### AFFIRMATION OF BOARD VOTING RECORD

### **SUBJECT:** Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review

#### **Doc Control#2016-019**

The Board, with Board Member(s) Joyce L. Connery, Jessie H. Roberson *approving*, Board Member(s) Sean Sullivan, Daniel J. Santos, Bruce Hamilton *disapproving*, Board Member(s) none *abstaining*, and Board Member(s) none *recusing*, have voted to disapprove the above document on December 24, 2015.

The votes were recorded as:

	APRVD	DISAPRVD	ABSTAIN	NOT PARTICIPATING*	COMMENT	DATE
Joyce L. Connery	$\boxtimes$					12/22/15
Jessie H. Roberson	$\boxtimes$					12/24/15
Sean Sullivan		$\boxtimes$			$\boxtimes$	12/23/15
Daniel J. Santos		$\boxtimes$				12/21/15
Bruce Hamilton		$\boxtimes$			$\boxtimes$	12/23/15

<sup>\*</sup>Reason for Not Participating:

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

Assistant Executive Secretary to the Board

#### Attachments:

- 1. Voting Summary
- 2. Board Member Vote Sheets

cc: Board Members

**OGC** 

**OGM Records Officer** 

OTD

Doc Control#2016-019						
	/- ::					
Approved	Dis	sapproved	Abstain			
Recusal – Not Par	ticipating					
COMMENTS:	Below	Attached	None /			

**Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review** 

FROM:

**SUBJECT:** 

Joyce L. Connery

Joyce L. Connery

12/22/15

Doc Control#2016-0	19	8.	
Approved	Disapproved		Abstain
Recusal – Not Partic	ipating		8
COMMENTE	<b>D.</b>	. D.T.	<u>\</u>

**Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review** 

FROM:

**SUBJECT:** 

Jessie H. Roberson

## ARCHIVE: Doc#2016-019, Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review

Shelby Qua	lls
From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments:	Sean Sullivan Wednesday, December 23, 2015 9:55 AM Shelby Qualls; Lotus Smith RE: Notational Vote: Doc#2016-019, Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review - BLUE FOLDER 2016-019 TEF DSA.pdf
Disapproved w	vith comment. See attached.
To: Bruce Ham Cc: Lotus Smit Subject: Nota This email is electronic vot DEFENSE N NOTATION	nilton; Daniel J. Santos; Jessie Roberson; Joyce Connery; Sean Sullivan ch; Shelby Qualls; James Biggins tional Vote: Doc#2016-019, Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review - BLUE FOLDER an electronic record of Notational Vote. Voting ballot will follow shortly. Also, accepting tes.  NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD AL VOTE RESPONSE SHEET
FROM: SUBJECT:	Members of the Board Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review
DOC#2016-0	)19
Approved	ot Participating
Shelby Qualis Assistant Exec	utive Secretary

Office of the Chairman

Sean Sullivan

FROM:

SUBJECT: Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review				
Doc Control#2016-	019			
Approved	Disar	proved <u>X</u>	Abstain	
Recusal – Not Part	icipating	_		
COMMENTS:	Rolow V	Attached	None	
			<del></del>	4
Doc#2016-019A, M			ntained in this letter. See my commer ent to this letter.	it on
		<u></u>	//s//	-
		Se	ean Sullivan	
			<u>12/23/15</u>	_

ARCHIVE: Doc#2016-019, Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review

Sent:	Daniel J. Santos		
Sent.	Wednesday, December 23, 2015 12:02 PM Shelby Qualls; Lotus Smith		
To:			
Subject: Re: Notational Vote: Doc#2016-019, Tritium Extraction Facility Saf			
	BLUE FOLDER		
Disapproved without	comments.		
W)			
From: Shelby Qualls			
Sent: Tuesday, Decemb	per 22, 2015 3:56 PM		
	niel J. Santos; Jessie Roberson; Joyce Connery; Sean Sullivan		
Cc: Lotus Smith; Shelby			
·	te: Doc#2016-019, Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review - BLUE FOLDER		
•			
This email is an electr	ronic record of Notational Vote. Voting ballot will follow shortly. Also, accept	ing	
electronic votes.		2	
	7/		
DEFENSE NUCLEA	AR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD		
	TE RESPONSE SHEET		
FROM: Memb	ers of the Board		
	ers of the Board Facility Safety Basis Review		
Tritium Extraction F			
Tritium Extraction F			
Tritium Extraction F 9 —			
Tritium Extraction F 9 —			
Tritium Extraction F 9 — Participating			
Tritium Extraction F 9 — Participating			
Tritium Extraction F			
Tritium Extraction F 9 — Participating			

Office of the Chairman

SUBJECT:	Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis	Review
Doc Control	¥2016-019	
Approved	Disapproved	Abstain
Recusal – No	t Participating	
COMMENT	S: Below Attached	None

**FROM:** 

**Bruce Hamilton** 

Bruce Hamilton

23 DEC 2015

Date

### ARCHIVE: Doc#2016-019, Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review

December 23, 2015

Board Member Hamilton

Comment on Notational Vote Doc#2016-019, Tritium Extraction Facility Safety Basis Review

Justification: I have no disagreement with the Staff Issue Report accompanying this letter. The Staff Issue Report is well written and technically sound, and it is helpful to share DNSFB staff insights and observations with the NNSA Administrator.

That notwithstanding, the Board should generally practice a narrow interpretation of its statutory authority to require reports. 42 U.S.C. § 2286b(d) authorizes the Board to, "... establish reporting requirements for the Secretary of Energy ...," (emphasis added). If the Board determines that an issue is of sufficient significance that is should invoke the formal reporting requirement of its enabling statute, then it follows that the requirement should usually be transmitted directly to the Secretary. The Board should generally refrain from using this authority at various touchpoints within the Department subordinate to the Secretary. Such broader interpretation of the language in the statute would bypass the Secretary and might have negative consequences, including: (i) omitting the Secretary's endorsement of the reporting requirement, thus eroding the Department's urgency to address it; (ii) interfering with the Secretary's ability to allocate the Department's resources for processing the reporting requirement in the most efficient manner; and, (iii) creating the false perception that the Secretary is unaccountable for the response to the reporting requirement.

A narrow interpretation of 42 U.S.C. § 2286b(d) should not in any way constrain the Agency's staff from requesting information from the Department at any level through routine staff-to-staff communications. Should the Department not be forthcoming in providing relevant information, the staff may elevate the request to incrementally higher levels within the Department until the information is provided. In the unlikely event of an impasse, the Board could choose to require a report from the Secretary.

Additionally, the authority of 42 U.S.C. § 2286b(d) should not be used as a surrogate for making a Recommendation. Where an issue of adequate protection needs to be addressed, the Board should make a Recommendation vice issuing a reporting requirement.

It appears from the Staff Issue Report that the Department has cooperated with the Agency's staff in providing details on the areas of concern listed. It is reasonable to expect that the staff will be able to obtain updates on these issues through routine staff-to-staff communications. Using the authority of 42 U.S.C. § 2286b(d) is thus unnecessary, and since the reporting requirement is not addressed to the Secretary of Energy, it also appears inappropriate.

I therefore decline to approve this correspondence.