

Public Comment Hearings
January 25, 2001, Oak Ridge, TN
Page 1 of 2

149 Pembroke Road
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
February 15, 2001

Gary Hartman
U.S. Department of Energy
Oak Ridge Operations Office, DP-80
P.O. Box 2001
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Dear Mr. Hartman:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Y-12 Draft Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement. I was unable to attend the public hearings, but I appreciate the opportunity to comment in this correspondence.

As a resident who has lived in the Oak Ridge Woodland Area for 24 years, I strongly urge the Department of Energy (DOE) to drop any proposed plans for upgrading the weapons production facilities at the Y-12 National Security Complex.

Other options for Y-12 need to be studied and carefully evaluated. I believe that the mission of Y-12 needs to be changed to that of a facility that provides services and products that are not associated with nuclear weapons, which cause mass destruction not only of military installations but also of civilian population, resources, and infrastructure as well.

I do not see how the continued operation and upgrade of Y-12's weapon production facilities will be compatible with the preservation of the local, regional, or global environment. This nation and its political leaders have a moral obligation to significantly reduce our nuclear arsenal and demonstrate clear signs of working towards nuclear disarmament as an actual foreign policy goal. The modernization of the Y-12 National Security Complex will work against achieving this goal in a timely manner.

An environmentally sound mission for Y-12 would include the cleanup of the radioactive and hazardous materials in the East Tennessee region from past activities at the facility. I strongly support Y-12 and its dedicated workforce in this mission. I further urge DOE to establish and support programs at Y-12 for dismantling nuclear weapons along with programs that produce nonmilitary goods and services that provide beneficial uses to the welfare of all people. Such activities would provide functions and missions for the Y-12 workforce that can be considered positive and meaningful in regards to the potential social benefits that many nonmilitary products could provide.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this critical, difficult, and complex topic. I greatly appreciate your serious consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Stephen N. Storch

Stephen N. Storch
Oak Ridge, TN

Comment No. 1

Issue Code: 16

Comment noted. The proposed action and alternatives analyzed in the Y-12 SWEIS address the continued operation of the assigned nuclear weapons stockpile management requirements 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.

This Y-12 SWEIS analysis includes the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental consequences of the continued operation of the Y-12 National Security Complex and the construction and operation of new facilities for the HEU Storage and Special Materials missions at Y-12. The proposed action is not expected to have any impacts upon the nuclear weapons endeavors of other nations; would not violate or impact any international treaties or agreements; would not have any impact on ongoing negotiations to further reduce nuclear weapons stockpiles; and would not promote nuclear proliferation.

Dismantlement of nuclear weapons and environmental clean-up activities (see Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2, respectively) are ongoing activities at Y-12. These activities would not change under any of the alternatives analyzed in the Y-12 SWEIS

1/16

'01 FEB 20 PM 1:52