

Weaver, Deborah

From: Herrera, Tomas
Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2018 7:58 AM
To: Brad Fisher (bradf@meprolight.com)
Cc: Valentin-Rodriguez, Celimar
Subject: Follow-up Question for Meprolight Amendment Request

Good morning Mr. Fisher,

We have reviewed your response to our request for additional information, and have one follow-up question.

In Paragraph A.12 of your letter dated May 22, you state that Meprolight tested the RSA6 model with two light sources. You further explained that the RSA6 model incorporates the existing RSA5 rear sight, which includes two light sources, with a mechanical assembly and that the RSA6 sight, as a whole, was tested instead of relying on the fact that RSA5 has already been tested and approved for distribution. In NRC letter dated April 23, section A, question 12, we asked Meprolight to provide a rationale for testing a sight with two light sources, instead of testing a sight with four light sources. We note that your response does not fully address this issue. Please provide further clarification on Meprolight's decision to test the RSA6 sight with two sources, instead of testing the RSA6 sight with four light sources.

Thank you,
Tomas Herrera
SSD Team Leader
U.S. NRC
NMSS/MSST/MSLB