

GEHitachiUELACEm Resource

From: Obarr, Kevin [kevin.obarr@labor.nc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 12:48 PM
To: GLE_EIS Resource
Subject: docket ID NRC-2009-0157
Attachments: image001.gif; General Electric GLE Draft Environmental Impact Statement comments.doc

Please accept these comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the General Electric – Hitachi Global Laser Enrichment, LLC Proposed Laser-Based Uranium Enrichment Facility. The attachment contains the same language as that below.

Submitted by Kevin O'Barr, Standards Supervisor, N.C. Department of Labor

Section 1.5.1.14 references federal OSHA. I suggest inserting a sentence like “North Carolina is one of the states that manages its own OSH program through the N.C. Department of Labor.” The report attempts to clarify the issue in section 1.5.3; however, that section is short and vague so I think a more specific reference would provide improvement and clarification.

Page 4-79

Line 30

Change “overseen” to “regulated by” or “under the jurisdiction of”

Line 31

The organizational unit is technically correctly titled “Occupational Safety and Health Division”

Line 33

Change “General Industrial Regulations for eye and face protection under 29 CFR 1910.132” to “29 CFR 1910.133, eye and face protection”.

Line 35

Change “Department of Environmental Health” to “Department of Labor” or if the writer means to reference Dept. of Environmental Health the NCAC reference needs to be changed. The current NCAC reference is to the N.C. Department of Labor.

Page 4-89

Section 4.2.11.3

Line 46 OSHA standards are not best practices. They are minimum requirements. This sentence is inaccurate as currently written by implying OSHA standards are best practices.

Kevin O'Barr MS, MESH

Standards Supervisor
Education, Training & Technical Assistance Bureau
Occupational Safety and Health Division
N. C. Department of Labor

Email: kevin.obarr@labor.nc.gov
Phone: 919-807-2878
Fax: 919-807-2888

Email correspondence to and from this sender may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Federal Register Notice: 75FR36447
Comment Number: 1

Mail Envelope Properties (0870453D895ED6469AB84C9F05461471091132991C)

Subject: docket ID NRC-2009-0157
Sent Date: 7/15/2010 12:48:08 PM
Received Date: 7/15/2010 12:48:11 PM
From: Obarr, Kevin

Created By: kevin.obarr@labor.nc.gov

Recipients:
"GLE_EIS Resource" <GLE_EIS.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: NCWITMXMBEV51.ad.ncmail

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2022	7/15/2010 12:48:11 PM
image001.gif	1992	
General Electric GLE Draft Environmental Impact Statement comments.doc		

23104

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:



Comments for the General Electric GLE Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Docket ID NRC-2009-0157

Submitted by Kevin O'Barr, Standards Supervisor, N.C. Department of Labor

Section 1.5.1.14 references federal OSHA. I suggest inserting a sentence like "North Carolina is one of the states that manages its own OSH program through the N.C. Department of Labor." The report attempts to clarify the issue in section 1.5.3; however, that section is short and vague so I think a more specific reference would provide improvement and clarification.

Page 4-79

Line 30

Change "overseen" to "regulated by" or "under the jurisdiction of"

Line 31

The organizational unit is technically correctly titled "Occupational Safety and Health Division"

Line 33

Change "General Industrial Regulations for eye and face protection under 29 CFR 1910.132" to "29 CFR 1910.133, eye and face protection".

Line 35

Change "Department of Environmental Health" to "Department of Labor" or if the writer means to reference Dept. of Environmental Health the NCAC reference needs to be changed. The current NCAC reference is to the N.C. Department of Labor.

Page 4-89

Section 4.2.11.3

Line 46 OSHA standards are not best practices. They are minimum requirements. This sentence is inaccurate as currently written by implying OSHA standards are best practices.