30 to facilitate correction of the minutes. He told me that he now believes Attachment 2A not to be the version of the letter provided to the members for review at the meeting (remember that Mr. Jordan had a version that had item (g)). I verified that Attachment 2A is the version we emailed to all the CRGR members in the late afternoon of the day before the meeting, and forwarded another copy of the email to him so he could confirm this himself. He told me that he has tentative plans to check with all the Committee members to confirm what version of the letter they had in their hands during the meeting. If not the one in our email, he believes that Att. 2A needs to be replaced if the minutes are to be corrected and would need the Committee to agree to this change as well.

Melinda

[illegible]

From: Frank Miraglia, *WER*
To: TWD1.TWP4.JHC *Common, AEDD*
Date: 8/27/96 4:54pm
Subject: Minutes Mtg 290

Jim - rec'd minutes. I don't believe attachments 2A and B are right attachments. A looks OK -- B is a draft you appeared to have gotten from EDO staff that was later modified. Suggest you compare notes with EDO staff (Dean??) and my staff (Frank A).

CC: TWD1, TWP4, ELJ1, TTM, BKG1, FMA

9704030170 970327
PDR FOIA
WILLIAM96-466 PDR

7/28