I would like to thank each member of the NSSAB for their review of the NNSSER Summary; Chapter 5, Section 5.1; Chapter 10, Section 10.1; and Chapter 11. The resultant review comments received by the Department of Energy (DOE) in the January 21, 2015, NSSAB correspondence were constructive and insightful on how DOE can improve the clarity, quality, and readability of this public document.

In reviewing the comments and after some discussion, we decided to group the NSSAB recommendations into several categories as it seemed they had similar themes.

We grouped together the editorial comments suggesting word changes (ex. “Improve phrasing of, ‘...seven were moved out of harm’s way off roads.’” to “... seven were moved off NNSS roads.” (page 20)). Many of these were regarding wording that remains similar from year to year; so these comments will be incorporated in the next edition of the NNSSER, as appropriate.

We grouped together comments regarding graphical changes to existing tables/maps/figures (ex. “Change the colors for the labels on the Types of Groundwater Sampling Locations table and the colors for the well locators on the adjacent NNSA/NFO Water Sampling Network map so they match (page 11)”). For tables, figures, and maps generated specifically for the NNSSER, we intend to incorporate these recommended changes into future editions of the report. Due to limited funding, we do use some figures and maps from other existing documents. We also use these to ensure consistency between reports. We will incorporate the NSSAB comments on these graphics as funding becomes available to support such changes.

We agreed with all the suggested organizational changes (ex. “Move “Understanding Radiation Dose” section before radiological monitoring sections”)) and will incorporate in future reports.

Some comments addressed specific technical issues (ex. “Mention that all appropriate radionuclides in groundwater are sampled and explain the reason that tritium is the primary contaminant of concern”). While in some cases we thought we had explained the specific technical issue, your review proved to be a good litmus test. It showed us that we had not clearly discussed the subject as well as we thought or the discussion was not where the public might expect it to be found. For most cases, we will address this seeming gap in explanation, such as a
better explanation of sampling design for the radiological water monitoring. One NSSAB comment suggested discussing the impacts of global atmospheric testing on surface water, but we believe this is beyond the scope or intent of this document.

Finally, we plan to include hyperlinks as part of the online NNSSER. However, we will not be adding a list of Corrective Action Sites to the NNSSER as there are more than 5,000 at the NNSS.

Again, I would like to reiterate my thanks to each member of the NSSAB for their contributions to the NNSSER review.

Please direct comments and questions to Kelly Snyder at (702) 295-2836.
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