AFFIRMATION OF BOARD VOTING RECORD

SUBJECT: EM-33 Federal Oversight

Doc Control#2015-056

The Board, with Board Member(s), Sean Sullivan, Daniel J. Santos approving, Board Member(s) Jessie H. Roberson disapproving, Board Member(s) none abstaining, and Board Member(s) none recusing, have voted to approve the above document on March 13, 2015.

The votes were recorded as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRVD</th>
<th>DISAPRVD</th>
<th>ABSTAIN</th>
<th>RECUSAL</th>
<th>NO VOTE*</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessie H. Roberson</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Sullivan</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel J. Santos</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 Assistant to the Board

Attachments:
1. Voting Summary
2. Board Member Vote Sheets
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FROM: Jessie H. Roberson
SUBJECT: EM-33 Federal Oversight
Doc Control#2015-056

Approved ___ Disapproved ___ Abstain ___
Recusal – Not Participating ___

COMMENTS: Below ___ Attached ___ None ___

This letter appears to go too far to create a reporting requirement. I think communicating information the Staff has gathered will, in itself, be useful to both NNSA and EM. However, the reporting requirement is a document request and I fear will be misunderstood.

Jessie H. Roberson
March 13 2015
Date
FROM: Sean Sullivan

SUBJECT: EM-33 Federal Oversight

Doc Control#2015-056

Approved _X_ Disapproved__ Abstain____

Recusal – Not Participating____

COMMENTS: Below X__ Attached_____ None____

The letter seeks additional information from DOE on EM management or risk due to deficiencies in software quality assurance of the Radcalc program.

I am concerned that users of Radcalc outside DOE may overreact to what could be inconsequential administrative deficiencies. On the other hand, if quality assurance has indeed been lost, this letter may actually understate the significance of the issue. Erring on the side of conservatism, I support the reporting requirement contained in the letter.

Sean Sullivan
3/12/15
Date
It is of concern that the current level of risk associated with the use of RADCALC is not well understood. However, I think it is important that DOE be notified in a timely manner of the various DNFSB staff findings to date with the use of RADCALC and provide an opportunity for DOE to help better explain the current levels of risk, if any, and how they are being managed.