ALLEY, CLYDE, AMARILLO, TX
PAGE 1 OF 5

Comment Form

United States Department of Energy

NAME: (Optional) CLYDE ALLEY
ADDRESS: 8 CAMBRIDGE ROAD AMARILLO TX 79124
TELEPHONE: (806) 353-8273

SOCIOECONOMIC QUESTIONS (ATTACHED)
PANTEX PLANT WATER USAGE (ATTACHED)

SSM PEIS and S&D PEIS
SOCIOECONOMIC QUESTIONS

* Please explain why LLNL and LANL Stockpile Management budgets show projected increases from 1996 to 2004 since the US has terminated the development of new nuclear weapons ?
  Ref. SSM PEIS Preferred Alternatives Report, pp 26,30.

* Are these projected increases in Stockpile Management at the two labs based on transferring missions to them which have previously been done at the production plants ?

* Please elaborate on a statement made on page 34 of the SSM PEIS Preferred Alternatives Report that " personnel from the laboratories could perform assembly / disassembly for some weapon surveillance operations to improve the programmatic tie between Stockpile Stewardship and Stockpile Management ".
  - Would laboratory personnel replace Pantex personnel for this work ? If not, explain.
  - Would this add to the projected layoffs at Pantex ? If not, explain.
  - Would the laboratory personnel be trained and certified to perform this work ?
  - What organization(s) would be responsible for safety, safeguards, and conduct of operations associated with this work ?
  - Explain how this would improve Stockpile Stewardship and Management ?

* Under Phaseout (page S-21) of the S&D PEIS the statement is made " All of the regional economic areas surrounding the DOE sites would experience a loss in employment with 1/09.08.08

M-125

09 08 08 Comment Number 1

With the exception of RFETS, the phaseout of existing storage facilities at DOE sites would involve, at most, the loss of 200 direct jobs (Hanford and SRS). At Pantex, the phaseout would only affect five jobs, and no jobs would be lost at INEL. The impacts of these employment losses on the affected regional economies would be minimal. As stated in the PEIS, the regional economies in which the DOE sites are located are too large to be adversely affected by such a small decrease in employment at one site. Although the phaseout of storage facilities at RFETS would involve a greater number of workers, the impact on the regional economy would still be small because of the plant's location near a large metropolitan area. The PEIS analyses (including analyses of socioeconomic impacts), along with technical and cost studies, nonproliferation considerations, and public comments will be considered by DOE in the Record of Decision (ROD).

ALLEY, CLYDE, AMARILLO, TX
PAGE 3 OF 5

phaseout. However, compared to total employment in these areas, the loss of jobs would have no or negligible impacts at all the DOE sites."
- For which sites would the impact be negligible ?
- For which sites would the impact be significant ?
- What is the basis for determining the significance of the impacts ?
- How does the DOE plan to use this significance in their selection process ?

1/09.08.08 cont.

* The socioeconomic analyses of the three EIS's are not consistent. The SWEIS (p. S-17) assumes 1.65 indirect jobs in the region for every job at Pantex. The SSM PEIS (p. S-32) assumes 1.16 and the S&D PEIS (p. 4-205) assumes 3.51.
  - Please explain these differences ?
  - Why didn't the DOE use the analysis of the Amarillo Economic Development Commission (AEDC) which is based on local knowledge of the area ? Their analysis gives a ratio of 2.87 to 1 (REF. Chamber Quarterly, 2nd Quarter, 1996, Amarillo Chamber of Commerce).

2/09.08.04

* Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, and President Clinton's February 11, 1994 Memorandum for the Heads of all Departments and Agencies requires an analysis of environmental effects on low-income and minority populations to include human health, social, and economic effects.
Why do the draft SWEIS, SSM PEIS, and S&D PEIS analyze only human health effects of the proposed actions and not the social and economic effects as required ?

3/09.12.08

M-125

09 08 04 Comment Number 2

The number of indirect jobs generated by the Proposed Alternatives was based on the Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II) model developed by BEA. The multipliers used in the model are available for every economic region in the Nation (each of the DOE sites). This allowed a consistent method to be applied to all sites. Site-specific numbers should be used in site-specific EISs. Section 4.1.8 of the PEIS has been modified to clarify the utilization of the RIMS II model.

Projections of the number of indirect jobs generated depends on a number of factors, including the activity performed, the type of data used, and the methodology employed. The Storage and Disposition PEIS evaluates the socioeconomic impacts for the storage and disposition of fissile materials at Pantex, while the Stockpile Stewardship and Management PEIS evaluated the impacts of weapon assembly and disassembly operations. The activities of the two programs are quite different and each requires very different inputs for production. The availability of inputs within the region determines the size of the multiplier.

09 12 08 Comment Number 3

Socioeconomic impacts are analyzed in detail in all of the environmental statements noted by the commentor. The Storage and Disposition PEIS analyzes potential socioeconomic impacts for all of the Proposed Alternatives. For those alternatives that would add a new mission to a particular DOE site, there would be no adverse socioeconomic impacts. In fact, the analyses indicate that the impacts of these alternatives would be small but beneficial to the affected regional economies. There would be no environmental justice issues associated with these alternatives. For those alternatives involving phaseout of storage facilities, the job loss would be very small in all cases except RFETS. Even in the case of RFETS storage facility phaseout, the employment loss would have a minimal impact on the local communities and on the regional economy. Hence, there would be no environmental justice impacts from these alternatives.

* In the draft SWEIS (p. S-17) it is stated that at the 500 weapon activity level Pantex " would support 2,400 direct jobs and 3,949 secondary jobs" and that " personal income additions to the economy would be reduced to $365 million annually ?
-Please explain why this degree of economic loss would not only be an adverse but a Significant Adverse Impact to the community.
- At the 500 weapon activity employment level what would be the impact to the revenues for the governing bodies within the Pantex ROI compared with the current revenues presented in Table 4.11.1.6-1 (p.4-165) ?

* In the draft SSM PEIS (I-4-450) please explain the statement " The downsizing A/D and HE fabrication alternative would result in the addition of 280 workers at Pantex "
- If the statement is incorrect what would be the result ?

M-125

ALLEY, CLYDE, AMARILLO, TX
PAGE 5 OF 5

WATER USAGE : PANTEX PLANT

* Plant used 230 million gallons in 1995.
  - Texas Tech Farms used 66 million gallons (29%) of the total plant water usage.
  - Nuclear weapons operations used 163 million gallons (71%).
* Amarillo Water District consumed 16 billion gallons in FY 1995.
* Pantex Plant including Texas Tech Farms used 1.4% as much water as Amarillo District.
* Nuclear weapons operations used 1% of the water used by Amarillo.
* Considering the water also used for irrigation, the Plant withdrew 0.6% of the regional withdrawal from the Ogellala aquifer.* Nuclear weapons operations consumed 0.43% of the regional withdrawal.
* Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Continued Operation of the Pantex Plant and Associated Storage of Nuclear Weapon Components, March 1996, page S-15.