

**From:** sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 14, 2008 9:09 AM  
**To:** Dimarzio, John A.  
**Cc:** Nigam, Hitesh; Groome, Chadi D.; drew.grainger [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: SPD SEIS - PDCF/WSB Land Disturbed

**Attachments:** Response to Baseline Comments on WSB Response-030508.doc; Comments on PDCF Response-030508.doc

I'm not sure if this answers your question, but I think it does. If it does not, then perhaps we can set up a conference call.

Sachiko

----- Forwarded by Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs on 05/14/2008 09:05 AM -----

**Samuel Speight** [REDACTED] To Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs@Srs  
cc  
05/13/2008 02:20 PM Subject Fw: SPD SEIS - PDCF/WSB Land Disturbed

\*\*\*\*\*

Samuel Speight  
Manager  
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Programs  
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded by Samuel Speight [REDACTED] on 05/13/2008 02:19 PM -----

**Cliff Thomas** [REDACTED] To Samuel Speight [REDACTED]  
cc Perry Stanley [REDACTED]  
04/28/2008 08:42 AM Subject Fw: SPD SEIS - PDCF/WSB Land Disturbed

Sam,  
This is what I provided to Joe Kelley for SAIC. The 48 acres was changed to 50 based on PDCF input for permanent impact. The original numbers were low for permanent and construction. The numbers provided below should bound everything planned and eliminate the multiple numbers being generated as the plan changes. Technically, we can defend the numbers below.  
cliff

----- Forwarded by Cliff Thomas [REDACTED] on 04/28/2008 08:30 AM -----

Cliff Thomas [REDACTED]

04/08/2008 12:29 PM

To Joseph Kelley [REDACTED], Randy Yourchak [REDACTED],  
Sterling Robertson [REDACTED]  
cc Brent Blunt [REDACTED], Don Baker [REDACTED],  
Douglas Meltor [REDACTED], William02 Martin [REDACTED],  
[REDACTED] "Rees, Joe" [REDACTED], Dave  
Grimm [REDACTED], James Mcentire [REDACTED]

Subject Re: Fw: SPD SEIS - PDCF/WSB Land Disturbed [Link](#)

Joe,  
WSB and PDCF should accept or change these numbers before being published. UNDERSTAND: An EIS is a bounding case for impacts; Bigger is better unless the impacts/risks become too high. For disturbed acreage, it is an insignificant impact within the bigger picture.  
The 9 acres for completed WSB is a good number to use for permanent footprint/impact (actual number is about 6.1 acres). The area for construction should also be stated as 9 acres. The reason the construction number is the same is that WSB will use already disturbed area for laydown and fabrication shops (PDCF footprint). The suggested number for permanent PDCF footprint is 48 acres. The 48 acres is the area which will not be revegetated with trees. This includes 4 acres for the training facility. The remaining acreage within the Site Development Working Area and Borrow pit (not assigned to WSB or PDCF) which totals almost 20 acres was disturbed by MOX which took credit for 37 acres of disturbance and will not be recounted. The PDCF acreage for construction is 48 plus the 60 planned for laydown and fab shops; total 108 acres for PDCF.  
Give me a call if you have questions.  
cliff

Joseph Kelley [REDACTED]

04/02/2008 12:07 PM

To Cliff Thomas [REDACTED]  
cc Sterling Robertson [REDACTED], Randy Yourchak [REDACTED],  
[REDACTED] Douglas Meltor [REDACTED], Don Baker [REDACTED],  
[REDACTED] William02 Martin [REDACTED], Brent  
Blunt [REDACTED], Don Baker [REDACTED]

Subject Fw: SPD SEIS - PDCF/WSB Land Disturbed

Cliff;  
Thanks for helping. Dimarzio's e-mail of 3/28 presents the concern. That e-mail is provided below.  
There are four questions to be answered.  
How much land was disturbed to construct the PDCF?

How much land was disturbed to construct the WSB?

How much land will be occupied (or occupied and maintained) by the completed PDCF?

How much land will be occupied (or occupied and maintained) by the completed WSB?

I'm forwarding the e-mail I sent earlier today asking for resolution to the land use questions. Also attached are the first round of SAIC's questions. Their questions are posted as comments within our original submittal. Only the pages of our submittal that were questioned are included, not the entire NEPA technical information. In the WSB document, our responses are also included within the marginal comments.

### WSB

The issue for WSB begins on page two of the response above.

In answer to the WSB space questions Doug Melton has replies:

Design Engineering has estimated that 9 acres will be disturbed during construction of WSB. They believe the same amount will be required to be maintained (including the sloped areas).

Joe, we need common understanding what is meant by occupied/maintained. Cliff Thomas may be able to answer this question. I would suggest that you ask him how much land has been or going to be disturbed for site prep for PDCF/WSB and assume that it will all have to be maintained. Subtract out WSB number and you have the PDCF numbers.

### PDCF

Randy Yourchak received the following set of comments:

The issue for PDCF begin on page three or the response above.

Both Randy and Brent Blunt replied that you were the person to provide input.

When I sent the first e-mail I was expecting a response by COB Friday, April 4. However since you have some catch up to do, please let me know if that's still possible

If you have any questions, please call [REDACTED] or page [REDACTED] me.

Thanks,

Joe

----- Forwarded by Joseph Kelley [REDACTED] on 04/02/2008 10:37 AM -----

Joseph Kelley [REDACTED]

To Sterling Robertson [REDACTED] Randy Yourchak [REDACTED]

cc William02 Martin [REDACTED], Douglas Melton [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

04/01/2008 05:22 PM

Subject Fw: SPD SEIS - PDCF/WSB Land Disturbed

Gents;

In reviewing our NEPA input, SAIC seems to have a lingering concern regarding the specific amount of real estate disturbed and taken up by PDCF and WSB.

The dilemma is based in numbers found in PDCF and WSB NEPA documents and those derived from the MOX FFF EIS.

After reading the information presented below, please provide answers to the following questions:

How much land was disturbed to construct the PDCF?

How much land was disturbed to construct the WSB?

How much land will be occupied (or occupied and maintained) by the completed PDCF?

How much land will be occupied (or occupied and maintained) by the completed WSB?

If your numbers vary from the WSB 9 or PDCF 50, a brief explanation would help.

If you have questions call me at [REDACTED], or page me at [REDACTED].

I would appreciate a response by COB Friday, April 4.

Thanks,

Joe

----- Forwarded by Joseph Kelley [REDACTED] on 04/01/2008 04:35 PM -----

Sachiko Mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov

To Joseph Kelley [REDACTED]

cc

04/01/2008 08:59 AM

Subject Fw: SPD SEIS - PDCF/WSB Land Disturbed

As discussed.

Sachiko

----- Forwarded by Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs on 04/01/2008 09:00 AM -----

"Dimarzio, John A." [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

To <sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov>

cc <drew.grainger [REDACTED] "Groome, Chadi D." [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

03/28/2008 12:04 PM

Subject SPD SEIS - PDCF/WSB Land Disturbed

I'm hoping you can help end our confusion over some of the land disturbed numbers for the PDCF and WSB.

The PDCF NEPA Evaluation (B-PDCF-1-02-033) states that the current design facility acreage is 50 acres for the PDCF. The latest WSB Data Call Response (3/27/08) lists the land area occupied by the completed WSB at 9 acres.

This appears to be inconsistent with the MOX FFF EIS (NRC 2005: Figure 3.7 on page 3-30) that shows 22.5 acres within the PDCF/WSB project area and the NNSA Plutonium Disposition Projects Overview (Bozzone, 3/5/08) slides 3 and 7. Slide 7 shows an artist's perspective of what the PDCF/WSB will look like overlain on the area before it was cleared. Slide 3 shows the land that was cleared for the PDCF/WSB.

Based on a comparison of the information provided above, it appears that the land to be occupied by these facilities is between 23 and 50 acres.

Please clarify how much land was disturbed to construct the PDCF? WSB?

Please clarify how much land will be occupied by the completed PDCF? WSB?

Thanks for your help...John

