

CONTENTS

COVER SHEET	iii
NOTATION	xxv
SUMMARY	S-1
S.1 Introduction.....	S-1
S.1.1 Background Information.....	S-1
S.1.1.1 Creation of USEC.....	S-4
S.1.1.2 Growing Concern over the DUF ₆ Inventory.....	S-5
S.1.1.3 Programmatic NEPA Review and Congressional Interest.....	S-6
S.1.1.4 DOE Request for Contractor Proposals and Site-Specific NEPA Review	S-7
S.1.1.5 Public Law 107-206 Passed by Congress.....	S-9
S.1.1.6 Characteristics of DUF ₆	S-9
S.1.2 Purpose and Need	S-10
S.1.3 Proposed Action.....	S-10
S.1.4 Scope.....	S-10
S.1.5 Relationship to Other NEPA Reviews.....	S-11
S.1.6 Organization of This Environmental Impact Statement	S-12
S.2 ALTERNATIVES	S-12
S.2.1 No Action Alternative.....	S-12
S.2.2 Proposed Action Alternatives	S-14
S.2.2.1 Alternative Location A (Preferred Alternative)	S-15
S.2.2.2 Alternative Location B	S-15
S.2.2.3 Alternative Location C	S-15
S.2.2.4 Conversion Process Description.....	S-15
S.2.2.5 Option of Shipping ETTP Cylinders to Paducah	S-17
S.2.2.6 Possible Extension of Conversion Facility Operations and the Potential for Paducah-to-Portsmouth DUF ₆ Cylinder Shipments	S-21
S.2.3 Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail	S-22
S.2.3.1 Use of Commercial Conversion Capacity	S-22
S.2.3.2 Sites Other Than Paducah	S-22
S.2.3.3 Alternative Conversion Processes	S-22
S.2.3.4 Long-Term Storage and Disposal Alternatives	S-23
S.2.3.5 Other Transportation Modes	S-23
S.2.3.6 One Conversion Plant for Two Sites	S-23
S.3 Affected Environment	S-23
S.4 Environmental Impact Assessment Approach, Assumptions, and Methodology	S-24

CONTENTS (Cont.)

S.5	Consequences and Comparison of Alternatives	S-26
S.5.1	Human Health and Safety — Construction and Normal Facility Operations	S-27
S.5.2	Human Health and Safety — Facility Accidents	S-28
S.5.2.1	Physical Hazards.....	S-28
S.5.2.2	Facility Accidents Involving Radiation or Chemical Releases.....	S-28
S.5.3	Human Health and Safety — Transportation.....	S-32
S.5.4	Air Quality and Noise	S-35
S.5.5	Water and Soil.....	S-36
S.5.6	Socioeconomics.....	S-37
S.5.7	Ecology.....	S-37
S.5.8	Waste Management	S-38
S.5.9	Resource Requirements.....	S-39
S.5.10	Land Use	S-39
S.5.11	Cultural Resources	S-40
S.5.12	Environmental Justice	S-40
S.5.13	Option of Shipping ETTP Cylinders to Paducah	S-40
S.5.14	Impacts Associated with Conversion Product Sale and Use.....	S-41
S.5.15	Impacts from D&D Activities	S-41
S.5.16	Cumulative Impacts.....	S-42
S.5.17	Mitigation	S-43
S.5.18	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	S-45
S.5.19	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	S-45
S.5.20	Relationship between Short-Term Use of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity	S-45
S.5.21	Pollution Prevention and Waste Minimization	S-46
S.6	Environmental and Occupational Safety and Health Permits and Compliance Requirements	S-46
S.7	Preferred Alternative	S-46
1	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	Background Information.....	1-2
1.1.1	Creation of USEC.....	1-3
1.1.2	Growing Concern over the DUF ₆ Inventory.....	1-4
1.1.3	Programmatic NEPA Review and Congressional Interest.....	1-5
1.1.4	DOE Request for Contractor Proposals and Site-Specific NEPA Review	1-6
1.1.5	Public Law 107-206 Passed by Congress	1-8
1.2	Characteristics of DUF ₆	1-8
1.2.1	Cylinder Inventory	1-9
1.2.2	Cylinder Condition and Potential Transuranic Contamination	1-11

CONTENTS (Cont.)

1.3	Purpose and Need	1-12
1.4	Proposed Action.....	1-12
1.5	DOE DUF ₆ Management Program.....	1-13
1.6	Scope.....	1-14
1.6.1	Public Scoping Process for This Environmental Impact Statement.....	1-14
1.6.2	Scope of This Environmental Impact Statement.....	1-16
1.6.2.1	Alternatives.....	1-16
1.6.2.2	Depleted Uranium Conversion Technologies and Products.....	1-17
1.6.2.3	Transportation Modes.....	1-18
1.6.2.4	Conversion Product Disposition.....	1-18
1.6.2.5	Human Health and Environmental Issues	1-19
1.7	Relationship to Other NEPA Reviews.....	1-20
1.8	Other Documents and Studies Related to DUF ₆ Management and Conversion Activities.....	1-22
1.9	Organization of This Environmental Impact Statement	1-25
2	DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	2-1
2.1	No Action Alternative.....	2-1
2.2	Proposed Action.....	2-4
2.2.1	Action Alternatives	2-5
2.2.1.1	Alternative Location A (Preferred Alternative).....	2-6
2.2.1.2	Alternative Location B.....	2-6
2.2.1.3	Alternative Location C.....	2-6
2.2.2	Conversion Process Description.....	2-8
2.2.2.1	Cylinder Transfer System	2-11
2.2.2.2	Vaporization System.....	2-12
2.2.2.3	Conversion System	2-12
2.2.2.4	Depleted Uranium Conversion Product Handling System	2-13
2.2.2.5	HF Recovery System	2-13
2.2.2.6	Emptied Cylinder Processing.....	2-14
2.2.2.7	Management of Potential Transuranic Contamination	2-14
2.2.3	Conversion Product Disposition	2-15
2.2.4	Option of Shipping ETTP Cylinders to Paducah	2-17
2.2.5	Possible Extension of Conversion Facility Operations and the Potential for Paducah-to-Portsmouth DUF ₆ Cylinder Shipments	2-19
2.3	Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail	2-21
2.3.1	Utilization of Commercial Conversion Capacity	2-21
2.3.2	Other Sites	2-21
2.3.3	Other Conversion Technologies.....	2-22
2.3.4	Long-Term Storage and Disposal Alternatives	2-22

CONTENTS (Cont.)

2.3.5	Other Transportation Modes	2-23
2.3.6	One Conversion Plant Alternative.....	2-23
2.4	Comparison of Alternatives	2-23
2.4.1	General	2-23
2.4.2	Summary and Comparison of Potential Environmental Impacts	2-25
2.4.2.1	Human Health and Safety—Construction and Normal Facility Operations	2-25
2.4.2.2	Human Health and Safety — Facility Accidents	2-26
2.4.2.3	Human Health and Safety — Transportation	2-30
2.4.2.4	Air Quality and Noise.....	2-33
2.4.2.5	Water and Soil	2-34
2.4.2.6	Socioeconomics.....	2-34
2.4.2.7	Ecology.....	2-35
2.4.2.8	Waste Management	2-36
2.4.2.9	Resource Requirements	2-37
2.4.2.10	Land Use.....	2-37
2.4.2.11	Cultural Resources.....	2-37
2.4.2.12	Environmental Justice	2-37
2.4.2.13	Option of Shipping ETTP Cylinders to Paducah	2-38
2.4.2.14	Impacts Associated with Conversion Product Sale and Use	2-38
2.4.2.15	Impacts from D&D Activities	2-39
2.4.2.16	Cumulative Impacts.....	2-39
2.5	Preferred Alternative	2-41
3	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3-1
3.1	Paducah Site.....	3-1
3.1.1	Cylinder Yards	3-2
3.1.2	Site Infrastructure.....	3-2
3.1.3	Climate, Air Quality, and Noise.....	3-5
3.1.3.1	Climate	3-5
3.1.3.2	Existing Air Emissions.....	3-5
3.1.3.3	Air Quality.....	3-7
3.1.3.4	Existing Noise Environment	3-11
3.1.4	Geology and Soil.....	3-11
3.1.4.1	Topography, Structure, and Seismic Risk	3-11
3.1.4.2	Soils	3-14
3.1.5	Water Resources.....	3-15
3.1.5.1	Surface Water	3-15
3.1.5.2	Groundwater.....	3-16

CONTENTS (Cont.)

3.1.6	Biotic Resources.....	3-17
3.1.6.1	Vegetation	3-17
3.1.6.2	Wildlife.....	3-18
3.1.6.3	Wetlands.....	3-19
3.1.6.4	Threatened and Endangered Species	3-22
3.1.7	Public and Occupational Safety and Health.....	3-24
3.1.7.1	Radiation Environment.....	3-24
3.1.7.2	Chemical Environment.....	3-26
3.1.8	Socioeconomics.....	3-26
3.1.8.1	Population.....	3-28
3.1.8.2	Employment	3-28
3.1.8.3	Personal Income	3-29
3.1.8.4	Housing	3-30
3.1.8.5	Community Resources	3-31
3.1.9	Waste Management	3-32
3.1.9.1	Wastewater	3-34
3.1.9.2	Solid Nonhazardous, Nonradioactive Waste	3-34
3.1.9.3	Nonradioactive Hazardous and Toxic Waste	3-35
3.1.9.4	Low-Level Radioactive Waste	3-35
3.1.9.5	Low-Level Radioactive Mixed Waste.....	3-35
3.1.10	Land Use	3-35
3.1.11	Cultural Resources	3-37
3.1.12	Environmental Justice	3-38
3.1.12.1	Minority Populations	3-38
3.1.12.2	Low-Income Populations	3-39
3.2	East Tennessee Technology Park	3-39
3.2.1	Cylinder Yards	3-42
3.2.2	Site Infrastructure.....	3-44
3.2.3	Climate, Air Quality, and Noise	3-44
3.2.3.1	Climate	3-44
3.2.3.2	Existing Air Emissions	3-45
3.2.3.3	Air Quality.....	3-47
3.2.3.4	Existing Noise Environment	3-50
3.2.4	Geology and Soil.....	3-52
3.2.4.1	Topography, Structure, and Seismic Risk	3-52
3.2.4.2	Soils	3-52
3.2.5	Water Resources.....	3-53
3.2.5.1	Surface Water	3-53
3.2.5.2	Groundwater	3-55
3.2.6	Biotic Resources.....	3-57
3.2.6.1	Vegetation	3-57
3.2.6.2	Wildlife.....	3-57

CONTENTS (Cont.)

3.2.6.3	Wetlands	3-58
3.2.6.4	Threatened and Endangered Species	3-58
3.2.7	Public and Occupational Safety and Health.....	3-58
3.2.7.1	Radiation Environment.....	3-58
3.2.7.2	Chemical Environment.....	3-61
3.2.8	Socioeconomics.....	3-61
3.2.8.1	Population.....	3-61
3.2.8.2	Employment	3-63
3.2.8.3	Personal Income	3-64
3.2.8.4	Housing	3-67
3.2.8.5	Community Resources	3-68
3.2.9	Waste Management	3-68
3.2.9.1	Wastewater	3-68
3.2.9.2	Solid Nonhazardous, Nonradioactive Waste.....	3-71
3.2.9.3	Nonradioactive Hazardous and Toxic Waste	3-71
3.2.9.4	Low-Level Radioactive Waste	3-71
3.2.9.5	Low-Level Radioactive Mixed Waste.....	3-71
3.2.10	Land Use	3-72
3.2.11	Cultural Resources	3-72
3.2.12	Environmental Justice	3-74
3.2.12.1	Minority Populations	3-74
3.2.12.2	Low-Income Populations	3-75
4	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT APPROACH, ASSUMPTIONS, AND METHODOLOGY	4-1
4.1	General Approach.....	4-1
4.2	Major Assumptions and Parameters	4-2
4.3	Methodology.....	4-2
4.3.1	Overview of the Human Health Assessment.....	4-5
4.3.2	Radiation	4-5
4.3.2.1	Background Radiation	4-5
4.3.2.2	Radiation Doses and Health Effects	4-7
4.3.3	Chemicals	4-9
4.3.4	Accidents	4-10
4.3.4.1	Accident Consequences.....	4-10
4.3.4.2	Accident Frequencies	4-12
4.3.4.3	Accident Risk	4-12
4.3.4.4	Physical Hazard Accidents	4-13
4.4	Uncertainty in Estimated Impacts.....	4-13

CONTENTS (Cont.)

5	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES	5-1
5.1	No Action Alternative.....	5-1
5.1.1	Introduction	5-1
5.1.1.1	Cylinder Maintenance Activities.....	5-2
5.1.1.2	Assumptions and Methods Used to Assess Impacts Associated with Cylinder Breaches.....	5-5
5.1.2	Impacts of No Action at the Paducah Site.....	5-6
5.1.2.1	Human Health and Safety.....	5-6
5.1.2.2	Transportation	5-15
5.1.2.3	Air Quality and Noise.....	5-15
5.1.2.4	Water and Soil	5-16
5.1.2.5	Socioeconomics.....	5-18
5.1.2.6	Ecology.....	5-19
5.1.2.7	Waste Management	5-19
5.1.2.8	Resource Requirements	5-20
5.1.2.9	Land Use.....	5-20
5.1.2.10	Cultural Resources	5-20
5.1.2.11	Environmental Justice	5-20
5.2	Proposed Action Alternatives	5-21
5.2.1	Conversion Facility Construction Impacts	5-21
5.2.1.1	Human Health and Safety — Normal Construction Activities.....	5-22
5.2.1.2	Human Health and Safety — Accidents.....	5-22
5.2.1.3	Air Quality and Noise.....	5-23
5.2.1.4	Water and Soil	5-27
5.2.1.5	Socioeconomics.....	5-29
5.2.1.6	Ecology.....	5-30
5.2.1.7	Waste Management	5-39
5.2.1.8	Resource Requirements	5-39
5.2.1.9	Land Use.....	5-40
5.2.1.10	Cultural Resources	5-41
5.2.1.11	Environmental Justice	5-42
5.2.2	Operational Impacts	5-42
5.2.2.1	Human Health and Safety — Normal Facility Operations.....	5-42
5.2.2.2	Human Health and Safety — Facility Accidents	5-47
5.2.2.3	Air Quality and Noise.....	5-59
5.2.2.4	Water and Soil	5-64
5.2.2.5	Socioeconomics.....	5-66
5.2.2.6	Ecology.....	5-66
5.2.2.7	Waste Management	5-68
5.2.2.8	Resource Requirements	5-70
5.2.2.9	Land Use.....	5-70

CONTENTS (Cont.)

5.2.2.10	Cultural Resources	5-71
5.2.2.11	Environmental Justice	5-72
5.2.3	Transportation	5-72
5.2.3.1	Collective Population Risk.....	5-73
5.2.3.2	Maximally Exposed Individuals during Routine Conditions.....	5-81
5.2.3.3	Accident Consequence Assessment	5-81
5.2.3.4	Historical Safety Record of Anhydrous NH ₃ and Anhydrous HF Transportation in the United States	5-87
5.2.4	Impacts Associated with HF and CaF ₂ Conversion Product Sale and Use	5-89
5.2.5	Impacts If ETTP Cylinders Are Shipped to Paducah Rather Than to Portsmouth	5-90
5.2.5.1	Construction and Operation Impacts	5-90
5.2.5.2	Cylinder Preparation Impacts at ETTP	5-92
5.2.5.3	Transportation of Cylinders from ETTP to Paducah.....	5-95
5.2.6	Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with Extended Conversion Facility Operations and Possible Paducah-to-Portsmouth Cylinder Shipments	5-102
5.2.6.1	Operations	5-103
5.2.6.2	Transportation	5-103
5.3	Cumulative Impacts	5-104
5.3.1	Issues and Assumptions	5-104
5.3.2	Other Actions at the Paducah Site.....	5-107
5.3.3	Results	5-108
5.3.3.1	Radiological Releases — Normal Operations.....	5-108
5.3.3.2	Accidental Releases — Radiological and Chemical Materials.....	5-108
5.3.3.3	Transportation	5-109
5.3.3.4	Chemical Exposure — Normal Operations.....	5-109
5.3.3.5	Air Quality.....	5-109
5.3.3.6	Noise.....	5-109
5.3.3.7	Water and Soil	5-110
5.3.3.8	Ecology.....	5-110
5.3.3.9	Land Use.....	5-110
5.3.3.10	Cultural Resources	5-111
5.3.3.11	Environmental Justice	5-111
5.3.3.12	Socioeconomics.....	5-111
5.4	Mitigation	5-111
5.5	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	5-114
5.6	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	5-114
5.6.1	Land.....	5-115

CONTENTS (Cont.)

5.6.2 Materials.....	5-115
5.6.3 Energy	5-116
5.7 Relationship between Short-Term Use of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity	5-116
5.8 Pollution Prevention and Waste Minimization.....	5-117
5.9 Decontamination and Decommissioning of the Conversion Facility	5-118
5.9.1 Human Health and Safety — Off-Site Public	5-119
5.9.2 Human Health and Safety — On-Site Workforce.....	5-120
5.9.3 Air Quality.....	5-121
5.9.4 Socioeconomics.....	5-121
5.9.5 Waste Management	5-122
6 ENVIRONMENTAL AND OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH PERMITS AND COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS	6-1
6.1 DUF ₆ Cylinder Management and Construction and Operation of a DUF ₆ Conversion Facility.....	6-1
6.2 Transportation of UF ₆	6-1
6.3 Worker Safety and Health	6-2
7 REFERENCES	7-1
8 LIST OF PREPARERS	8-1
9 GLOSSARY	9-1
10 INDEX	10-1
APPENDIX A: Text of Public Law 107-206 Pertinent to the Management of DUF ₆	A-1
APPENDIX B: Estimation of Impacts Associated with Transuranic and Technetium Contamination in the DUF ₆ Cylinders.....	B-1
APPENDIX C: Scoping Summary Report for Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facilities Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Process	C-1
APPENDIX D: Environmental Synopsis for the Depleted UF ₆ Conversion Project.....	D-1
APPENDIX E: Impacts Associated with HF and CAF ₂ Conversion Product Sale and Use.....	E-1
APPENDIX F: Assessment Methodologies.....	F-1

CONTENTS (Cont.)

APPENDIX G: Consultation Letters	G-1
APPENDIX H: Contractor Disclosure Statement	H-1

FIGURES

S-1 Regional Map of the Paducah, Kentucky, Site Vicinity	S-2
S-2 Storage of DUF ₆ Cylinders	S-4
S-3 Three Alternative Conversion Facility Locations within the Paducah Site	S-16
S-4 Conceptual Overall Material Flow Diagram for the Paducah Conversion Facility	S-18
S-5 Conceptual Conversion Facility Site Layout for Paducah	S-19
S-6 Areas of Potential Impact Evaluated for Each Alternative	S-25
1-1 DUF ₆ Storage Locations	1-2
1.1-1 Storage of DUF ₆ Cylinders	1-4
2.2-1 Three Alternative Conversion Facility Locations within the Paducah Site	2-7
2.2-2 Conceptual Overall Material Flow Diagram for the Paducah Conversion Facility	2-9
2.2-3 Conceptual Conversion Facility Site Layout for Paducah	2-10
3.1-1 Regional Map of the Paducah Site Vicinity	3-3
3.1-2 Locations of Cylinder Yards at the Paducah Site That Are Used to Store DOE-Managed Cylinders	3-4
3.1-3 Wind Rose for the Barkley Regional Airport, 1990–1994.....	3-6
3.1-4 Wetlands in the Vicinity of the Three Candidate Locations for the Paducah Conversion Facility.....	3-20
3.1-5 Areas of Potential Indiana Bat Habitat at the Paducah Site	3-23

FIGURES (Cont.)

3.1-6	Land Cover in McCracken County, Kentucky	3-36
3.1-7	Census Tracts within 50 mi of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site with Minority Populations in Excess of State-Specific Thresholds	3-40
3.1-8	Census Tracts within 50 mi of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site with Low-Income Populations in Excess of State-Specific Thresholds	3-41
3.2-1	Regional Map of the ETTP Vicinity	3-42
3.2-2	Locations of Storage Yards at ETTP That Are Used to Store DOE-Managed Cylinders	3-43
3.2-3	Wind Rose for the ETTP K1209 Meteorological Tower, 2001	3-46
3.2-4	Surface Water Features in the Vicinity of ETTP	3-54
3.2-5	Land Cover in Roane County, Tennessee	3-73
3.2-6	Census Tracts within 50 mi of the Storage Facility at ETTP with Minority Populations in Excess of State-Specific Thresholds	3-76
3.2-7	Census Tracts within 50 mi of the Storage Facility at ETTP with Low-Income Populations in Excess of State-Specific Thresholds	3-77
4.3-1	Areas of Potential Impact Evaluated for Each Alternative	4-4
5.2-1	Wetlands within Location A at the Paducah Site	5-34
5.2-2	Wetlands along the Proposed Rail Line at the Paducah Site	5-36
5.2-3	Areas of Potential Indiana Bat Habitat at the Paducah Site	5-38

TABLES

S-1	Inventory of DOE UF ₆ Cylinders Considered in This EIS	S-4
S-2	Summary of Alternatives Considered for the Paducah Conversion Facility EIS	S-13
S-3	Summary of Paducah Conversion Facility Parameters	S-20

TABLES (Cont.)

S-4	Summary of Proposed Conversion Product Treatment and Disposition	S-20
S-5	Summary of Major EIS Data and Assumptions.....	S-26
S-6	Summary Comparison of Potential Environmental Consequences of the Alternatives.....	S-47
1.1-1	Inventory of DOE UF ₆ Cylinders Considered in This EIS	1-10
2.1-1	Summary of Alternatives Considered	2-2
2.2-1	Summary of Paducah Conversion Facility Parameters.....	2-11
2.2-2	Summary of Proposed Conversion Product Treatment and Disposition.....	2-16
2.4-1	Summary Comparison of Potential Environmental Consequences of the Alternatives	2-42
3.1-1	DOE-Managed DUF ₆ Cylinders at the Paducah Site.....	3-2
3.1-2	Annual Criteria Pollutant and Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Selected Major Point Sources around the Paducah Site in 1999.....	3-7
3.1-3	National Ambient Air Quality Standards, Kentucky State Ambient Air Quality Standards, Maximum Allowable Increments for Prevention of Significant Deterioration, and Highest Background Levels Representative of the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant	3-8
3.1-4	Additional Commonwealth of Kentucky Ambient Air Quality Standards	3-10
3.1-5	Federal- and State-Listed Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species near the Paducah Site	3-22
3.1-6	Estimated Radiation Doses to Members of the General Public and Cylinder Yard Workers at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant.....	3-25
3.1-7	Estimated Hazard Quotients for Members of the General Public near the Paducah Site under Existing Environmental Conditions	3-27
3.1-8	Population in the Paducah Region of Influence, Kentucky, and Illinois in 1990, 2000, and 2003	3-28
3.1-9	Employment in McCracken County by Industry in 1990 and 2000	3-29

TABLES (Cont.)

3.1-10	Employment in the Paducah Region of Influence by Industry in 1990 and 2000	3-30
3.1-11	Unemployment Rates in McCracken County, the Paducah Region of Influence, and Kentucky	3-31
3.1-12	Personal Income in McCracken County and the Paducah Region of Influence in 1990, 2000, and 2003.....	3-31
3.1-13	Housing Characteristics in the City of Paducah, McCracken County, and the Paducah Region of Influence in 1990 and 2000.....	3-32
3.1-14	Public Service Employment in the City of Paducah, McCracken County, and Kentucky in 2002	3-33
3.1-15	Number of Physicians in McCracken County and Kentucky in 1997	3-33
3.1-16	School District Data for McCracken County and Kentucky in 2001.....	3-33
3.1-17	Medical Facility Data for McCracken County in 1998.....	3-34
3.1-18	Projected Waste Generation Volumes for the Paducah Site	3-34
3.2-1	DOE-Managed DUF ₆ Cylinders at the ETTP Site.....	3-42
3.2-2	Annual Criteria Pollutant and Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Selected Major Point Sources around the ETTP Site in 1999.....	3-47
3.2-3	National Ambient Air Quality Standards, Tennessee State Ambient Air Quality Standards, Maximum Allowable Increments for Prevention of Significant Deterioration, and Highest Background Levels Representative of the ETTP Site	3-48
3.2-4	Additional Tennessee Ambient Air Quality Standards	3-50
3.2-5	Allowable Noise Level by Zoning District in Anderson County, Tennessee	3-51
3.2-6	Federal- and State-Listed Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species on ORR	3-59
3.2-7	Estimated Radiation Doses to Members of the General Public and Cylinder Yard Workers at ETTP	3-60

TABLES (Cont.)

3.2-8	Estimated Hazard Quotients for Members of the Public near ETTP under Existing Environmental Conditions	3-62
3.2-9	Population in the ETTP Region of Influence and Tennessee in 1990, 2000, and 2003	3-63
3.2-10	Employment in Knox County by Industry in 1990 and 2000	3-64
3.2-11	Employment in Anderson County by Industry in 1990 and 2000.....	3-65
3.2-12	Employment in the ETTP Region of Influence by Industry in 1990 and 2000	3-65
3.2-13	Unemployment Rates in the Knoxville Metropolitan Statistical Area and Tennessee	3-66
3.2-14	Personal Income in Knox and Anderson Counties and the ETTP Region of Influence in 1990, 2000, and 2003.....	3-66
3.2-15	Housing Characteristics in the City of Knoxville, Knox and Anderson Counties, and the ETTP Region of Influence in 1990 and 2000.....	3-67
3.2-16	Public Service Employment in the City of Knoxville, ETTP Region-of-Influence Counties, and Tennessee in 2001	3-69
3.2-17	Number of Physicians in Knox and Anderson Counties and Tennessee in 1997.....	3-69
3.2-18	School District Data for Knox and Anderson Counties and Tennessee in 2001.....	3-70
3.2-19	Medical Facility Data for Knox and Anderson Counties in 1998.....	3-70
3.2-20	Projected Waste Generation Volumes for ETTP	3-71
4.2-1	Summary of Major EIS Data and Assumptions	4-3
4.3-1	Key Features of Potential Human Exposures to Radiological, Chemical, and Physical Hazards	4-6
4.3-2	Comparison of Radiation Doses from Various Sources.....	4-8
5.1-1	No Action Alternative: Comparison of Frequencies Assumed in the PEIS with Planned Frequencies for Activities at the Paducah Site.....	5-3

TABLES (Cont.)

5.1-2	No Action Alternative: Estimated Consequences of Chemical Exposures for Cylinder Accidents at the Paducah Site.....	5-11
5.1-3	No Action Alternative: Estimated Consequences from Radiation Exposures for Cylinder Accidents at the Paducah Site.....	5-13
5.2-1	Potential Impacts to Human Health from Physical Hazards during Conversion Facility Construction and Operations at the Paducah Site.....	5-23
5.2-2	Annual Criteria Pollutant and Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Construction of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site	5-24
5.2-3	Maximum Air Quality Impacts at the Construction Site Boundary Due to Emissions from Activities Associated with Construction of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site.....	5-25
5.2-4	Socioeconomic Impacts from Construction of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site	5-29
5.2-5	Wastes Generated from Construction Activities for the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site	5-39
5.2-6	Materials/Resources Consumed during Construction of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site	5-40
5.2-7	Estimated Radiological Doses and Cancer Risks under Normal Conversion Facility Operations at the Paducah Site.....	5-45
5.2-8	Bounding Radiological Accidents Considered for Conversion Operations at the Paducah Site	5-48
5.2-9	Estimated Radiological Doses per Accident Occurrence during Conversion at the Paducah Site	5-49
5.2-10	Estimated Radiological Health Risks per Accident Occurrence during Conversion at the Paducah Site	5-50
5.2-11	Bounding Chemical Accidents during Conversion Operations at the Paducah Site	5-53
5.2-12	Consequences of Chemical Accidents during Conversion at the Paducah Site: Number of Persons with the Potential for Adverse Effects	5-55

TABLES (Cont.)

5.2-13	Consequences of Chemical Accidents during Conversion at the Paducah Site: Number of Persons with the Potential for Irreversible Adverse Effects.....	5-56
5.2-14	Annual Point Source Emissions of Criteria Pollutants and Volatile Organic Compounds from Operation of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site	5-60
5.2-15	Maximum Air Quality Impacts Due to Emissions from Activities Associated with Operation of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site	5-61
5.2-16	Socioeconomic Impacts from Operation of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site	5-66
5.2-17	Wastes Generated from Operation of the Conversion Facility at the Paducah Site	5-69
5.2-18	Materials Consumed Annually during Normal Conversion Facility Operations at the Paducah Site.....	5-70
5.2-19	Utilities Consumed during Conversion Facility Operations at the Paducah Site	5-71
5.2-20	Collective Population Transportation Risks for Shipment of Anhydrous NH ₃ to the Paducah Conversion Facility	5-74
5.2-21	Collective Population Transportation Risks for Shipment of Conversion Products to Envirocare as the Primary Disposal Site, Assuming the U ₃ O ₈ Is Disposed of in Bulk Bags.....	5-75
5.2-22	Collective Population Transportation Risks for Shipment of Conversion Products to NTS as the Primary Disposal Site, Assuming the U ₃ O ₈ Is Disposed of in Bulk Bags.....	5-77
5.2-23	Collective Population Transportation Risks for Shipment of U ₃ O ₈ Conversion Products in Emptied Cylinders	5-79
5.2-24	Collective Population Transportation Risks for Shipment of the HF Conversion Co-Product from the Paducah Site to Commercial Users	5-80
5.2-25	Collective Population Transportation Risks for Shipment of CaF ₂ for the Neutralization Option	5-80

TABLES (Cont.)

5.2-26	Estimated Radiological Impacts to the MEI from Routine Shipment of Radioactive Materials from the Paducah Conversion Facility	5-82
5.2-27	Potential Radiological Consequences to the Population from Severe Transportation Accidents	5-83
5.2-28	Potential Chemical Consequences to the Population from Severe Transportation Accidents	5-84
5.2-29	Potential Radiological Consequences to the MEI from Severe Transportation Accidents Involving Shipment of Radioactive Materials	5-87
5.2-30	Products from DUF ₆ Conversion	5-89
5.2-31	Summary of Environmental Parameters for a Cylinder Transfer Facility	5-94
5.2-32	ETTP UF ₆ Cylinder Shipments to Paducah	5-96
5.2-33	Estimated Radiological Impacts to the MEI from Routine Shipment of DUF ₆ Cylinders	5-97
5.2-34	Potential Radiological Consequences to the Population from Severe Transportation Accidents Involving Shipment of DUF ₆ Cylinders	5-98
5.2-35	Potential Chemical Consequences to the Population from Severe Transportation Accidents Involving Shipment of DUF ₆ Cylinders	5-99
5.2-36	Potential Radiological Consequences to the MEI from Severe Transportation Accidents Involving Shipment of DUF ₆ Cylinders	5-100
5.2-37	Potential Chemical Consequences to the MEI from Severe Transportation Accidents Involving Shipment of DUF ₆ Cylinders	5-100
5.2-38	Estimated Radiological Impacts to the MEI from Routine Shipment of Non-DUF ₆ Cylinders	5-101
5.2-39	Annual Transportation Impacts for the Shipment of DUF ₆ Cylinders from Paducah to Portsmouth, Assuming 1,000 DUF ₆ Cylinders Shipped per Year	5-104
5.3-1	Cumulative Impacts of DUF ₆ Activities and Other Past, Present, or Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions at the Paducah Site	5-105

TABLES (Cont.)

5.6-1	Materials/Resources Consumed during Conversion Facility Construction at the Paducah Site	5-116
5.6-2	Materials Consumed Annually during Conversion Facility Operations at the Paducah Site	5-117
5.6-3	Utilities Consumed during Conversion Facility Operations at the Paducah Site	5-118
5.9-1	Estimated Latent Cancer Fatalities from Radiation Exposure Resulting from Conversion Facility D&D Activities at the Paducah Site	5-120
5.9-2	Annual and Total Waste Volume Estimates from Conversion Facility D&D Activities at the Paducah Site.....	5-123
6.1	Potentially Applicable Consents for the Construction and Operation of a DUF ₆ Conversion Facility	6-4
B-1	Bounding Concentrations of Dispersed Transuranic and Tc-99 Contamination in the DUF ₆ Full and Heels Cylinders.....	B-5
B-2	Maximum Total Quantities of Transuranics and Technetium in the DUF ₆ Inventory.....	B-6
B-3	Concentrations of Transuranic Constituents and Tc-99 in Depleted Uranium That Would Result in 10% Contribution to Dose	B-8
B-4	Radiological Parameters for Uranium, Transuranic, and Technetium Isotopes.....	B-10
B-5	Relative Contributions of Transuranic and Technetium Isotopes to Dose.....	B-10
B-6	Estimated Maximum Transuranic Radioactivity Concentration in Heels.....	B-13
B-7	Estimated Maximum Transuranic Activity Concentration in Converted Heels Material	B-13
B-8	Estimated Maximum Number of Drums Containing Potential Transuranic Waste.....	B-13
E-1	Products from DUF ₆ Conversion Assuming HF Acid Is Sold.....	E-4
E-2	Aqueous HF Levels for Sale	E-4

TABLES (Cont.)

E-3	Activity Levels for Aqueous HF	E-5
E-4	Activity Levels for CaF ₂	E-5
E-5	Process Control Specifications for HF	E-6
E-6	Process Control Specifications for Acid-Grade CaF ₂	E-6
F-1	Bounding Aqueous HF Spill Source Term	F-15
F-2	Anhydrous NH ₃ Tank Rupture Spill Parameters	F-16
F-3	Potential Shipments of Material Analyzed for the DUF ₆ Conversion EIS	F-22
F-4	Environmental Management Waste Generation Forecast for Fiscal Years 2002 through 2025	F-41

