

3.7 Generic Responses to Other Organizations and Individuals

Table 3.3. Generic Responses to Organizations and Individuals

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F005/4 F073/1 F074/3 L004/1 L010/7 L012/2 L012/8 L013/2 L020/7 L023/1 L023/7	L025/1 L026/1 L043/6 L045/1 L045/7 L091/6 L091/21 L097/9 L106/31 L106/44 L106/45	ME001/1 ME001/7 ML002-04/2 ML002-17/2 MP003-005/1 MP003-012/1 MP003-036/2 MP003-044/1 MP003-065/2 MP003-067/2 MP003-071/2 MP003-075/1 MP003-132/2	RL003/3 SEA001/30 SEA010/9 SEA023/5 SEA025/2	Gen001: Additional Alternatives - Disposal alternatives, groundwater impacts, cumulative impacts Additional disposal alternatives have been analyzed. Section 5.3 and Appendix G have been revised to present additional information on groundwater impacts. Section 5.14 and Appendix L have been revised to present additional information on cumulative impacts.
F001/3	L097/22	PDB018/3	SEA016/3	Gen002: Additional Alternatives - LLW disposal potential impacts, cumulative impacts Additional disposal alternatives, including alternatives for the disposal of low-level waste, have been analyzed. The potential environmental impacts of these additional alternatives are presented in Section 5 and related appendixes. Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste through Washington and Oregon has been added to Section 5.8 and Appendix H.
E018/4 F079/6 HR002/4	L010/5 L011/7 L020/6 L023/6 L026/6 L045/6 L049/5	L056/4 L063/6 L064/6 L085/5 L091/4 L097/7 L102/23	PDA005/6 RL008/4	Gen003: Additional Alternatives - LLW disposal, potential impacts, long term stewardship, commercial disposal Additional disposal alternatives, including alternatives for the disposal of low-level waste, have been analyzed. Potential environmental impacts of these additional alternatives are presented in Section 5 and related appendixes. Further discussion of long-term stewardship and commercial disposal has been added.
L054/9	SEA018/6			Gen004: Additional Alternatives - No mixed waste in unlined trenches The HSW EIS does not include any alternatives for the disposal of mixed waste in unlined trenches.
L091/42 L091/43 L106/6	PDA024/3	SEA006/1		Gen005: Additional Alternatives - Potential impacts, cumulative impacts, commercial disposal Additional disposal alternatives have been analyzed. The potential environmental impacts of these additional alternatives are presented in Section 5 and related appendixes. Further information on cumulative impacts has been added to Section 5.14 and Appendix L. Further discussion of commercial disposal has also been added to this HSW EIS.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E004/3 E012/1 E017/1 E020/1 E033/1 E045/2 F016/16 F061/4 F083/1 HR003/2	L001/2 L012/7 L020/1 L048/3 L070/3 L092/7 L097/61 L098/10 L104/15 L104/23 L104/48 L104/51 L106/53 LG004/2 LG012/5	ML002/4 ML002-25/1 MP001-17/1 MP002-03/2 MP003-009/1 MP003-018/1 MP003-021/1 MP003-021/2 MP003-030/3 MP003-073/2 MP003-095/2 MP003-116/2 MP003-141/2	P011/1 SEA001/2 SEA001/4 SEA001/6 SEA001/24 SEA013/6 SEA035/3	Gen006: Additional Alternatives - Potential impacts, cumulative impacts, transportation impacts Additional disposal alternatives, including alternatives for the disposal of low-level waste, have been analyzed. The potential environmental impacts of these additional alternatives are presented in Section 5 and related appendixes. Further information on cumulative impacts has been added to Section 5.14 and Appendix L. Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste through Washington and Oregon has been added to Section 5.8 and Appendix H.
L003/2 L038/2 L102/10	MP001-58/1 MP003-020/1 MP003-030/1 MP003-061/2 MP003-069/1 MP003-080/3	PDA004/1 PDA005/4 PDA028/1	SEA023/2 SEA041/1	Gen007: Additional Analysis - Human health and environmental impacts, movement of contaminants to Columbia River, impacts on Columbia River Additional analysis of human health and environmental impacts has been done. Section 5 and related appendixes have been revised to present this additional information. For all waste alternatives analyzed in this HSW EIS, DOE has analyzed the movement of contaminants through groundwater to the Columbia River. In all cases, it found that the water quality of the Columbia River would be indistinguishable from the current river background levels. The concentrations of all the constituent contaminants were well below benchmark maximum contaminant levels at a hypothetical well located near the Columbia River. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Section 5.3 and Appendix G. See also Sections 5.11 and Appendixes F and G.
E004/7 F015/1	L080/226 L091/11 L091/35 L097/39 L102/11 L104/37 L106/12 L106/32 L106/47 LG004/3 LG012/2	MP001-61/1 PDA022/4 PDA033/11	RL007/4 SEA013/14 SEA028/8	Gen008: Biological and Ecological Resource Impacts - Natural vegetation reestablishment, mitigation measures for ecological impacts, BRMiS Biological and ecological resources (vegetation, wildlife, aquatic ecology, and threatened and endangered species) potentially impacted by the proposed actions are assessed in Appendix I and summarized in Section 4.6 of this HSW EIS. Wildlife species evaluated and ecological resource impacts are summarized in Section 5.5 of this EIS. The natural vegetation is expected to be reestablished after closure of the disposal facilities and the borrow area. Potential mitigation measures for addressing ecological impacts are described in the Biological Resources Management Plan (BRMaP) and the Biological Resources Mitigation Strategy (BRMiS), which are discussed in Section 5.18 of this HSW EIS.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F072/1 HR002/9	L097/29 L097/30 L097/31 L098/12 MP003-029/2	RL003/7 RL003/8 RL003/9 RL003/10 RL004/4	SEA010/8 SEA010/16 SEA025/1 SEA042/2	Gen009: Carbon Tetrachloride - Recent incident During the trench sampling, industrial hygienists conducted repeated air monitoring at the top of the PVC pipe above the trench—a required health and safety practice for all sampling activities to protect the workers from potentially being exposed during the sampling. After the carbon tetrachloride had been detected in the air at the bottom of the trench, industrial hygienists again monitored the trench to ensure that other workers who entered this area in the burial ground would not be exposed. The measurements for all “organics” in the air above the trench (including carbon tetrachloride and its decay products) showed readings ranging from “not detectable” to 4 ppm—well below the standard set by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) of 10 ppm per day during a 40-hour work week. Samples taken in the “breathing zone” did not show any level of organics. The monitoring at the surface of the trenches indicated that toxic vapors were not emanating from the vent risers.
E049/4 F005/3 F009/1 F009/2 F011/3 F011/4	HR001/2 HR002/2 HR006/2 HR009/3 HR010/1 HR010/4 HR012/1 HR015/5 HR017/3	L080/376 L097/10 L097/53 L097/54 L097/55 L097/56	P001/1 RL005/3 SEA028/10	Gen010: Columbia River - Analytical consistency with CRCIA methods The approach taken in the HSW EIS is consistent with the methods, characteristics, and controls associated with a composite analysis as described by the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) team. The analysis modules included in the SAC parallel those identified by CRCIA and were developed through work group meetings that included regulator and stakeholder participation. Several key modules were adopted directly from the CRCIA including the module used to calculate human health impacts (the HUMAN code) and the module used to calculate impacts to ecological species (the ECEM code).
E005/1 E006/2 E007/2 E007/4 E011/4 E014/4 E021/3 E026/2 E028/2 E030/1 E035/4 E049/1 E049/2 F002/5 F016/20	L001/7 L012/9 L017/2 L017/3 L021/3 L023/12 L028/3 L030/1 L034/3 L035/2 L039/2 L040/5 L042/2 L044/2 L049/3 L053/1	ME001-04/1 ME001-05/1 ME001-07/2 ME001-09/3 ML002-02/2 ML002-24/1 MP001-25/1 MP001-29/1 MP001-30/1 MP001-37/1 MP001-38/1 MP001-44/1 MP001-49/1 MP001-50/1 MP001-50/2 MP001-51/1	MP003-068/2 MP003-068/3 MP003-074/1 MP003-074/2 MP003-084/1 MP003-087/1 MP003-087/2 MP003-088/1 MP003-104/3 MP003-105/2 MP003-115/3 MP003-124/2 MP003-125/3 MP003-130/3 MP003-137/3 MP003-140/2	Gen011: Columbia River - Evaluation of impacts, health impacts to downstream populations DOE shares your concerns about protecting the Columbia River. Analysis of alternatives assesses the impacts on water quality in the Columbia River. For all waste alternatives analyzed in this HSW EIS, DOE has analyzed the movement of contaminants through groundwater to the Columbia River. In all cases, it found that the water quality of the Columbia River would be indistinguishable from the current river background levels. The concentrations of all the constituent contaminants were well below benchmark maximum contaminant levels at a hypothetical well located near the Columbia River. The health impacts on downstream populations of groundwater reaching the Columbia River are discussed in Section 5.11

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F024/3 F055/9 F062/2 F071/1 F074/4 F079/2 F079/5 F083/5 F084/6 F086/1 HR004/4	L054/10 L057/11 L061/3 L067/3 L067/5 L077/3 L091/38 L093/3 L104/21 LG004/1 LG004/7 LG006/11 LG009/1 LG011/1 LG018/1	MP002-20/2 MP003-001/2 MP003-007/1 MP003-007/2 MP003-015/1 MP003-017/1 MP003-018/3 MP003-018/4 MP003-023/2 MP003-025/3 MP003-037/1 MP003-048/2 MP003-052/1 MP003-057/2 MP003-060/1	MP003-146/2 MP003-147/1 MP003-150/1 P005/1 PDA005/5 PDA031/9 PDB007/2 PDB012/7 SEA013/17 SEA018/7 SEA029/2 SEA039/1	and Appendix of this HSW EIS. The ecological impacts are discussed in Section 5.5 and Appendix I. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Section 5.3 and Appendix G. Additional discussion of uncertainties has been included in Section 3.5. Additional discussion of mitigation measures appears in Section 5.18.
F042/3 F071/2 F071/3 HR002/10 HR014/1	L009/5 L018/6 L046/2 L073/6 L080/452 L093/7 L093/8 L104/1	MP003-016/3 MP003-050/3 MP003-051/2 MP003-053/3 MP003-064/2 MP003-078/2 MP003-081/2 MP003-117/2 MP003-117/4 MP003-120/3 MP003-123/2 MP003-133/3	PDA009/3 PDA033/3 PDA033/4 RL001/9 RL001/10 RL007/2 SEA010/11 SEA011/2 SEA011/3 SEA036/2 SEA042/11	Gen012: Columbia River - Evaluation of impacts, health impacts to downstream populations, EPA survey DOE shares your concerns about protecting the Columbia River. Analysis of alternatives assesses the impacts on water quality in the Columbia River. For all waste alternatives analyzed in this HSW EIS, DOE has analyzed the movement of contaminants through groundwater to the Columbia River. In all cases, it found that the water quality of the Columbia River would be indistinguishable from the current river background levels. The concentrations of all the constituent contaminants were well below benchmark maximum contaminant levels at a hypothetical well located near the Columbia River. The health impacts on downstream populations of groundwater reaching the Columbia River are discussed in Section 5.11 and Appendix of this HSW EIS. The ecological impacts are discussed in Section 5.5 and Appendix I. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Section 5.3 and Appendix G. Additional discussion of uncertainties has been added to Section 3.5. Additional discussion of mitigation measures appears in Section 5.18. According to Columbia River Basin Fish Contaminant Survey (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 1996-1998, EPA 910-R-02-006, Region 10, Seattle, WA), contaminants contributing to the potential risks for Native Americans were polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) (Aroclors and dioxin-like PCBs), chlorinated dioxins and furans, a limited number of pesticides (DDT and others), mercury, and arsenic. These chemicals occur in the Columbia River as a result of agricultural and industrial operations (pulp and paper plants, for example) and are unlikely to be of Hanford origin. These chemicals would not exist in wastes proposed for future disposal at Hanford, or if present, would be treated to reduce their mobility and toxicity.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E017/5 E019/3 E029/5 F027/5 F032/3 F047/5	L054/4 L084/6 L106/24 L106/54	ME001-09/1 RL003/24	SEA001/25 SEA001/35 SEA002/1	Gen013: Cost Evaluation - Costs for maintenance of leachate collection, monitoring of cap, groundwater monitoring, compliance requirements DOE has developed and analyzed the costs for each alternative considered in this HSW EIS. The scope of the cleanup activity is expected to include maintenance of the leachate collection system, monitoring of the cap performance, and maintenance of passive administrative controls (signs/postings). Groundwater monitoring is conducted according to DOE Orders, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit, and Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) requirements for the disposal areas, and will be expanded as necessary according to agreements between DOE and regulatory agencies to support future waste management operations. DOE is committed to meeting environmental regulations and standards now and in the future. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Ecology (under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act [CERCLA] and RCRA) require monitoring, reporting, and record keeping. Thus, there is a legal requirement that DOE, or its successor entities, meet these requirements.
E004/9 E025/2 F016/9 F025/2 F057/3	L097/28 L098/14 L104/18 LG028/1	MP003-034/2 MP003-140/1 MP003-140/3	SEA002/4 SEA028/14	Gen014: Costs - Additional information on costs Additional information on costs has been included in this EIS. The wastes under consideration for shipment to Hanford are generated by DOE programs at other locations, and DOE is therefore responsible for costs associated with these wastes.
E018/5	L011/8 L098/15 L102/24 L104/52	RL003/30		Gen015: Costs - Charging generators for full cost of disposal Discussion of charging generators the full cost for disposal has been added (see Appendix N). Alternatives for the use of lined trenches for the disposal of low-level waste have also been added (see Section 3.1).

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E004/2 E023/2 E028/1 F016/10 L011/1 L057/10 L091/8	L097/17 L098/16 L102/2 L102/17 L104/19 L104/22 L104/24 L104/26 L104/30	L104/43 L106/46 MP003-028/4 P003/2 PDA005/2 RL003/20 RL005/2	RL008/1 RL008/6 SEA013/16 SEA023/11 SEA028/5 SEA041/2 SEA041/7	Gen016: Cumulative Impacts - Additional Information, transportation impacts Further information on cumulative impacts has been added to Section 5.14 and Appendix L. Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste through Washington and Oregon has been added to Section 5.8 and Appendix H.
SEA041/6				Gen017: Cumulative Impacts - Activities in Hanford PMP The cumulative impacts discussion in Section 5.14 has been expanded. Some activities described in the Hanford Performance Management Plan could be implemented based on current NEPA documentation, still others are not ripe for evaluation and would require further planning, analysis, and preparation of additional NEPA documentation.
HR011/1	L073/2	L097/27		Gen018: DOE - Responsibilities for cleanup around the country, curies to be disposed at Hanford, charging disposal costs to generators DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite. Discussion of charging generators the full cost for disposal has been added (see Appendix N).
L049/2	PDA031/2			Gen019: DOE - Responsibilities for cleanup around the country, WIPP, Yucca Mountain, curies to be disposed at Hanford DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F061/6 F061/8 L080/182 L084/5 LG007/6	ML001/1 ML002/3 MP003-006/1 MP003-126/2	PDA020/7	SEA001/20 SEA010/2 SEA042/9 SEA046/3	<p>Gen020: DOE - Responsibilities for cleanup around the country, WIPP, Yucca Mountain, curies to be disposed at Hanford, wastes can be managed without complicating future remediations, diverting resources, disposal capacity</p> <p>DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite. Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities.</p>
	MP001-35/1 MP002-27/4 MP003-120/4	PDA003/2		<p>Gen021: FFTF</p> <p>Issues regarding the Hanford Fast Flux Test Facility are not within the scope of the HSW EIS NEPA review process.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs			Subject/Response	
E017/3	F081/4	L012/6 L080/418 L080/421 L097/59 L097/60 L097/64		Gen022: Groundwater Monitoring - Groundwater monitoring, LLW disposal in lined trenches Groundwater monitoring is conducted according to DOE Orders, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit, and Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) requirements for the disposal areas. Groundwater monitoring will be expanded as necessary according to agreements between DOE and regulatory agencies to support future waste management operations. DOE has added alternatives for evaluation in the HSW EIS that include disposal of LLW in lined trenches with regulatory-compliant leachate collection systems (see Section 3.1).
F014/2 F019/3 HR015/4 HR021/2 L027/4	PDA003/11 PDA025/3 PDA028/2 PDA028/8 PDA030/6 PDB012/4 PDB013/3 PDB017/3	MP002-19/1 RL002/2	SEA001/18 SEA001/19 SEA038/1	Gen023: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations.
E003/4 E008/1 E010/2 E019/2 E029/1 F002/2 F010/6 F014/1 F016/1 F016/2 F024/4 F026/1 F026/3 F027/1 F037/3 F041/4 F054/4 F059/1 F064/4 F065/4	L036/3 L040/6 L041/1 L053/3 L054/2 L054/6 L060/1 L069/5 L070/1 L070/4 L073/4 L074/1 L077/2 L077/5 L077/8 L080/3 L097/36 L104/50	ML002-17/4 ML002-23/1 MP001-09/1 MP001-22/1 MP001-42/1 MP001-45/1 MP001-57/1 MP001-57/2 MP002-06/1 MP002-06/2 MP002-25/1 MP003-004/1 MP003-016/2 MP003-033/1 MP003-040/2 MP003-048/1 MP003-051/1 MP003-062/1 MP003-074/3	PDA015/1 PDA020/4 PDA022/5 PDA023/5 PDA024/5 PDA027/2 PDA031/3 PDA033/12 PDA034/2 PDB006/3 PDB013/2 PDB015/4 RL003/25 SEA001/13 SEA005/2 SEA006/3 SEA009/1	Gen024: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, DOE responsibilities around the country, DOE waste management approach, WIPP, Yucca Mountain, curies disposed at Hanford, no resource diversion The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste;

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F082/4	LG003/4	P004/4 P006/3	SEA010/5	<p>Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite. Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities.</p>
HR002/8	LG010/1 LG010/2 LG011/3	P009/1 PDA001/1 PDA002/2 PDA003/4	SEA015/2 SEA019/3 SEA021/6 SEA028/1	
L007/4 L014/4	ME001-02/2 ML002-05/1	PDA003/9 PDA003/10 PDA008/3		
L034/2 L034/5				
L027/3	LG006/9			
				<p>Gen025: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, DOE responsibilities around the country, DOE waste management approach, WIPP, Yucca Mountain, curies disposed at Hanford, no resource diversion, transportation discussion</p> <p>cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite. Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities. Additional discussion of transportation has been added in Section 2.2.4, Section 5.8, and Appendix H in Volumes I and II of this HSW EIS. A discussion of transporting waste to and from Hanford through the states of Oregon and Washington is included.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E001/1	HR007/2	MP001-16/1	MP003-097/3	<p>Gen026: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, DOE responsibilities for sites around the country, DOE waste management approach, WIPP, Yucca Mountain, curies to be disposed at Hanford, wastes can be managed without complicating future remediations, diver</p> <p>cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List, and released for other uses. As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing reactor fuel from the K Basins located near the Columbia River, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico is used for the disposal of transuranic waste. It is expected that Yucca Mountain in Nevada will be used for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste. The total amount of radioactivity expected to leave Hanford is much greater than the amount of radioactivity expected to come to Hanford. About 400 MCi of radioactivity are currently onsite. About 375 MCi are expected to be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and other places. Less than 10 MCi would come to Hanford even if all the offsite waste evaluated in this HSW EIS were to come to Hanford. Additional disposal alternatives, including alternatives for the disposal of low-level waste, have been analyzed. The potential environmental impacts of these additional alternatives are presented in Section 5 and related appendixes.</p>
E004/1	HR008/2	MP001-26/1	MP003-107/1	
E010/4		MP001-33/1	MP003-108/1	
	HR017/1	MP001-39/1	MP003-113/2	
E025/1		MP001-53/2	MP003-118/1	
E034/5	L003/3	MP002-07/4	MP003-124/1	
E046/3		MP002-09/1	MP003-131/2	
	L006/1	MP002-15/1	MP003-132/1	
	L012/4	MP002-21/1	MP003-136/1	
F002/4	L020/3	MP002-26/2	MP003-136/3	
F006/3		MP003-001/1	MP003-138/2	
	L023/3		MP003-139/2	
F010/2	L025/2	MP003-008/1		
F015/8	L026/3	MP003-010/1	MP003-142/3	
F019/2		MP003-011/5	MP003-144/1	
	L035/1		MP003-148/1	
F028/5	L037/1	MP003-019/2		
F031/2	L045/3	MP003-022/1	MP003-151/2	
F033/2		MP003-024/2		
F045/2	L051/1	MP003-026/2	P002/1	
F047/3	L064/3	MP003-034/1		
F052/1	L085/3	MP003-041/1	P006/1	
F053/3	L097/5	MP003-045/1	P008/1	
	L104/54	MP003-046/2		
F062/1		MP003-050/2		
F063/2	ME001-03/1	MP003-050/4	RL005/8	
F076/2	ME001-09/2	MP003-057/1	RL006/3	
F076/3	ML001/2	MP003-058/2	RL007/5	
F080/3	ML002/6	MP003-064/1		
	ML002-10/	MP003-072/1	SEA018/3	
	ML002-14/3	MP003-076/1		
	ML002-16/1	MP003-080/4		

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E010/1 E017/9 E020/3 E023/1 F043/2 F055/8 F081/11 F084/7	HR005/1 L018/7	MP001/6 MP001-02/2 MP001-04/1 MP001-06/1 MP001-27/1 MP001-31/2 MP002-04/1 MP002-27/5 MP003-027/2 MP003-089/3 MP003-101/1	P010/4 PDA006/1 PDA014/2	Gen027: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, DOE responsibilities for sites around the country, WIPP, Yucca Mountain The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List, and released for other uses. As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing reactor fuel from the K Basins located near the Columbia River, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico is used for the disposal of transuranic waste. It is expected that Yucca Mountain in Nevada will be used for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste.
E027/1 E027/2 E029/2 E031/2 E033/2 E034/2 E034/3 E035/3 E037/2 E040/2 E042/1 E042/3 E046/5 E050/2 E051/3 F001/1 F005/6 F015/6 F016/8 F027/3 F029/3 F032/2 F034/3 F038/3 F039/3	L024/2 L024/3 L025/3 L026/4 L028/4 L031/2 L032/2 L033/1 L040/2 L042/1 L043/2 L043/5 L045/4 L046/1 L048/1 L051/5 L052/1 L053/5 L055/1 L057/9 L059/1 L059/2 L060/3 L060/4 L062/2 L063/1 L063/4	MP002-13/1 MP002-16/1 MP002-17/1 MP002-18/1 MP003-002/3 MP003-003/2 MP003-008/3 MP003-010/3 MP003-013/1 MP003-015/2 MP003-016/4 MP003-018/2 MP003-021/4 MP003-023/1 MP003-025/1 MP003-025/2 MP003-027/3 MP003-029/1 MP003-030/2 MP003-031/1 MP003-032/1 MP003-036/1 MP003-037/2 MP003-039/3 MP003-040/1 MP003-044/2 MP003-049/1	MP003-116/1 MP003-119/3 MP003-119/4 MP003-123/1 MP003-125/2 MP003-126/1 MP003-127/3 MP003-133/1 MP003-134/1 MP003-136/2 MP003-137/1 MP003-141/1 MP003-143/2 MP003-146/1 MP003-148/2 MP003-149/1 P003/5 P004/2 P004/3 P006/2 P010/2 P011/2 PDA008/1 PDA022/10 PDA027/4	Gen028: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, DOE responsibilities for sites around the country, WIPP, Yucca Mountain, radioactivity disposed at Hanford, wastes can be managed without complicating future remediations The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F041/1	L064/1	MP003-050/1	PDA028/7	waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite. Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities. DOE has added alternatives that include disposal of LLW in lined trenches with leachate collection systems (see Section 3.1).
F047/4	L064/4	MP003-052/3	PDA031/4	
F055/2	L066/4	MP003-053/2	PDA033/8	
F056/2	L067/7	MP003-054/2	PDB008/1	
F057/4	L069/2	MP003-058/1	PDB017/5	
F060/2	L070/2	MP003-063/1		
F065/3	L084/10	MP003-065/1	RL001/5	
F067/1	L093/2	MP003-066/2	RL001/17	
F071/4	L098/20	MP003-067/1	RL003/1	
F071/6	L102/14	MP003-067/3	RL004/1	
F073/4	L104/16	MP003-073/1	RL006/2	
F077/3		MP003-076/4		
F079/3	LG006/6	MP003-077/2	SEA007/1	
F082/3	LG011/2	MP003-080/1	SEA010/1	
F084/3	LG012/4	MP003-080/2	SEA010/3	
	LG019/3	MP003-081/1	SEA013/3	
HR021/1		MP003-083/2	SEA016/4	
	ME001/4	MP003-088/2	SEA017/2	
L003/4	ME001/10	MP003-092/2	SEA019/2	
L003/5	ME001-06/1	MP003-093/1	SEA023/8	
L004/4	ME001-06/2	MP003-094/2	SEA025/4	
L005/4		MP003-096/4	SEA025/5	
L008/1	ML002/1	MP003-102/2	SEA027/3	
L008/3	ML002-01/1	MP003-102/3	SEA028/13	
L009/4	ML002-04/1	MP003-103/1	SEA033/1	
L010/3	ML002-10/2	MP003-104/1	SEA035/2	
L010/6	ML002-11/2	MP003-105/1	SEA039/6	
L011/3	ML002-17/1	MP003-108/2	SEA041/3	
L011/6	ML002-19/2	MP003-110/1	SEA043/2	
L012/5	MP001/2	MP003-111/1	SEA045/1	
L013/4	MP001/5	MP003-111/2	SEA048/5	
L016/1	MP001-03/1	MP003-111/4	SEA049/3	
L017/1	MP001-36/1	MP003-113/1		
L019/2	MP002-03/1	MP003-114/4		
L020/4	MP002-07/2	MP003-115/1		
L023/4	MP002-10/1	MP003-115/2		
L023/10				

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs			Subject/Response
MP003-009/2	MP003-117/1	MP003-122/1	<p>Gen029: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, DOE responsibilities for sites around the country, WIPP, Yucca Mountain, radioactivity disposed at Hanford, wastes can be managed without complicating future remediations, alternatives, mixed waste disposal</p> <p>The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible.</p> <p>Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite. Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities. DOE has added alternatives that include disposal of LLW in lined trenches with leachate collection systems (see Section 3.1). The HSW EIS does not evaluate alternatives for disposal of mixed low-level waste unlined trenches.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs			Subject/Response
L077/7	MP003-097/2	PDA003/8	<p>Gen030: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, DOE responsibilities for sites around the country, WIPP, Yucca Mountain, radioactivity disposed at Hanford, wastes can be managed without complicating future remediations, transportation, TRU</p> <p>The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. DOE is responsible for the cleanup of dozens of sites around the country. DOE's approach is to consolidate and dispose of radioactive waste from all its cleanup efforts in the safest and most cost-effective manner possible. Hanford and other sites would be available for the disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste; WIPP is used for the disposal of TRU waste; Yucca Mountain is expected to be used for the disposal of high-level waste and spent nuclear fuel. Many more curies of waste will be sent offsite from Hanford than will be received from offsite. Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities. DOE has added alternatives that include disposal of LLW in lined trenches with leachate collection systems (see Section 3.1). A discussion of the impacts of transporting waste to and from Hanford through the states of Oregon and Washington has been added to this HSW EIS. A discussion of the storage of offsite TRU waste at Hanford pending its disposal at WIPP is also included in this HSW EIS (see Section 5 and its associated appendixes).</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
L007/1	PDA010/3	RL001/2	SEA011/5	Gen031: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, offsite TRU management, WM PEIS, evaluation of Hanford-only waste
L014/1	PDA026/3	RL001/8	SEA019/1	
LG024/1	PDA033/2	RL002/4	SEA019/4	<p>The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. Offsite TRU waste would not be sent to Hanford for disposal. It will have been shipped to WIPP before closure. The WM PEIS was a comprehensive evaluation of DOE nationwide waste management, and DOE determined there was sufficient information to make decisions regarding the sites that were suitable for waste management missions. A discussion of the WM PEIS and its relationship to the HSW EIS can be found in Section 1.5. Notwithstanding the above, as encouraged by various commenters, the HSW EIS includes an evaluation that assumes only Hanford wastes are managed at Hanford in the future.</p>
		PDB011/5	RL003/12	
MP003-089/1	PDB012/3	RL003/13		
	PDB012/8	RL003/14		
MP003-089/2		RL003/15		
		RL003/21		
		RL003/22		
		RL003/23		

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E017/10 E044/3 F008/2 F073/3 F081/6 F082/1 F083/6 F086/2 HR006/3 HR009/5 HR015/1	L001/6 L018/1 L018/2 L054/8 L057/3 L069/1 L075/2 L084/12 L092/2 L097/41 MP001-02/1 MP001-18/1 MP001-31/1 MP001-52/1 MP003-010/2	MP003-011/4 MP003-022/2 MP003-045/4 MP003-070/3 MP003-082/1 MP003-083/1 MP003-130/1 MP003-152/1 PDA033/13 PDB001/2 PDB009/1 RL002/7 RL003/32	SEA001/32 SEA005/1 SEA006/2 SEA006/4 SEA006/5 SEA006/6 SEA009/3 SEA018/2 SEA018/5 SEA021/2 SEA021/3 SEA030/1 SEA039/8 SEA042/1 SEA044/5	<p>Gen032: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment, HSW EIS Section 6.0 regulatory requirements discussion, Section 6.19 permits</p> <p>The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleaning up the Hanford Site in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and applicable environmental requirements under federal and state laws and regulations. Chapter 6 of this HSW EIS identifies potential statutory and regulatory requirements that may apply to the proposed action and alternatives, including Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and State Dangerous Waste Regulations under the Hazardous Waste Management Act (see Section 6.3 of the HSW EIS). Section 6.19 addresses permits required to construct and operate treatment, storage, and disposal facilities related to the alternatives.</p>
				<p>Gen032: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment, HSW EIS Section 6.0 regulatory requirements discussion, Section 6.19 permits</p> <p>The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleaning up the Hanford Site in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and applicable environmental requirements under federal and state laws and regulations. Chapter 6 of this HSW EIS identifies potential statutory and regulatory requirements that may apply to the proposed action and alternatives, including Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and State Dangerous Waste Regulations under the Hazardous Waste Management Act (see Section 6.3 of the HSW EIS). Section 6.19 addresses permits required to construct and operate treatment, storage, and disposal facilities related to the alternatives.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
L092/8				<p>Gen033: Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment, HSW EIS Section 6.0 regulatory requirements discussion, Section 6.19 permits, transportation discussion</p> <p>The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleaning up the Hanford Site in accordance with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and applicable environmental requirements under federal and state laws and regulations. Chapter 6 of this HSW EIS identifies potential statutory and regulatory requirements that may apply to the proposed action and alternatives, including Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and State Dangerous Waste Regulations under the Hazardous Waste Management Act (see Section 6.3 of the HSW EIS). Section 6.19 addresses permits required to construct and operate treatment, storage, and disposal facilities related to the alternatives. About 300,000,000 hazardous material shipments take place every year in the United States. Of those shipments, about 3,000,000 involve radioactive materials and less than 10,000 involve shipment of DOE radioactive materials. Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste through Washington and Oregon has been added to Section 5.8 and Appendix H. Additional information on DOE shipping practices has been added to Section 2 of this HSW EIS.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs			Subject/Response
ML002-28/1 ML002-29/1 ML002-30/1 MP001-01/1	MP001-07/1 MP001-13/1 MP001-14/1	SEA011/9	<p>Gen034: Hanford Cleanup - DOE priorities, land use, long term stewardship</p> <p>The DOE takes very seriously its responsibility to protect and preserve the environment. Environmental restoration is DOE's top priority at Hanford and other DOE sites. Cleanup activities are being performed in accordance with the milestones and other provisions of the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (also referred to as the Tri-Party Agreement or TPA). Long-term stewardship activities began at Hanford when the site was first used to support national defense beginning in 1943. Approximately 6% of the total area within the Hanford Site was occupied and actively used; with the remainder of the site managed by DOE, and its predecessor agencies, as a buffer zone. The buffer zone provided protection for the cultural, biological and natural resources located within the site's boundaries. Most of the site is undisturbed and is as environmentally pristine as it was before the Hanford national defense mission was undertaken during World War II. The long-term stewardship vision for Hanford's future is that the vitality of human, biological, natural and cultural resources be sustained over multiple generations. The revised draft HSW EIS evaluates various forecast waste quantities that include only Hanford-generated waste, in addition to varying amounts of offsite waste. This evaluation reflects the uncertainty in waste quantities that Hanford might receive from offsite. The inclusion of a Hanford-only waste volume provides the basis for determining the incremental impacts of offsite waste. See Section 3.2 for a discussion of the different waste volumes addressed in the HSW EIS. The evaluations of groundwater impacts in Section 5.15 of the draft HSW EIS include the impacts of the wastes to be managed within the scope of the HSW EIS NEPA review, as well as the CERCLA wastes disposed in the Hanford ERDF. Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
L040/1	SEA013/18	SEA013/19		<p>Gen035: Hanford Cleanup - Environmental monitoring program</p> <p>In 2001 alone, samples were collected from 735 groundwater monitoring wells to determine the distribution and movement of existing radiological and chemical constituents in Hanford Site groundwater and identify and characterize potential and emerging groundwater contamination problems. Samples were analyzed for about 40 different radionuclide constituents and about 290 different chemical constituents. Airborne radionuclide samples were collected at 45 continuously operating samplers: 24 on the Hanford Site, 11 near the site perimeter, 8 in nearby communities, and 2 in distant communities. Nine stations were community-operated environmental surveillance stations managed and operated by local school teachers as part of an ongoing DOE-sponsored program to promote public awareness of Hanford Site environmental monitoring programs.</p>
<p>ML002-15/3</p> <p>MP001-20/1</p> <p>MP001-32/1</p> <p>MP001-34/1</p> <p>MP001-46/1</p> <p>MP001-54/1</p> <p>MP001-60/1</p> <p>MP002-14/1</p>	<p>MP002-23/1</p> <p>MP002-27/1</p> <p>MP003-005/4</p> <p>MP003-013/2</p> <p>MP003-014/2</p> <p>MP003-016/1</p> <p>MP003-061/3</p> <p>MP003-069/2</p>	<p>MP003-090/4</p> <p>MP003-108/4</p> <p>MP003-112/1</p> <p>MP003-117/3</p> <p>MP003-119/2</p> <p>MP003-128/3</p> <p>MP003-148/3</p>	<p>SEA010/14</p> <p>SEA032/1</p> <p>SEA042/10</p> <p>SEA043/3</p> <p>SEA048/3</p>	<p>Gen036: Hanford Cleanup - Hanford Cleanup - DOE commitment and progress, cultural resource protection, stewardship</p> <p>The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is committed to cleanup of the Hanford Site through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) process. A lot in the way of cleanup has happened at Hanford over the last decade. Portions of the site have already been cleaned up, removed from the National Priority List (NPL), and released for other uses (e.g., the 1100 Operable Unit). As part of the river corridor cleanup, DOE is remediating contaminated soil sites, decommissioning the plutonium production reactors and associated facilities, removing production reactor fuel from the K Basins to interim storage in the 200 Area, and treating groundwater contaminated by past operations. Over the years, DOE, and its predecessor agencies, have developed and implemented various activities to protect these unique resources, which now fall under the umbrella of long-term stewardship. The DOE presence and restricted access to the site has preserved a number of critical habitats and protected a number of threatened ecological resources that probably would not exist today without the 60-year federal control of the site. The preservation of the critical habitats has provided a vital link in the preservation of the bio-diversity of the Columbia Basin's eco-region. The long-term stewardship vision for Hanford's future is that the vitality of human, biological, natural and cultural resources be sustained over multiple generations.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F073/2 L072/1 L093/1 L093/4	MP001-43/1 MP003-003/1 MP003-004/2 MP003-008/2 MP003-026/1 MP003-152/2	PDA011/2 PDA020/1 PDA024/4	SEA047/9	<p>Gen037: Hanford Cleanup - Scope of cleanup activities</p> <p>The scope of the cleanup activity is expected to include maintenance of the leachate collection system, monitoring of the cap performance, and maintenance of passive administrative controls (signs/postings). Groundwater monitoring is conducted according to DOE Orders, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit, and Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) requirements for the disposal areas, and will be expanded as necessary according to agreements between DOE and regulatory agencies to support future waste management operations. DOE is committed to meeting environmental regulations and standards now and in the future. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Washington State Department of Ecology (under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act [CERCLA] and RCRA) require monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping. Thus, there is a legal requirement that DOE, or its successor entities, meet these requirements.</p>
L054/3	PDA021/2			<p>Gen038: Hanford Cleanup - Wastes can be managed without complicating future remediations, diverting resources, disposal capacity</p> <p>Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities.</p>
MP003-142/2				<p>Gen039: Hanford Cleanup - Wastes can be managed without complicating future remediations, diverting resources, disposal capacity, transportation</p> <p>Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities. Additional discussion of transportation has been added in Section 2.2.4, Section 5.8, and Appendix H in Volumes I and II of this HSW EIS. A discussion of transporting waste to and from Hanford through the states of Oregon and Washington is included.</p>
F079/4	F081/8	ML002-14/1		<p>Gen040: Health Impact Evaluation - Additional analysis and information</p> <p>Additional analysis of human health and environmental impacts has been done. Section 5 and related appendixes have been revised to present this additional information.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E017/2 L011/2 L011/9	L042/3 L097/43 L102/8 L102/9	L106/11 L106/16 ML002-27/1	SEA013/7 SEA028/7	<p>Gen041: Health Impact Evaluation - Groundwater impacts, uncertainties, mitigation measures, monitoring, alternatives for LLW disposal in lined trenches</p> <p>This Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement (HSW EIS) evaluates health impacts on downstream populations of groundwater reaching the Columbia River over a 10,000-year time frame. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Section 5.3 and Appendix G. See also Sections 5.11 and Appendixes F and G. Additional discussion of uncertainties associated with these analyses has been included in Section 3.5. Refer to Section 5.18 for additional discussion of potential mitigation measures. Groundwater monitoring is conducted according to DOE Orders, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit, and Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) requirements for the disposal areas. Groundwater monitoring will be expanded as necessary according to agreements between DOE and regulatory agencies to support future waste management operations. DOE has added alternatives for evaluation in this HSW EIS that include disposal of LLW in lined trenches with regulatory-compliant leachate collection systems (see Section 3.1).</p>
E004/6 F015/4	L091/41 L106/17 L106/28	PDA003/3	SEA023/9 SEA028/6	<p>Gen042: Health Impact Evaluation - Time frame, impacts on Columbia River, uncertainties, mitigation measures</p> <p>This Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement (HSW EIS) evaluates health impacts on downstream populations of groundwater reaching the Columbia River over a 10,000-year time frame. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Section 5.3 and Appendix G. See also Sections 5.11 and Appendixes F and G. Additional discussion of uncertainties associated with these analyses has been included in Section 3.5. Refer to Section 5.18 for additional discussion of potential mitigation measures.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E012/2	RL004/3	SEA010/10		<p>Gen043: Health Impact Evaluation - Time frame, impacts on Columbia River, uncertainties, mitigation measures, LLW disposal in lined trenches</p> <p>This Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement (HSW EIS) evaluates health impacts on downstream populations of groundwater reaching the Columbia River over a 10,000-year time frame. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Section 5.3 and Appendix G. See also Sections 5.11 and Appendixes F and G. Additional discussion of uncertainties associated with these analyses has been included in Section 3.5. Refer to Section 5.18 for additional discussion of potential mitigation measures. DOE has added alternatives for evaluation in the HSW EIS that include disposal of LLW in lined trenches with regulatory-compliant leachate collection systems (see Section 3.1).</p>
E004/10 E023/3 E035/2 F015/5 L010/2 L033/4 L061/2 L063/11	L064/11 L067/6 L073/7 L080/23 L102/3 L102/4 L102/21 L106/1 L106/36 L106/41	LG001/1 MP003-021/3 P007/2 PDA022/11 PDA028/3 RL001/16	SEA001/17 SEA008/2 SEA011/6 SEA013/11 SEA013/13 SEA013/15 SEA013/20	<p>Gen044: Information Content - Additional information on alternatives, environmental impacts, cumulative impacts, and other subjects</p> <p>Further information on alternatives, environmental impacts, cumulative impacts, and other subjects has been added.</p>
E014/3 F065/6	L080/273 L080/314 L080/316	L080/318 L080/319 L080/322	L080/323 L080/324	<p>Gen045: Information Content - Geologic information references, not a basis for EIS revisions</p> <p>Details regarding the geology of this area are documented in the Hanford Site Environmental Report 2001 (Poston et al. 2002) and the Hanford Site National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Characterization document (Neitzel 2002). These details do not change the assessment documented in the HSW EIS.</p>
L080/246 L080/330 L080/424	L080/427 L080/469 L080/470	L080/472 L080/476	L080/477 L080/482	<p>Gen046: Information Content - Historical document availability, not a basis for EIS revisions</p> <p>Historical documents are publicly available at the DOE Reading Room or Public Library in Richland, Washington and additional information is available on the Internet. These details do not change the assessment documented in this HSW EIS.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F013/1 L018/5 L074/4 L091/2 LG022/1	MP003-042/1 MP003-047/2 MP003-091/1 MP003-099/1	PDA016/1		Gen047: Information Content - Information included to assist in DOE decisions, revised purpose and need in response to regulatory agency and public comments This HSW EIS provides important environmental information to assist DOE in making decisions about site-specific storage, treatment, and disposal actions at Hanford. This EIS includes a revised purpose and need statement that was developed in consultation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) staff, as well as in consideration of comments received from the public (see HSW EIS Section 1.2).
E017/11 F016/14	L063/2 L085/4 L104/25 L104/36	SEA008/1 SEA041/4		Gen048: Information Content - NEPA analysis approach The DEIS uses available data, computer modeling, assumptions, and related analytical methods to produce estimates of reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts. The analytical approach was consistently applied to each alternative, and it provided information that allowed objective parametric comparison of the alternatives. Additional information has been provided in the revised HSW EIS.
L080/10 L080/237 L080/238 L080/247 L080/252 L080/254 L080/259 L080/263 L080/265 L080/272 L080/274 L080/275 L080/278 L080/282 L080/283 L080/284 L080/286 L080/296 L080/297 L080/298 L080/299 L080/301 L080/304 L080/306 L080/307	L080/348 L080/349 L080/350 L080/351 L080/352 L080/355 L080/357 L080/358 L080/360 L080/361 L080/362 L080/363 L080/364 L080/365 L080/366 L080/367 L080/369 L080/370 L080/371 L080/372 L080/374 L080/375 L080/377 L080/378 L080/379	L080/413 L080/414 L080/415 L080/417 L080/419 L080/420 L080/422 L080/429 L080/430 L080/431 L080/433 L080/434 L080/435 L080/436 L080/438 L080/439 L080/440 L080/441 L080/442 L080/443 L080/444 L080/445 L080/446 L080/447 L080/448	L080/483 L080/485 L080/486 L080/487 L080/488 L080/489 L080/490 L080/491 L080/492 L080/493 L080/494 L080/500 L080/502 L080/506 L080/507 L080/508 L080/509 L080/510 L080/511 L080/512 L080/513 L080/514 L080/515 L080/517 L080/519	Gen049: Information Content - Purpose and relationship of Sections 3, 4, and 5, changes not incorporated The purpose of Section 4 is to provide a description of the environment that might be affected by the alternatives described in Section 3. The results of analyses performed to assess potential environmental consequences of implementing the alternatives are presented in Section 5. These comments do not change the assessment documented in this HSW EIS.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response	
L080/309	L080/383	L080/449	L080/520		
L080/310	L080/384	L080/450	L080/521		
L080/312	L080/385	L080/451	L080/522		
L080/313	L080/386	L080/453	L080/523		
L080/317	L080/388	L080/454	L080/524		
L080/320	L080/389	L080/455	L080/525		
L080/321	L080/390	L080/456	L080/526		
L080/325	L080/391	L080/457	L080/527		
L080/327	L080/392	L080/459	L080/528		
L080/328	L080/393	L080/460	L080/529		
L080/329	L080/394	L080/461	L080/530		
L080/332	L080/395	L080/462	L080/531		
L080/333	L080/397	L080/463	L080/532		
L080/334	L080/398	L080/464	L080/533		
L080/335	L080/399	L080/465	L080/534		
L080/336	L080/401	L080/467	L080/535		
L080/338	L080/402	L080/468	L080/536		
L080/339	L080/403	L080/471	L080/541		
L080/340	L080/404	L080/473	L080/542		
L080/341	L080/406	L080/474	L080/543		
L080/342	L080/407	L080/479	L080/544		
L080/343	L080/408	L080/480	L106/26		
L080/344	L080/411	L080/481			
L080/6	L080/311	L080/382	L080/495		Gen050: Information Content - Purpose and relationship of Sections 3, 4, and 5, some changes incorporated The purpose of Section 4 is to provide a description of the environment that might be affected by the alternatives described in Section 3. The results of analyses performed to assess potential environmental consequences of implementing the alternatives are presented in Section 5. These comments do not change the assessment documented in this HSW EIS. In some cases, however, the comments have been incorporated.
L080/12	L080/315	L080/400	L080/496		
L080/241	L080/326	L080/409	L080/497		
L080/243	L080/337	L080/410	L080/498		
L080/248	L080/345	L080/412	L080/499		
L080/258	L080/347	L080/416	L080/537		
L080/260	L080/354	L080/425	L080/538		
L080/261	L080/373	L080/426	L080/539		
L080/288	L080/380	L080/458	L080/540		
L080/291	L080/381	L080/478			
SEA004/1	SEA038/2			Gen051: Information Content - Regulatory This comment is not addressed to DOE. However, in Section 6 of this HSW EIS, we identify the regulatory requirements followed in conducting operations at Hanford Site, including RCRA and State Dangerous Waste Regulations under the Hazardous Waste Management Act (Section 6.3). Section 6.19 addresses permits required to construct and operate treatment, storage, and disposal facilities related to the alternatives.	
HR022/3	L091/37 L093/9 LG012/3	PDB018/1 RL007/1 RL007/3	SEA043/4	Gen052: Native American Concerns - Potential adverse impacts DOE is cognizant of the concerns of Native Americans and others that operations at Hanford, including those discussed in this HSW EIS, could adversely impact	

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
				Native Americans and their lifestyle. This HSW EIS includes discussion of potential impacts to cultural resources (Section 5.7), aesthetic and scenic resources (Section 5.12), and environmental justice (Section 5.13).
E032/1 F016/12 F047/1 F061/5	L011/5 L057/6 L080/155	L091/7 L097/3 L106/7 LG007/5	P007/1 RL003/26	Gen053: No Action Alternative - Evaluation of Impacts waste coming from offsite (the Hanford Only waste volume) have been evaluated. A discussion of these impacts has been added to this HSW EIS.
F005/5	L091/12 L097/35 L097/37 L097/46 L097/57 L106/48	SEA010/12 SEA010/13 SEA023/10		Gen054: Point of Assessment Approach - Basis for NEPA evaluation, intruder scenario evaluation, groundwater monitoring The maximum point of impact from multiple and widely dispersed sources is not necessarily directly underneath the Low Level Burial Grounds or at the Low Level Burial Ground boundary. To model the groundwater impacts from multiple and widely dispersed disposal units over long periods of time, a 1-km "point of analysis" location was deemed to be more appropriate and representative than a regulatory "point of compliance" well location. The point of analysis approach is considered more technically appropriate for a NEPA evaluation of groundwater impacts. More specific clarification about the differences between the point of analysis used in the HSW EIS groundwater impact analysis and the RCRA point of compliance for land disposal unit groundwater monitoring wells is provided in Section 5.3 and Appendix G. The potential impacts of drilling or digging into waste sites are included in this HSW EIS. These "intruder" scenarios can be found in Section 5.11 and Appendix F. Groundwater monitoring is conducted according to DOE Orders, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit, and Tri-Party Agreement requirements for the disposal areas. Groundwater monitoring will be expanded as necessary according to agreements between DOE and regulatory agencies to support future waste management operations.
L098/3 L098/5	PDA017/12 PDA018/1 PDA030/4	SEA032/3		Gen055: Public Involvement - Access to additional information The DOE Environmental Management program websites with information relevant to the HSW EIS process are located at http://www.em.doe.gov/webindex.html and http://www.hanford.gov/netlib/eis.asp . Access to some of the information on the website has been restricted due to national security concerns. Information can also

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
				be requested from the NEPA Document Manager, or may be reviewed at the DOE Hanford Reading Room in Richland, WA.
E004/5 F005/7 L057/13	L100/5 L102/7 PDA032/5 PDB018/2	SEA011/7 SEA023/7 SEA026/1 SEA027/1	SEA028/3 SEA032/6 SEA044/4	Gen056: Public Involvement - Consultations during EIS process DOE consults extensively with regulatory agencies, Native American Tribal governments, organizations, and members of the public during its NEPA review processes.
F064/1	LG003/7	PDB021/1		Gen057: Public Involvement - DOE legal obligations under applicable laws and regulations DOE takes its legal obligations very seriously and works toward fulfilling the letter and intent of applicable laws and regulations.
L077/1 L097/26	MP003-039/2	RL002/6	SEA049/2	Gen058: Public Involvement - Issues or concerns addressed in revised draft HSW EIS During preparation of the draft HSW EIS, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has been cognizant of issues raised during public review of related National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other Hanford initiatives that address waste management issues. To the extent that those issues or concerns were related to the HSW EIS, they are addressed in this HSW EIS.
F001/2 F016/11 F046/2 F075/3 HR022/4 L097/33 LG019/1	ME001-01/1 ML002-26/2 MP002-12/1 MP003-031/2 MP003-041/2 MP003-045/3 MP003-065/5 MP003-079/1	PDA003/7 PDA022/6 PDA032/4 PDB011/4 PDB013/4 RL003/18	SEA001/16 SEA040/1 SEA043/1 SEA047/3	Gen059: Public Involvement - Issues or concerns considered in developing revised draft HSW EIS During preparation of the draft HSW EIS, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has been cognizant of issues raised during public review of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other Hanford initiatives addressing waste management issues. To the extent that the issues or concerns raised during these public reviews are related to this HSW EIS, they have been considered by DOE in developing the revised analyses and discussions included in this current draft HSW EIS.
F016/6 L097/19 L098/17	LG003/11 PDA022/3 PDA029/1	PDA031/10 PDA034/5 PDA035/1		Gen060: Public Involvement - Notices of public meetings DOE issues press releases in advance of public meetings. Other public announcement efforts include briefings to concerned parties, advance mailing of information, and newspaper advertisements.
F084/1 L010/1 L015/1	L091/3 L097/20 L106/4 L106/60	PDA022/8 PDA027/1 PDA032/1 PDA032/3 PDA034/1		Gen061: Public Involvement - Response to public comments All public comments received during the HSW EIS process are recorded, reviewed, and responded to in

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
		PDB014/1		accordance with applicable NEPA regulations and DOE policies.
L080/11 L080/48 L080/58	L080/60 L080/217 L080/281	L080/428 L080/437	SEA041/10	Gen062: Reference Availability Some of the references used in preparing the first draft HSW EIS have been withdrawn from the Internet because of national security concerns. Supporting documentation is available at the Hanford Reading Room in Richland, WA. Key references may also be available on compact disk (CD) or may be requested from the NEPA Document Manager.
E017/8 F011/5 F016/17 F081/1 HR009/4 HR022/2	L092/12 L097/14 L097/40 L106/49 L106/50	MP002-04/2 MP002-20/1 MP003-028/3 RL001/15 RL003/2	SEA001/33 SEA013/5 SEA013/8 SEA013/9	Gen063: Regulatory Compliance and Oversight - Waste management at Hanford Waste management practices at Hanford are regulated by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Washington State Department of Ecology. In addition, Congress has oversight responsibilities over these waste management activities.
E017/4 E037/1 E041/1 E046/2 E046/4 E051/2 F046/4 F055/3 F055/5 F074/2 HR004/2	L009/3 L026/7 L029/2 L031/3 L033/5 L051/3 L058/2 L063/7 L064/7 L066/2 L071/2 L073/3 L093/6 L100/3	LG004/6 MP003-002/4 MP003-045/2 MP003-066/3 MP003-076/2 MP003-077/3 MP003-096/2 MP003-131/3 MP003-149/2 MP003-153/1	PDB012/6 PDB017/4 SEA036/3	Gen064: Revisions - ILAW and other bases for revisions EIS to accommodate disposal of ILAW, in addition to new waste management alternatives under consideration since the first draft was issued in April 2002. This HSW EIS analyzes additional alternatives that include mitigation measures such as liners, leachate collection systems, a lined mega-trench, ranges of waste volumes, and capping. This EIS includes additional alternatives for disposal of LLW, MLLW, immobilized low-activity waste (ILAW), and Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) melters in either independent or combined-use facilities that would comply with RCRA and state standards for disposal of hazardous wastes. A number of locations for the facilities are considered, including the ERDF. This EIS also evaluates various forecast waste quantities that include only Hanford generated waste, in addition to various amounts of offsite waste. This evaluation reflects the uncertainty in waste quantities that Hanford might receive under the WM PEIS decisions for MLLW, LLW, and TRU waste. The inclusion of a Hanford Only waste volume provides the basis for determining the incremental impacts of offsite waste and the impacts that would be avoided at Hanford Site if these offsite wastes were disposed of elsewhere. DOE shares your concerns for protecting the Columbia River. Analysis of alternatives assess the impacts on water quality in the Columbia River. For all waste alternatives analyzed in this HSW EIS, DOE has analyzed the movement of contaminants through groundwater to the Columbia River. In all cases, it

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs			Subject/Response
			<p>found that the water quality of the Columbia River would be indistinguishable from the current river background levels. The concentrations of all constituent contaminants were well below benchmark maximum contaminant levels at a hypothetical well located near the Columbia River. The health impacts on downstream populations of groundwater reaching the Columbia River are discussed in Section 5.11 and Appendix F. The ecological impacts are discussed in Section 5.5 and Appendix I. The impacts of groundwater reaching the river are discussed in Section 5.3 and Appendix G. Additional discussion of uncertainties has been added to Section 3.X. Additional discussion of mitigation measures appears in Section 5.18. According to the Columbia River Basin Fish Contaminant Survey (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1996-1998. Columbia River Basin Fish Contaminant Survey. EPA 910-R-02-006. Region 10, Seattle, Washington), contaminants contributing to the potential risks for Native Americans were PCBs (Aroclors and dioxin-like PCBs), chlorinated dioxins and furans, a limited number of pesticides (DDT and others), mercury and arsenic. These chemicals occur in the Columbia River as a result of agricultural and industrial operations (pulp and paper plants, for example) and are very unlikely to be of Hanford origin. These chemicals would not exist in wastes proposed for future disposal at Hanford, or, if present, would be treated to reduce their mobility and toxicity if present.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs			Subject/Response
L047/1 L050/1	L061/1 L104/2		SEA003/1 Gen065: Revisions - ILAW and other bases for revisions DOE has elected to prepare a second draft of the HSW EIS to accommodate disposal of ILAW, in addition to new waste management alternatives under consideration since the first draft was issued in April 2002. This HSW EIS analyzes additional alternatives that include mitigation measures such as liners, leachate collection systems, a lined mega-trench, ranges of waste volumes, and capping. This EIS includes additional alternatives for disposal of LLW, MLLW, immobilized low-activity waste (ILAW), and Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) melters in either independent or combined-use facilities that would comply with RCRA and state standards for disposal of hazardous wastes. A number of locations for the facilities are considered, including the ERDF. This EIS also evaluates various forecast waste quantities that include only Hanford generated waste, in addition to various amounts of offsite waste. This evaluation reflects the uncertainty in waste quantities that Hanford might receive under the WM PEIS decisions for MLLW, LLW, and TRU waste. The inclusion of a Hanford Only waste volume provides the basis for determining the incremental impacts of offsite waste and the impacts that would be avoided at Hanford Site if these offsite wastes were disposed of elsewhere. The approach taken in the HSW EIS is consistent with the methods, characteristics, and controls associated with a composite analysis as described by the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) team. The analysis modules included in the SAC parallel those identified by CRCIA and were developed through work group meetings that included regulator and stakeholder participation. Several key modules were adopted directly from the CRCIA including the module used to calculate human health impacts (the HUMAN code) and the module used to calculate impacts to ecological species (the ECEM code).

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
	L021/2	L098/19	MP003-056/2	<p>Gen066: Revisions - ILAW, other bases</p> <p>DOE has elected to prepare a second draft of the HSW EIS to accommodate disposal of ILAW, in addition to new waste management alternatives under consideration since the first draft was issued in April 2002. This HSW EIS analyzes additional alternatives that include mitigation measures such as liners, leachate collection systems, a lined mega-trench, ranges of waste volumes, and capping. This EIS includes additional alternatives for disposal of LLW, MLLW, immobilized low-activity waste (ILAW), and Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) melters in either independent or combined-use facilities that would comply with RCRA and state standards for disposal of hazardous wastes. A number of locations for the facilities are considered, including the ERDF. This EIS also evaluates various forecast waste quantities that include only Hanford generated waste, in addition to various amounts of offsite waste. This evaluation reflects the uncertainty in waste quantities that Hanford might receive under the WM PEIS decisions for MLLW, LLW, and TRU waste. The inclusion of a Hanford Only waste volume provides the basis for determining the incremental impacts of offsite waste and the impacts that would be avoided at Hanford Site if these offsite wastes were disposed of elsewhere.</p>
E015/1	L023/2	L100/1	MP003-061/1	
E015/2	L023/11	L100/4		
E018/3	L024/1	L102/1	MP003-070/2	
E023/5		L102/22	MP003-075/2	
E026/1	L026/11	L102/27	MP003-078/1	
E035/1	L028/1	L104/3		
	L031/4	L104/4	MP003-109/1	
E038/4	L033/2	L104/5	MP003-114/1	
E041/4	L033/3	L104/13	MP003-139/1	
E043/2	L034/1	L104/27		
E043/3	L037/2	L104/38	MP003-145/1	
		L104/42	MP003-146/3	
F004/1	L040/3	L104/53		
F004/2	L045/2	L104/55		
F015/7	L045/11	L106/5		
F020/1		L106/13	PDA003/6	
F027/6	L056/1	L106/56	PDA007/2	
F027/7	L057/14	L106/57		
F028/1	L061/4	L106/61	PDA010/1	
F029/5		LG006/7	PDA022/2	
F037/1	L064/2		PDA024/1	
F042/4	L067/2	LG009/2		
F061/2	L071/1	LG012/6	PDA033/9	
F067/3		LG012/7	PDB011/3	
F074/5	L073/1			
F076/1	L074/3	LG030/1		
F078/2	L076/1		RL001/12	
F080/1		ME001/2	RL001/20	
F081/5	L080/50		RL003/6	
F083/3	L080/165		RL003/28	
	L080/220	ML002-02/1	RL008/7	
HR005/2		ML002-07/2	RL008/8	
HR008/1	L085/1	ML002-12/1		
HR010/3	L085/2	ML002-17/3	SEA001/22	
HR015/3	L091/5	ML002-21/1	SEA015/1	
HR017/2		ML003/1	SEA028/2	
HR018/1	L097/2		SEA028/12	
HR022/1	L097/6	MP001-12/1		
	L097/13	MP001-28/1	SEA030/2	
L001/1		MP001-41/1	SEA035/5	
L003/1	L097/18	MP001-48/1	SEA041/5	
L009/1	L097/65	MP002-08/1		
	L098/1	MP003-006/2	SEA049/4	
L012/12	L098/4	MP003-020/2		
L020/2	L098/11	MP003-039/1		
L020/11	L098/18	MP003-043/1		

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
L084/7				<p>Gen067: Revisions - ILAW, other bases, pre-1970 waste</p> <p>DOE has elected to prepare a second draft of the HSW EIS to accommodate disposal of ILAW, in addition to new waste management alternatives under consideration since the first draft was issued in April 2002. This HSW EIS analyzes additional alternatives that include mitigation measures such as liners, leachate collection systems, a lined mega-trench, ranges of waste volumes, and capping. This EIS includes additional alternatives for disposal of LLW, MLLW, immobilized low-activity waste (ILAW), and Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) melters in either independent or combined-use facilities that would comply with RCRA and state standards for disposal of hazardous wastes. A number of locations for the facilities are considered, including the ERDF. This EIS also evaluates various forecast waste quantities that include only Hanford generated waste, in addition to various amounts of offsite waste. This evaluation reflects the uncertainty in waste quantities that Hanford might receive under the WM PEIS decisions for MLLW, LLW, and TRU waste. The inclusion of a Hanford Only waste volume provides the basis for determining the incremental impacts of offsite waste and the impacts that would be avoided at Hanford Site if these offsite wastes were disposed of elsewhere. In general, waste disposed of prior to 1970 will be addressed through Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) response activities or other NEPA documentation, as appropriate. Cumulative impacts of waste remaining onsite, including waste disposed of prior to 1970, are addressed in Section 5.14 and Appendix L of the HSW EIS. Uncertainties regarding the inventory of wastes are discussed in Section 3.5.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E018/1	L049/6	MP001-56/1		Gen068: Revisions - In response to comments, new waste management activities and alternatives
E032/2	L049/7	MP002-08/2	RL008/2	
E038/2	L063/3	MP002-22/1	RL008/5	<p>response to comments on the first draft HSW EIS, and to incorporate new waste management activities and alternatives that have been under consideration since the first draft was issued. Revisions include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more comprehensive discussion of Hanford waste management activities as they relate to cleanup at Hanford and other DOE sites (see Summary and Section 1) • expanded analyses for groundwater quality (Section 5.3, Appendix G), transportation (Section 5.8, Appendix H), cumulative impacts (Section 5.14), and other consequences identified as being of particular concern in public comments • evaluation of impacts from managing Hanford-generated waste separately from offsite waste to facilitate understanding the incremental consequences from offsite waste that may be received for treatment or disposal at Hanford <p>ILAW, and WTP melters in either independent or combined-use facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluation of some new waste management activities proposed as a result of the C3T process and plans to accelerate Hanford cleanup, such as the Hanford Performance Management Plan issued in August 2002, to the extent possible. <p>In some cases, those proposals would need to be evaluated during future NEPA reviews because they are not ripe for decision at this time.</p>
	L063/10	MP003-009/3		
F010/4	L064/10	MP003-011/1	SEA003/2	
F010/5	L078/5	MP003-014/3	SEA010/6	
F018/7	L080/68		SEA011/4	
F018/8	L080/154	MP003-026/3		
F018/9	L084/9	MP003-028/2		
F028/2	L091/1	MP003-133/2	SEA013/2	
F030/1	L091/15		SEA013/12	
F030/2	L091/26	P003/1	SEA016/1	
F041/5	L092/6	P003/3	SEA016/2	
F050/1	L097/11		SEA023/1	
F051/1	L100/2		SEA024/2	
	L102/12	PDA005/8	SEA028/4	
HR004/1	L104/17	PDA008/2	SEA028/15	
HR006/1	L104/39	PDA028/5	SEA028/16	
	L106/25		SEA032/2	
L012/11	L106/52	PDB003/2	SEA042/5	
L013/1		PDB004/1	SEA042/6	
L019/1	LG002/1	PDB005/1		
L020/10			SEA047/1	
L026/10	ML002/2	PDB011/2		
L045/10		PDB014/2		
	ML002-11/1	PDB026/2		
E020/2	F016/18	MP003-005/3	SEA010/19	Gen069: Revisions - LLW in lined trenches
E036/1	F018/6	MP003-103/2	SEA010/22	
E042/2	F029/6		SEA010/23	
E045/3		RL003/29		
	L062/1		SEA035/1	
	L074/2			

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F073/6	L080/85	L080/137		Gen070: Revisions - Section 4.0 and other editorial comment revisions Thank you for your comments. The results of analyses performed to assess the potential environmental consequences of implementing the alternatives are not affected by these comments.
	L080/86	L080/138	L080/197	
L002/1	L080/88	L080/140	L080/198	
	L080/89	L080/141	L080/199	
L080/8	L080/93	L080/142		
L080/9	L080/94	L080/143	L080/201	
L080/15	L080/95	L080/144	L080/202	
L080/16	L080/96	L080/145	L080/203	
	L080/97			
L080/18	L080/99	L080/147	L080/205	
L080/20	L080/100	L080/148	L080/206	
L080/21	L080/101	L080/149	L080/207	
L080/22	L080/102	L080/150		
L080/27	L080/103	L080/151	L080/210	
L080/28	L080/104	L080/153	L080/212	
L080/30	L080/105	L080/156	L080/213	
	L080/106	L080/158	L080/214	
L080/38	L080/107	L080/159	L080/215	
L080/41	L080/108	L080/161	L080/216	
L080/42	L080/109	L080/162		
L080/49	L080/110	L080/163	L080/219	
L080/52	L080/111	L080/164	L080/222	
L080/55	L080/112	L080/166	L080/229	
L080/59	L080/113	L080/167		
L080/61	L080/114	L080/168	L080/244	
L080/62	L080/115	L080/169	L080/256	
L080/63	L080/116	L080/170	L080/346	
L080/65	L080/117	L080/171	L080/505	
L080/66	L080/118	L080/172	L091/13	
L080/67	L080/119	L080/174	L102/26	
L080/69	L080/120		L104/8	
L080/70	L080/121	L080/176	L104/9	
L080/71	L080/122		L104/20	
L080/72	L080/123	L080/180	L106/22	
L080/73	L080/124	L080/181	L106/29	
L080/74	L080/125	L080/183	L106/30	
	L080/126			
L080/76	L080/127	L080/186	LG005/4	
L080/77	L080/128	L080/187		
	L080/129	L080/188	PDB018/4	
L080/79	L080/130			
	L080/131	L080/190	RL003/19	
L080/81		L080/191	RL003/31	
L080/82	L080/134	L080/192		
	L080/135	L080/193	SEA014/1	
L080/84	L080/136	L080/194		

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E018/2 F032/1 F049/3 L041/2 L080/24 L102/25 L104/11	L106/2 L106/58 LG013/2 LG020/2 ML002-06/1 MP003-094/1 MP003-095/1 MP003-108/3	PDA010/2 PDA010/5 PDA017/9 PDA020/5 PDA024/2 PDA025/2 PDA027/6 PDA029/6 PDA031/8	RL001/13 SEA001/27	Gen071: Scope - Consistency with WM PEIS, WIPP SEIS, other environmental documentation, additional information The scope of this HSW EIS is consistent with decisions made as part of the Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, and other environmental documentation. Further information on alternatives, environmental impacts, cumulative impacts, and other subjects has been added, in part, to respond to comments.
F023/5 F049/1 HR013/1	L005/2 L043/1 L057/7 L068/1 L092/3	LG006/4 MP002-27/2 PDB012/5	SEA001/5 SEA013/1 SEA025/6 SEA039/4	Gen072: Scope - Hanford Tanks not included in scope Management of the Hanford Single-Shell Tank System and Double-Shell Tank System is beyond the content and purpose of the HSW EIS, but will be addressed in the Hanford Tank Closure EIS which is in preparation. Additional NEPA documentation for Hanford may be found at: http://www.hanford.gov/netlib/eis.asp . Cumulative impacts, including impacts from other Hanford site activities such as tank farm operations, are addressed in Section 5.14 and Appendix G.
L014/3				Gen073: Scope - Hanford Tanks not included in scope, transportation discussion Management of the Hanford Single-Shell Tank System and Double-Shell Tank System is beyond the content and purpose of the HSW EIS, but will be addressed in the Hanford Tank Closure EIS which is in preparation. Additional NEPA documentation for Hanford may be found at: http://www.hanford.gov/netlib/eis.asp . Cumulative impacts, including impacts from other Hanford site activities such as tank farm operations, are addressed in Section 5.14 and Appendix G. Additional discussion of transportation has been added in Section 2.2.4, Section 5.8, and Appendix H in Volumes I and II of this HSW EIS. A discussion of transporting waste to and from Hanford through the states of Oregon and Washington is included.
L057/4 L057/5 L092/4	LG029/1 MP001-55/1 MP003-072/2	PDA013/1	SEA039/2 SEA039/3 SEA039/5	Gen074: Scope - HLW exclusion, ILAW inclusion This HSW EIS proposes no changes to existing decisions made regarding the management of high-level waste. Alternatives for the disposal of immobilized low-activity waste have been added to this HSW EIS. Potential environmental impacts of these alternatives are presented in Section 5 and related appendices.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E036/4 F057/5 F065/1	HR002/5 HR002/6 L001/5 L102/15 LG020/1	ML002-18/1 PDA031/7 PDA032/2 PDB025/3		Gen075: Terrorist Attacks - Expected consequences discussed in HSW EIS While the probability of malicious events (including sabotage and terrorist attacks) cannot be determined, it is expected that the consequences of such events would be similar to accidents involving fires and explosions, which are discussed in this HSW EIS (see Sections 5.8 and 5.11 and associated Appendixes H and F).
E006/4 E011/2 E017/7 E023/4 E034/4 F006/2 F060/3 F063/1 F068/1 HR002/7 HR008/3 L004/3 L011/10 LG005/6	L080/13 L080/230 L084/8 L087/2 L087/3 L091/45 L097/23 L102/16 LG003/6 LG003/12 LG004/5 LG006/10 LG007/2 LG008/1 LG012/1 LG005/8	LG013/1 LG014/1 LG015/1 LG016/1 LG017/1 LG021/1 LG023/1 LG025/1 LG030/2 ME001/9 MP003-086/1 MP003-114/2 PDA005/3 PDA006/3	PDA007/4 PDA033/10 PDB005/2 PDB013/1 PDB022/1 PDB022/2 PDB023/1 PDB025/1 PDB026/3 RL001/1 SEA001/36 SEA041/9 SEA044/2	Gen076: Transportation - Additional discussion of transportation, Washington and Oregon impacts (Edits to revised VV for PDB-026-3) Additional discussion of transportation has been added in Section 2.2.4, Section 5.8, and Appendix H in Volumes I and II of this HSW EIS. A discussion of transporting waste to and from Hanford through the states of Oregon and Washington is included.
LG005/6	LG005/8			Gen077: Transportation - Containers, DOE policy Specialized containers are used for shipment of DOE radioactive and mixed wastes. The are dedicated to transportation of radioactive wastes and are not used for other purposes. DOE Order 460.1A sets out DOE policy on packaging and transportation safety. The Order states that onsite hazardous materials transfers shall comply with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) hazardous materials regulations, or the site- or facility-specific cognizant DOE Operations or Field Office approved Transportation Safety Document that describes the methodology and compliance process to meet equivalent safety for any deviation from the hazardous materials regulations. For offsite hazardous materials packaging and transportation safety, DOE's policy, as stated in DOE Order 460.1A, is that each package and shipment of hazardous materials shall be prepared in compliance with the DOT hazardous materials regulations and applicable tribal, state, and local regulations not otherwise preempted by DOT.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs			Subject/Response
L025/6	LG027/1	LG027/2	<p>Gen078: Transportation - DOE policy</p> <p>DOE Order 460.1A sets out DOE policy on packaging and transportation safety. The Order states that onsite hazardous materials transfers shall comply with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) hazardous materials regulations, or the site- or facility-specific cognizant DOE Operations or Field Office approved Transportation Safety Document that describes the methodology and compliance process to meet equivalent safety for any deviation from the hazardous materials regulations. For offsite hazardous materials packaging and transportation safety, DOE's policy, as stated in DOE Order 460.1A, is that each package and shipment of hazardous materials shall be prepared in compliance with the DOT hazardous materials regulations and applicable tribal, state, and local regulations not otherwise preempted by DOT.</p>
PDB024/1			<p>Gen079: Transportation - DOE policy, purpose and relationship of Sections 3, 4, and 5.</p> <p>DOE Order 460.1A sets out DOE policy on packaging and transportation safety. The Order states that onsite hazardous materials transfers shall comply with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) hazardous materials regulations, or the site- or facility-specific cognizant DOE Operations or Field Office approved Transportation Safety Document that describes the methodology and compliance process to meet equivalent safety for any deviation from the hazardous materials regulations. For offsite hazardous materials packaging and transportation safety, DOE's policy, as stated in DOE Order 460.1A, is that each package and shipment of hazardous materials shall be prepared in compliance with the DOT hazardous materials regulations and applicable tribal, state, and local regulations not otherwise preempted by DOT. The purpose of Section 4 is to provide a description of the environment that might be affected by the alternatives described in Section 3. The results of analyses performed to assess potential environmental consequences of implementing the alternatives are presented in Section 5. These comments do not change the assessment documented in this HSW EIS. In some cases, however, the comments have been incorporated.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response	
E006/3		L066/3	MP003-052/2	Gen080: Transportation - National hazardous material shipments, transporting wastes through Washington and Oregon, DOE shipping practices About 300,000,000 hazardous material shipments take place every year in the United States. Of those shipments, about 3,000,000 involve radioactive materials and less than 10,000 involve shipment of DOE radioactive materials. Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste through Washington and Oregon has been added to Section 5.8 and Appendix H. Additional information on DOE shipping practices has been added to Section 2 of this HSW EIS.	
E011/1	F049/2	L066/5			
E012/3	F052/2	L069/3	MP003-076/3		
E017/6	F054/3	L079/1	MP003-077/1		
E019/1	F055/1		MP003-086/2		
E021/1	F077/2	LG004/4	MP003-096/3		
E029/3		LG006/1	MP003-097/1		
E038/3	HR018/2	LG007/3	MP003-111/3		
E041/2			MP003-118/2		
E044/2	L001/4	ME001/8	MP003-123/3		
E048/3	L009/2	ME001-08/1	MP003-127/2		
	L013/3		MP003-138/3		
F002/3	L014/2		MP003-147/2		
	L020/8	ML002-04/3	MP003-149/3		
F012/2	L022/2	ML002-15/2			
F015/2	L023/8	ML002-17/5			
F016/4	L025/5	ML002-27/2			
F016/19	L026/8		PDA006/2		
F017/1	L027/2	MP001/1	PDA009/1		
F022/1	L045/8	MP002-18/2	PDA014/4		
F023/2	L046/3	MP002-23/2	PDB011/1		
F026/5	L049/4		PDB015/1		
F027/2	L053/2	MP003-003/3	PDB015/5		
F029/2	L054/1	MP003-005/2	PDB017/2		
F031/1	L054/7	MP003-023/3			
F034/2		MP003-024/1	SEA010/18		
F035/1		MP003-027/1	SEA018/1		
	L056/3		SEA022/4		
F036/1	L062/3	MP003-036/3	SEA035/4		
F038/4	L063/8	MP003-038/3	SEA041/8		
F039/4		MP003-047/1	SEA042/8		
E052/1	L038/3	P003/4	RL002/5		shipments, transporting wastes through Washington and Oregon, DOE waste disposal in other states place every year in the United States. Of those shipments, about 3,000,000 involve radioactive materials and less than 10,000 involve shipment of DOE radioactive materials. Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste through Washington and Oregon has been added to Section 5.8 and Appendix H. Additional information on DOE shipping practices has been added to Section 2. DOE's radioactive waste will continue to be disposed of in several states around the country where there are existing DOE and commercial disposal facilities. These states include Washington, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Ohio. While the probability of malicious events cannot be determined, it is expected that the consequences of those events would be similar to accidents involving
	L040/4		RL005/7		
	L065/1				
		PDA017/1	SEA001/7		
F043/1	L073/10				
F051/2	L097/4	PDA020/6	SEA015/6		
F053/1	L104/29	PDA022/7	SEA023/3		
F064/2	L106/8	PDA028/6	SEA032/4		
F084/4			SEA036/1		
	LG005/5	PDA031/6	SEA047/6		
L005/1	LG018/2				
L008/2		PDB025/2			
L017/4	ML002-03/1	PDB026/1			
L018/3		PDB027/1			
L031/1	MP003-029/4				

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
				fires and explosions, which are discussed in Sections 5.8 and 5.11 and Appendixes H and F.
PDA017/2	PDA017/5	PDA017/6		Gen082: Transportation - Suspended shipments of TRU Shipments of radioactive waste to Hanford have been suspended pending the outcome of litigation by the State of Washington against DOE.
E043/4	L020/9 L023/9 L063/9	L064/9 L066/1 L104/28	ME001-03/2 SEA023/6	Gen083: Transportation - Transporting wastes through Washington and Oregon, onsite receipt of LLW, MLLW, and TRU Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste through Washington and Oregon has been added to Section 5.8 and Appendix H. This new information addresses low-level waste, mixed low-level waste, and transuranic waste that might be received from offsite.
F055/4 L012/10 L026/9 L045/9 L051/4	L080/40 L093/10 L097/24 L098/6 L098/8 L098/9 L102/5	LG005/1 MP003-052/4 RL003/16	SEA013/21 SEA013/23 SEA028/11 SEA049/1	Gen084: Transportation - Transporting wastes through Washington and Oregon, onsite TRU storage pending disposal at WIPP A discussion of the impacts of transporting waste to and from Hanford through the states of Oregon and Washington has been added to this HSW EIS (see Sections 2.2.4, 5.8, and Appendix H). A discussion of the storage of offsite TRU waste at Hanford pending its disposal at WIPP is also included in this HSW EIS (see Section 5 and its associated appendixes).
F027/4	LG005/7	MP002-07/1		Gen085: Waste - Additional wastes generated as part of cleanup, plutonium production ended, TRU-HLW-SNF repository disposal Some additional wastes will be generated as part of the cleanup of Hanford Site and other DOE sites. However, plutonium production, the source of most of the waste created, has stopped at Hanford. TRU waste, high-level waste, and spent nuclear fuel will be sent to underground repositories in other states that have been designed to safely contain the waste.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E027/6 L001/3 L020/5	L023/5 L025/4 L026/5 L045/5	L063/5 L064/5 ME001/5	MP003-033/2 SEA010/4	<p>Gen086: Waste - Disposal of DOE waste in other states, net curies to be disposed at Hanford, groundwater monitoring, LLW disposal in lined trenches</p> <p>DOE's radioactive waste will continue to be disposed of in several states around the country where there are existing DOE and commercial disposal facilities. These states include Washington, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Ohio. The total amount of radioactivity expected to leave Hanford is much greater than the amount of radioactivity expected to come to Hanford. About 400 MCi of radioactivity is currently onsite. About 375 MCi are expected to be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and other places. Less than 10 MCi would come to Hanford even if all the offsite waste evaluated in the HSW EIS comes to Hanford. Groundwater monitoring is conducted according to DOE Orders, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit, and Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) requirements for the disposal areas. Groundwater monitoring will be expanded as necessary according to agreements between DOE and regulatory agencies to support future waste management operations. DOE has added alternatives for evaluation in this HSW EIS that include disposal of LLW in lined trenches with regulatory-compliant leachate collection systems (see Section 3.1).</p>
E002/1 E011/3 F016/7 F028/4 F042/1 F056/4 F075/1 HR002/11	L004/6 L019/6 L044/3 L054/11 L069/4 L080/34 L080/90 L106/40 LG031/1	ML002-19/1 MP001-06/2 MP002-27/3 MP003-028/1 MP003-055/1 MP003-096/1 MP003-120/2	PDA010/4 PDA013/5 PDA028/4 PDB010/2 PDB016/3 PDB017/1 RL002/3 RL003/27 SEA001/23	<p>Gen087: Waste - Disposal of DOE waste in other states, net curies to be disposed at Hanford, scope consistency with WM PEIS and WIPP SEIS</p> <p>DOE's radioactive waste will continue to be disposed of in several states around the country where there are existing DOE and commercial disposal facilities. These states include Washington, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Ohio. The total amount of radioactivity expected to leave Hanford is much greater than the amount of radioactivity expected to come to Hanford. About 400 MCi of radioactivity are currently onsite. About 375 MCi are expected to be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and other places. Less than 10 MCi would come to Hanford even if all the offsite waste evaluated in this HSW EIS were to come to Hanford. The scope of this HSW EIS is consistent with decisions made as part of the Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, and other environmental documentation. Further</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
				information on alternatives, environmental impacts, cumulative impacts, and other subjects has been added, in part, to respond to comments.
E002/2 E044/1 F007/1 F013/2 F023/1 F068/3 F080/4 F081/9 HR005/3 L004/5 L073/9	LG006/5 LG006/8 ML002-22/1 ML002-26/1 MP002/1 MP002-05/1 MP002-07/3 MP003-038/2 MP003-077/4 MP003-090/1 MP003-090/3 MP003-093/2	MP003-098/1 MP003-101/2 MP003-114/3 MP003-120/1 MP003-125/1 MP003-128/1 MP003-131/1 MP003-137/2 MP003-153/2 P005/2 P007/3 P010/3	PDA012/1 PDA023/3 PDA029/7 PDA033/6 RL005/6 RL006/1 SEA017/1 SEA025/3 SEA047/5	Gen088: Waste - Disposal of DOE waste in other states, net curies to be disposed at Hanford, transportation impact information DOE's radioactive waste will continue to be disposed of in several states around the country where there are existing DOE and commercial disposal facilities. These states include Washington, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Ohio. The total amount of radioactivity expected to leave Hanford is much greater than the amount of radioactivity expected to come to Hanford. About 400 MCi of radioactivity are currently onsite. About 375 MCi are expected to be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and other places. Less than 10 MCi would come to Hanford even if all the offsite waste evaluated in this HSW EIS were to come to Hanford. Information on the potential impacts of transporting waste through Washington and Oregon has been added to Section 5.8 and Appendix H.
E036/2 F081/3	L080/64 L080/139 L080/185 L080/359	L097/32 L097/47 L097/48 L097/50	L106/27 L106/33	Gen089: Waste - Disposed in LLBG prior to and since 1962 Wastes disposed of in the LLBGs since they opened in 1962 are evaluated in this HSW EIS. Wastes disposed of prior to 1962 are addressed as part of the cumulative impacts (see Sections 5.14 and Appendix L). Uncertainties about hazardous chemical constituents in the previously disposed of waste are discussed in Section 3.X. This waste will ultimately go through a CERCLA or RCRA past practice remedial action process prior to closure of the LLBGs.

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
L097/44				<p>Gen090: Waste - Disposed in LLBG prior to and since 1962,</p> <p>Wastes disposed of in the LLBGs since they opened in 1962 are evaluated in this HSW EIS. Wastes disposed of prior to 1962 are addressed as part of the cumulative impacts (see Sections 5.14 and Appendix L). Uncertainties about hazardous chemical constituents in the previously disposed of waste are discussed in Section 3.X. This waste will ultimately go through a CERCLA or RCRA past practice remedial action process prior to closure of the LLBGs.</p> <p>During the trench sampling, industrial hygienists conducted repeated air monitoring at the top of the PVC pipe above the trench—a required health and safety practice for all sampling activities to protect the workers from potentially being exposed during the sampling. After the carbon tetrachloride had been detected in the air at the bottom of the trench, industrial hygienists again monitored the trench to ensure that other workers who entered this area in the burial ground would not be exposed. The measurements for all “organics” in the air above the trench (including carbon tetrachloride and its decay products) showed readings ranging from “not detectable” to 4 ppm—well below the standard set by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) of 10 ppm per day during a 40-hour work week. Samples taken in the “breathing zone” did not show any level of organics. The monitoring at the surface of the trenches indicated that toxic vapors were not emanating from the vent risers.</p>
F042/2 HR010/2	MP003-060/2 MP003-066/1 MP003-068/1	MP003-098/2 MP003-104/2 MP003-150/2	SEA001/21	<p>Gen091: Waste - DOE waste disposal in other states, net curies to be disposed at Hanford</p> <p>DOE’s radioactive waste will continue to be disposed of in several states around the country where there are existing DOE and commercial disposal facilities. These states include Washington, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Ohio. The total amount of radioactivity expected to leave Hanford is much greater than the amount of radioactivity expected to come to Hanford. About 400 MCi of radioactivity are currently onsite. About 375 MCi are expected to be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and other places. Less than 10 MCi would come to Hanford even if all the offsite waste evaluated in the HSW EIS comes to Hanford.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
L080/195 L091/14 L097/58 L098/13	L102/20 L106/15 L106/34 L106/35	PDB016/1 RL003/11	SEA010/7	Gen092: Waste - Evaluation of wastes disposed prior to 1970 In general, waste disposed of prior to 1970 will be addressed through Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) response activities or other NEPA documentation, as appropriate. Cumulative impacts of waste remaining onsite, including waste disposed of prior to 1970, are addressed in Section 5.14 and Appendix L of the HSW EIS. Uncertainties regarding the inventory of wastes are discussed in Section 3.5.
E006/1 E007/1 E009/1 E010/3 E014/1 E016/1 E021/2 E024/1 E027/5 E031/1 E034/1 E035/6 E038/1 E039/1 E039/2 E040/1 E043/1 E045/1 E047/1 E048/1 E050/1 E051/1 F002/1 F004/3	F005/1 F006/1 F008/1 F010/1 F010/3 F011/2 F012/1 F016/5 F018/3 F019/1 F023/4 F024/2 F025/1 F025/4 F026/2 F029/1 F030/5 F033/1 F037/2 F037/4 F038/1 F039/1 F041/2 F045/1 F050/2 F054/1	F055/7 F056/1 F065/2 F065/5 F065/7 F071/5 F073/5 F079/7 F081/2 F081/7 F084/2 HR001/3 HR003/4 HR007/3 L006/2 L017/5 L022/1 L027/1 L030/2 L036/1 L039/1 L044/1 L054/5	L058/1 L062/4 L065/2 L068/2 L073/5 L080/36 L080/39 L080/160 L080/177 L087/1 L097/38 L104/12 L104/44 L104/49 L106/42 PDA005/1 PDA014/3 PDB015/2 RL001/3 SEA001/28 SEA010/15	revised draft HSW EIS The revised draft HSW EIS evaluates various forecast waste quantities that include only Hanford-generated waste, in addition to varying amounts of offsite waste. This evaluation reflects the uncertainty in waste quantities that Hanford might receive from offsite. The inclusion of a Hanford-only waste volume provides the basis for determining the incremental impacts of offsite waste. See Section 3.2 for a discussion of the different waste volumes addressed in the HSW EIS. The evaluations of groundwater impacts in Section 5.15 of the draft HSW EIS include the impacts of the wastes to be managed within the scope of the HSW EIS NEPA review, as well as the CERCLA wastes disposed in the Hanford ERDF. Analysis indicates that these wastes could be handled without complicating future remediations, or diverting resources or disposal capacity from other Hanford cleanup activities.
E004/8 F059/2 F059/3	L043/3 L102/13	RL008/3	SEA023/4 SEA028/9	Gen094: Waste - Hanford-only waste evaluation The “no import of out of state waste” scenario is evaluated as the Hanford Only waste volume that has been added to this HSW EIS.
F016/13 F030/4	L057/2 L059/3 L102/19 L106/21 L106/43	ME001/6 MP002/2	RL001/21 SEA001/31	Gen095: Waste - Hanford-only waste evaluations, carbon tetrachloride discussion Evaluation of a Hanford Only waste volume has been added to this HSW EIS. The Hanford Only waste volume assumes that no more waste would be received from offsite. Further information on alternatives, environmental impacts, cumulative impacts, and other subjects has been added. Discussion of carbon

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
				tetrachloride has also been added to this HSW EIS.
L057/12				<p>Gen096: Waste - Hanford-only waste evaluations, terrorist attacks</p> <p>The “no import of out of state waste” scenario is evaluated as a result of evaluating the Hanford Only waste volume that has been added to this HSW EIS.</p> <p>In response to comments, DOE included a discussion of the potential impacts of deliberate acts of sabotage or terrorist attacks in Section 5.8 and Appendix H of this EIS.</p>
E027/4 F003/1 F012/3 F046/5	L018/4 LG031/2	MP003-043/2 MP003-070/1 MP003-082/2 MP003-119/1	PDA023/1 SEA048/4	<p>Gen097: Waste - HLW and spent nuclear fuel will not be disposed at Hanford</p> <p>power facilities will not be disposed of at Hanford.</p>
L019/3 L093/5	LG003/5 LG006/2 LG006/14	ME001/3	MP001/4 MP002-02/1	<p>Gen098: Waste - Net curies to remain at Hanford</p> <p>The total amount of radioactivity expected to leave Hanford is much greater than the amount of radioactivity expected to come to Hanford. About 400 MCi of radioactivity are currently onsite. About 375 MCi are expected to be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and other places. Less than 10 MCi would come to Hanford even if all the offsite waste evaluated in this HSW EIS were to come to Hanford.</p>
E005/2 E006/5	L051/6	PDA007/1	SEA001/29	<p>Gen099: Waste - Net curies to remain at Hanford, evaluation of additional alternatives</p> <p>The total amount of radioactivity expected to leave Hanford is much greater than the amount of radioactivity expected to come to Hanford. About 400 MCi of radioactivity is currently onsite. About 375 MCi are expected to be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, Yucca Mountain in Nevada, and other places. Less than 10 MCi would come to Hanford even if all the offsite waste evaluated in this HSW EIS were to come to Hanford. Additional disposal alternatives, including alternatives for the disposal of low-level waste, have been analyzed. Potential environmental impacts of these additional alternatives are presented in Section 5 and related appendixes.</p>
L080/25 L091/40	L097/49	L102/6 L106/14		<p>Gen100: Waste - Pre-1970 LLBG waste</p> <p>Waste disposed of in the Low Level Burial Grounds, including waste disposed of prior to 1970, are evaluated in this HSW EIS. Wastes disposed of elsewhere are addressed as part of the cumulative impacts. Further</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
				information on cumulative impacts has been added to Section 5.14 and Appendix L.
L091/22	L106/20			<p>Gen101: Waste Minimization</p> <p>Waste minimization and pollution prevention practices are used at all DOE sites to control waste management costs and to comply with regulatory requirements. The NEPA documents relevant to the Hanford Solid Waste EIS are identified in Section 1.5. The most comprehensive NEPA document addressing DOE waste management practices is the 1997 WM PEIS. DOE's pollution prevention program is evaluated in Appendix G of the WM PEIS.</p>
F057/1	L092/11 L098/7	RL001/14 RL005/4		<p>Gen102: WM PEIS - Comprehensive national evaluation of DOE waste management, DOE decisions, public availability</p> <p>The Waste Management PEIS was a comprehensive evaluation of DOE nationwide waste management activities, and DOE determined there was sufficient information to make decisions regarding the sites that were suitable for long-term waste management missions. The WM PEIS was widely distributed, and documents cited in the WM PEIS were made available at numerous libraries and reading rooms in Washington and Oregon. Likewise, documents cited in this HSW EIS are available in public reading rooms listed in published notices and this document.</p>

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
E007/3	HR019/3	ML002-08/1	PDA030/2	Gen103: Thank you for your comment.
E027/3	HR020/1	ML002-09/1	PDA030/3	
E029/4	HR022/5	ML002-10/1	PDA030/7	
E030/2		ML002-13/1	PDA031/11	
E036/3	L005/3	ML002-15/1	PDB001/1	
E037/3	L007/2	ML002-20/1		
E039/3	L009/6	ML002-25/2	PDB003/1	
E040/3	L010/4	MP001-05/1	PDB003/3	
E041/3	L012/1	MP001-08/1	PDB006/1	
	L016/2	MP001-10/1	PDB006/2	
F001/4	L017/6	MP001-11/1	PDB008/2	
F005/2	L019/4	MP001-19/1	PDB010/3	
F005/9	L019/5	MP001-21/1	PDB010/4	
F007/3	L022/3	MP001-23/1	PDB012/1	
F011/1	L023/13	MP001-24/1	PDB012/9	
F011/6	L029/3		PDB014/3	
F013/3	L030/3	MP001-59/1	PDB015/3	
F016/15	L032/1	MP002-01/1	PDB016/2	
F018/5	L032/3	MP002-11/1	PDB019/1	
F021/1	L032/4	MP002-24/1		
F023/6	L032/5	MP002-24/2	RL001/6	
F023/7	L034/4	MP003-001/3	RL002/1	
F026/4	L034/6	MP003-011/2	RL002/9	
F028/3	L036/4	MP003-011/3	RL009/1	
F029/4	L039/3	MP003-012/2	RL009/2	
F029/7	L041/3	MP003-019/1		
F030/3	L046/4	MP003-035/1	SEA002/3	
F031/4	L048/2	MP003-038/1	SEA002/5	
F034/4	L060/5	MP003-044/3	SEA009/2	
F038/2	L067/1	MP003-046/1		
F038/5	L067/4	MP003-053/4	SEA011/1	
F039/2	L071/3	MP003-056/1	SEA012/1	
F040/1	L075/1	MP003-056/3	SEA012/2	
F041/3	L075/3	MP003-059/1	SEA015/3	
F042/5	L078/1	MP003-063/2	SEA015/4	
F042/6	L078/2	MP003-090/2	SEA015/5	
F043/3	L078/3	MP003-100/1	SEA020/1	
	L080/91	MP003-121/1	SEA020/4	
F055/6	L080/98	MP003-122/3	SEA021/1	
F059/4	L080/152	MP003-128/2	SEA022/2	
F060/1	L080/179	MP003-129/1	SEA022/5	
F061/1	L084/1	MP003-135/1		
F061/3	L084/2	MP003-138/1	SEA024/4	
F061/7	L084/3		SEA024/5	
F064/3	L085/7	P011/3	SEA025/7	
F067/2	L092/1		SEA027/2	
F067/4	L092/5	PDA002/1	SEA027/4	
F075/2	L092/9	PDA003/1	SEA029/1	
F078/1	L097/21	PDA004/2	SEA029/3	
F079/1	L106/3	PDA004/3	SEA031/1	
F081/10	L106/59	PDA005/9	SEA031/2	
F081/12		PDA012/2	SEA032/5	

Table 3.3. (contd)

CommentIDs				Subject/Response
F083/2	LG003/1	PDA012/3	SEA033/2	
F084/5	LG003/2	PDA013/3	SEA034/1	
F085/1	LG003/3	PDA014/1	SEA036/4	
F085/2	LG003/8	PDA017/8	SEA036/5	
F085/3	LG003/9	PDA020/2	SEA036/6	
F086/3	LG003/10	PDA022/1	SEA037/1	
	LG006/3	PDA022/9	SEA042/3	
HR001/1	LG006/13	PDA023/4	SEA044/1	
HR002/1	LG006/15	PDA025/1	SEA044/6	
HR004/3	LG007/7	PDA026/1	SEA046/1	
HR004/5	LG013/3	PDA026/2	SEA047/2	
HR007/1		PDA027/5	SEA047/4	
HR011/2	ME001-02/1	PDA028/9	SEA047/7	
HR015/2	ME001-04/2	PDA029/2	SEA047/8	
HR016/2	ME001-07/1	PDA029/4	SEA048/1	
HR018/3	ME001-08/3	PDA029/5	SEA048/2	
HR019/1	ME001-08/4	PDA030/1	SEA048/6	
HR019/2				