

other onsite storage facilities. The RHWF will be used for segregating, size-reducing, repackaging, and otherwise preparing remote-handled radioactive wastes for transportation and disposal.

- Continuing onsite storage of all wastes, with the exception of 4,100 cubic meters (145,000 cubic feet) of Class A LLW wastes that would be shipped off the site.
- Ventilating the waste storage tanks and their surrounding vaults to manage moisture levels as a corrosion prevention measure.

Shipments under the No Action Alternative would be limited to 4,100 cubic meters (145,000 cubic feet) of Class A LLW addressed under previous NEPA documentation, until more extensive shipping can be assessed under the other alternatives in this EIS. Class A LLW is currently being shipped to Envirocare and NTS; however, for the purposes of analysis, shipments of these wastes to Hanford have also been assessed under the No Action Alternative. Table 2-2 identifies the number of containers and shipments required to dispose of up to 4,100 cubic meters (145,000 cubic feet) of Class A LLW.

**Table 2-2. Waste Shipped Under the No Action Alternative**

Waste Type	Container Type	Waste Shipped (cubic feet) <sup>a</sup>	Number of Containers	Number of Shipments
Class A LLW	Boxes	97,649	1,206	87 (truck) 44 (rail)
	Drums	47,351	6,878	82 (truck) 41 (rail)
<b>Total</b>		<b>145,000</b>	<b>8,084</b>	<b>169 (truck) 85 (rail)</b>

a. To convert cubic feet to cubic meters, multiply by 0.028.

Class A LLW would be disposed of at Hanford, NTS, or a commercial disposal site such as Envirocare. Activities at those sites would include unloading trucks or railcars, inspecting the waste containers, and moving the waste to the disposal areas for shallow land burial. Waste handling and disposal activities at Envirocare are regulated by the NRC and the State of Utah under a Radioactive Material License (UT2300249). LLW handling and disposal activities at Hanford and NTS are described in the *Draft Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement* (DOE 2002b) and the *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Nevada Test Site and Off-site Locations* (DOE 1996b), respectively.

## 2.4 ALTERNATIVE A – OFFSITE SHIPMENT OF HLW, LLW, MIXED LLW, AND TRU WASTE TO DISPOSAL, AND ONGOING MANAGEMENT OF WASTE STORAGE TANKS

Under Alternative A, DOE's Preferred Alternative, DOE would ship Class A, B and C LLW and mixed LLW to one of two DOE potential disposal sites (in Washington or Nevada) or to a commercial disposal site (in Utah), ship TRU waste to WIPP in New Mexico, and ship HLW to the proposed Yucca Mountain HLW repository. LLW and mixed LLW would be shipped over the next 10 years. TRU waste shipments to WIPP could occur within the next 10 years if the TRU waste is determined to meet all the requirements for disposal in this repository; however, if some or all of WVDP's TRU waste does not meet these requirements, the Department would need to explore other alternatives for disposal of this waste. HLW would continue to be stored on the site until 2025 or later, then shipped to the proposed Yucca Mountain Repository. Although this period would extend well beyond the 10 years required for all other proposed

actions under this alternative, the impacts of transporting the HLW have been included in this EIS to fully inform the decisionmakers should an earlier opportunity to ship HLW present itself. The waste storage tanks would continue to be managed as described under the No Action Alternative.

Table 2-3 shows the number of containers that would be required and the number of offsite shipments that, by either truck or rail, would be needed to remove the waste under Alternative A. The waste volumes used in this EIS were based on waste volumes that are currently in storage and projections of additional wastes that could be generated from ongoing operations over the next 10 years. These volumes were then escalated by about 10 percent to account for the uncertainties in future waste projections, packaging efficiency, and the choice of shipping container. Using this process, CH-TRU waste was escalated to 1,130 cubic meters (40,000 cubic feet) (from 1,020 cubic meters [36,000 cubic feet]), and RH-TRU waste was escalated to 250 cubic meters (9,000 cubic feet) (from 230 cubic meters [8,000 cubic feet]). LLW was escalated to 14,000 cubic meters (500,000 cubic feet) (from 13,000 cubic meters [450,000 cubic feet]), with the exception of the LLW volumes stored in the Drum Cell, which were not escalated because actual container counts are known. This escalated volume includes 223 cubic meters (7,889 cubic feet) of mixed LLW.

LLW and mixed LLW would be disposed of at Hanford, NTS, or a commercial disposal site such as Envirocare. Activities at those sites would include unloading trucks or railcars, inspecting the waste containers, and moving the waste to the disposal areas for shallow land burial. Waste handling and disposal activities at Envirocare are regulated by the NRC and the State of Utah under a Radioactive Material License (UT2300249). LLW and mixed LLW handling and disposal activities at Hanford and NTS are described in the *Final Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Managing, Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Radioactive and Hazardous Waste* (DOE/EIS-0200) (DOE 1997a).

TRU waste would be disposed of at WIPP or DOE would explore other alternatives. TRU waste would arrive on tractor-trailer trucks or railcars. At WIPP, DOE would unload the waste, inspect the waste packages, prepare the packages to be moved underground, and then move them underground for disposal. Environmental and health impacts of TRU waste handling and disposal activities at WIPP are described in the WIPP Supplemental EIS II (DOE 1997b).

HLW would be disposed of at a geologic repository (assumed to be the Yucca Mountain Repository). Waste handling and disposal activities for HLW are described in the *Final Environmental Impact Statement for a Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste at Yucca Mountain, Nye County, Nevada* (DOE 2002a).

## **2.5 ALTERNATIVE B – OFFSITE SHIPMENT OF LLW AND MIXED LLW TO DISPOSAL, SHIPMENT OF HLW AND TRU WASTE TO INTERIM DISPOSAL, AND ONGOING INTERIM STABILIZATION OF WASTE STORAGE TANKS**

Under Alternative B, LLW and mixed LLW shipping would occur as characterized under Alternative A; however, TRU and HLW would be shipped to interim offsite storage. As would be the action under Alternative A, LLW and mixed LLW currently in storage would be prepared for disposal and shipped off the site to Hanford, NTS, or a commercial disposal site such as Envirocare. TRU waste would be shipped to Hanford, INEEL, ORNL, or SRS for interim storage, then to WIPP for disposal. TRU waste could also