

**From:** sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 23, 2008 12:25 PM  
**To:** Dimarzio, John A.  
**Cc:** Nigam, Hitesh; Groome, Chadi D.; drew.grainger [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response

I hope this answers your questions on the missing information for PDCF. I have also asked WSRC to pull together a story of the changes on the land use question and show what has changed for the 3 facilities in the total areas that need to be cleared.

Sachiko

----- Forwarded by Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs on 04/23/2008 12:22 PM -----

**Randy Yourchak** [REDACTED]

To Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs@Srs

cc Joseph Kelley [REDACTED]

04/21/2008 07:14 AM

Subject Fw: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response

Here's the information requested from the SAIC reviewers for the PDCF NEPA assessment/update.

----- Forwarded by Randy Yourchak [REDACTED] on 04/21/2008 07:12 AM -----

**"Reddick, Randy"** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

To "Z Yourchak, Randy" [REDACTED]

cc

04/15/2008 03:21 PM

Subject RE: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response

Randy,

Here is what we have:

- Potable water (units/yr) No estimate
- Non-potable water (units/yr) 9M gal/yr
- Electricity (units) 92,000 MWh
- Gasoline (units/yr) None
- Diesel Fuel (units/yr) No estimate of annual quantity used. Diesel used for stand-by and emergency services. PDCF will have four day tanks, 658 gal each, one stand-by storage tank 34,687 gal, one emergency storage tank 9,838 gal, and a 200 gal storage day tank. There is one diesel generator for each day tank (5 total) and on a routine basis each diesel generator will operate two hours per month for required testing.

- Concrete (units) 128,000 CY
- Asphalt (units) No estimate
- Steel (units) 21,000 tons
- Crushed stone (units) No estimate
- Sand & Gravel (units) No estimate
- Soil (units) Complete estimate not available, up to 128,000 CY will be used from MOX
- Lumber (units) No estimate
- Chemicals (units) See table at end of "Comments on PDCF Response-030508 (2)"
- Gases (units) See table at end of "Comments on PDCF Response-030508 (2)"
- Other construction materials (units) See table at end of "Comments on PDCF Response-030508 (2)"

Thanks,

Randy R

**From:** randy.yourchak [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 01, 2008 1:31 PM  
**To:** Reddick, Randy  
**Subject:** Fw: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response

Can you look at the utility/resource needs that were added back to the table (page 4 of "Comments on PDCF Response-030508" file) and reply? What I attached ("NEPA Page 4" file) is what I believe is missing from the version sent to you.

There always seems to be one more question.....

----- Forwarded by Randy Yourchak [REDACTED] on 04/01/2008 03:23 PM -----

Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs

04/01/2008 03:03 PM

To Randy Yourchak [REDACTED]

cc

Subject Fw: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response

Can you please help with this one? Apparently they left off one section of the table.

Thanks,  
Sachiko

----- Forwarded by Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs on 04/01/2008 03:02 PM -----

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

03/26/2008 11:24 AM

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

cc <drew.grainger [REDACTED] "Nigam, Hitesh" [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], "Groome, Chadi D." [REDACTED]

Subject FW: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response

I don't know how I missed this on all the previous versions of the table, but the Utility and Resource Use information requests for construction were somehow deleted from the table. I've added them back on page 4. Can you respond to this request?

Thanks...John

---

**From:** sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov [mailto:sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 20, 2008 9:17 AM  
**To:** Dimarzio, John A.  
**Cc:** sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov; drew.grainger [REDACTED]; Groome, Chadi D.; Hitesh. NIGAM [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response

Attached are the WGI responses to the PDCF comments. I hope this is what you were looking for. If you need clarification, we can get on a conference call with both Randy Yourchak (WSRC) and Randy Reddick (WGI).

Sachiko

----- Forwarded by Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs on 03/20/2008 08:58 AM -----

"Reddick, Randy" [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

03/19/2008 05:38 PM

To "Z Yourchak, Randy" [REDACTED]  
cc <craig02.martin [REDACTED]>, "Z Mcalhany, Sachiko" <sachiko-w.mcalhany@nnsa.srs.gov>, <brent.blun [REDACTED]>, "Shoberg, Roger" [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Subject RE: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response

Randy,

I have attached the data call table with responses to the comments. A couple of notes for clarification: a) my approach to this table was in a timeline fashion, i.e., 1) the SPD EIS (November 1999) provides the original basis, 2) the NEPA evaluation in B-PDCF-1-02-033 provided an update in March of 2007 comparing the PDCF design at that time with the SPD EIS, and finally 3) the table provided in the SAIC data call request was used to update B-PDCF-1-02-033. So when I used "No Changes" on the data

call it meant there were no changes to design or those parameters under evaluation since B-PDCF-1-02-033 was submitted in March 2007, b) the 9 MT of additional surplus material was assumed to be similar to the material to be processed at PDCF during the first 7.5 years. Adding the 9 MT for processing at PDCF would extend the operating life of PDCF by 2.6 years. This additional material would not require any changes to the facility design and would not result in different waste quantities (on an annual basis) or products. Cumulative impacts should be considered for the additional 9MT since that translates to an additional 2.6 years of waste disposal. The SPD EIS was based on a 15-year operation for PDCF so our current design (7.5 years) plus the additional 2.6 years is still within that envelope, and c) I have added some background information on construction air emissions and some recently developed PDCF resource needs at the end of the data call file. The resource information is undocumented at this point and may be refined in the future.

It should also be noted that the URS design effort does not include the PDCF administration building that will be built onsite. Also, the evaluation in B-PDCF-1-02-033 was intended to highlight only those items involving a relatively significant change in the PDCF design from the SPD EIS. The PDCF design has undoubtedly deviated from the SPD EIS in several other instances that were not evaluated in B-PDCF-1-02-033. Those changes will come to light during the full NEPA process – should DOE opt to revise the SPD EIS.

Please don't hesitate to contact me for further information needs. This e-mail and the attached document have received a classification review and are U/NU.

Thanks,

Randy R

**Sachiko Mcalhany/NNSA/DOE/Srs**

03/06/2008 03:07 PM

To Craig02 Martin [REDACTED]

cc Randy Yourchak [REDACTED]

Subject Fw: Comments on the PDCF Data Call Response