

to ship TRU waste to WIPP for interim storage prior to disposal at WIPP would require siting, construction, and operation of TRU waste storage capacity at WIPP and additional NEPA review. Shipment of TRU waste from the interim storage facilities to WIPP and activities at that site are described in the WIPP Supplemental EIS II (DOE 1997b).

Interim storage of WVDP HLW at Hanford or SRS for interim storage prior to disposal at a geologic repository was analyzed as part of the Regionalized Alternatives in the WM PEIS (DOE 1997a).

2.6 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED

In contrast with alternatives assessed in the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Completion of the West Valley Demonstration Project and Closure or Long-Term Management of Facilities at the Western New York Nuclear Service Center* (DOE 1996a), this EIS does not consider any new onsite disposal of wastes or indefinite storage of currently stored wastes or wastes to be generated as a result of ongoing operations over the next 10 years. DOE has issued EISs and decisions that identify disposal sites other than the WVDP for each waste type considered in this EIS (see Section 1.7). These sites, identified in Alternatives A and B, already have existing or planned disposal capacity; they are safe, secure, and suitable from an environmental standpoint. In light of the current and anticipated availability of disposal facilities at these other sites, DOE presently does not consider an alternative to construct and maintain waste storage facilities at the WVDP to be practical or reasonable over time, because of continuing costs of construction of new facilities and maintenance of existing facilities.

For purposes of analysis in this EIS, DOE selected potential sites for interim storage and disposal of TRU waste and HLW based on the WM PEIS (DOE 1997a), the WIPP Supplemental EIS II (DOE 1997b), and the associated RODs for these documents. For TRU waste, DOE analyzed Hanford, INEEL, LANL, ORR, Mound, NTS, SRS, and WIPP as potential storage sites for TRU waste. The TRU waste ROD stated that:

“In the future, the Department may decide to ship TRU wastes from sites where it may be impractical to prepare them for disposal to sites where DOE has or will have the necessary capability. The sites that could receive such shipments of TRU waste are [INEEL, ORR, SRS, and Hanford]. However, any future decisions regarding transfer of TRU wastes would be subject to appropriate review under [NEPA] and to agreements DOE has entered into.” 63 Fed. Reg. 3629 (1998).

Based on this analysis and documentation, DOE considered Hanford, INEEL, ORNL, and SRS as the potential interim storage locations under Alternative B for TRU waste generated at WVDP. Further, the WM PEIS (DOE 1997a) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with the possible treatment of TRU waste from offsite generators at WIPP prior to disposal. For that reason, DOE included WIPP as a potential location for interim storage of TRU waste generated at WVDP. A decision to ship TRU waste to WIPP for interim storage prior to disposal at WIPP would require additional NEPA review.

With respect to HLW, the HLW ROD stated that DOE had decided to store immobilized HLW at Hanford, INEEL, SRS, and WVDP (64 Fed. Reg. 46661 (1999)). In this WVDP Waste Management EIS, DOE examined the environmental impacts associated with shipping HLW generated at WVDP to Hanford or SRS for interim storage prior to disposal at a geologic repository. Although the impacts of shipping HLW to INEEL are not specifically analyzed in this EIS, DOE expects those impacts would be less than shipping to Hanford because the distance to INEEL is shorter and impacts are directly related to the miles traveled.