

- 1 • **Section 2.0 – HSW EIS Waste Streams and Waste Management Facilities:** Describes Hanford
2 waste management operations, waste types, waste streams, existing facilities, and proposed facilities
3 related to the proposed action and alternatives.
4
- 5 • **Section 3.0 – Description and Comparison of Alternatives:** Describes alternative actions that
6 could be taken at Hanford to manage solid radioactive and mixed waste (waste that contains both
7 radioactive and hazardous constituents), including alternative management strategies for each waste
8 type, and the No Action Alternative. This section also provides a comparison of environmental
9 impacts among the alternatives.
10
- 11 • **Section 4.0 – Affected Environment:** Discusses the human and physical environment that might be
12 affected by radioactive and mixed waste management operations at Hanford.
13
- 14 • **Section 5.0 – Environmental Consequences:** Identifies the potential impacts on the human and
15 physical environment that might result from implementation of the alternatives for waste management
16 at Hanford. This section also addresses environmental justice, cumulative impacts, irreversible and
17 irretrievable commitment of resources, the relationship between short-term uses of the environment
18 and the maintenance or enhancement of long-term productivity, and potential mitigation measures.
19
- 20 • **Section 6.0 – Regulatory Framework:** Identifies regulations and permits that apply to radioactive
21 and mixed waste management operations at Hanford.
22
- 23 • **Section 7.0 – List of Preparers and Contributors:** Identifies key persons who contributed to the
24 preparation of the HSW EIS.
25
- 26 • **Index** – Provides an alphabetized list of key names, terms, and subjects in this EIS and the sections in
27 which each item is mentioned.
28
- 29 • **Vol. II Appendixes** – Provide additional information regarding specific sections of the EIS and
30 discusses key issues identified during the scoping process for the ILAW SEIS.
31
- 32 • **Vol. III Comment-Response Document** – explains DOE’s role in the cleanup process at Hanford;
33 discusses key issues raised during the public comment process and responses to those key issues,
34 including changes incorporated into this revised draft HSW EIS; and presents over 3800 comments
35 from federal agencies; State, local, and tribal governments; public and private organizations; and
36 individuals; and DOE’s response to each comment.
37

38 **1.2 Purpose and Need and Proposed Action**

39

40 DOE needs to provide capabilities to continue, or modify, the way it treats, stores, and/or disposes of
41 existing and anticipated quantities of solid LLW, MLLW, TRU waste, and ILAW at the Hanford Site in
42 order to protect human health and the environment; facilitate cleanup at Hanford and other DOE facilities;
43 take actions consistent with decisions reached by DOE under the WM PEIS; comply with local, State, and

1 federal laws and regulations; and meet other obligations such as the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement
2 and Consent Order (also referred to as the Tri-Party Agreement, or TPA) (Ecology et al. 1989).

3
4 To address anticipated needs for waste management capabilities, DOE proposes to do the following:

- 5
- 6 • continue to operate existing treatment, storage, and disposal facilities for LLW and MLLW, and
7 treatment and storage facilities for TRU waste
- 8 • construct additional disposal capacity for LLW
- 9 • develop capabilities to treat MLLW
- 10 • construct additional disposal capacity for MLLW
- 11 • construct disposal capacity for ILAW and WTP melters
- 12 • close onsite disposal facilities and provide for post-closure stewardship of disposal sites
- 13 • develop additional capabilities to certify TRU waste for disposal at WIPP.
- 14

15 Alternatives proposed to accomplish the purpose and need are described in Section 3. The No Action
16 Alternative is also evaluated as required by NEPA. For purposes of analysis in this HSW EIS, the No
17 Action Alternative is defined as continuing ongoing activities, or as implementing previous NEPA
18 decisions where those activities have not commenced.

19

20 **1.3 Overview of Hanford Site Operations and DOE Waste**

21 **Management Activities**

22
23 The Hanford Site occupies approximately 1517 km² (586 mi²), principally in Benton and Franklin
24 counties of south-central Washington state (Figure 1.1). The Columbia River flows through the northern
25 and eastern parts of the site, which extends about 46 km (25 mi) north from Richland, Washington.

26
27 DOE and its predecessors, the Manhattan Project, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), and
28 the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA), have operated the Hanford Site
29 since the 1940s. From the beginning through the 1980s, the primary mission at Hanford was to produce
30 nuclear materials in support of United States defense, research, and biomedical programs. Operations
31 associated with those programs used facilities for fabrication of nuclear reactor fuel, reactors for nuclear
32 materials production, chemical separation plants, nuclear material processing facilities, research
33 laboratories, and waste management facilities. Plutonium production at Hanford has ceased, and DOE
34 activities at the site currently include research, environmental restoration, and waste management.
35 Additional historical information regarding the Hanford Site is available on the Internet at
36 <http://www.hanford.gov>.

37
38 In addition to the DOE activities at Hanford, there are several facilities operated by other agencies at
39 the site. The Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory (LIGO) is an advanced scientific
40 observatory for measuring gravity waves at extremely low levels. The project involves the California
41 Institute of Technology, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the National Science Foundation.
42 The Hanford Site was selected for the LIGO because of its available space and seismic stability. A