

Contents

Cover Sheet	
Acronyms/Abbreviations	xxiv
Glossary of Terms.....	xxxii
Glossary of Terms Related to Radioactivity, Radiation Dose, and Exposure.....	xliv
Units of Measure.....	xlviii
Reference Citations.....	li
1.0 Introduction.....	1.1
1.1 Organization of the HSW EIS	1.2
1.2 Purpose and Need and Proposed Action	1.3
1.3 Overview of Hanford Site Operations and DOE Waste Management Activities.....	1.4
1.3.1 DOE National Waste Management	1.5
1.3.2 DOE Waste Management Activities at Hanford	1.9
1.4 Related Department of Energy Initiatives at the Hanford Site	1.14
1.4.1 EM Top-to-Bottom Review.....	1.14
1.4.2 DOE Cost Report	1.15
1.4.3 Cleanup, Constraints, and Challenges Team (C3T)	1.15
1.4.4 Hanford Performance Management Plan (HPMP).....	1.15
1.5 Relationship of the HSW EIS to Other Hanford and DOE NEPA Documents	1.16
1.5.1 Interim Actions During Preparation of the HSW EIS	1.16
1.5.2 Related NEPA Documents	1.18
1.5.3 Related State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Documents.....	1.30
1.5.4 Related CERCLA Documents.....	1.31
1.6 NEPA Process for the HSW EIS	1.31
1.6.1 Scoping for the Draft HSW EIS	1.32
1.6.2 Publication of the First Draft HSW EIS	1.32
1.6.3 Public Comments on the First Draft HSW EIS	1.33
1.6.4 Scoping for the ILAW Disposal SEIS.....	1.34
1.6.5 Revised Draft HSW EIS.....	1.35
1.6.6 Preparation of the Final HSW EIS and Record(s) of Decision	1.36
1.7 Scope of the HSW EIS	1.37
1.7.1 Waste Types Evaluated in the HSW EIS	1.37
1.7.2 Waste Volumes Evaluated in the HSW EIS.....	1.39
1.7.3 Hanford Waste Management Alternatives Evaluated in the HSW EIS.....	1.39
1.7.4 Environmental Impact Analyses in the HSW EIS.....	1.45
1.8 References	1.46
2.0 HSW EIS Waste Streams and Waste Management Facilities.....	2.1
2.1 Solid Waste Types and Waste Streams Related to the Proposed Action	2.1
2.1.1 LLW Streams	2.2
2.1.2 Mixed Low-Level Waste Streams.....	2.4

2.1.3	TRU Waste Streams	2.8
2.1.4	Waste Treatment Plant Wastes.....	2.11
2.2	Hanford Waste Storage, Treatment, and Disposal Facilities, and Transportation Capabilities Related to the Proposed Action	2.12
2.2.1	Storage Facilities	2.12
2.2.2	Treatment and Processing Facilities.....	2.16
2.2.3	Disposal Facilities	2.24
2.2.4	Transportation	2.37
2.2.5	Pollution Prevention/Waste Minimization	2.40
2.2.6	Decontamination and Decommissioning of Hanford Facilities	2.41
2.2.7	Long-Term Stewardship.....	2.41
2.3	References	2.42
3.0	Description and Comparison of Alternatives.....	3.1
3.1	Alternatives Considered in Detail and Their Development.....	3.1
3.1.1	No Action Alternative	3.6
3.1.2	Alternative Group A.....	3.7
3.1.3	Alternative Group B	3.9
3.1.4	Alternative Group C	3.10
3.1.5	Alternative Group D.....	3.11
3.1.6	Alternative Group E	3.11
3.1.7	Summary Tables of Alternative Groups	3.12
3.2	Alternatives Considered but Not Evaluated in Detail	3.12
3.2.1	Storage Options	3.12
3.2.2	Treatment Options.....	3.15
3.2.3	Disposal Options	3.16
3.2.4	Stop Work Scenario.....	3.17
3.3	Volumes of Waste Considered in Each Alternative	3.18
3.3.1	LLW Volumes.....	3.19
3.3.2	MLLW Volumes	3.19
3.3.3	TRU Waste Volumes.....	3.20
3.3.4	Waste Treatment Plant Waste Volumes	3.21
3.4	Comparison of Environmental Impacts Among the Alternatives	3.21
3.4.1	Land Use	3.25
3.4.2	Air Quality.....	3.26
3.4.3	Water Quality	3.27
3.4.4	Geologic Resources	3.36
3.4.5	Ecological Resources	3.36
3.4.6	Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	3.36
3.4.7	Cultural, Aesthetic, and Scenic Resources	3.37
3.4.8	Transportation	3.37
3.4.9	Noise.....	3.39
3.4.10	Resource Commitments	3.39

3.4.11	Human Health and Safety.....	3.39
3.4.12	Cumulative Impacts.....	3.43
3.5	Areas of Uncertainty, Incomplete, or Unavailable Information	3.54
3.5.1	Waste Volumes	3.55
3.5.2	Waste Inventories of Radioactive Materials.....	3.56
3.5.3	Waste Inventories of Non-Radioactive Hazardous Materials	3.56
3.5.4	Release, Fate, and Transport of Radioactive and Hazardous Materials	3.58
3.5.5	Human and Ecological Risk Associated with Exposure to Radioactive and Hazardous Materials.....	3.60
3.5.6	Technical Maturity of Alternative Treatment Processes	3.60
3.5.7	Timing of Activities Evaluated in the Alternative Groups.....	3.61
3.6	Costs of Alternatives	3.62
3.7	DOE Preferred Alternative.....	3.63
3.8	References	3.64
4.0	Affected Environment.....	4.1
4.1	Introduction	4.1
4.2	Land Use	4.3
4.2.1	Hanford Reach National Monument	4.6
4.2.2	200 Areas.....	4.7
4.3	Meteorology and Air Quality	4.12
4.3.1	Climate and Meteorology.....	4.12
4.3.2	Atmospheric Dispersion.....	4.20
4.3.3	Air Quality.....	4.21
4.3.4	Background Radiation.....	4.24
4.4	Geologic Resources.....	4.25
4.4.1	Topography and Geomorphology	4.25
4.4.2	Stratigraphy	4.26
4.4.3	Soils.....	4.30
4.4.4	Seismicity	4.30
4.5	Hydrology.....	4.36
4.5.1	Surface Water.....	4.36
4.5.2	Hanford Site Vadose Zone	4.40
4.5.3	Groundwater.....	4.44
4.6	Biological and Ecological Resources	4.55
4.6.1	Vegetation	4.56
4.6.2	Wildlife.....	4.63
4.6.3	Aquatic Ecology	4.67
4.6.4	Threatened and Endangered Species	4.68
4.6.5	Microbiotic Crusts.....	4.74
4.6.6	Biodiversity	4.75
4.7	Cultural, Archaeological, and Historical Resources.....	4.75
4.7.1	Native American Cultural Resources and Archaeological Resources.....	4.75
4.7.2	Historic Archaeological Resources	4.77

4.7.3	Historic Built Environment	4.78
4.7.4	200 Areas.....	4.79
4.8	Socioeconomic Activity	4.81
4.8.1	Local Economy	4.81
4.8.2	Environmental Justice	4.83
4.8.3	Demography	4.89
4.8.4	Housing	4.89
4.8.5	Traffic and Transportation.....	4.89
4.8.6	Educational Services	4.94
4.8.7	Health Care and Human Services.....	4.94
4.8.8	Police and Fire Protection	4.95
4.8.9	Utilities	4.95
4.8.10	Aesthetic and Scenic Resources	4.96
4.9	Noise.....	4.96
4.10	Occupational Safety	4.98
4.11	Occupational Radiation Exposure at the Hanford Site	4.99
4.12	References	4.103
5.0	Environmental Consequences.....	5.1
5.1	Land Use	5.8
5.2	Air Quality.....	5.16
5.2.1	Alternative Group A	5.19
5.2.2	Alternative Group B	5.21
5.2.3	Alternative Group C	5.22
5.2.4	Alternative Groups D ₁ , D ₂ , and D ₃	5.23
5.2.5	Alternative Groups E ₁ , E ₂ , and E ₃	5.25
5.2.6	No Action Alternative	5.25
5.2.7	Comparison of the Alternative Groups	5.27
5.3	Water Quality.....	5.30
5.3.1	Potential Short-Term Impacts of Operations and Construction Activities.....	5.30
5.3.2	Methods for Assessment of Potential Long-Term Impacts	5.31
5.3.3	Use of ILAW Performance Assessment Calculations to Support the HSW EIS	5.40
5.3.4	Potential Long-Term Impacts on Groundwater Quality.....	5.41
5.3.5	Effect of Long-Term Cover System Performance Assumptions.....	5.75
5.3.6	Potential Groundwater Quality Impacts at Waste Management Area Boundaries for Selected Alternatives	5.78
5.3.7	Potential Groundwater Quality Impacts from Hazardous Chemicals in Pre-1988 Wastes.....	5.91
5.4	Geologic Resources	5.96
5.5	Ecological Resources	5.97
5.5.1	Alternative Group A	5.98
5.5.2	Alternative Group B	5.102
5.5.3	Alternative Group C	5.103

5.5.4	Alternative Group D ₁	5.104
5.5.5	Alternative Group D ₂	5.105
5.5.6	Alternative Group D ₃	5.105
5.5.7	Alternative Group E ₁	5.107
5.5.8	Alternative Group E ₂	5.107
5.5.9	Alternative Group E ₃	5.108
5.5.10	No Action Alternative.....	5.109
5.5.11	Microbiotic Crusts.....	5.110
5.5.12	Threatened or Endangered Species	5.111
5.5.13	Potential Impacts on Columbia River Aquatic and Riparian Biota in the Long Term.....	5.112
5.6	Socioeconomics.....	5.114
5.6.1	Alternative Group A.....	5.117
5.6.2	Alternative Group B	5.119
5.6.3	Alternative Group C	5.121
5.6.4	Alternative Group D	5.121
5.6.5	Alternative Group E	5.124
5.6.6	No Action Alternative	5.124
5.7	Cultural Resources Impacts.....	5.126
5.7.1	Alternative Group A.....	5.127
5.7.2	Alternative Group B	5.128
5.7.3	Alternative Group C	5.128
5.7.4	Alternative Group D	5.129
5.7.5	Alternative Group E	5.129
5.7.6	No Action Alternative	5.129
5.8	Traffic and Transportation.....	5.131
5.9	Noise	5.147
5.9.1	Alternative Group A.....	5.148
5.9.2	Alternative Group B	5.149
5.9.3	Alternative Group C	5.150
5.9.4	Alternative Groups D and E	5.150
5.9.5	No Action Alternative	5.150
5.10	Resource Commitments	5.151
5.11	Human Health and Safety Impacts	5.154
5.11.1	Operational Human Health and Safety Impacts	5.158
5.11.2	Long-Term Human Health and Safety Impacts.....	5.217
5.12	Aesthetic and Scenic Resources.....	5.270
5.12.1	Alternative Group A.....	5.271
5.12.2	Alternative Group B	5.271
5.12.3	Alternative Group C	5.272
5.12.4	Alternative Group D	5.272
5.12.5	Alternative Group E	5.273
5.12.6	No Action Alternative	5.273

5.13	Environmental Justice	5.275
5.14	Cumulative Impacts.....	5.277
5.14.1	Land Use	5.279
5.14.2	Air Quality.....	5.279
5.14.3	Ecological, Cultural, Aesthetic, and Scenic Resources	5.280
5.14.4	Geologic Resources.....	5.281
5.14.5	Socioeconomics.....	5.282
5.14.6	Public Health.....	5.283
5.14.7	Worker Health and Safety	5.299
5.15	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	5.300
5.16	Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance or Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity	5.302
5.17	Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	5.303
5.17.1	Alternative Group A	5.303
5.17.2	Alternative Group B	5.304
5.17.3	Alternative Group C	5.304
5.17.4	Alternative Groups D and E (All Subalternatives).....	5.304
5.17.5	No Action Alternative	5.304
5.18	Potential Mitigation Measures.....	5.306
5.18.1	Pollution Prevention/Waste Minimization	5.306
5.18.2	Cultural Resources	5.307
5.18.3	Ecological Resources	5.307
5.18.4	Water Quality	5.308
5.18.5	Health and Safety – Routine Operations	5.308
5.18.6	Health and Safety – Accidents	5.309
5.18.7	Traffic and Transportation.....	5.309
5.18.8	Area and Resource Management and Mitigation Plans	5.310
5.18.9	Long-Term Stewardship and Post Closure	5.312
5.19	References	5.313
6.0	Regulatory Framework	6.1
6.1	Potentially Applicable Statutes.....	6.1
6.1.1	Federal Statutes	6.1
6.1.2	Washington State Statutes	6.6
6.2	Land-Use Management.....	6.8
6.3	Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order	6.9
6.4	Hazardous Waste Management.....	6.10
6.5	Radioactive Waste Management.....	6.11
6.6	Radiological Safety Oversight	6.12
6.7	Radiation Protection of the Public and the Environment.....	6.13
6.8	Occupational Safety and Occupational Radiation Exposure	6.15
6.9	Non-Radioactive Air Emissions	6.16
6.10	State Waste Discharge Requirements	6.16
6.11	Transportation Requirements.....	6.16

6.12 Cultural Resources	6.17
6.13 Treaties, Statutes, and Policies Relating to Native Americans	6.18
6.14 Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	6.20
6.15 Chemical Management	6.21
6.16 Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know	6.21
6.17 Pollution Prevention	6.21
6.18 Endangered Species	6.21
6.19 Permit Requirements.....	6.22
6.20 References.....	6.24
7.0 List of Preparers and Contributors.....	7.1
Index	Index.1
Distribution	Dist.1

Figures

1.1	Hanford Site Location Map	1.4
1.2	States with Radioactive Waste Disposal Activities	1.6
1.3	Relationship of the HSW EIS to Other Hanford Cleanup Operations, Material Management Activities, and Key Environmental Reviews	1.12
1.4	Radioactive Material Disposition at Hanford in Terms of Waste Activity (MCi).....	1.13
1.5	Treatment Action Alternatives.....	1.41
1.6	Disposal Action Alternatives	1.42
1.7	Development of Alternative Groups	1.44
2.1	Waste Types and Waste Streams Considered in the HSW EIS	2.2
2.2	Long-Length Tank Equipment.....	2.6
2.3	Aerial View of the Central Waste Complex	2.13
2.4	Storage of Waste Drums in Central Waste Complex	2.14
2.5	Schematic Drawing of RH TRU Caisson in the LLBGs	2.15
2.6	Waste Receiving and Processing Facility	2.17
2.7	X-Ray Image of Transuranic Waste Drum Contents	2.17
2.8	Layout for the Waste Receiving and Processing Facility	2.18
2.9.	Transuranic Package Transporter-II Being Loaded in the Waste Receiving and Processing Facility	2.19
2.10	Macroencapsulation of Mixed Low-Level Waste Debris at a Commercial Treatment Facility	2.20
2.11	View of the T Plant Complex with 2706-T Facility and the T Plant Canyon Noted	2.22
2.12	Aerial View of a Low Level Burial Ground	2.24
2.13	High-Integrity Containers in a Low-Level Waste Disposal Trench	2.25
2.14	Trench Grouted Wastes.....	2.26
2.15	Treatment by Macroencapsulation at the LLBGs	2.27
2.16	Mixed Low-Level Waste Disposal Trench	2.29
2.17	Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF)	2.32
2.18	Typical Liner System.....	2.34
2.19.	Modified RCRA Subtitle C Barrier for Mixed Low-Level Waste Trenches and the Low Level Burial Grounds	2.36
3.1	Options for HSW EIS Alternatives.....	3.2
3.2	Locations of Existing and Potential Processing and Disposal Facilities on the Hanford Site	3.4
3.3	Range of Waste Volumes Considered in the HSW EIS.....	3.5
3.4	Hypothetical Annual Dose from Drinking Water Containing Maximum Concentrations of Radionuclides in Groundwater at 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area Disposal Facilities as a Function of Calendar Year – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	3.31
3.5	Hypothetical Annual Dose from Drinking Water Containing Maximum Concentrations of Radionuclides in Groundwater at 1 km Downgradient from ERDF as a Function of Calendar Year – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	3.32

3.6	Hypothetical Annual Dose from Drinking Water Containing Maximum Concentrations of Radionuclides in Groundwater at 1 km Northwest Downgradient from the 200 East Area as Disposal Facilities as Function of Calendar Year – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	3.33
3.7	Hypothetical Annual Dose from Drinking Water Containing Maximum Concentrations of Radionuclides in Groundwater at 1 km Downgradient Southeast from the 200 East Area Disposal Facilities as a Function of Calendar Year – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	3.34
3.8	Hypothetical Annual Dose from Drinking Water Containing Maximum Concentrations of Radionuclides in Groundwater Near the Columbia River as a Function of Calendar Year – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	3.35
3.9	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well 1 km Downgradient from 200 West Area	3.44
3.10	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well 1 km Downgradient from ERDF	3.45
3.11	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from 200 East Area	3.46
3.12	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well 1 km Downgradient Southeast of 200 East Area	3.47
3.13	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well Adjacent to the Columbia River	3.48
3.14	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener with Sauna/Sweat Lodge at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well 1 km Downgradient from 200 West Area	3.49
3.15	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener with Sauna/Sweat Lodge at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well 1 km Downgradient from ERDF	3.50
3.16	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener with Sauna/Sweat Lodge at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from 200 East Area	3.51
3.17	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener with Sauna/Sweat Lodge at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well 1 km Downgradient Southeast from 200 East Area	3.52
3.18	Annual Dose to a Hypothetical Resident Gardener with Sauna/Sweat Lodge at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from a Well Adjacent to the Columbia River	3.53
4.1	Department of Energy – Hanford Site	4.2
4.2	DOE Preferred Alternative for Land Use on the Hanford Site from the Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan EIS Record of Decision	4.4
4.3	Hanford Reach National Monument	4.8
4.4	200 West Area	4.9
4.5	200 East Area	4.10
4.6	Hanford Meteorological Monitoring Network	4.13
4.7	Wind Roses at the 9.1-m (30-ft) Level of the Hanford Meteorological Monitoring Network, 1982 to 2001	4.15

4.8	Wind Roses at the 60-m (197-ft) Level of the Hanford Meteorological Monitoring Network, 1986 to 2001	4.17
4.9	Geographic Setting and General Structural Geology of the Pasco Basin and Hanford Site.....	4.27
4.10	Stratigraphic Column for the Hanford Site.....	4.28
4.11	Generalized West to East Cross-Section of the Hanford Site Structure and Topography	4.29
4.12	Soil Map of the Hanford Site.....	4.31
4.13	Historical Seismicity of the Columbia Plateau and Surrounding Areas.....	4.34
4.14	Seismicity of the Columbia Plateau and Surrounding Areas as Measured by Seismographs.....	4.35
4.15	Surface Water Features Including Rivers, Ponds, Major Springs, Ephemeral Streams, and Artificial Ponds on the Hanford Site.....	4.37
4.16	Extent of Probable Maximum Flood in Cold Creek Area.....	4.41
4.17	Groundwater Elevations for the Unconfined Aquifer at Hanford, March 2001	4.46
4.18	Groundwater Elevations for the Unconfined Aquifer at the 200 Areas	4.47
4.19	Distribution of Major Radionuclides in Groundwater at Concentrations Above the Drinking Water Standards During FY 2001.....	4.49
4.20	Distribution of Major Hazardous Chemicals in Groundwater at Concentrations Above the Drinking Water Standards During FY 2001.....	4.50
4.21	Distribution of Vegetation Types and Land Use Areas on the Hanford Site Prior to the <i>24 Command Fire</i> of 2000.....	4.57
4.22	Distribution of Vegetation Types and Land Use Areas in the 200 West Area Prior to the <i>24 Command Fire</i>	4.64
4.23	Distribution of Vegetation Types and Land Use Areas in the 200 East Area Prior to the <i>24 Command Fire</i>	4.65
4.24	Species of Concern on the Hanford Site and the <i>24 Command Fire</i> Area.....	4.73
4.25	Location of Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander, and Overall Minority Populations Near the Hanford Site	4.85
4.26	Location of Low-Income Populations Near the Hanford Site	4.88
4.27	Transportation Routes in the Vicinity of the Hanford Site	4.91
4.28	Transportation Routes on the Hanford Site.....	4.93
4.29	Occupational Injury and Illness Total Recordable Case Rates at the Hanford Site Compared with the DOE Complex and Private Industry	4.99
4.30	Average Occupational Dose (mrem/yr) to Hanford Site Individuals with Measurable Dose, 1997-2001	4.101
4.31	Collective Operational Dose (person-rem/yr) at the Hanford Site, 1997-2001	4.102
5.1	Schematic Representation of Computational Framework and Codes Used in the HSW EIS.....	5.32
5.2	LOAs Used in Comparing Potential Long-Term Groundwater Quality Impacts	5.34
5.3	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group A – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.43
5.4	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group A – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.44

5.5	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group B – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.45
5.6	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group B – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.46
5.7	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group C – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.47
5.8	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group C – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.48
5.9	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group D ₁ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes).....	5.49
5.10	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group D ₁ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes).....	5.50
5.11	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group D ₂ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes).....	5.51
5.12	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group D ₂ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes).....	5.52
5.13	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group D ₃ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes).....	5.53
5.14	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group D ₃ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes).....	5.54
5.15	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group E ₁ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.55
5.16	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group E ₁ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.56
5.17	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group E ₂ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.57
5.18	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group E ₂ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.58
5.19	Technetium-99 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group E ₃ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.59
5.20	Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (Alternative Group E ₃ – Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes)	5.60
5.21	Technetium-99, and Iodine-129 Concentration Profiles at Various Lines of Analysis (No Action Alternative – Hanford Only Waste Volume)	5.61
5.22	Comparison of Predicted Peak Concentrations of Technetium-99 and Iodine-129 at 200 East SE LOA from Upper Bound Inventories in UngROUTed MLLW Disposed of After 2007	5.76
5.23	Comparison of Predicted Peak Concentrations of Uranium-238 at 200 East SE LOA from Upper Bound Inventories in UngROUTed and Grouted MLLW Disposed of After 2007	5.77
5.24	Impact of HSW EIS Alternatives on Total Hanford Employment	5.116
5.25	Impact of HSW EIS Alternatives on Solid Waste Program Employment	5.116
5.26	Impact of HSW EIS Alternatives Groups on Solid Waste Program Total Cost	5.117
5.27	Shipment-Mileages for Onsite and Offsite Waste Shipments.....	5.132

5.28	Highway Routes used in the Analysis of Offsite Transportation Impacts	5.136
5.29	Potential Transportation Impacts of Onsite and Offsite Waste Shipments—LCFs from Radiological Incident-Free Transport, Radiological Accidents, and Non-Radiological Emissions	5.139
5.30	Shipment Mileages and Potential Transportation Impacts of Onsite and Offsite Waste Shipments—Non-Radiological Accident Fatalities	5.140
5.31	Shipping Routes in Washington and Oregon.....	5.141
5.32	Association of Noise Levels with Common Sources or Activities	5.147
5.33	Location of the Resident Gardener for Routine Airborne Releases.....	5.156
5.34	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group A, Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.219
5.35	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group B, Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.224
5.36	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group C, Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.228
5.37	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group D ₁ , Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.234
5.38	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group D ₂ , Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.239
5.39	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group D ₃ , Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.243
5.40	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group E ₁ , Hanford Only and Lower Bound Waste Volumes	5.248
5.41	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group E ₂ , Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.253
5.42	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – Alternative Group E ₃ , Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.258
5.43	Annual Dose to a Maximally Exposed Individual at Various Times over 10,000 Years Using Water from Various Locations – No Action Alternative, Hanford Only and Upper Bound Waste Volumes	5.263
5.44	Concentrations of Technetium-99, Iodine-129, and Uranium in Groundwater Southeast of the 200 East Area from All Hanford Sources	5.290
5.45	Hypothetical Drinking Water Dose from Technetium-99, Iodine-129, and Uranium in Groundwater Southeast of the 200 East Area from All Hanford Sources	5.290

5.46	Hypothetical Total Drinking Water Dose from Groundwater for All Hanford Sources and the Hanford Solid Waste Contribution at the Line of Analysis Southeast of the 200 East Area.....	5.292
5.47	Concentrations of Technetium-99, Iodine-129, and Uranium in the Columbia River at the City of Richland Pumping Station from All Hanford Sources	5.292
5.48	Drinking Water Dose from Technetium-99, Iodine-129, and Uranium in the Columbia River at the City of Richland Pumping Station from All Hanford Sources.....	5.294
5.49	Hypothetical Total Drinking Water Dose from All Hanford Sources and the Hanford Solid Waste Contribution in the Columbia River at the City of Richland Pumping Station.....	5.294

Tables

1.1	Consequences of Retrieving and Processing TRU Waste as Evaluated in the HDW EIS	1.19
3.1	Treatment Alternatives Summary	3.13
3.2	Disposal Alternatives Summary	3.14
3.3	Estimated Volumes of LLW Waste Streams	3.19
3.4	Estimated Volumes of MLLW Waste Streams.....	3.20
3.5	Estimated Volumes of TRU Waste Streams	3.20
3.6	Estimated Volumes of WTP Waste Streams Through 2046.....	3.21
3.7	Summary Comparison of Potential Impacts Among the Alternatives During Operational Period (Present to 2046).....	3.22
3.8	Summary Comparison of Hypothetical Long-Term (up to 10,000 years) Impacts Among the Alternatives	3.24
3.9	Comparison of Land Area Permanently Committed in the Various Alternatives as of 2046, ha.....	3.25
3.10	Comparison Among the Alternative Groups of Estimated Criteria-Pollutant Impact Maximums for Solid Waste Operations in the 200 Areas, Percent of Air Quality Standards.....	3.26
3.11	Highest Percentage of Maximum Contaminant Levels to the Year 12,050 A.D.	3.28
3.12	Highest Percentage of Maximum Contaminant Levels from 10,200 to 12,050 A.D. – All Due to Uranium	3.29
3.13	Comparison of Commitments of Geologic Resources, Millions of m ³	3.36
3.14	Summary Comparison of Potential Radiological and Non-Radiological Transportation Impacts – Hanford Only Waste Volumes	3.38
3.15	Potential Impacts in Oregon and Washington by State from Shipments of Solid Wastes to and from Hanford	3.38
3.16	Comparison of Fossil Fuel Commitments Among the Alternatives	3.40
3.17	Comparison of Worker Health Impacts	3.40
3.18	Comparison of Public Health Impacts from Emissions of Radioactive Material to the Atmosphere During Routine Operations.....	3.41
3.19	Comparison of Consequences of Industrial Accidents on Workers Among the Alternatives	3.41
3.20	Comparison of Health Impacts on the Public from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Chemicals	3.42
3.21	(Sheet 1). Consolidated Cost Estimates for Alternative Groups A, B, and C	3.62
3.21	(Sheet 2). Consolidated Cost Estimates for Alternative Groups D, E, and No Action	3.63
4.1.	Station Numbers, Names, and Meteorological Parameters for Each Hanford Meteorological Monitoring Network Site.....	4.14
4.2	Number of Days with Peak Gusts Above Specific Thresholds at 15-m (50-ft) Level, 1945 through 2001	4.18
4.3	Monthly and Annual Prevailing Wind Directions, Average Speeds, and Peak Gusts at 15-m (50-ft) Level, 1945 through 2001.	4.18

4.4	Estimate of the Probability of Extreme Winds Associated with Tornadoes Striking a Point at Hanford	4.19
4.5	Percent Probabilities for Extended Periods of Surface-Based Inversions	4.21
4.6	Federal and Washington State Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	4.22
4.7	Non-Radioactive Constituents Emitted to the Atmosphere for the Year 2001	4.24
4.8	Radionuclides Emitted to the Atmosphere at the Hanford Site, 2001	4.25
4.9	Soil Types on the Hanford Site	4.32
4.10	Maximum Concentrations of Groundwater Contaminants at Hanford in FY 2001	4.51
4.11	Common Vascular Plants on the Hanford Site	4.59
4.12	Federally Listed Threatened, Endangered, Candidate Species, and Species of Concern and Washington State-Listed Threatened and Endangered Species Occurring or Potentially Occurring on the Hanford Site.....	4.69
4.13	Washington State Candidate Animal Species Found on the Hanford Site	4.70
4.14	Washington State Plant Species of Concern Occurring on the Hanford Site, as Determined by the Washington Natural Heritage Program 2002	4.72
4.15	Birds of Conservation Concern Observed on the Hanford Site.....	4.74
4.16	Population Estimates and Percentages by Race and Hispanic Origin within Selected County in Washington State and the 80-km (50 mi) Radius of Hanford as Determined by the 2000 Census	4.86
4.17	Number and Percentages of Persons Defined as Low-Income Living in Counties Near the Hanford Site, in 1999, as Determined by the 2000 Census.....	4.87
4.18	Occupational Injury, Illness, and Fatality Incidence Rates for U.S. Department of Energy Facilities and Private Industry	4.100
4.19	Radiation Exposure Data for the Hanford Site, 1997-2001	4.102
5.1	Land Use – Areas Used for Disposal, ha	5.11
5.2	Land Use – Areas of HSW Treatment and Storage Facilities, ha.....	5.15
5.3	200 East and 200 West Area Emissions: Location and Dispersion Factors Used to Determine Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public.....	5.18
5.4	Area C (Borrow Pit) Emissions: Location and Dispersion Factors Used to Determine Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public.....	5.19
5.5	Alternative Group A: Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public from Activities in the 200 Areas.....	5.20
5.6	All Alternative Groups: Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public from Area C (Borrow Pit) Activities.....	5.20
5.7	Alternative Group B: Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public from Activities in the 200 Areas.....	5.22
5.8	Alternative Group C: Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public from Activities in the 200 Areas.....	5.23
5.9	Alternative Group D: Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public from Activities in the 200 Areas.....	5.24
5.10	Alternative Group E: Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public from Activities in the 200 Areas.....	5.26
5.11	No Action Alternative: Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public from Activities in the 200 Areas.....	5.27

5.12	Comparison Across all Alternative Groups of Maximum Air Quality Impacts to the Public from Activities in the 200 Areas.....	5.29
5.13	Comparison of Predicted Peak Concentrations of Selected Constituents at the 200 East SE LOA from Upper Bound Inventories in Ungrounded MLLW Disposed of After 2007	5.78
5.14	Sum of MCL Fractions and Drinking Water Doses from Maximum Potential Concentrations at LLWMA Boundaries for Technetium-99 and Iodine-129 for Waste Buried Before 2008.....	5.84
5.15	Sum of MCL Fractions and Drinking Water Doses from Maximum Potential Concentrations at Combined-Use Facility Boundaries for Technetium-99 and Iodine-129 for Waste Buried After 2007	5.86
5.16	Estimated Inventories of Selected Hazardous Chemicals Potentially Disposed of in HSW LLBGs Between 1962 and 1987	5.92
5.17	Estimated Peak Concentrations in Groundwater from Selected Hazardous Chemicals in Waste Hypothetically Disposed of in HSW LLBGs Before 1988	5.95
5.18	Comparison of Commitments of Geologic Resources, Millions of m ³	5.96
5.19	Hanford Budget and Direct Employment Associated with Baseline Conditions.....	5.115
5.20	Socioeconomic Impacts Associated with Alternative Group A, Relative to Baseline Conditions.....	5.118
5.21	Socioeconomic Impacts Associated with Alternative Group B, Relative to Baseline Conditions.....	5.120
5.22	Socioeconomic Impacts Associated with Alternative Group C, Relative to Baseline Conditions.....	5.122
5.23	Socioeconomic Impacts Associated with Alternative Group D, Relative to Baseline Conditions.....	5.123
5.24	Socioeconomic Impacts Associated with the No Action Alternative, Relative to Baseline Conditions	5.125
5.25	Summary of Potential Radiological and Non-Radiological Transportation Impacts – Hanford Only Waste Volumes, All Alternative Groups	5.133
5.26	Summary of Radiological and Non-Radiological Transportation Impacts for Offsite Shipments by Waste Type	5.135
5.27	Summary of the Potential Transportation Impacts by Shipment Origin.....	5.138
5.28	Impacts in Oregon and Washington by State from Shipments of Solid Wastes to and from Hanford	5.144
5.29	Impacts of Transporting Construction and Capping Materials	5.145
5.30	Hazardous Chemical Concentrations (mg/m ³) 100 m (109 yd) Downwind from Severe Transportation Accidents	5.146
5.31	Typical Noise Levels Associated with Construction Equipment and Blasting.....	5.149
5.32	Resource Commitment Summary by Alternative Group and for ILAW	5.152
5.33	Resource Commitment Summary by Alternative Group with ILAW Resources Included	5.153
5.34	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group A, Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.160
5.35	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group A, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.161

5.36	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group A, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.162
5.37	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Chemicals – Alternative Group A, All Waste Volumes	5.163
5.38	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group A, Hanford Only Waste Volume.....	5.164
5.39	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group A, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.165
5.40	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group A, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.166
5.41	Radiological Consequences of Accidents at the CWC	5.168
5.42	Non-Radiological Air Concentrations for Accidents at the CWC	5.170
5.43	Radiological Consequences of Accidents at WRAP.....	5.171
5.44	Non-Radiological Air Concentrations for a Process Enclosure Fire Accident at WRAP	5.173
5.45	Radiological Consequences of Accidents at the Modified T Plant Complex for Continuing T Plant Activities	5.174
5.46	Radiological Consequences of Accidents for the Modified T Plant Complex with the New Waste Processing Facility	5.175
5.47	Radiological Consequences of Accidents at the Low-Level Waste Trenches	5.177
5.48	Radiological Consequences of Accidents at the MLLW Trenches	5.178
5.49	Non-Radiological Air Concentrations for a Heavy Equipment Accident with Fire at the LLBGs.....	5.179
5.50	Non-Radiological Air Concentrations for a Heavy Equipment Accident Without Fire at the LLBGs.....	5.180
5.51	Non-Radiological Air Concentrations for a Drum Explosion at the LLBGs.....	5.181
5.52	Non-Radiological Air Concentrations for a Seismic Event Without Fire at the LLBGs	5.182
5.53	Radiological Consequences of Accidents Involving ILAW Disposal	5.183
5.54	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group B, Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.186
5.55	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group B, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.187
5.56	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group B, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.188
5.57	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Chemicals – Alternative Group B, All Waste Volumes	5.189
5.58	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group B, Hanford Only Waste Volume.....	5.190
5.59	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group B, Lower Bound Waste Volume	5.191
5.60	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group B, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.192
5.61	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group C, Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.196
5.62	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group C, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.197
5.63	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group C, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.198
5.64	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group C, Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.199
5.65	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group C, Lower Bound Waste Volume	5.200
5.66	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group C, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.201

5.67	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group D, Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.202
5.68	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group D, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.203
5.69	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – Alternative Group D, Upper Bound Waste Volume.....	5.204
5.70	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group D, Hanford Only Waste Volume.....	5.206
5.71	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group D, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.207
5.72	Occupational Radiation Exposure – Alternative Group D, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.208
5.73	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – No Action Alternative, Hanford Only Waste Volume.....	5.211
5.74	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Radionuclides – No Action Alternative, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.212
5.75	Non-Involved Worker and Public Health Impacts from Routine Atmospheric Releases of Chemicals – No Action Alternative.....	5.213
5.76	Occupational Radiation Exposure – No Action Alternative, Hanford Only Waste Volume....	5.214
5.77	Radiological Consequences of Melter Storage Accidents at the CWC	5.215
5.78	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group A, Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.220
5.79	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group A, Lower Bound Waste Volume	5.220
5.80	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group A, Upper Bound Waste Volume.....	5.220
5.81	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group A	5.221
5.82	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group A.....	5.221
5.83	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Southeast from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group A.....	5.222
5.84	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group A.....	5.222
5.85	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group B, Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.225
5.86	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group B, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.225
5.87	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group B, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.225
5.88	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group B	5.226
5.89	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group B.....	5.226
5.90	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group B	5.226

5.91	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group C, Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.229
5.92	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group C, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.229
5.93	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group C, Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.229
5.94	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group C	5.230
5.95	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group C.....	5.230
5.96	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Southeast from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group C	5.230
5.97	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group C	5.231
5.98	Hypothetical Drinking Water Dose from Groundwater 100 Meters Downgradient of LLW Management Areas.....	5.232
5.99	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₁ , Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.235
5.100	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₁ , Lower Bound Waste Volume	5.235
5.101	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₁ , Upper Bound Waste Volume.....	5.235
5.102	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group D ₁	5.236
5.103	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group D ₁	5.236
5.104	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Southeast from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group D ₁	5.237
5.105	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group D ₁	5.237
5.106	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₂ , Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.240
5.107	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₂ , Lower Bound Waste Volume	5.240
5.108	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₂ , Upper Bound Waste Volume.....	5.240
5.109	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group D ₂	5.241
5.110	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group D ₂	5.241
5.111	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group D ₂	5.242
5.112	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₃ , Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.244

5.113	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₃ , Lower Bound Waste Volume	5.244
5.114	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group D ₃ , Upper Bound Waste Volume.....	5.244
5.115	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group D ₃	5.245
5.116	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the ERDF Site, Alternative Group D ₃	5.245
5.117	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group D ₃	5.246
5.118	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group D ₃	5.246
5.119	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₁ , Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.249
5.120	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₁ , Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.249
5.121	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₁ , Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.249
5.122	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group E ₁	5.250
5.123	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the ERDF Site, Alternative Group E ₁	5.250
5.124	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group E ₁	5.251
5.125	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group E ₁	5.251
5.126	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₂ , Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.254
5.127	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₂ , Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.254
5.128	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₂ , Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.254
5.129	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group E ₂	5.255
5.130	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the ERDF Site, Alternative Group E ₂	5.255
5.131	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group E ₂	5.256
5.132	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Southeast from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group E ₂	5.256
5.133	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group E ₂	5.257
5.134	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₃ , Hanford Only Waste Volume	5.259

5.135	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₃ , Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.259
5.136	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – Alternative Group E ₃ , Upper Bound Waste Volume	5.259
5.137	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, Alternative Group E ₃	5.260
5.138	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the ERDF Site, Alternative Group E ₃	5.260
5.139	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group E ₃	5.261
5.140	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Southeast from the 200 East Area, Alternative Group E ₃	5.261
5.141	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, Alternative Group E ₃	5.262
5.142	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – No Action Alternative, Hanford Only Waste Volume.....	5.264
5.143	Population Health Impacts from Drinking Water Downstream of Hanford over 10,000 Years – No Action Alternative, Lower Bound Waste Volume.....	5.264
5.144	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient from the 200 West Area, No Action Alternative.	5.264
5.145	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Northwest from the 200 East Area, No Action Alternative	5.265
5.146	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well 1 km Downgradient Southeast from the 200 East Area, No Action Alternative	5.265
5.147	Maximum Annual Drinking Water Dose for a Hypothetical Well Near the Columbia River, No Action Alternative	5.266
5.148	Maximum Impacts to an Individual from Drilling into Low Level Burial Grounds	5.267
5.149	Maximum Impacts to an Individual from Excavation into Low Level Burial Grounds	5.268
5.150	Cumulative Air Quality Impacts for Criteria Pollutants	5.280
5.151	Largest Criteria-Pollutant Impacts for HSW Operations Among the Alternative Groups and the No Action Alternative	5.280
5.152	Cumulative Population Health Effects in the Hanford Environs from Atmospheric Pathways due to Hanford Site Activities	5.284
5.153	Radiological Impacts (principally from uranium) in Various Sources of Water on, Near, or Downstream of the Hanford Site	5.297
5.154	Cumulative Transportation Impacts.....	5.298
5.155	Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Selected Resources by Alternative Group with ILAW	5.301
6.1	Potential Permits and Approvals Needed for Storage and Disposal	6.22
6.2	Coverage of Hanford Solid Waste Management Units in Existing Permits	6.24