Dear Secretary Chu:

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (Board) issued Recommendation 2008-1, Safety Classification of Fire Protection Systems, on January 29, 2008, which identified the need for standards applicable to the design and operation of fire protection systems being relied upon as a primary means of protecting the public and workers from radiological hazards at the Department of Energy’s (DOE) defense nuclear facilities. Your letter to the Board, dated March 21, 2013, describes actions DOE has taken to address the remaining open commitments of the Implementation Plan and notifies the Board that you are closing Recommendation 2008-1.

The Board has reviewed your letter and its attachment and has evaluated them in accordance with Policy Statement 1. The Board agrees that DOE’s actions taken on the remaining open commitments are sufficient to close Recommendation 2008-1, and we hereby close this Recommendation.

The Board notes that your letter stated a purpose “to close Recommendation 2008-1.” The Board interprets the purpose as a request by DOE to close the recommendation. In accordance with our Policy Statement 1, the Board evaluates the adequacy of DOE responses and implementation plans for our Recommendations. The Board and DOE have developed practices over the past 23 years, many of which are also laid out in DOE Manual 140.1-1B, Interface with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. The Manual identifies the process through which the Board and DOE work to close a recommendation. Key among these is the mechanism delineated in Chapter III:

When all actions and commitments in an implementation plan are complete and corresponding closure packages have been transmitted to the Board, the Secretary must propose closure of the original recommendation in a letter to the Board and should include the following sentence or equivalent: “The Department has completed the commitments identified under its implementation plan for this recommendation, and proposes closure of the recommendation.” Alternatively, proposed recommendation closure may be based on resolution of the original safety concerns on some other basis than completion of the associated implementation plan commitments. For such cases, the Department’s rationale for proposing closure must be spelled out for the Board’s consideration.
The Board sees no reason to depart from this heretofore successful method and views your letter of March 21, 2013, and its attachment as transmitting such a request to close the recommendation.

Sincerely,

Peter S. Winokur, Ph.D.
Chairman