AFFIRMATION OF BOARD VOTING RECORD

SUBJECT: Idaho National Laboratory Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis

Doc Control#2015-023

The Board, with Board Member(s) Sean Sullivan *approving*, Board Member(s) Peter S. Winokur, Jessie H. Roberson *disapproving*, Board Member(s) none *abstaining*, and Board Member(s) none *recusing*, have voted to disapprove the document on December 10, 2014.

The votes were recorded as:

	APRVD	DISAPRVD	ABSTAIN	RECUSAL	<u>NO</u> VOTE*	COMMENT	DATE
Peter S. Winokur		\boxtimes				\boxtimes	12/10/14
Jessie H. Roberson		\boxtimes				\boxtimes	12/10/14
Sean Sullivan	\boxtimes						12/08/14

*Reason for "No Vote

This Record contains a summary of voting on this matter together with the individual vote sheets, views and comments of the Board Members.

Executive Secretary to the Board

Attachments:

- 1. Voting Summary
- 2. Board Member Vote Sheets
- cc: Board Members OGC OGM Records Officer OTD

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD NOTATIONAL VOTE RESPONSE SHEET

FROM: Peter S. Winokur, Ph.D.

SUBJECT: Idaho National Laboratory Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis

Doc Control#2015-023

Approved	Disapproved X	Abstain
Recusal – Not Par	ticipating	
COMMENTS:	Below X Attached	None

I am concerned about the tone of this letter. I could support the letter without the amendment that was recently agreed to by the Board.

Peter S. Winokur, Ph.D.

12-12-14

Date

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD NOTATIONAL VOTE RESPONSE SHEET

FROM: Jessie H. Roberson

SUBJECT: Idaho National Laboratory Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis

Doc Control#2015-023

Approved	Disapproved_X	Abstair
xpproved	Disappioreu_11	1

Recusal – Not Participating

COMMENTS: Below_X___ Attached____ None____

Based on my evaluation of the proposed communication, I cannot support the proposed action. I note the following key concerns included in the Staff Issue Report:

- 1) The 2010 sensitivity analysis isn't consistent with the NPHA & DC Standard issued in 2012.
- 2) They have a plan to conduct studies to refine their path forward, an approach that is consistent with their standard.
- 3) Their plan keeps moving to the right and based on their contractor's current plan, which continues to slip, their sensitivity analysis is out of date and they are approaching 20 years, even with the partial update in 2000, since their PHSA was updated.
- 4) The Board is telling DOE that DOE's own evaluation team concluded in 2010 that the PHSA needed to be updated.

These are all important pieces of information. However, I am unclear if the Board is making an informal recommendation to the Secretary, we are sharing our view of their actions based on our vantage point or our own analyses, or we are asking for information. I expect DOE will simply send the DNFSB their current plan and any future schedule updates, which we already have.

essie H. Roberson

Date

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD NOTATIONAL VOTE RESPONSE SHEET

FROM: Sean Sullivan

SUBJECT: Idaho National Laboratory Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis

Doc Control#2015-023

Approved 🎾	Disapproved	Abstain

Recusal – Not Participating

COMMENTS:

Below____ Attached___

None 🎾

Sean Sullivan

0/14 Date