

In the Matter of:

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

June 3, 2015
Closed Board Meeting

Condensed Transcript with Word Index



For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

Closed Board Meeting

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

6/3/2015

1

1
2
3 DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 CLOSED BOARD MEETING
11
12
13
14 JUNE 3, 2015
15 3:00 p.m.
16
17 DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD
18 625 INDIANA AVENUE, NW
19 ROOM 425
20 WASHINGTON, DC 20004
21
22
23
24
25

3

1 CLOSED BOARD MEETING
2 - - - - -
3 (3:02 p.m.)
4 MR. SANTOS: Good afternoon. My name is Daniel
5 Santos, and I'm a member of the Defense Nuclear
6 Facilities Safety Board. I will preside over this closed
7 meeting. With me today are my colleagues on the Safety
8 Board. Seated to my immediate right is Ms. Jessie
9 Roberson, the Board's Vice Chairman. Seated to my left
10 is Mr. Sean Sullivan. We three constitute the Board.
11 Also sitting -- to Mr. Sullivan is John
12 Batherson, the Board's Acting General Counsel, who shall
13 serve as the Board Executive Secretary for this meeting.
14 Having established a quorum of three Board
15 members, this closed meeting will now come to order.
16 This closed meeting was announced on May 18, 2015, on the
17 Board's public website. It was also subsequently noticed
18 in the Federal Register on May 20th and May 26th, 2015.
19 The meeting is closed to the public per the
20 provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, also
21 known as the Sunshine Act, as well as the Board's
22 regulations implementing the Sunshine Act and the Board's
23 operating procedures for meetings.
24 The Board is invoking Exception 3 to close the
25 meeting as authorized under 5 U.S. Code 552(b)(c)(3) and

2

1 INDEX
2
3 Topic: Page:
4
5 Board's Opening Remarks 3
6
7 Potential Recommendation on Pantex Emergency
8 Response 6
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Board's Closing Remarks 69
21
22
23
24
25

4

1 10 CFR 1704.4(c). The Board has determined that it is
2 necessary to close the meeting to the public since
3 conducting an open meeting is likely to disclose matters
4 that are specifically exempted from disclosure by
5 statute. Specifically, the deliberations will pertain to
6 potential recommendations, which, under 42 USC 2286(d)(b)
7 and (h)(3), may not be made publicly available until
8 after they have been received by the Secretary of Energy
9 or the President, respectively. The Acting General
10 Counsel has certified closure of this meeting under
11 Exception 3.
12 The Board is recording this proceeding through
13 a verbatim transcript and video recording. This closed
14 meeting concerns member deliberations pertaining to the
15 development or formulation of potential Board
16 recommendations to the Secretary of Energy.
17 As a reminder to those staff who are privy to
18 these proceedings, the Board and its staff are prohibited
19 from publicly disclosing information relating to the
20 development and formulation of our recommendation prior
21 to receipt of that final recommendation by the Secretary
22 of Energy. Specifically, you are prohibited from
23 disclosing, reproducing, or disseminating to any person
24 or entity outside the agency any information you might
25 learn concerning potential Board recommendations as a

5

1 result of this closed meeting.
 2 This prohibition applies to information you may
 3 learn during the course of the meeting, and it also
 4 applies to information you may learn after the meeting by
 5 review of the transcript, related documents, or from
 6 other sources. Disclosure of such information will be
 7 viewed as a violation of the Board's enabling legislation
 8 and could subject you to adverse personnel action.
 9 Now the Board will discuss the
 10 potential recommendation on
 11 Pantex emergency response;
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16 The Board should not conduct deliberations in
 17 this closed meeting on procedural aspects of
 18 recommendations that are not coupled to a particular
 19 recommendation. A copy of the closed meeting agenda is
 20 posted on the Board's public website.
 21 This concludes my opening remarks. I will now
 22 turn to the Board members for their opening remarks.
 23 Vice Chairman Roberson.
 24 MS. ROBERSON: No comments, Mr. Santos.
 25 MR. SANTOS: Thank you, Vice Chairman.

6

1 Mr. Sullivan?
 2 MR. SULLIVAN: No comments.
 3 MR. SANTOS: This concludes the Board's opening
 4 remarks. At this time, I would like to begin with the
 5 first order of business of the agenda, which is a
 6 potential recommendation related to the Pantex emergency
 7 response. I would like to invite any discussions --
 8 initial discussions by the Board members on this topic
 9 before -- so I will start with Mr. Sullivan.
 10 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, well, so, we've had a
 11 Board briefing on this where the staff said that they
 12 believed it was an issue of adequate protection and a
 13 recommendation was appropriate. And I understand they're
 14 drafting the recommendation, so I'd like to hear from the
 15 staff where are we. And, I mean, I've seen actually in
 16 response to a request from the technical director, he
 17 pointed us to a document as it currently exists, so I've
 18 taken a look through it.
 19 So, I guess I'm anxious to see when we can get
 20 going on it. So, again, I'd like to just hear from the
 21 staff on where we are.
 22 MR. SANTOS: Thank you.
 23 Before I call on the staff, Ms. Roberson, do
 24 you have any initial thoughts or questions?
 25 MS. ROBERSON: No. I'll comment once I

7

1 understand the status, as well.
 2 MR. SANTOS: Okay. For the purpose of the
 3 transcript, we have what I call two hot seats, where
 4 we're going to be calling staff in and out. I would
 5 kindly ask the staff as they can approach the seats to
 6 introduce themselves and their position within the Board.
 7 MR. BULLEN: Thank you, Mr. Santos. My name is
 8 Daniel Bullen. I'm the Group Lead for Nuclear Programs
 9 and Analysis at the Defense Board. So, in response to
 10 your question about the status, when we briefed the Board
 11 -- I'm thinking it was late April -- yeah, late April,
 12 the status of the recommendation was it was about 85
 13 percent done. So, we needed to finish the risk
 14 assessment and the cost/benefit analyses that were
 15 completed.
 16 So, that was done, and then immediately after
 17 that, my lead reviewer, my lead author on it, was
 18 deployed to Norway for two weeks. So, we had essentially
 19 availability issues. So, the current status right now is
 20 that I have the latest revision, which you may have seen
 21 in the transfer file, was updated on 5/26/15. It
 22 included the changes that were made by Jack Deplitch, who
 23 signed off on it on the 27th. Monique had signed off on
 24 it in early May, after we finished up the 85 -- the final
 25 85 percent.

8

1 I had received -- retrieved this from our
 2 admin. It's waiting for Ramsey Arnold's signature right
 3 now. That's the cognizant -- the cog engineer, at which
 4 point then Tim Dwyer and I will do the review for -- the
 5 final review before it goes up to Steve and to Rich, at
 6 which point it gets distributed to the site reps. So, it
 7 hasn't gone through site rep review yet.
 8 So, as it stands right now, we've basically got
 9 two more sign-offs that will have to happen before it
 10 comes up to the tech director's office.
 11 MS. ROBERSON: Can I ask a quick question?
 12 MR. SANTOS: Yes, ma'am.
 13 MS. ROBERSON: So, on the transfer file, is the
 14 only date in there the original date it was dumped in?
 15 It doesn't -- there's no automatic update?
 16 MR. BULLEN: I do not know.
 17 MS. ROBERSON: Okay.
 18 MR. BULLEN: I did ask Shelby the latest
 19 update, and according to Shelby, the latest update was
 20 eight days ago, so the 26th of May was the latest
 21 update.
 22 The other thing I'd like to point out about
 23 this recommendation is a little bit different than the
 24 normal. Since it contains UCNI information, it can't be
 25 distributed by email, and so when we have people remote,

9

1 they actually have to have this when they're doing their
2 review. And, so, it's a little bit different. That's
3 just a fact about this one. It's not any -- it's just
4 the constraints with which we have to work as we put this
5 one through the process.

6 So, that's the current status.

7 MR. SULLIVAN: When do we think it might come
8 to us in Orange Folder?

9 MR. BULLEN: I have Ramsey coming back next
10 week. I'm here all next week. I would assume that after
11 Ramsey gets it done, Tim and I can crank it out -- I'm
12 looking back at Tim -- in short order. When it comes to
13 Orange Folder, it has to go through the site rep review,
14 and I don't have a good handle on how long that takes.
15 So, it may be a week; it may be a couple of days.
16 Usually, a couple of days for site reps to review it.

17 Now, we don't have a site rep at Pantex. We
18 have interim site reps. So, that would be an interesting
19 review. My guess is that Rich will be the one that
20 decides how the site rep review is done. So, hopefully,
21 that provided you the current status. That's where we
22 are.

23 MR. SANTOS: Can I follow up on that and maybe
24 ask Mr. Tontodonato what the plan is really going to be.

25 MR. TONTODONATO: I'm Richard Tontodonato. I'm

10

1 the Deputy Technical Director. As far as the site rep
2 review, I mean, we just aren't doing a site rep factual
3 accuracy review from Pantex now, because we don't have a
4 site rep there.

5 MR. SANTOS: Okay.

6 MR. TONTODONATO: So, the other ones will
7 review it. And, I mean, generally, they're instructed to
8 turn it around in a day. A recommendation package is
9 very thick now, especially with the requirements to have
10 all the supporting documentation included as part of the
11 package now. So, it may take them more than a day, but,
12 I mean, we do not let them languish for weeks with the
13 site reps.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so, again, we don't -- we
15 don't really have a time frame. You know, so, I'm asking
16 because this is an issue of adequate protection, and I
17 tend to agree that it is, and but -- so I'd like to get
18 going. You know, this is -- this is the trigger-happy
19 thing I was talking about. I've seen what Travis has
20 because it was made available to me. It looks -- it
21 looks pretty good, but I also know we started working on
22 this back in February, so it's been a while.

23 MR. BULLEN: Actually, the technical basis
24 document to support this, we actually started working
25 this two and a half years ago. So, if you take a look at

11

1 all of the issues that we have rolled up into the
2 supporting basis document, it's over about two and a half
3 years. So, putting together the actual recommendation
4 was earlier this year, but the actual technical basis and
5 all the reviews, as you'll see when you get it, it
6 started over two and a half years ago.

7 MR. SULLIVAN: And I just -- I cheated. See, I
8 did use my technical prowess and figured out that the
9 actual Word document that we have that says the May 26th
10 date, it was initially created February 20th by Travis.
11 And then there's also this period of time between April
12 24th and May 26 where just nothing happened. And, well,
13 I mean, looking at the document, nothing happened.

14 MR. BULLEN: Correct.

15 MR. SULLIVAN: It doesn't mean nothing
16 happened. It's -- so, again, this, to me, it's kind of
17 like I know we have our process, the process is orderly,
18 but it's also slow. And I'm trying to figure out if we
19 can't get this sooner. This is -- it's a big issue,
20 right? I mean, it's an issue where the staff's made a
21 recommend -- you know, the staff's recommendation to us
22 is this -- this should be a formal recommendation to the
23 Secretary. I agree. I want to tell the Secretary to get
24 moving. That's -- I guess that's my point.

25 So, with that said, you know, without breaking

12

1 eggshells, if there's any way we could, you know, look at
2 doing things in parallel or whatever, I would appreciate
3 it. And I don't want to -- I don't want to upset the
4 applecart, but I also don't want to have another closed
5 meeting in July and we're still looking for the Orange
6 Folder on this thing.

7 MR. BULLEN: Your point is well taken, and I
8 will also highlight what you just exactly said. We have
9 a procedure that we're following, a 34-page procedure.
10 If you're asking, I'm on about page 16 right now. So,
11 that's where it is.

12 MR. SANTOS: Have you seen a draft? I mean,
13 it's going to come to a technical director for review,
14 but have you seen this already?

15 MR. TONTODONATO: I haven't, no.

16 MR. SANTOS: Oh, you have not.

17 MR. TONTODONATO: Right.

18 MR. SANTOS: Interesting. I'm not here to
19 change procedures, but it's -- it's, again, things that
20 can smartly be done in parallel, even if there's
21 additional changes, it would probably save time. I'm
22 just afraid now that the directors are going to look at
23 it and then cycle you guys for a few more months.

24 MR. BULLEN: As the cognizant group lead, I
25 would reiterate that I kind of like parts of the

13

1 procedure. In fact, I like a lot of the procedure
 2 because it gives us configurational control.
 3 MR. SANTOS: Sure.
 4 MR. BULLEN: If I had an important document
 5 like a recommendation and I was having it reviewed in
 6 parallel and I was the person that had to deconflict -- I
 7 mean, it's a challenge to deconflict Orange Folder
 8 comments. If I had to deconflict all site rep comments
 9 and all group lead comments and all of my tech staff
 10 comments, it would be a nightmare. And as cumbersome as
 11 the process may appear, it's orderly and methodical.
 12 And I know engineers are good at being orderly
 13 and methodical, but I think it's the process that you
 14 have to follow or it will be very difficult, if not
 15 chaotic, to finally resolve the final issue that you get.
 16 And, so, even though it's tight control, I think the
 17 tight control in this case is necessary.
 18 MR. SANTOS: Yeah, I hear you, and I'm not
 19 suggesting you don't do that, but at the same time,
 20 there's an element of surprise, of risk you may want to
 21 eliminate. So, while my -- you might not need to
 22 necessarily resolve the technical director comments in
 23 parallel, you may want to know if there's any big
 24 showstoppers or surprises ahead of time. That's all.
 25 So, not necessarily that you have to do this

14

1 configuration nightmare, but do I have any showstoppers
 2 here type item. That's all.
 3 MR. BULLEN: And I would -- I would suggest
 4 that we rediscuss this at the group lead level, so this
 5 is not a surprise to the people that are in the other
 6 groups. People are well aware -- I guess this is also an
 7 interdisciplinary team, because Jack Deplitch is in Tim's
 8 group and Monique and Travis are in my group. So, we
 9 actually do talk.
 10 We don't necessarily brief the Tech Director
 11 and Deputy Technical Director on what we're doing,
 12 although you guys -- they do see our weeklies, they do
 13 see our hot topics, they do see that we're working on
 14 this. And I have spoken, although not officially
 15 briefed, you know, both of my bosses about how this --
 16 how this works.
 17 MR. SANTOS: Thank you.
 18 MS. ROBERSON: So -- so, you did scare me
 19 because you said really you're halfway through your
 20 procedure.
 21 MR. BULLEN: Well, actually, what happens after
 22 page 16 is it's out of my control, so that's the part
 23 that I'm -- but it goes to the reviews that we talked
 24 about. And they're explicit, so it's the step-by-step
 25 process. And part of the criticism you could have of

15

1 these procedures is they're written by engineers, so
 2 they're very, very detailed. But that's good and bad.
 3 And, so, in this case, we are halfway through, but
 4 we're -- I would say we're 95 percent of the way
 5 through the process itself, so this is almost done, is
 6 my answer.
 7 MS. ROBERSON: So, let me just ask you a
 8 general question. So, I mean, we've all -- we've been
 9 briefed. I certainly have seen the draft as well, too.
 10 Are we getting our -- are we going to get ourselves into
 11 a cycle where it takes so long that we have to up -- go
 12 back and update information? How -- how are we moving
 13 this? I mean, are there big technical issues left?
 14 MR. BULLEN: No. We're ready -- we're almost
 15 ready.
 16 MS. ROBERSON: So, it's just getting through
 17 the review process.
 18 MR. BULLEN: It's getting through the review
 19 process.
 20 MS. ROBERSON: And style, to some degree.
 21 MR. BULLEN: And part of it also is trying to
 22 resolve some of the tough questions that we have now that
 23 we have new guidance on our recommendations. What's the
 24 risk assessment? So, we had to identify what that was,
 25 and then, you know, is there a cost implication to this.

16

1 And one would argue, well, there is and there isn't,
 2 because they're supposed to do these review; they're
 3 supposed to do these exercises but -- and, so, are they
 4 doing that? Is that an extra cost? So we have to
 5 justify some more things that we didn't used to justify.
 6 And, so again, this is the second recommendation that's
 7 come out of my group. I actually think it's gone
 8 smoother than the first.
 9 MR. SANTOS: Okay.
 10 MR. BULLEN: But that's just my -- my --
 11 MR. SANTOS: Yeah, sorry to interrupt.
 12 MR. BULLEN: Yeah.
 13 MR. SANTOS: I just want to let you know we
 14 have one hour --
 15 MR. BULLEN: Okay.
 16 MR. SANTOS: -- to do everything, so, Sean?
 17 MR. SULLIVAN: Do we actually have to address
 18 the cost piece? I don't think we do, do we?
 19 MS. ROBERSON: Economic feasibility.
 20 MR. BULLEN: Economic feasibility is what it
 21 is.
 22 MR. TONTODONATO: Yeah, I think that's what
 23 he's talking about.
 24 MR. SULLIVAN: That's right, but we never used
 25 to include that in our recommendations, and I didn't

17

1 interpret the statutory --
 2 MR. SANTOS: The statute, right.
 3 MR. SULLIVAN: -- change as changing that.
 4 MR. BULLEN: I'm sorry, I just have risk
 5 recommendation back here. That's all I have.
 6 MR. SULLIVAN: No, there's something in the
 7 draft that talks about technical and economic
 8 feasibility.
 9 MR. BULLEN: Yep.
 10 MS. ROBERSON: We do.
 11 MR. BULLEN: Yeah, that's there. That's the
 12 one before risk.
 13 MS. ROBERSON: It's in the last two.
 14 MR. SANTOS: That's a good point, Sean. Can we
 15 get -- not now, obviously -- a look into the -- our
 16 current statutory requirements on that?
 17 MS. ROBERSON: I think we can. I think we need
 18 to make sure we look at the letter we sent to Congress a
 19 couple years ago on this specific topic and what we
 20 committed to.
 21 MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, just to -- my
 22 recollection, 2013, they put the assessed risk into the
 23 recommendation procedure. They put it in there in a way
 24 that the sentence doesn't actually make sense from -- you
 25 know, the commas aren't in the right place. It doesn't

18

1 matter. There was actually this disconnect over on
 2 Capitol Hill as to whether or not the words "specifically
 3 assessed" only applied to risk or also applied to
 4 technical and economic feasibility. Then the House, last
 5 year, wanted a further amendment amended, but that never
 6 made it into law.
 7 So, we're still back with the 2013, if I
 8 remember correctly, where it's in this sentence that
 9 doesn't make -- it's kind of a mangled sentence. But the
 10 more liberal interpretation of that sentence, the one
 11 more favorable to us, was they added this specific
 12 assessment of risk; they did not add anything that said
 13 do anything different on technical and economic
 14 feasibility. That's my recollection of the statute.
 15 MS. ROBERSON: I agree with your recollection.
 16 The only element that I think we need to look at is we
 17 were also asked to explain to Congress --
 18 MR. SULLIVAN: Right, we were.
 19 MS. ROBERSON: -- how we were dealing with it,
 20 and that, I'm not so sure, that we as a Board didn't make
 21 commitments in that, and we just need to look at it.
 22 MR. SULLIVAN: I don't think we committed to
 23 write something down each time we did a recommendation,
 24 but you just look.
 25 MR. SANTOS: So, the only thing I'll ask is

19

1 this is very relevant to the recommendation at hand, and
 2 the timely advice from legal on this is the biggest
 3 priority so we don't create unnecessary delays.
 4 I will conclude this topic for now, given the
 5 other topics. So, I'll move to the next potential
 6 recommendation -- any final thoughts on this one from the
 7 Board?
 8 MR. SULLIVAN: A final thought. And, again,
 9 this may not be by your procedures, but I would think
 10 that if we don't expect a whole lot of technical change
 11 as we move forward, legal, if they haven't looked at it,
 12 might want to do their review. And you could later give
 13 them a redline, strikeout version so they could see what
 14 changed.
 15 I mean, I'm just trying to suggest ways so that
 16 we might make -- when we get to the step of the
 17 procedure, in the order the procedure says to get to,
 18 right, then, you know, can we speed things up. I mean, I
 19 can already look at the May 26th version. If I have
 20 comments in it, then I'll create a redline, strikeout
 21 between that and what you give me later, and, you know,
 22 try to figure it out so I don't have to start from ground
 23 zero on the day it shows up in Orange Folder.
 24 MR. SANTOS: So, for example, can we get a copy
 25 now to OGC?

20

1 MR. BULLEN: Sure, that's fine.
 2 MR. TONTODONATO: Yes.
 3 MR. SULLIVAN: So, I mean, I would just like to
 4 -- I would move the Board --
 5 MR. SANTOS: Mm-hmm.
 6 MR. SULLIVAN: -- to give direction to staff,
 7 execute the procedure as expeditiously as possible. It's
 8 a pretty simple motion, if --
 9 MR. SANTOS: Well, I have a motion on the table
 10 to --
 11 MS. ROBERSON: I second the motion.
 12 MR. SANTOS: Second the motion?
 13 MR. SULLIVAN: I think we've discussed it. No,
 14 I think we have to vote.
 15 MR. SANTOS: Oh, you want to vote now?
 16 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, we've got a motion.
 17 MR. SANTOS: The motion -- the motion is on the
 18 table; the motion passed.
 19 MR. SULLIVAN: Did we vote?
 20 MR. SANTOS: So, now let's go for a vote.
 21 We're going to vote now.
 22 MR. BATHERSON: Okay, so, Mr. Sullivan?
 23 MR. SANTOS: Restate the question, please.
 24 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, the motion is for the Board
 25 to direct the staff to execute the procedure as

21

1 expeditiously as possible with respect to this
 2 recommendation.
 3 MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Stokes has something to
 4 say.
 5 MR. SANTOS: Hold on. We're in deliberations
 6 here.
 7 MR. BATHERSON: Well, do you want to hear from
 8 him?
 9 MR. SANTOS: I'll ask Sean, who made the
 10 proposal, if you have any objections, because we're in
 11 the middle of deliberations.
 12 MR. SULLIVAN: Right, no. I mean, yeah, I
 13 consent to -- we want to hear from the Technical
 14 Director. That's fine.
 15 MR. SANTOS: Okay, I consent, too.
 16 MS. ROBERSON: I consent.
 17 MR. STOKES: Steven Stokes. I'm the Technical
 18 Director, just asking for some clarification on the
 19 motion from the Board, to ensure that what's being asked
 20 for is to execute this consistent with the procedure to
 21 exclude any other competing activities. So, this would
 22 make this the priority activity of all the staff involved
 23 in producing a recommendation as quickly as possible, if
 24 that's what "expeditiously execute the procedure" means.
 25 MR. SULLIVAN: I think it does. That would be

23

1 MR. SANTOS: Thank you. Any final comment from
 2 any Board member on this topic before we move on to the
 3 next topic?

22

1 my intent, unless -- unless you're going to tell me you
 2 have some other thing that you're working on that is an
 3 issue of adequate protection, you already think it's an
 4 issue of adequate protection that would conflict with
 5 that. Do you?
 6 MR. STOKES: I do not know at this point in
 7 time. What I would do is if -- if that were, in fact,
 8 the case, I would bring that to the attention of the
 9 Board as soon as I became aware of it.
 10 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I think that would be just
 11 the logical outflow. My intent here is to really provide
 12 the sense of the Board that, yeah, this is important,
 13 let's try to do it as quickly as we can. It's nothing
 14 more than that.
 15 MR. STOKES: Speed priority.
 16 MR. BATHERSON: Let's have a vote.
 17 Mr. Sullivan?
 18 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
 19 MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos?
 20 MR. SANTOS: Yes.
 21 MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson?
 22 MS. ROBERSON: Yes.
 23 MR. BATHERSON: The vote carries. The
 24 recommendation will proceed pursuant to the procedures as
 25 expeditiously as possible.

**PAGES 24 – 68
CONTAIN EXEMPT
TESTIMONY THAT HAS
BEEN REDACTED**

1
2 MR. SANTOS: Any final comments on this topic?
3 MS. ROBERSON: I don't have any additional.
4 MR. SANTOS: Okay.
5 Okay, any other comments on any other previous
6 topics?
7 MS. ROBERSON: No, sir.
8 MR. SULLIVAN: No.
9 MR. SANTOS: Okay, having completed each of the
10 closed meeting topics, I would like to thank everybody
11 for their participation in this closed meeting. Again,
12 one last chance, do the Board members have any final
13 comments on anything associated with the topic of this
14 meeting?
15 MS. ROBERSON: No, sir, I don't, Mr. Santos.
16 MR. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Vice Chairman.
17 Mr. Sullivan?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. I think it was a useful
19 exercise and I look forward to doing it again regularly.
20 MR. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.
21 As a final reminder, all of you who have been
22 privy to this proceeding or who may later gain access to
23 information discussed here are under a nondisclosure
24 obligation and are prohibited from disclosing,
25 reproducing, or disseminating to any person or entity

1 outside the agency any information you have learned here
2 today concerning potential Board recommendation.
3 This concludes the Defense Nuclear Facilities
4 Safety Board closed meeting. The meeting is adjourned.
5 (Whereupon, the closed board meeting was
6 adjourned at 4:25 p m.)
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2
3
4 I, LINDA METCALF, the officer before whom the
5 foregoing testimony was taken, do hereby certify that the
6 proceeding was digitally recorded by me and thereafter
7 reduced to typewriting by me or under my direction; that
8 said testimony is a true record of the event; that I am
9 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of
10 the parties to the action in which this proceeding was
11 taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee
12 of any of the parties hereto, nor financially or
13 otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.
14
15
16
17 LINDA METCALF
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25