

Oberschlake, Mary E.

Orange, CA

Page 1 of 2

February 22, 2001

Gen. Hutman
US Department of Energy
Oak Ridge Operations, D-80
PO Box 5001
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Dear Mr. Hutman,

As a mother, health care worker
and concerned citizen I must
tell you that the United States
does not need a new bomb plant!

1/16

President Bush campaigned on a platform
that included unilateral cuts in nuclear
weapons and he must honor his promises

In Oak Ridge, the predominantly African-
American Scenic community sits less than
0.5 miles from the Y-12 plant. The DOE
claim that there is no environmental justice
is a simple racism.

2/13

As regards jobs, current Y-12 workforce can
be gradually employed in dismantling nuclear
weapons.

3/03

Don't let this happen. Please!

Sincerely,
Mary E. Oberschlake
11256 East Orchard Avenue
Orange, California 92667

Comment No. 1

Issue Code: 16

The proposed action and alternatives analyzed in the Y-12 SWEIS address the continued operation of the assigned nuclear weapons stockpile management requirement of Y-12. There is no proposal to expand capabilities or to increase nuclear weapons production at Y-12. In accordance with Section 91 of the Atomic Energy Act, DOE carries out its mission (i.e., atomic weapons activities) consistent with the consent of and direction from the President and Congress. This consent and direction are contained in the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum, which is updated annually. The issue of whether DOE should produce nuclear weapons is beyond the scope of the Y-12 SWEIS.

Dismantlement of nuclear weapons (see Section 2.2.1) is an ongoing activity at Y-12 and would not change under any of the alternatives analyzed in the Y-12 SWEIS.

Comment No. 2

Issue Code: 13

DOE is committed to compliance with Executive Order 12898, Federal actions to address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. The environmental justice analysis was prepared in accordance with the CEQ's guidelines of environmental justice under NEPA. The Y-12 SWEIS addresses the issue of whether implementation of the proposed action or alternatives would result in disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. The CEQ's guidance further states that an environmental effect must be significant to qualify as disproportionately high and adverse, where significant is defined by the CEQ's implementation recommendations (see 40 CFR Part 1508.27). As discussed in Volume I, Chapter 5, Section 5.12 of the Y-12 SWEIS, implementation of the alternatives for the continuation of the Y-12's weapons support mission, and the construction and operation of new facilities for the HEU Storage and Special Materials missions at Y-12 would pose no significant radiological or nonradiological health risks

Oberschlake, Mary E.
Orange, CA
Page 2 of 2

Comment No. 2 (cont.)

Issue Code: 13

to the public. The conservatively estimated dose to the MEI for Alternative 4 would be approximately 4.5 mrem/year, which is below the NESHAP standard of 10 mrem/year. The risks would not be significant regardless of the racial, ethnic, and economic composition of potentially affected populations. (See also the response to Comment No. 20 regarding the Scarboro Community on page 212.)

Comment No. 3

Issue Code: 03

The Y-12 SWEIS has been prepared in accordance with CEQ's regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and DOE's NEPA regulations (10 CFR Part 1021) and procedures. The potential socioeconomic impacts identified for the alternatives are included in the Y-12 SWEIS. DOE believes that it has adequately addressed socioeconomic impacts that could result from implementing the various alternatives. Volume I, Chapter 5, Section 5.3 of the Y-12 SWEIS addresses socioeconomic impacts from the proposed action and alternatives.