

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
PLANT FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE					
The annual utility usage for the plant and six new projects would be: Steam - 181M kg (398M lb) Electricity - 90,400 MWh Natural Gas - 16.2M m³ (573M ft³) Utility demand would be substantially less than utility capacity; therefore, no significant impacts to infrastructure are expected.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur, and there would be no construction impacts. Due to reduced workload expected in the future, infrastructure impacts from current operations would be expected to be less than current impacts. Under the downsizing alternative, all construction activities would be modifications to existing facilities. Facilities would be consolidated and impacts would be expected to be less than current impacts. Under the relocation alternative, the facilities would undergo decontamination and decommissioning.	The utility usage would conservatively be: Steam - 180M kg (392M lb) Electricity - 33,350 MWh Natural Gas - 0.8M m³ (27M ft³) Utility demand would be within system capacity; therefore, there are no significant impacts to infrastructure expected	Site infrastructure resources required would be less than resources available onsite. No increases in electricity and gas usage would occur. Oil requirements would increase slightly during construction.	Site infrastructure requirements would be: Electricity - 24,333 MWh Oil - 1,356,233 liters Gas - 0 m³	Site infrastructure requirements would be: Electricity - 1,154,000 MWh Oil - 844,750 liters Gas - 8,976,000 m³

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
LAND RESOURCES					
The impacts to land resources are expected to be limited. New land use for new facilities would involve an area of 1.6 hectares (4 acres), equal to 0.04 percent of total area at Pantex Plant.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur, and there would be no change in land use. Under the downsizing alternative, facilities would be consolidated and impacts would be expected to be less than current impacts. Under the relocation alternative, the Pantex Plant facilities would be decommissioned and no longer active.	Total land used for the new facilities would involve an area of 10.6 hectares (26.3 acres).	New plutonium (Pu) and HEU storage facility would require 89.5 hectares (221 acres) of land. No new land disturbance would occur.	Land disturbance would conservatively be 639 hectares (1,580 acres).	Land disturbance would conservatively be 403 hectares (995 acres).
GEOLOGY AND SOILS					
The impacts to geology or soils would be limited to the temporary disturbance of 31,800 m ² (342,000 ft ²) resulting from construction of new facilities.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur, and there would be no construction. Therefore, impacts to soils would be expected to be the same as those from current operations. Under the downsizing alternative, all construction activities would be modifications to existing facilities. Consequently, no significant land disturbance would occur. Under the relocation alternative, decontamination and decommissioning of the facilities would not be expected to have impacts to the soil.	No impacts on soils identified in the PEIS. However, temporary disturbance of up to 21.2 hectares (56.2 acres) could occur during construction.	No apparent direct or indirect effects on geologic resources would be anticipated. Soil impacts during construction would be minimal.	No apparent direct or indirect effects on geologic resources would be anticipated. Soil impacts during construction would be minimal.	No apparent direct or indirect effects on geologic resources and soils are anticipated.

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
WATER RESOURCES					
Annual wastewater generation and water demand for the plant and six new projects would be: Wastewater - 647M liters (172M gal) Water - 1,011M liters (267M gal) Compliance with current discharge standards would keep levels of contaminants the same. The increase in Pantex Plant annual water usage (currently 0.6 percent of regional withdrawal from the Ogallala aquifer) would not significantly affect the ongoing regional depletion of the aquifer.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Due to the reduced workload expected in the future, impacts to water resources from operations would be expected to be approximately 249M liters (66M gallons) per year. Water requirements would be met without increased aquifer drawdowns. Under the downsizing alternative, the groundwater withdrawals would be approximately 209M liters (55M gallons) per year, a reduction of 16 percent compared to those under the No Action Alternative. Under the relocation alternative, all water use for assembly and disassembly operations and HE fabrication would cease.	Annual wastewater generation and water demands would be: Wastewater - 43,660 liters (11,535 gal) Water - 96,200 liters (25,416 gal) The Pantex Plant water usage (currently 0.6 percent of regional withdrawal from the Ogallala aquifer) would not significantly affect the ongoing regional depletion of the aquifer.	Annual wastewater generation and water usage would be: Wastewater - 13M liters (3.4M gal) Water - 130M liters (34M gal)	Annual wastewater generation and water usage would be: Wastewater - 110.2M liters (29M gal) Water - 130.2M liters (34.4M gal)	Annual wastewater generation and water usage would be: Wastewater - 484.7M liters (128M gal) Water - 572.9M liters (151.3M gal)

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
AIR QUALITY					
Offsite concentrations of air pollutants were modeled and compared to screening levels which showed no adverse impacts to human health are expected. The onsite air quality levels are below those that would pose health risks to workers. The impacts from temporary increases in emissions from construction of new facilities would be negligible.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Due to the reduced workload expected in the future, air quality impacts from operations would be expected to be less than current impacts. Air quality would remain within regulatory limits. Under the downsizing alternative, the operations would be consolidated. Air quality impacts would be equivalent to those of the No Action Alternative. Under the relocation alternative, air quality impacts from assembly and disassembly operations and HE fabrication would cease.	Impacts would remain below the National and State air quality standards.	The new Pu and HEU facility would have minimal air quality impacts. Concentrations of criteria, toxic, and hazardous air pollutants are predicted to be in compliance with Federal, State, and local air quality regulations or guidelines.	Construction of facilities would result in emissions of some pollutants. Emissions would typically not exceed Federal, State, or local air quality regulations or guidelines.	Operations of facilities would result in emissions of some pollutants. Emissions would typically not exceed Federal, State, or local air quality regulations or guidelines.
ACOUSTICS					
Except for airblast from HE detonations, noise levels from Pantex Plant activities would be below 65 dBA at the plant boundary. The detonations could be audible at a distance of 5 to 10 kilometers (3 to 6 miles). Due to the size of the site, noise from construction of the new facilities would not reach the public.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Due to the reduced workload expected in the future, noise impacts from operations would be expected to be less than current impacts. Under the downsizing alternative, facilities would be consolidated. The noise impacts would be equivalent to the No Action Alternative. Under the relocation alternative, noise from assembly and disassembly operations and HE fabrication would cease.	Associated construction activities include heavy construction equipment and increased traffic. Non-traffic noise associated with the operation would be located at sufficient distance that contribution to offsite noise levels would continue to be small.	Noise from construction equipment or operations activities would not be expected to cause annoyance to the public due to size of the site.	Noise from construction equipment would not be expected to cause annoyance to the public.	Noise from operations activities would not be expected to cause annoyance to the public.

**TABLE 4.21–1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects—Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
BIOTIC RESOURCES					
There would be no impacts to threatened or endangered species, wetlands, or terrestrial or aquatic resources from Pantex Plant operations. The construction of new facilities would result in loss of 15,900 m ² (171,000 ft ²) of common plant and animal habitat, but would not impact sensitive species or habitats.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Impacts to biological resources from operations would be expected to remain the same as current impacts. Under the downsizing alternative, all construction activities would be modifications to existing facilities. Consequently, no potential impacts to biota would occur. Under the relocation alternative, decontamination and decommissioning activities of the existing facilities would not impact biotic resources.	Since specific sites for disposal facilities have not yet been identified, no specific impacts can be discussed at this stage.	Construction and operations of new Pu and HEU facility would have minimal impact on biological resources due to use of disturbed area of the site.	Facility construction would adversely affect 429 hectares (1,150 acres) of vegetation from land clearing activities. Animal populations would also be affected.	Facility operations would not result in any additional impacts other than those shown for construction of facilities.

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
CULTURAL RESOURCES					
No impacts to cultural, Native American, or paleontological resources are anticipated from the Proposed Action or the construction of new facilities.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Impacts to cultural resources from operations would be expected to remain the same as current impacts. Under the downsizing alternative, all construction activities would be modifications to existing facilities. Consequently, no potential impacts to cultural resources would occur.	Since specific sites for disposal facilities have not yet been identified, no specific impacts can be discussed at this stage. In general, given that future siting priorities would include minimum or no impact to specific cultural resources, significant impacts from these activities are unlikely.	Impacts to prehistoric and historic resources are not anticipated within the previously disturbed construction area of the new facility. Operations would not result in additional impacts.	Facility construction could adversely affect some cultural resources on as much as 429 hectares (1,150 acres) of previously undisturbed lands.	Facility operations would not result in additional impacts other than those shown for construction of facilities.

**TABLE 4.21–1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects—Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES					
3,800 direct jobs and 6,257 secondary jobs would continue. Total personal income of \$564 million would be added to the economy annually. Construction of new facilities would temporarily generate 1,227 direct and indirect jobs. A total of \$56 million of personal income would be added to the economy in the peak construction year.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Due to the reduced workload expected in the future, the most significant change at Pantex Plant would involve the number of workers associated with the assembly and disassembly mission, which would be expected to decrease from approximately 2,365 to approximately 915 for one-shift operations. The number of direct workers associated with HE fabrication would decrease from approximately 365 to 105. Under the downsizing alternative, assembly and disassembly operations at Pantex Plant would proceed more efficiently and require approximately 800 workers for one-shift operations, 115 workers less than under the No Action Alternative. For three-shift operations, the bounding-case, approximately 1,266 workers would be required. All construction activities would be modifications to existing facilities. Consequently, socioeconomic impacts from the construction would be minimal.	654 direct workers would be required during the operations period. This figure is conservative because the employment due to new treatment facilities is already taken into account in the figures for the Proposed Action.	Construction and operation of the new facility would require 1,524 and 676 workers, respectively.	Construction of facilities would require an average of 1,850 construction workers per year over a 6-year period.	Facility operations would require 5,122 new workers at the plant site.

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES (CONTINUED)					
	Under the relocation alternative, approximately 1,644 direct and 1,905 indirect jobs would be lost in the regional economic area. The loss of approximately 3,549 total jobs would cause the regional economic area unemployment rate to increase from 4.8 to 6.2 percent. Housing and rental vacancies and public finance expenditures and revenue would change by less than 1 percent.				
INTRASITE TRANSPORTATION					
The Proposed Action would have an estimated worker exposure of 61 person-rem, and a group latent cancer fatality risk for 10-year exposure of 0.024.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Due to the reduced workload expected in the future, impacts from intrasite transportation activities would be expected to be less than current impacts. Under the downsizing alternative, the facilities would be consolidated; this could further reduce the amount of intrasite transportation impacts. Under the relocation alternative, intrasite transportation associated with assembly and disassembly operations and HE fabrication would cease.	Potential fatalities to the offsite population and to workers from waste management activities are essentially zero for every alternative.			

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
WASTE MANAGEMENT					
The Proposed Action would result in the annual generation of the following amounts of waste: LLW - 249 m ³ (326 yd ³) LLMW - 183 m ³ (240 yd ³) HW - 192 m ³ (251 yd ³) NHW (Class 1) - 742 m ³ (970 yd ³) NHW (Class 2) - 574 m ³ (751 yd ³)	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Due to the reduced workload expected in the future, waste management impacts from operations would be expected to be less than current impacts. Generated wastes would be adequately managed with existing waste management facilities. Under the downsizing alternative, Pantex Plant would have adequate waste management facilities to treat, store, and dispose of its wastes, although LLW at Pantex Plant would continue to be shipped offsite to Nevada Test Site. Under the relocation alternative, the amount of eventual decontamination and decommissioning activities and wastes would increase.	The Pantex Plant Proposed Action includes the construction and operation of the treatment facilities. The construction of the disposal facilities would not generate any waste, only fill dirt. The operation of the disposal facilities would not generate any wastes. Therefore, the amount of waste to be managed would remain as shown under the Pantex Plant Proposed Action.	The collocated facility would result in annual generation of the following amounts of liquid/solid waste: TRU Waste - 0.02/10 m ³ Mixed TRU - 0/4 m ³ LLW - 2.1/1,300 m ³ LLMW - 0.2/66 m ³ HW - 2/2 m ³ NHW - 129,500/1,840 m ³	Construction of facilities would result in the generation of minimal amounts of hazardous and non-hazardous wastes. These wastes would be managed onsite.	Facility operations would result in the annual generation of the following amounts of liquid/solid waste: TRU Waste - 3.2/651 m ³ Mixed TRU - 0/204 m ³ LLW - 18,964/2,498 m ³ LLMW - 1.24/235.7 m ³ HW - 8/191.7 m ³ NHW - 485,300/7,516 m ³ Spent fuel - 52 metric tons

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
HUMAN HEALTH					
The Proposed Action would have an estimated worker exposure of 330 person-rem, and a group latent cancer risk for 10-year exposure of 0.13.	Under the No Action Alternative, no downsizing or modification of facilities would occur. Due to the reduced workload expected in the future, human health impacts from operations would be expected to be less than current impacts. The average radiological dose to workers would not be expected to change, although the total worker dose would change due to the reduced number of workers associated with a reduction in workload. Potential impacts from accidents, which are essentially independent of a given operating tempo, would not be expected to change.	Potential fatalities to the offsite population and to workers from waste management activities are essentially zero for every alternative.	The annual dose to the public from the collocated facility would be 5.3×10^{-5} person-rem. This would cause an estimated 1.3×10^{-6} fatal cancers during 50 years of operation. The alternative of storing surplus pits from RFETS at Pantex Plant in the near-term could cause less than 10^{-2} fatal cancers for affected workers due to repackaging operations. There would be no effect to the public.	Facility construction is expected to have negligible human health impacts.	The annual doses resulting from facility operations would be within radiological limits and well below levels of natural background radiation.

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT					
An aircraft accident capable of causing a release from a pit storage or weapons storage magazine is extremely unlikely (frequency of occurrence less than 10^{-4} but greater than or equal to 10^{-6}). A person in the vicinity of the plant has an approximately 3.0×10^{-12} increase in fatal cancer risk from potential aircraft crash plutonium dispersal accidents for the bounding Zone 4 storage configuration.	The SSM PEIS includes three alternatives that apply to Pantex Plant: No Action, Downsize Existing Capability, and Relocate Capability. Although the No Action Alternative, does not account for the time plutonium is at risk, there would be a reduction in the risk from an aircraft crash because of the reduction in operations. Under the downsizing alternative, there would be a consolidation of facilities and a commensurate reduction in the risk from an aircraft crash due to the fewer number of facilities. Under the relocation alternative, the risk from an aircraft crash into assembly and disassembly and HE fabrication facilities would be reduced to zero.	The impacts resulting from an aircraft accident to waste management facilities were not calculated in the WM PEIS.	The collocated storage facility would result in a reduction in the probability of an aircraft crash into a building or magazine containing plutonium. This reduction is due to the reduced number of buildings and magazines that would be utilized.	Facility construction was not analyzed for aircraft accidents. No plutonium release would occur in the event of an aircraft crash.	No aircraft accident analysis was conducted in the S&D PEIS.

**TABLE 4.21-1.—Environmental Impacts of Pantex Plant Operations
and Other Reasonably Foreseeable Projects-Continued**

IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT PROPOSED ACTION LEVEL (2,000 WEAPONS LEVEL INCLUDING 20,000 PITS IN STORAGE)	IMPACTS OF PANTEX PLANT OPERATIONS AT STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PEIS LEVEL (SSM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (WM PEIS)	IMPACTS OF COLLOCATION OF PU AND HEU STORAGE FACILITY (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)	IMPACTS OF OPERATIONS OF DISPOSITION FACILITIES (S&D PEIS)
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE					
Minority and low-income populations would not be disproportionately affected.	The SSM PEIS includes three alternatives that apply to Pantex Plant: No Action, Downsize Existing Capability, and Relocate Capability. None of the alternatives would result in impacts that would disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations in the Pantex Plant area.	No disproportionate effects on minority or low income populations were identified in the WM PEIS.	Minority and low- income populations would not be disproportionately affected.	Minority and low- income populations would not be disproportionately affected.	Minority and low- income populations would not be disproportionately affected.

M - Million

LLW - Low-level waste

HW - Hazardous waste

dBA - Decibel A-weighted scale

MWh - Megawatt hours

LLMW - Low-level mixed waste

NHW - Nonhazardous nonradioactive waste