

This record is responsive to the second sixth bullet point in your 5/19/2020 letter: the emails that Mr. Purtscher received from Mr. Hiser.

From: Hiser, Matthew
Sent: Mon, 27 Aug 2018 15:27:01 +0000
To: Purtscher, Patrick
Subject: RE: TLR Update

Hi Pat,

I had also rewritten the first paragraph and deleted the last paragraph from the summary and path forward section (see screenshots below), so I'm definitely in agreement at a high level with where changes should be made.

(b)(5)



I'd suggest reworking the first sentence to avoid commenting on whether and how technical gaps are addressed by GALL-SLR. Here's my suggestion, which has some similarities to what I had in tracked changes on Friday. Feel free to take this below and pull from the couple sentences in the screenshot above if that would be useful.

(b)(5)

Thanks!
Matt

Matthew Hiser

Materials Engineer

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission | Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research

Division of Engineering | Corrosion and Metallurgy Branch

Phone: 301-415-2454 | Office: TWFN 10D62

Matthew.Hiser@nrc.gov

From: Purtscher, Patrick

Sent: Monday, August 27, 2018 11:11 AM

To: Hiser, Matthew <Matthew.Hiser@nrc.gov>

Subject: RE: TLR Update

Matt,

Can you could give me any comments you might have on these changes for the

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Pradeep originally had this for the first paragraph

(b)(5)

I also think we should recommend the last paragraph shown below, be deleted.

(b)(5)

Pat

\

From: Hiser, Matthew
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2018 2:29 PM
To: Purtscher, Patrick <Patrick.Purtscher@nrc.gov>
Subject: RE: TLR Update

Hi Pat,

Here's my edits and comments on the whole report. I went through pretty closely up through section 3.3, then mostly skimmed focusing on areas where NRR staff had major comments.

It's definitely a lot better, but needs a lot of cleaning up. I think we might need to iterate again with Pradeep and have him do a more thorough scrub before sending back to NRR.

Thanks!

Matt

From: Hiser, Matthew
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 2:28 PM
To: Purtscher, Patrick <Patrick.Purtscher@nrc.gov>
Subject: RE: TLR Update

Hi Pat,

OK, here's my fairly extensive editing of everything up to Ch. 2. I'll keep plugging on Ch. 3 and beyond tomorrow...

Thanks!

Matt

From: Purtscher, Patrick
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 9:13 AM
To: Hiser, Matthew <Matthew.Hiser@nrc.gov>
Subject: RE: TLR Update

I still think "technical issue" would raise the same concern from NRR as "technical gap". It should be OK to use "technical gap" for pre-GALL-SLR documents, but not after that.

Pat

From: Hiser, Matthew
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 8:37 AM
To: Purtscher, Patrick <Patrick.Purtscher@nrc.gov>
Subject: RE: TLR Update

Hi Pat,

Yeah, I agree that the use of "gap" needs to be scaled back even more. In a few places I've been replacing "gap" with "issue."

I like what you've written – I think it's pretty similar to this text in the Abstract (my tracked changes marked there), but that may need to be pulled into the Intro section as well.

(b)(5)

I've started working through with a clean version of what Pradeep sent to make my suggested edits (attached). I'm hoping to get all the way through it today if possible and share with you.

Thanks!

Matt

From: Purtscher, Patrick
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 8:02 AM
To: Hiser, Matthew <Matthew.Hiser@nrc.gov>
Subject: RE: TLR Update

Matt,

I was reviewing the document and was struck by the continued use of "gap" (90 times). The combination "technical gaps" is used 24 times. This does seem excessive and it would seem to be a good idea to find different words to use. I would suggest "topic" as a sub in many of these places, probably not all.

The main concern of the NRR reviewers is that the document makes SLR look like it is dependent on harvesting. Pradeep suggested in his response to one of the comments that "Perhaps there needs to be a context setting statement up front". I don't see that he has proposed anything in this draft, but I think that is true and we should provide a specific recommendation like "For many years now, harvesting and evaluation of ex-plant materials has been a critical part of the technical basis behind the regulatory framework used at the NRC, but the process was always limited by the availability of representative materials. Now with multiple plants announcing that they are or will be closing, many new potential opportunities will become available." I hope that by starting with this, we can reduce the concern of the NRR reviewers.

What do you think?

Pat

Materials Engineer
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission | Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
Division of Engineering | Corrosion and Metallurgy Branch
11545 Rockville Pike | Rockville, MD 20852-2738
Phone: 301-415-3942 | Office: TWFN 10A49
ptp1@nrc.gov

From: Ramuhalli, Pradeep [<mailto:Pradeep.Ramuhalli@pnnl.gov>]
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2018 2:45 PM
To: Hiser, Matthew <Matthew.Hiser@nrc.gov>; Purtscher, Patrick <Patrick.Purtscher@nrc.gov>
Subject: [External_Sender] TLR Update

The update so far is attached. This still needs some cleanup and citations included; I am working on a tech editor on these.

With best regards,

Pradeep

Pradeep Ramuhalli, PhD
Senior Research Scientist,
Applied Physics Group
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
902 Battelle Blvd.
P.O.Box 999, MSIN K5-26
Richland, WA 99352
Tel: 509-375-2763
Email: pradeep.ramuhalli@pnnl.gov
<http://www.pnnl.gov>

Note to requester: After searching further, the 8/17/2018 Email from PNNL to NRC staff with the subject line "[External_Sender] TLR Update" could not be located.