

From: drew.grainger [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 07, 2010 4:30 PM
To: sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov
Cc: Dimarzio, John A.; virginia.kay [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Glass Waste Storage Building (GWSB)

The DWPF SEIS (DOE/EIS-0082-S, November 1994) says (p. 2-25) "The design of the second building has not been developed, but it would also be designed to contain radioactivity in the event of natural disasters. If the siting of a Federal repository continues to be delayed, canister storage capacity up to a maximum of 10,000 radioactive canisters, as addressed in the 1982 EIS, could be constructed." When we built #2 we documented in an EEC that it was covered in the DWPF EIS and SEIS.

The actions in the SPD SEIS would not cause us to build another GWSB. Only if the presence of Pu in the glass or the small canisters requires significant design changes in GWSB #3 would we have to address it in the SPD SEIS. Otherwise, it could be mentioned in the SPD SEIS with a statement that the appropriate NEPA review will be conducted.

Andrew R. Grainger, NEPA Compliance Officer
 Savannah River Operations Office
 [REDACTED]

From: Sachiko Mcalhany [REDACTED]
 To: "Dimarzio, John A." [REDACTED]
 Cc: drew.grainger [REDACTED]; virginia.kay [REDACTED]
 Date: 09/07/2010 10:35 AM
 Subject: RE: Glass Waste Storage Building (GWSB)

Drew, do you know the answer to John's question on the NEPA coverage for another GWSB?

Specific to the 3 bullets:

- [The No Action alternative would include storage of 7 MT of pits at Pantex and 6 MT of non-pit Pu at KAMS at SRS. The storage of other pits and non-pit Pu will not be considered part of our No Action Alternative. Correct.](#)
- [Do we need to include the impacts of operating KIS and the new S&P in our alternatives? We were not anticipating including these activities, but you can make the argument that storage under the no action alternative includes these activities, and under the action alternatives, you would perform these activities until all Pu was removed from KAMS.](#)

Since the decision to construct/operate these processes are already documented in the EA/FONSI, under the action alternative we should include that the surveillance, packaging/repackaging, and storage activities will continue to ensure safe storage of the plutonium.

- [How much Pu would be processed in H-Canyon/HB-Line under the No Action Alternative?](#)

Approximately 0.6 MT of non pit plutonium currently stored in KAMS will be processed under the No Action Alternative. We need to make it clear in the document that this quantity is not part of the action considered in the SEIS so this 0.6 MT is not a subset of the 6 MT of non-pit Pu.

I will also update the GC talking points based on our meeting with GC last week to help clarify some points. I'm hoping to

send it out tomorrow.

Sachiko

From: "Dimarzio, John A." [REDACTED]
To: <sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov>
Cc: <virginia.kay [REDACTED]>, <drew.grainger [REDACTED]>
Date: 09/02/2010 08:49 AM
Subject: RE: Glass Waste Storage Building (GWSB)

Wanted you to verify some assumptions/questions for the alternatives:

- The No Action alternative would include storage of 7 MT of pits at Pantex and 6 MT of non-pit Pu at KAMS at SRS. The storage of other pits and non-pit Pu will not be considered part of our No Action Alternative.
- Do we need to include the impacts of operating KIS and the new S&P in our alternatives? We were not anticipating including these activities, but you can make the argument that storage under the no action alternative includes these activities, and under the action alternatives, you would perform these activities until all Pu was removed from KAMS.
- How much Pu would be processed in H-Canyon/HB-Line under the No Action Alternative?

We are working on development of the alternatives and therefore will have lots of questions like these for you over the next week or so.

From: Dimarzio, John A.
Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2010 3:17 PM
To: 'sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov'
Cc: 'virginia.kay [REDACTED]'; drew.grainger [REDACTED]
Subject: Glass Waste Storage Building (GWSB)

We've seen some talk that another Glass Waste Storage Building (GWSB) may be needed at SRS. Is there NEPA coverage for construction and operation of another building? I don't remember seeing NEPA coverage for a third building.

John DiMarzio | SAIC
Senior Environmental Scientist | Project Manager
Energy, Environment & Infrastructure Solutions

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]