

Cover Sheet

Responsible Agency: U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)

Cooperating Agencies: Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Title: *Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (TC & WM EIS)* (DOE/EIS-0391)

Location: Benton County, Washington

Contacts: For copies of this *Final TC & WM EIS*, call toll-free 1-888-829-6347, or contact Mary Beth Burandt at the address below.

For additional information on this
Final TC & WM EIS, contact:

Mary Beth Burandt, Document Manager
Office of River Protection
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 1178
Richland, WA 99352
Attention: *TC & WM EIS*
Email: TC&WMEIS@saic.com
Fax: 1-888-785-2865
Telephone and voicemail: 1-888-829-6347

For general information on the DOE National
Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, contact:

Carol M. Borgstrom, Director
Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance (GC-54)
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Telephone: 202-586-4600, or leave a message
at 1-800-472-2756
Email: askNEPA@hq.doe.gov
Website: <http://energy.gov/nepa>

Abstract: The Hanford Site (Hanford), located in southeastern Washington State along the Columbia River, is approximately 1,518 square kilometers (586 square miles) in size. Hanford's mission from the early 1940s to approximately 1989 included defense-related nuclear research, development, and weapons production activities. These activities created a wide variety of chemical and radioactive wastes. Hanford's mission now is focused on the cleanup of those wastes and ultimate closure of Hanford. To this end, several types of radioactive waste are being managed at Hanford: (1) high-level radioactive waste (HLW) as defined in DOE Manual 435.1-1; (2) transuranic (TRU) waste, which is waste containing alpha-particle-emitting radionuclides with atomic numbers greater than uranium (92) and half-lives greater than 20 years in concentrations greater than 100 nanocuries per gram of waste; (3) low-level radioactive waste (LLW), which is radioactive waste that is neither HLW nor TRU waste; and (4) mixed low-level radioactive waste (MLLW), which is LLW containing hazardous constituents as defined under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 (42 U.S.C 6901 et seq.). Thus, this environmental impact statement (EIS) analyzes the following three key areas:

1. **Retrieval, treatment, and disposal of waste from 149 single-shell tanks (SSTs) and 28 double-shell tanks (DSTs) and closure of the SST system.** In this *TC & WM EIS*, DOE proposes to retrieve and treat waste from 177 underground tanks and ancillary equipment and dispose of this waste in compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. At present, DOE is constructing a Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) in the 200-East Area of Hanford. The WTP would separate waste stored in Hanford's underground tanks into HLW and low-activity waste (LAW) fractions. HLW would be treated in the WTP and stored at Hanford until disposition decisions are made and implemented. LAW would be treated in the WTP and disposed of as LLW at Hanford as decided in DOE's Record of Decision (ROD) issued in 1997 (62 FR 8693), pursuant to the *Tank Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, Final Environmental Impact Statement* (DOE/EIS-0189, August 1996). DOE

proposes to provide additional treatment capacity for the tank LAW that can supplement the planned WTP capacity in fulfillment of DOE's obligations under the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement). DOE would dispose of immobilized LAW and Hanford's (and other DOE sites') LLW and MLLW in lined trenches on site. These trenches would be closed in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.

2. **Final decontamination and decommissioning of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), a nuclear test reactor.** DOE proposes to determine the final end state for the aboveground, belowground, and ancillary support structures.
3. **Disposal of Hanford's waste and other DOE sites' LLW and MLLW.** DOE needs to decide where to locate onsite disposal facilities for Hanford's waste and other DOE sites' LLW and MLLW. DOE committed in the ROD (69 FR 39449) for the *Final Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement, Richland, Washington* (DOE/EIS-0286F, January 2004) that LLW would be disposed of in lined trenches. Specifically, DOE proposes to dispose of the waste in either the existing Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) in the 200-East Area (IDF-East) or the proposed 200-West Area IDF (IDF-West).

DOE released the *Draft TC & WM EIS* in October 2009 (74 FR 56194) for review and comment by other Federal agencies, states, American Indian tribal governments, local governments, and the public. The comment period was 185 days, from October 30, 2009, to May 3, 2010.

In accordance with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR 1502.9(c)) and DOE regulations (10 CFR 1021.314(c)), DOE prepared a supplement analysis (SA) of the *Draft TC & WM EIS (Supplement Analysis of the "Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington"* [DOE/EIS-0391-SA-01, February 2012]). DOE prepared an SA to evaluate updated, modified, or expanded information developed subsequent to publication of the *Draft TC & WM EIS* to determine whether a supplement to the draft EIS or a new draft EIS was warranted. Fourteen topic areas were reviewed. Revisions include changes to contaminant inventories, corrections to estimates, updates to characterization data, and new information that was not available at the time of publication of the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. The modified inventories do not change the key environmental findings presented in the draft EIS. They do not present significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action(s) and their impacts. Changes to some of the parameters used in the alternatives analysis do not significantly affect the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives on an absolute or relative basis, whether the changes are considered individually or collectively. These are not substantial changes in the proposed action(s) that are relevant to environmental concerns. DOE concluded, based on analyses in the SA, that the updated, modified, or expanded information developed subsequent to the *Draft TC & WM EIS* does not constitute significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed actions(s) in the *Draft TC & WM EIS* or their impacts. Therefore, DOE determined that a supplement to the *Draft TC & WM EIS* or a new *Draft TC & WM EIS* was not required.

DOE posted the *Supplement Analysis of the "Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington"* on the DOE NEPA website, <http://energy.gov/nepa/office-nepa-policy-and-compliance>, on February 8, 2012, and on the *TC & WM EIS* website, <http://www.hanford.gov/index.cfm?page=1117&>, on February 9, 2012, and the SA was provided on February 14, 2012, to the DOE public reading room at 2770 University Drive, Room 101L, Richland, Washington 99352. The SA is also provided here as Appendix X of this final EIS for convenience only.

In preparing this *Final TC & WM EIS*, DOE considered all comments received on the draft EIS and revised this final EIS, as appropriate. DOE has clarified and/or revised its Preferred Alternatives for the three program areas as presented in this *TC & WM EIS*, as follows:

Tank Closure

Eleven alternatives for potential tank closure actions are evaluated in this final EIS. These alternatives cover tank waste retrieval and treatment, as well as closure of the SSTs. DOE has identified the following Preferred Alternatives: For retrieval, DOE prefers Tank Closure alternatives that would retrieve at least 99 percent of the tank waste. All Tank Closure alternatives would do this except Alternatives 1 (No Action) and 5. For closure of the SSTs, DOE prefers landfill closure; this could include implementation of corrective/mitigation actions as described in the Summary of this EIS, Section S.5.5.1, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10.1, which may require soil removal or treatment of the vadose zone. Decisions on the extent of soil removal or treatment, if needed, will be made on a tank farm– or waste management area–basis through the RCRA closure permitting process. These landfill closure considerations would apply to Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, 5, and 6C. DOE does not prefer alternatives that include removal of the tanks as evaluated in Tank Closure Alternatives 4, 6A, and 6B. As described in the Summary of this EIS, Section S.5.5.1, and Chapter 2, Section 2.10.1, DOE believes that removal of the tank structures is technically infeasible and, due to both the depth of the contamination and the technical issues associated with removal of the tank structures, that it presents significant uncertainty in terms of worker exposure risk and waste generation volume.

DOE does not have a preferred alternative regarding supplemental treatment for LAW; DOE believes it beneficial to study further the potential cost, safety, and environmental performance of supplemental treatment technologies. Nevertheless, DOE is committed to meeting its obligations under the TPA regarding supplemental LAW treatment. When DOE is ready to identify its preferred alternative regarding supplemental treatment for LAW, this action will be subject to NEPA review as appropriate. DOE will provide a notice of its preferred alternative in the *Federal Register* at least 30 days before issuing a ROD. For the actions related to tank waste retrieval, treatment and closure, DOE prefers Tank Closure Alternative 2B, without removing technetium in the Pretreatment Facility.

Although DOE previously expressed its preference that no Hanford tank waste would be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) (74 FR 67189), DOE now prefers to consider the option to retrieve, treat, and package waste that may be properly and legally designated as mixed transuranic (TRU) waste from specific tanks for disposal at WIPP, as analyzed in Tank Closure Alternatives 3A, 3B, 3C, 4, and 5. Initiating retrieval of tank waste identified as mixed TRU waste would be contingent on DOE's obtaining the applicable disposal and other necessary permits and ensuring that the WIPP Waste Acceptance Criteria and all other applicable regulatory requirements have been met. Retrieval of tank waste identified as mixed TRU waste would commence only after DOE had issued a *Federal Register* notice of its preferred alternative and a ROD.

FFTF Decommissioning

There are three FFTF Decommissioning alternatives from which the Preferred Alternative was identified: (1) No Action, (2) Entombment, and (3) Removal. DOE's Preferred Alternative for FFTF Decommissioning is Alternative 2: Entombment, which would remove all above-grade structures, including the reactor building. Below-grade structures, the reactor vessel, piping, and other components would remain in place and be filled with grout to immobilize the remaining radioactive and hazardous constituents. Waste generated from these activities would be disposed of in an IDF, and an engineered modified RCRA Subtitle C barrier would be constructed over the filled area. The remote-handled special components would be processed at Idaho National Laboratory and returned to Hanford. Bulk sodium inventories would be processed at Hanford for use in the WTP.

Waste Management

Three Waste Management alternatives were identified for the proposed actions: (1) Alternative 1: No Action, under which all onsite LLW and MLLW would be treated and disposed of in the existing lined Low-Level Radioactive Waste Burial Ground 218-W-5 trenches and no offsite waste would be accepted; (2) Alternative 2, which would continue treatment of onsite LLW and MLLW in expanded, existing facilities and dispose of onsite and previously treated, offsite LLW and MLLW in a single IDF (IDF-East); and (3) Alternative 3, which also would continue treatment of onsite LLW and MLLW in expanded, existing facilities, but would dispose of onsite and previously treated offsite LLW and MLLW in two IDFs (IDF-East and IDF-West). DOE's Preferred Alternative for waste management is Alternative 2, disposal of onsite LLW and MLLW streams in a single IDF (IDF-East). Disposal of SST closure waste that is not highly contaminated, such as rubble, soils, and ancillary equipment, in the proposed River Protection Project Disposal Facility (RPPDF) is also included under this alternative. After completion of disposal activities, IDF-East and the proposed RPPDF would be landfill-closed under an engineered modified RCRA Subtitle C barrier. The final EIS analyses show that, even when mitigation is applied to certain offsite waste streams (e.g., removal of most of the iodine-129), some environmental impacts of small quantities of iodine-129 would still occur and, therefore, limitations for that constituent should apply regardless of the alternative selected.

DOE will continue to defer the importation of offsite waste to Hanford, at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review and consistent with its previous Preferred Alternative for waste management (74 FR 67189). The limitations and exemptions defined in DOE's January 6, 2006, Settlement Agreement with the State of Washington (as amended on June 5, 2008) regarding *State of Washington v. Bodman* (Civil No. 2:03-cv-05018-AAM), signed by DOE, Ecology, the Washington State Attorney General's Office, and the U.S. Department of Justice, will remain in place.

This *Final TC & WM EIS* contains revisions and new information based in part on comments received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. Sidebars in the margins indicate the locations of these revisions and new information. Minor editorial changes are not marked. Volume 3 contains the comments received on the draft EIS and DOE's responses to the comments. DOE will use the analysis presented in this final EIS, as well as other information, in preparing one or more RODs. DOE will issue a ROD no sooner than 30 days after EPA publishes a Notice of Availability of this *Final TC & WM EIS* in the *Federal Register*.

***Final Tank Closure and Waste Management
Environmental Impact Statement
for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington
(Final TC & WM EIS)***

***Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)
Foreword***

Summary

Ecology believes that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and its contractor have prepared a *Final TC & WM EIS* that presents many important issues for discussion. Ecology's involvement in the production of this *TC & WM EIS* shows that this document has benefited from quality reviews and quality assurance procedures. In addition, this document benefited from public comments, and important additions were made in regard to mitigation measures and sensitivity studies.

The single best thing this document does is to clearly indicate the severity of the environmental impacts (both current and future) associated with the waste at the Hanford Site (Hanford), and, as such, DOE and its environmental impact statement (EIS) contractor should be commended for their factual representation.

The information in this document will help shed light on many key decisions that remain to be made about Hanford cleanup. To Ecology, the results of this EIS clearly indicate that some basic tenets concerning future Hanford cleanup are needed to reduce the impacts. They include the following:

- Waste from the tanks needs to be removed to the maximum extent possible. It is not the shell of the tanks or the act of landfill closing that increases the environmental impacts, it is the extent of retrieval from the tanks and the amount of vadose zone remediation.
- Glass is the only acceptable waste form for immobilized low-activity waste (ILAW) that is going to be disposed of at Hanford. This is true for the low-activity waste (LAW) treated through the existing LAW Vitrification Facility and for the LAW treated in the additional supplemental LAW treatment facility. This *TC & WM EIS* shows that all other waste forms are not protective of the groundwater and Columbia River.
- Groundwater pump-and-treat systems will have to continue to treat the groundwater beneath the Central Plateau for a long time after the tank waste has been retrieved and treated.
- A new emphasis should be placed on remediating problematic soil contamination in and beneath the tank farms and in other Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) waste sites in the Central Plateau to limit further groundwater impacts; this would include development of vadose zone remediation methods.
- Hanford's existing waste burden exceeds the capacity of the natural and engineered environment to attenuate it. Therefore, poorly performing waste forms and offsite waste should be eliminated as waste management options.
- As DOE and Ecology have indicated consistently throughout the *TC & WM EIS* development process, certain secondary waste from the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) must be treated and immobilized to a greater extent to protect groundwater. The performance criteria for secondary waste must be improved beyond a grouted waste form.

- Hanford should embrace the use of a Central Plateau cumulative risk tool to ensure that all individual remediation decisions are protective in aggregate.

Ecology expects DOE to consider our input through this foreword, as well as through our comments made during the public comment process. Ecology worked with DOE with the intent of helping to produce a final EIS that fully informs future decision making. Ecology will continue to work with DOE as it develops the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Record of Decision (ROD) and the important mitigation action plan. As defined in our cooperating agency Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Ecology expects to be fully involved in the preparation of the ROD.

I. Introduction

Ecology has been a cooperating agency with DOE since 2002 in the production of both the *Draft* and this *Final TC & WM EIS*, as well as a coauthor in the preceding *Tank Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, Final Environmental Impact Statement (TWRS EIS)*. DOE prepared this EIS to meet the requirements of NEPA. In addition, Ecology has reviewed this EIS to ensure important sections can be adopted to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) to support our permitting processes. The information in this EIS will help inform Ecology and others about critical future cleanup decisions impacting Hanford's closure. When Ecology makes decisions through its permitting process, Ecology will look to this *Final TC & WM EIS* and, if appropriate, adopt portions. Ecology will use the information to develop mitigating permit conditions.

Ecology provided comments regarding the *Draft TC & WM EIS* to document areas of agreement or concern with this EIS and to assist the public in their review. Public and regulator input on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* were critical for the completion of an acceptable *Final TC & WM EIS*.

In this *Final TC & WM EIS*, Ecology issued a revised foreword to comment on the EIS key findings, DOE's Preferred Alternatives, and disposition of Ecology's comments on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*. Ecology has also issued this revised foreword to discuss Ecology's position on certain issues and future needed mitigation actions.

II. Ecology's Role as a Cooperating Agency

Ecology has been a cooperating agency in the preparation of this EIS. A state agency may be a cooperating agency on a Federal EIS when the agency has jurisdiction by law over, or specialized expertise concerning, a major Federal action under evaluation in the EIS.

As a cooperating agency, Ecology did not coauthor or direct the production of this EIS. Ecology did have access to certain data and information as this document was being prepared by DOE and its contractor. Our roles and responsibilities in this process were defined in an MOU between Ecology and DOE.

DOE retained responsibility for making final decisions in the preparation of this *Final TC & WM EIS*, as well as for determining the Preferred Alternatives presented in this EIS. However, Ecology's participation as a cooperating agency enabled us to help formulate the alternatives presented in this *TC & WM EIS*.

Ecology's involvement as a cooperating agency—and the current scope of this *Final TC & WM EIS*—is grounded in a series of events.

On November 8, 2002, DOE asked Ecology to be a cooperating agency on the "Environmental Impact Statement for Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposal of Tank Waste and Closure of Single-Shell Tanks at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington," known as the "Tank Closure EIS." On November 27, 2002, Ecology formally agreed. The March 25, 2003, MOU outlines the respective agency roles and responsibilities.

While the “Tank Closure EIS” was being developed, another DOE EIS, the *Draft Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement, Richland, Washington (HSW EIS)*, was in the review stage. Among other matters, the *HSW EIS* examined the impacts of disposal at Hanford of certain volumes of radioactive waste and mixed radioactive and hazardous waste, including waste generated from beyond Hanford.

In March 2003, Ecology filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court seeking to prevent the importation and storage of certain offsite transuranic (TRU) and mixed TRU wastes that DOE had decided to send to Hanford prior to issuance of the *Final HSW EIS*. Ecology and intervening plaintiffs obtained a preliminary injunction against these shipments.

In January 2004, DOE issued the *Final HSW EIS*. Based on the *Final HSW EIS*, DOE amended a ROD that directed offsite radioactive and hazardous wastes to Hanford (within certain volume limits) for disposal and/or storage. In response, Ecology amended its lawsuit to challenge the adequacy of the *HSW EIS* analysis.

In May 2005, the U.S. District Court expanded the existing preliminary injunction to enjoin a broader class of waste and to grant Ecology a discovery period to further explore issues with the *HSW EIS*.

In January 2006, DOE and Ecology signed a Settlement Agreement, ending litigation on the *HSW EIS* and addressing concerns found in the *HSW EIS* quality assurance review during the discovery period. The Settlement Agreement called for expanding the scope of the “Tank Closure EIS” to provide a single, integrated set of analyses of (1) tank closure impacts considered in the “Tank Closure EIS” and (2) the disposal of all waste types considered in the *Final HSW EIS*. The Settlement Agreement also called for an integrated cumulative impacts analysis.

Under the Settlement Agreement, the “Tank Closure EIS” was renamed this *TC & WM EIS*. Ecology’s existing MOU with DOE was revised along with the Settlement Agreement so that Ecology remained a cooperating agency on the expanded *TC & WM EIS*.

The Settlement Agreement defined specific tasks to address concerns Ecology had with the *HSW EIS*. DOE has now revised information and implemented quality assurance measures used in this *TC & WM EIS* related to the solid-waste portion of the analysis. Ecology and its contractors have performed discrete quality assurance reviews of that information to help confirm that the quality assurance processes of DOE’s EIS contractor have been followed.

Based on Ecology’s involvement throughout the years of EIS development, we believe that positive changes have been made to address data quality shortcomings in the *HSW EIS*. These specifically relate to the following:

- The data used in analyzing impacts on groundwater
- The integration of analyses of all waste types that DOE may dispose of at Hanford
- The adequacy of the cumulative impacts analysis

Ecology reviewed the *Draft TC & WM EIS* and this *Final TC & WM EIS*. In our reviews, we confirmed that the terms of the Settlement Agreement have been addressed to our satisfaction.

III. Regulatory Relationships and SEPA

Now that this *TC & WM EIS* has been finalized, Ecology will proceed with approving regulatory actions required to complete the Hanford cleanup. These include actions under the (1) Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order, also known as the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA), and (2) *State of Washington v. Chu* (Civil No. 2:08-cv-05085-FVS) Consent Decree, as well as actions that require state permits or modifications to existing permits, such as the Hanford Dangerous Waste Sitewide Permit. This

permit regulates hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal activity at Hanford, including actions such as tank closure and supplemental treatment for tank waste.

Ecology must comply with SEPA when undertaking permitting actions. It is Ecology's sense that this *Final TC & WM EIS* will be suitable for adoption in whole or in part to satisfy SEPA. It is Ecology's plan to adopt in part portions of this *Final TC & WM EIS* when needed for individual permitting actions.

In addition, Ecology will have a substantial role in establishing standards and methods for the cleanup of contaminated soil and groundwater at Hanford, including areas that are regulated under hazardous waste corrective action authority and/or under CERCLA through a CERCLA ROD. Information developed in this EIS will thus be useful in other applications for the cleanup of Hanford.

IV. DOE's Responses to Ecology's Comments on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*

Ecology submitted comments on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* with a cover letter from Jane Hedges, Program Manager of Ecology's Nuclear Waste Program. These comments were discussed in detail with DOE and the EIS contractor. Many of our comments resulted in changes and additions in this *Final TC & WM EIS*. All of our comments were resolved to our satisfaction. Our comments and DOE's responses to those comments can be seen in the Comment-Response Document, Section 3.1, at Commentor No. 498.

V. Preferred Alternatives

This *Final TC & WM EIS* considers three sets of actions: tank waste treatment and tank farm closure, Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) decommissioning, and waste management. The Preferred Alternatives are summarized in this section. DOE's Preferred Alternative decisions with which Ecology disagrees are discussed in this section under Area of Disagreement; those Ecology generally agrees with are discussed in the subsequent section VI of this foreword.

The Preferred Alternatives for the three sets of actions can be summarized as follows:

Tank Waste Treatment and Tank Farm Closure:

- Retrieval of at least 99 percent of the waste from each tank.
- Landfill closure of the tank farms.
- Possible soil removal or treatment of the vadose zone.
- DOE chose to not identify a preferred alternative for supplemental treatment needed to treat that portion of LAW that the WTP, as currently designed, does not have the capacity to treat in a reasonable timeframe.

FFTF Decommissioning:

- All above-grade structures, including the reactor building, would be removed.
- Below-grade structures, the reactor vessel, piping, and other components would remain in place and be filled with grout to immobilize the remaining radioactive and hazardous constituents (FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2: Entombment).
- Waste generated from these activities would be disposed of in an Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF), and an engineered modified Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle C barrier would be placed on top.
- Bulk sodium inventories would be processed at Hanford.

Waste Management:

- Onsite low-level radioactive waste (LLW) and mixed low-level radioactive waste (MLLW) streams would be disposed of in a single 200-East Area IDF (IDF-East) under a modified RCRA Subtitle C barrier.
- Single-shell tank (SST) closure waste that is not highly contaminated would be disposed of in the River Protection Project Disposal Facility (RPPDF) under a modified RCRA Subtitle C barrier.
- This final EIS shows that, even when mitigation is applied to offsite waste, environmental impacts would still occur. DOE is deferring the decision on the importation of offsite waste at Hanford, at least until the WTP is operational, subject to appropriate NEPA review. The limitations and exemptions defined in DOE's January 6, 2006, Settlement Agreement with the State of Washington (as amended on June 5, 2008), signed by DOE, Ecology, the Washington State Attorney General's Office, and the U.S. Department of Justice, regarding *State of Washington v. Bodman* (Civil No. 2:03-cv-05018-AAM) will remain in place.

Area of Disagreement:

Ecology agrees with a majority of the Preferred Alternative choices made in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, except for DOE's decision to omit a preferred supplemental treatment alternative from this *Final TC & WM EIS*. This omission leaves this EIS incomplete. This omission is not supported by (and is contrary to) the analysis in this *TC & WM EIS*, which clearly supports a second LAW vitrification alternative as the only environmentally protective option for supplemental treatment. Further, the cost comparisons in this EIS show that all the various options are cost neutral, so any assumptions about potential cost savings in choosing other treatment options are invalid.

As a cooperating agency on this *TC & WM EIS*, Ecology encourages DOE to select a preferred alternative in the ROD that includes a supplemental treatment decision. Ecology prefers an alternative that is similar to Tank Closure Alternative 2B or, at the very least, Alternative 2A. It is essential that ILAW to be disposed of above groundwater and upstream from the Columbia River be vitrified to ensure the water and future users will be protected from the tank waste constituents.

Alternative 2B is consistent with the TPA and the *State of Washington v. Chu* Consent Decree. Also, Alternative 2B does not extend the mission as far as Alternative 2A. Alternatives 2A and 2B both support the retrieval of waste from all the tanks, treatment of all that waste, and a defined end of mission.

Ecology is concerned that, by choosing vague language in this *Final TC & WM EIS* concerning supplemental treatment, DOE is bringing into question its previous commitments about when and if all of the waste will be removed from the SSTs and when and if all the tank waste will be treated. This puts into question the end of mission for tank waste treatment. Because such an undefined scenario was not analyzed in any of the alternatives in this *TC & WM EIS*, related impacts are not visible to decision makers or the public. There are several milestone dates that were critical components of the Consent Decree settlement that resolved the *State of Washington v. Chu* lawsuit. We believe DOE's failure to identify a preferred alternative in this *Final TC & WM EIS* will jeopardize compliance with these dates.

DOE has invested 10 years and \$85 million, and Ecology has provided significant effort in cooperating agency review and consultation in producing this *TC & WM EIS*. Ecology expects that investment should result in a *Final TC & WM EIS* that supports making a supplemental treatment decision. We are especially concerned because the *Draft TC & WM EIS* identified no data gaps and gave no indication of DOE's intent to delay a decision on supplemental treatment. Further, no analysis in the *Preliminary Final TC & WM EIS* reviewed by Ecology identified gaps in the supplemental treatment data, nor did the analysis support a delay in making a supplemental treatment decision. No public comment received on the *Draft TC & WM EIS* encouraged DOE to delay selecting a preferred alternative.

If DOE does not select a preferred alternative for supplemental tank waste treatment, we request that it identify the following:

- The data it is using to make this decision and where is it documented in this *TC & WM EIS*.
- Any data gaps in this *TC & WM EIS* and how those gaps will be addressed in the future.
- Additional data it is analyzing to aid it in making the decision.
- The NEPA documentation DOE will use to analyze and support supplemental waste treatment selection. Will it be an additional EIS? How will DOE reconcile the timing of future NEPA documentation and TPA supplemental treatment milestones?

VI. Ecology Insights on Alternatives Considered, EIS Key Findings, and Needed Mitigation Measures

This *Final TC & WM EIS* considers 17 alternatives. Ecology's insights, technical perspectives, and legal and policy perspectives are provided below. Areas of agreement with DOE and points of concern are noted.

SST Waste Retrieval and Tank Farm Closure

Ecology believes that DOE has presented an appropriate range of alternatives for evaluating tank waste retrieval and tank closure impacts. However, based on the hazardous waste tank closure standards of the "Dangerous Waste Regulations" (WAC 173-303-610(2)) and the TPA requirements, Ecology supports only alternatives that involve tank waste retrieval to the maximum extent possible or 99 percent, whichever is greater, from each of the 149 SSTs. An acceptable performance assessment is essential in establishing a clear understanding of the risks and benefits of this retrieval goal. This assessment will be an important part of any specific tank farm closure plan permitting actions.

The analysis in this final EIS, including the new mitigation section, shows that the two most important factors in tank farm closure are (1) maximizing tank waste retrieval and (2) vadose zone remediation of specifically identified hot spots of contamination. Specific vadose zone mitigation will be addressed in specific tank farm closure plan permitting actions.

While DOE has identified the Preferred Alternative for tank closure as including landfill closure, it is important to point out that the specific details of how a tank farm will be closed will be identified in each tank farm closure plan permit. These closure plans will be subject to public comment and agency response before landfill decisions can be implemented.

High-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal

High-level radioactive waste (HLW) associated with the tank waste includes, but may not be limited to, immobilized high-level radioactive waste (IHLW) and HLW melters (both retired and failed). It has been DOE's longstanding plan to store these wastes at Hanford and then ship them off site and dispose of them in a deep geologic repository. The idea was that the nature of the geology would isolate the waste and protect humans from exposure to these very long-lived, lethal radionuclides. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) indicates that these waste streams require permanent isolation. By contrast, the ILAW glass, and perhaps other waste streams, may not require deep geologic disposal due to the level of pretreatment resulting in radionuclide removal and the degree of immobilization provided for in the ILAW glass.

However, the final decision on HLW disposal has recently become an issue with significant uncertainty. This *Final TC & WM EIS* contains the following statement:

The Secretary of Energy has determined that a Yucca Mountain repository is not a workable option for permanent disposal of spent nuclear fuel (SNF) and HLW. However, DOE remains committed to meeting its obligations to manage and ultimately dispose of these materials. The Administration has convened the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future (BRC) to conduct a comprehensive review of policies for managing the back end of the nuclear fuel cycle, including all alternatives for the storage, processing, and disposal of SNF and HLW. The BRC's final recommendations will form the basis of a new solution to managing and disposing of SNF and HLW.

The State of Washington asserts that there is only one legal process in place for developing a geologic repository, which is provided by the NWPA. Under the NWPA, only Congress can take Yucca Mountain off the table. The convening of the BRC to examine alternatives to Yucca Mountain and recommend possible amendments to the NWPA cannot substitute for a process already provided by law. Legally, Yucca Mountain is still the location for the deep geologic repository.

The NWPA requires permanent isolation of these most difficult waste streams. Leaving these wastes stored at Hanford indefinitely is not a legal option or an acceptable option to the State of Washington.

Ecology is concerned about the glass standards and canister requirements for the IHLW. These standards were developed based on what was acceptable for Yucca Mountain. Now that Yucca Mountain is no longer DOE's assumed disposal location, Ecology is concerned about what standards for glass and canisters will be utilized by the WTP. Ecology insists that DOE implement the most conservative approach in these two areas to guarantee that the glass and canister configurations adopted at the WTP will be acceptable at the future deep geologic repository.

In addition, Ecology maintains that DOE should build and operate adequate interim storage capacity for the IHLW and the HLW melters in a manner that does not slow down the treatment of tank waste.

This *Final TC & WM EIS* assumes that the used (both retired and failed) HLW melters are HLW and, therefore, should be disposed of in a deep geologic repository. This EIS also assumes that the used HLW melters will stay on site before shipment to such a repository. DOE has not requested, and Ecology has not accepted, long-term interim storage of used HLW melters at Hanford.

The final disposal of these melters should be in a deep geologic repository. This EIS evaluates only storage of the HLW melters and not the disposal pathway. The disposal pathway for the used melters (both retired and failed) will require further evaluation than is presented in this *Final TC & WM EIS*. Ecology and DOE will need to reach a mutual understanding and agreement on the regulatory framework for disposal.

Pretreatment of Tank Waste

This *Final TC & WM EIS* includes numerous alternatives that pretreat tank waste to separate the high-activity components and direct them to an HLW stream. The HLW stream will be vitrified, resulting in a glass waste product that will be sent to a deep geologic repository. However, this final EIS has one alternative (not the Preferred Alternative) that provides no pretreatment for some portion of the waste in the 200-West Area.

As a legal and policy issue, Ecology does not agree with alternatives that do not require pretreatment of the tank waste. Such alternatives do not meet the intent of the NWPA to remove as many of the fission products and radionuclides as possible to concentrate them in the HLW stream. For this reason, Ecology requests that DOE rule out any alternative that does not pretreat tank waste.

TRU Tank Waste

This *Final TC & WM EIS* considers the option of treating waste from specific tanks as mixed TRU waste and sending it to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). This final EIS also considers WTP processing of the waste from these specific tanks.

Ecology is concerned by DOE's current approach to the potential mixed TRU tank waste. Prior to public comment on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, DOE issued a statement in the Federal Register (74 FR 67189) that indicated that it was no longer considering sending Hanford tank waste to WIPP:

DOE is now expressing its preference that no Hanford tank wastes would be shipped to WIPP. These wastes would be retrieved and treated in the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) being constructed at Hanford. The State of Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), a cooperating agency on the EIS, has revised its Foreword to the Draft EIS in response to this modification to the preferred alternative for tank waste.

For this reason, Ecology did not comment on this approach during public comment, and no public meeting was held in New Mexico.

However, this *Final TC & WM EIS* reversed this course and is now supporting the idea of some tank waste being classified as TRU waste and being packaged for disposal at WIPP. Ecology has concerns that there may be significant public concern regarding this path forward that has not been given the opportunity to be voiced, particularly since the public meetings in New Mexico were canceled.

Ecology has legal and technical concerns with any tank waste being classified as mixed TRU waste at this time. DOE must provide peer-reviewed data and a strong, defensible, technically and legally detailed justification for the designation of any tank waste as mixed TRU waste, rather than as HLW. DOE must also complete the WIPP certification process and assure Ecology that there is a viable disposal pathway (i.e., permit approval from the State of New Mexico and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) before Ecology will modify the Hanford Sitewide Permit to allow tank waste to be treated as mixed TRU waste. Further, Ecology is concerned with the cost benefit viability of an approach that sends a relatively minor amount of tank waste to WIPP, given the cost it would take to secure the disposal path, and to construct and operate the drying facility for the TRU tank waste.

Supplemental Treatment

In this *Final TC & WM EIS*, DOE considers additions to the treatment processes that the WTP would use; specifically, technologies to supplement the WTP's treatment of LAW. Because the WTP as currently designed does not have the capacity to treat the entire volume of LAW in a reasonable timeframe, additional LAW treatment capacity is needed. In section V of this foreword, we describe DOE's approach to delay the decision on supplemental treatment and describe Ecology's significant concern over that approach. In this section, we provide further information on our concerns.

Ecology is stating that this EIS and ROD should make a decision on supplemental treatment; that the only viable choice is the second LAW Vitrification Facility; and that to delay the decision in this EIS will endanger future tank waste milestones and commitments.

Vitrification Options:

Ecology agrees that evaluation of additional LAW vitrification treatment capacity as part of the scope of this EIS was needed. An additional supplemental LAW treatment system is necessary to treat all the tank waste in a reasonable amount of time. Ecology fully supports the *Final TC & WM EIS* alternative that assumes a second LAW Vitrification Facility would provide additional waste processing. Building a second LAW Vitrification Facility has consistently been Ecology's and DOE's baseline approach.

Ecology is supportive of a second LAW Vitrification Facility as the Preferred Alternative in the ROD for the following reasons:

- LAW vitrification is a mature technology that is ready to be implemented with no further testing.
- LAW vitrification produces a well-understood waste form that is extremely protective of the environment (the bulk vitrification waste form is not as protective and the waste form performance data show that cast stone and steam reforming are the least protective forms).

Ecology's measuring stick for a successful supplemental treatment technology has always been whether it is "as good as glass" (from the WTP).

Bulk vitrification is a type of vitrification; however, data from the last bulk vitrification experimental testing indicate waste form performance and technology implementation issues. There has been a lack of significant progress on advancing a bulk vitrification test facility for actual waste. The environmental results from the waste form performance presented in this *Final TC & WM EIS* indicate that LAW vitrification is superior to bulk vitrification. A recently published DOE report indicates that a second LAW Vitrification Facility would be preferable.

Cast Stone and Steam Reforming Options:

Ecology is not supportive of alternatives that consider supplemental treatment methods that are not vitrification. This issue was addressed during the *State of Washington v. Chu* settlement negotiations and resolved with a series of target milestones, to become enforceable after the 2015 TPA negotiations on supplemental treatment, which dictate the schedule for a "Supplemental Treatment Vitrification Facility" (see TPA Milestones M-62-31-T01 through M-62-34-T01 and Milestone M-62-45). Specifically related to the cast stone (grout) and steam reforming alternatives, Ecology has waste form performance and technical concerns. From a technical standpoint, the waste treatment processes of steam reforming and cast stone would not provide adequate primary-waste forms for disposal of tank waste in onsite landfills. This has been the subject of a previous DOE down-select process, in which Ecology and other participants rated these treatment technologies as low in performance. This final EIS shows that the waste form performance of both cast stone and steam reforming would be inadequate. These alternatives do not merit any further review.

Specifically related to the steam reforming alternative, Ecology has technical concerns about the *Draft* and *Final TC & WM EIS* assumptions regarding contaminant partitioning and its effects on waste form performance. Additionally, recent testing (2009 to 2011) on steam reforming development has shown that the technology readiness is very low, the mass balance cannot be closed, cost savings assumptions have evaporated, and waste performance is still undetermined. In addition, there have been operational off-normal events in 2012 in an Idaho steam reforming plant that raise many operations and safety questions. DOE should not include steam reforming as part of the Preferred Alternative and no further studies are warranted.

Washington State is particularly concerned with the recent re-emergence of cast stone or grout as the favored choice for treating LAW. Because this re-emergence coincides with the vague-language change about a preferred alternative for supplemental treatment in this *TC & WM EIS*, Ecology would like to recap the important history of grouting tank waste at Hanford.

For the past two decades, the citizens of the Northwest have vigorously opposed grouting LAW. Their concerns included waste form performance and the increased waste volume (twice as much as ILAW glass) that would create increased disposal needs and associated costs.

Important information on grout and cast stone waste form performance history includes the following:

- The Hanford Waste Task Force, a stakeholder advisory group, concluded that “grout doesn’t adequately protect public, workers, and environment” and that “reduction of waste volume was an issue for grout” because grout increases final-waste-form volume significantly. (*Final Report of the Hanford Waste Task Force, Appendix F, 1993.*)
- DOE’s 1995 waste form performance assessment resulted in identification of three constituents that would ultimately violate drinking water standards if grout is used. The three constituents (nitrate, iodine-129, and technetium-99) violated drinking water standards before and after the 10,000-year analysis timeframe. (*Performance Assessment of Grouted Double Shell Tank Waste Disposal at Hanford, 1995, WHC-SD-WM-EE-004 Rev. 1.*)
- The 2003–2006 supplemental treatment down-select showed that cast stone would not be appropriate for LAW treatment because it would significantly impact the groundwater, i.e., above drinking water standards, and would not be “as good as glass.” Roy Schepens, Office of River Protection Manager, defined the term “as good as glass” in his letter to Mike Wilson, Ecology (June 12, 2003), as follows:

The waste form resulting from treatment must meet the same qualifications of those imposed for the expected glass form produced by the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP). We expect all waste forms produced from any supplemental technology to: (1) perform over the specified time period as well as, or better than WTP vitrified waste; (2) be equally protective of the environment as WTP glass; (3) meet LDR [land disposal restrictions] requirements for hazardous waste constituents; (4) meet or exceed all appropriate performance requirements for glass, including those identified in the WTP contract, Immobilized Low Activity Waste (ILAW) Interface Control Documents, and ILAW Performance Assessment.

- The 2009 *Draft* and 2011 *Preliminary Final TC & WM EIS* indicated that the environmental performance of the grouted waste form would not meet required standards and that grout actually performed the worst of all the supplemental treatment options considered.
- In 2012, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued a report, *Technical Evaluation Report for the Revised Performance Assessment for the Saltstone Disposal Facility at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina*, exposing issues related to long-term performance of the resulting waste form.

Based on this history and the results of this *Final TC & WM EIS*, no further consideration of grout or cast stone is warranted.

Cost Comparisons:

We believe that credible cost comparisons have been made in a number of documents and that all current data, including that in this EIS, do not demonstrate marked cost reductions, nor have our experiences with other technologies (bulk vitrification) at Hanford demonstrated significant cost reductions. The cost information is included in the following:

- In the mid-1990s, recognizing the broad-based public concern about grout and the potential for LAW vitrification at costs that appeared similar to those for grout on a grand scale, Washington State opted for vitrification when negotiating a new set of milestones for tank waste treatment. In return, Washington agreed to DOE’s desire to delay construction of the Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant [the treatment plant prior to the WTP] for budgetary reasons and other DOE sites competing for the same resources.

- DOE's 2003 report, *Assessment of Low-Activity Waste (LAW) Treatment and Disposal Scenarios for the River Protection Project (RPP)*, did not show a favorable grout waste treatment cost estimate.
- DOE's 2007 report, *Hanford River Protection Project Low Activity Waste Treatment: A Business Case Evaluation*, examined the cost and viability of implementing cast stone, bulk vitrification, and steam reforming waste treatment. The report stated that "cost differences between Business Cases 2 through 7 are unlikely to be the major factor in selecting a supplemental LAW technology."

In the report, all the technologies were cost neutral when compared to each other and to ILAW glass. The report went on to comment on the added time and cost that would be required to bring the supplemental technologies up to the technology readiness level of ILAW glass.

- The 2009 *Draft* and 2011 *Preliminary Final TC & WM EIS*, which have gone through extensive DOE and external review, indicate that the costs are relatively equivalent for ILAW glass and grouted LAW approaches.

Summary of Important History of Tank Waste Treatment:

This summary provides select relevant history on issues related to Hanford tank waste treatment that should be considered before the *TC & WM EIS* decision on supplemental treatment is finalized in the ROD.

- The 1996 *TWRS EIS*, which Ecology coauthored with DOE, resulted in a ROD that committed to some important actions, including the following:
 - Treating all of the tank waste
 - Pretreating and separating the tank waste so that some of the tank HLW can be disposed of in a near-surface landfill, while the remainder is disposed of in a deep geologic repository
 - Vitrifying the pretreated LAW portion prior to near-surface disposal and vitrifying the HLW portion for deep geologic disposal
 - Removing all of the retrievable waste out of the tanks

Because the *TWRS EIS* ROD will be superseded by the *TC & WM EIS* ROD, it is important to the State of Washington that DOE stand by its commitments to these actions.

- In 1997, NRC issued a determination that a portion of Hanford tank waste could be considered waste incidental to reprocessing and, therefore, could be disposed of in a near-surface landfill. The tank waste treatment system for 177 tanks included the following:
 - Solids leaching, complexant destruction, liquid–solids separation, and cesium ion exchange to separate tank waste into HLW and incidental waste fractions
 - Vitrification (glass) for treatment and disposal of the incidental waste fraction

NRC stated that the determination of the proposed LAW fraction as incidental waste is a provisional agreement. If the Hanford tank waste is not managed using a program comparable to the technical basis analyzed in the reference letter, NRC must revisit the waste determination (Paperiello [1997], NRC, to J. Kinzer, DOE). Changing the methods of pretreatment, the

near-surface disposal location, or the form of treatment for LAW from vitrification to something new would invalidate the incidental waste determination, and a new analysis would be necessary.

- Between 2003 and 2006, Washington State agreed to allow DOE to consider alternative supplemental treatment approaches as long as they performed “as good as glass.” DOE stated that its goal was to identify alternative approaches that were faster and cheaper, but still performed just as well as glass. This effort examined many different technologies; however, in the end, no viable approaches have been identified.
- In the Consent Decree settlement that resolved *State of Washington v. Chu*, Civil No. 2:08-cv-05085-FVS, we agreed to the following:
 - A delay in the end of tank waste treatment from 2028 to no later than 2047
 - A delay in final waste removal from SSTs from 2018 to no later than 2040
 - A schedule for supplemental treatment to be online by 2022

As outlined above, the State of Washington asserts that the milestones resulting from these negotiations dictate that supplemental treatment be some form of vitrification.

Secondary Waste from Tank Waste Treatment

This *Final TC & WM EIS* evaluates the impacts of disposing of secondary waste that would result from tank waste treatment. Ecology agrees with DOE that secondary waste from the WTP and from supplemental treatment operations will need additional mitigation before disposal. This assumption is not reflected in (and, in fact, is contradicted by) the current DOE baseline, which does not identify additional mitigation.

The new mitigation section in this final EIS outlines the requirement for treatment standards for the secondary waste. This was an important addition to this EIS. Chapter 7, Section 7.5.2.8, and Appendix M, Section M.5.7.5, discuss a number of options for improving grout performance for secondary waste. At an infiltration rate of 3.5 millimeters per year, lowering the diffusivity for grout by two orders of magnitude (i.e., from 1×10^{-10} to 1×10^{-12} square centimeters per second) would decrease the contribution of Effluent Treatment Facility-generated secondary waste by a factor of 100, thus deleting this waste from the list of dominant contributors to risk.

DOE has not determined what the secondary-waste treatment would be, but DOE and its contractor are evaluating various treatment options. These treatment options should meet at least the performance standard (1×10^{-12} square centimeters per second) identified in this final EIS. This will have to be refined and verified through the risk budget tool mitigation measures required in the IDF permit.

Tank Waste Treatment Flowsheet

In preparing this *Final TC & WM EIS*, some assumptions were made about highly technical issues, such as the tank waste treatment flowsheet, which is a representation of how much of which constituent would end up in which waste form and in what amount.

Certain constituents, such as technetium-99 and iodine-129, are significant risk drivers because they are mobile in the environment and have long half-lives. This final EIS assumes that 20 percent of the iodine-129 from the tank waste would end up in vitrified glass and 80 percent in the grouted secondary waste. The same assumption was made for bulk vitrification glass and the WTP LAW Vitrification Facility waste glass.

Based on review of the *Final TC & WM EIS* contaminant flowsheets for the WTP and bulk vitrification, Ecology has technical concerns with this approach. The design configuration for the WTP indicates that

iodine-129 recycles past the melter multiple times, which leads to a higher retention in the glass and less in the secondary waste. Therefore, Ecology believes the retention rate of iodine-129 in the ILAW glass may be higher than that in the bulk vitrification glass. However, Ecology is aware that there is uncertainty in the actual glass retention results.

Through our cooperating agency interactions, DOE agreed to run a sensitivity analysis to show the information under a different approach. The sensitivity analysis in this *Final TC & WM EIS* shows that if recycling of iodine-129 is as effective as the WTP flowsheets indicate, then the WTP with a Bulk Vitrification Facility alternative would place 80 percent of iodine-129 in secondary waste (a less robust waste form). This can be compared to an alternative that includes a second LAW Vitrification Facility in addition to the WTP, which would place 30 percent of the iodine-129 in secondary waste. This 50 percent difference in capture reinforces Ecology's opinion that choosing Tank Closure Alternative 2B, which would use the WTP and a second LAW Vitrification Facility, would be most protective from a tank waste treatment perspective. This is one more reason that Ecology is supportive of Alternative 2B as the Preferred Alternative.

One key treatment mitigation identified in this final EIS is that both WTP and supplemental treatment must include recycle of key contaminants through the melter systems to maximize the retention of these constituents into the most robust waste forms.

Waste Release

This *Final TC & WM EIS* models contaminant releases from several different types of final waste forms, including the following:

- ILAW glass
- LAW melters (retired and failed)
- Waste in bulk vitrification boxes
- Steam reformed waste
- Grouted LAW from tank waste
- Grouted secondary waste
- Waste left in waste sites
- Grouted waste in the bottom of tanks
- Waste buried directly in landfills
- Waste that has been macroencapsulate

Ecology understands the methods and formulas used for the waste form release calculations (for all waste types). After reviewing the analysis approaches and contaminant release results for the waste forms identified above, Ecology agrees with most of the approaches used. The one area where Ecology has concerns is the steam reforming waste form release rates. Based on the limited test data available, the results in this final EIS may overestimate the contaminant retention in the steam reforming waste form.

Offsite Waste

DOE is decades behind its legal schedule in retrieving tank waste from the SSTs and years behind its legal schedule in completing construction of the WTP. DOE has not even begun treating Hanford's 207 million liters (54.6 million gallons) of tank waste.

Ecology is concerned about DOE maintaining its legal schedule for contact-handled TRU waste shipments for disposal at WIPP. Additionally, it is essential that DOE proceed with planning and development of a remote-handled TRU waste facility.

Large areas of Hanford's soil and groundwater are contaminated, and many of these areas will likely remain contaminated for generations to come, even after final cleanup remedies have been instituted.

In light of the current issues associated with a deep geologic disposal facility and DOE's attempt to terminate the Yucca Mountain program, it is unclear when close to 60 percent of the nation's HLW and more than 90 percent of the nation's defense-related SNF will leave the state of Washington.

Washington State is aware that, under DOE's plans, more curies of radioactivity would leave Hanford (in the form of vitrified HLW and processed TRU waste) than would be added to Hanford through proposed offsite-waste disposal. However, based on the current lack of waste movement from Hanford, the current state of Hanford's cleanup, and the analysis in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, Washington objects to the disposal at Hanford of additional wastes that have been generated from beyond Hanford.

As the *Draft* and *Final TC & WM EISs* show, disposal at Hanford of the proposed offsite waste would significantly increase groundwater impacts to beyond acceptable levels. Such disposal would add to the risk term at Hanford today, at a time when progress on reducing the bulk of Hanford's existing risk term has yet to be realized. DOE should take a conservative approach to ensure that the impact of proposed offsite-waste disposal, when added to other existing Hanford risks, does not result in exceeding the "reasonable expectation" standard of DOE's own performance objectives (DOE Manual 435.1-1, Section IV.P(1)) and of other environmental standards (e.g., drinking water standards). The additional analysis in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, including the mitigation section, clearly indicates that eliminating offsite-waste disposal at Hanford is the only environmentally appropriate action.

Washington State supports a "no offsite-waste disposal" alternative as the Preferred Alternative in this *Final TC & WM EIS*, to be adopted in a ROD. DOE should forgo offsite-waste disposal at Hanford (subject to the exceptions in the current *State of Washington v. Bodman* Settlement Agreement).

Waste Disposal Location Alternatives

Ecology agrees with DOE that a preferred alternative utilizing IDF-East appears better for long-term disposal of waste than locating the IDF in the 200-West Area (IDF-West) because of the faster rate of groundwater flow in the 200-East Area.

Climate Change

Additional qualitative discussion of the potential effects of climate change on human health, erosion, water resources, air quality, ecological resources, and environmental justice has been added to Chapter 6 of this final EIS. Additional discussion of the types of regional climate change that could be expected has also been added to Chapter 6, Section 6.5.2, Global Climate Change. Appendix V has also been expanded. In the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, Appendix V focused on the potential impacts of a rising water table from a proposed Black Rock Reservoir. Following the retraction of this proposal, the focus of Appendix V was changed to analysis of potential impacts of infiltration increases resulting from climate change under three different scenarios.

Vadose Zone Modeling

This *Final TC & WM EIS* uses the STOMP [Subsurface Transport Over Multiple Phases] modeling code for vadose zone modeling. Based on its current review, Ecology believes that the Hanford parameters used with this code are adequate for the purposes served by this EIS. Ecology notes that the *TC & WM EIS* STOMP modeling code parameters are based on a regional scale and may need to be adjusted for site-specific closure decisions or other Hanford assessments. Use of STOMP in other assessments requires careful technical review and consideration of site-specific parameters. Ecology supports the process that DOE used for the Waste Management Area C performance assessment workshops in determining appropriate site-specific parameters. These workshops included a broad level of participation with other agencies, tribal nations, and stakeholders.

Risk Assessment and Cumulative Impacts

This *Final TC & WM EIS* evaluates risk under the alternatives and in the cumulative impact analyses. The risk assessment modeling presented in this final EIS should not be interpreted as a Hanford sitewide comprehensive human health and ecological risk assessment, applied to the river corridor or other specific

Hanford areas. Specific Hanford areas will require unique site parameters that are applicable to that area's specific use.

This *Final TC & WM EIS* presents an evaluation of the cumulative environmental impacts of treatment and disposal of wastes at Hanford. The cumulative impact analyses allow DOE to consider the impacts of all cleanup actions it has taken or plans to take at Hanford.

Cumulative Risk Evaluation Tool

This *Final TC & WM EIS* indicates that Hanford's Central Plateau remediation is going to be a difficult balancing of the risks from many contamination sources. This final EIS also points out the need to make cleanup and mitigation decisions with the cumulative impacts in mind and not in isolation. It is clear from reading this EIS that contamination source remediation across the Central Plateau will have to be gauged against a tool that evaluates cumulative risks as they are determined. Another DOE document, *Status of Hanford Site Risk Assessment Integration, FY2005* (DOE/RL-2005-37), stated that the groundwater and the Columbia River are natural accumulation points for impacts from multiple sources. A comprehensive risk assessment capability is necessary to address the cumulative impacts on these resources. The proposed acceptable risk left in an individual site will have to be evaluated against such a cumulative evaluation tool prior to making final decisions. For this and other reasons, a significantly detailed mitigation action plan is required by this NEPA process. From the standpoint of SEPA, the plan will have to point to requirements in the TPA to drive the required mitigation actions and their integration. Ecology will work with DOE to incorporate new TPA requirements to accomplish the following:

- Comprehensively and transparently transfer the working files, vadose zone and groundwater modeling framework, and quality assurance and quality control requirements to the appropriate site contractor and responsible DOE agent to serve as the basis for all future modeling.
- Develop a work plan for continuing this modeling for the purpose of making overall Central Plateau risk decisions and site-specific remedial decisions.
- Identify a gap analysis to highlight areas that are currently not being addressed by a risk evaluation.
- Develop a Central Plateau cumulative risk evaluation tool.
- Develop site-specific risk assessments that are integrated with the Central Plateau cumulative risk evaluation tool.

Without these requirements and implementation of such future risk evaluation tools, future Hanford remediation has the potential to be random at best and not protective, as well as, in some places, to re-contaminate groundwater and vadose zone areas that have been remediated.

VII. Noteworthy Areas of Agreement

Ecology and DOE have discussed and reached agreement on the following significant issues and parameters for the purposes of this *Final TC & WM EIS*:

- Tank waste must be retrieved from tanks and immobilized.
- Secondary waste will need to be mitigated in waste forms that are more protective than grout to provide adequate protection.
- The best location for the IDF is in the 200-East Area.

- Waste from the tanks needs to be removed to the maximum extent possible.
- In many cases, vadose zone contamination under the tank farms will have to be mitigated to be protective of the groundwater and the Columbia River.
- Remediation of problematic soil contamination in the Central Plateau will be needed to limit further groundwater impacts; this would include development of vadose zone remediation methods.
- Eliminating or limiting offsite waste disposal at Hanford is the only legitimate approach.
- The manner in which DOE presents groundwater data and information (i.e., with graphics).
- The quality assurance requirements that DOE and Ecology identified in the *State of Washington v. Bodman* Settlement Agreement.
- The *Technical Guidance Document for Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement Vadose Zone and Groundwater Revised Analyses* agreement, which focused on parameters shown to be important in groundwater analysis.
- The location of calculation points for contaminant concentrations in groundwater.
- The use of tank farm closure descriptions and alternatives analysis.
- The use of tank waste treatment descriptions and alternatives analysis.
- Inclusion of the US Ecology Commercial LLW Radioactive Waste Disposal Site and the cocooned reactors transported to the Central Plateau in the comprehensive cumulative impacts assessment.
- Overall modeling approaches for vadose zone and groundwater.
- The use of modeling assumptions for the double-shell tanks.
- Alternatives assumptions about how processes would treat existing wastes and generate other wastes during treatment processes, and how DOE would dispose of all of the wastes.
- The methods for evaluating and using waste inventory data.
- Release mechanisms for contaminants from various waste forms.
- An alternative in this *Final TC & WM EIS* that evaluates the impacts of treating and disposing of all tank waste and residue to meet the RCRA/Hazardous Waste Management Act HLW treatment standard of vitrification.
- The inventory assumptions used for the pre-1970 burial grounds.

Ecology's agreement on these issues and parameters is specifically for the purposes of this *Final TC & WM EIS* and is based on Ecology's current knowledge and best professional judgment.

***Final Tank Closure and Waste Management
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Hanford Site, Richland, Washington
(Final TC & WM EIS)***

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 10
Foreword**

After receiving the EPA comments on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) wrote to the EPA, inviting the EPA to be a cooperating agency in the development of this *Final TC & WM EIS*. The two agencies signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) in April 2011 to formalize the EPA's involvement as a cooperating agency and to define each agency's roles and responsibilities in the preparation of this final EIS. Prior to entering into the MOU, the EPA participated in two meetings organized by DOE, in April and October of 2010, to discuss the EPA's comments on the draft EIS and DOE's preliminary plans to address them.

The EPA was not involved in the development of the preliminary final EIS beyond the April and October 2010 meetings. When preliminary final EIS documents were released for review in August 2011, the limited timeframes for review necessitated our focused review on DOE's draft responses to the EPA's draft EIS comments and issues that the EPA considered important to address in this final EIS. This Foreword, therefore, reflects only a limited review of the preliminary and draft final EIS documents. Based on our limited review, the EPA has the following concerns regarding this *Final TC & WM EIS*:

Tank Closure and Waste Management

The EPA notes that the results of analyses of all Tank Closure alternatives in the preliminary and draft final EISs, including DOE's Preferred Alternative for tank closure, Tank Closure Alternative 2B, predict sustained release of contaminants to the environment, particularly to the vadose zone and to groundwater within the EIS analysis area. While we recognize the technical challenges associated with analyzing and addressing this problem, and that there are multiple sources of contaminants over time, we remain concerned about the potential impacts of sustained contaminant release to the vadose zone in the study area and migration to groundwater. We understand that the models used in this EIS to analyze impacts were developed in a process that included peer review. However, present and future users of the models should be aware of any limitations of the models, and assumptions employed in these analyses. We agree with statements in the preliminary and draft final EISs stating that, "these models are complex and rely on assumptions that are subject to a large degree of uncertainty...." At present, we collectively do not have enough information to accurately predict how various contaminants migrate through soils and groundwater, nor when peak groundwater impacts will occur. However, the best site-specific data should be incorporated into the assumptions, especially when the models are being used to inform site-specific decisions.

The EPA will continue to coordinate with DOE and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) to address contamination issues through our relevant authorities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA); Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA); and Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order, also known as the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). The TPA currently identifies groundwater in the study area as an operable unit, which will be addressed under CERCLA.

The EPA's comments on the preliminary final EIS addressed the relationship of this EIS to permitting requirements of Ecology's authorized dangerous waste program. We appreciate the changes made to this final EIS in response. The EPA believes that this EIS can serve as a set of bounding analyses reasonably expected to reflect the environmental performance requirements that Ecology may

establish through the permitting process. In this context, the EPA would support an approach to tank closure that includes landfill and clean closure components analyzed in this EIS. The EPA will continue to work closely with Ecology in support of that agency's authorized dangerous waste permitting program.

Secondary- and Offsite-Waste Disposal

This final EIS indicates that disposal of secondary and offsite waste on site at Hanford would continue to show significant impacts of the release of technetium-99 into the vadose zone and groundwater. To prevent additional contamination of the vadose zone and groundwater from such disposal, DOE will need to establish waste acceptance criteria and appropriate treatment technologies to reduce or immobilize contaminants in the wastes, primarily technetium-99 and iodine-129. For example, the steam reforming waste performance is still associated with a high degree of uncertainty, suggesting that steam reforming technology remains immature and requires more improvements. Similarly, iodine-129 is very volatile and cannot be easily converted to immobilized low-activity waste glass.

Next Steps

The EPA's role and responsibilities as a cooperating agency in the development of this final EIS are distinct from its obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, which require the EPA to review and comment in writing on the environmental impacts of major Federal actions, including actions that are the subject of draft and final EISs under NEPA. The EPA intends to carry out this independent authority in a review of the publicly released version of this final EIS. In addition, the EPA's role as a cooperating agency is separate from, and not intended to duplicate or replace the EPA's regulatory roles, including those under RCRA, CERCLA, and the TPA. We will continue to carry out these responsibilities in coordination with other agencies as appropriate.

***Final Tank Closure and Waste Management
Environmental Impact Statement for the
Hanford Site, Richland, Washington
(Final TC & WM EIS)***

**U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)
Foreword**

DOE appreciates the efforts of the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 10, which participated as cooperating agencies in the preparation of this *TC & WM EIS*. Although each had different roles as cooperating agencies, their involvement improved the quality of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for this environmental impact statement (EIS).

Ecology began participating in the EIS development as a cooperating agency in 2002 and reconfirmed their participation in 2006 after signing the January 6, 2006, Settlement Agreement (*State of Washington v. Bodman*, Civil No. 2:03-cv-05018-AAM) (subsequently amended on June 5, 2008) ending litigation on the January 2004 *Final Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement, Richland, Washington*. Ecology's participation as a cooperating agency was important, among other things, to ensure that this *TC & WM EIS* meets Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements. As a result of the 2006 Settlement Agreement, Ecology accepted additional responsibilities under a concurrent revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to conduct quality assurance reviews of the groundwater and other technical analyses. Ecology also independently ran the models used in this EIS and verified DOE's results. Ecology's role as a cooperating agency supporting SEPA requirements is different from its role under the Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (also known as the Tri-Party Agreement [TPA]) or its role in implementing Washington State's Hazardous Waste Program at the Hanford Site. More-detailed information on Ecology's role can be found in the cooperating agency agreements in Appendix C, Section C.1.1, of this *Final TC & WM EIS*.

DOE appreciates Ecology's support in the development of this EIS and its participation in all the scoping meetings, public hearings on the *Draft TC & WM EIS*, and stakeholder interactions, as well as its support of the EIS schedule. This EIS is needed to support NEPA and SEPA decisions related to the TPA and 2010 Consent Decree (*State of Washington v. Chu*, Civil No. 2:08-cv-05085-FVS) milestone commitments. DOE also appreciates the efforts made by Ecology to understand the inventory, input assumptions, modeling results, and uncertainty analyses and to conduct the quality assurance reviews, contribute to analysis development, assist in presentation of analyses, and participate jointly in public involvement activities. Ecology has expressed both substantial areas of agreement and some areas of disagreement with DOE's Preferred Alternative selections in its foreword to this *Final TC & WM EIS*, consistent with the opportunity afforded to them under the provisions of the *TC & WM EIS* MOU between Ecology and DOE. For its part, DOE understands the state's perspective and will continue to work with them on the path forward at the Hanford Site.

Ecology's comments on the draft EIS can be found in the Comment-Response Document (CRD) (Volume 3 of this final EIS), Section 3, commentor number 498. Ecology and DOE have identified the need for additional secondary-waste-form development (see Chapter 7, Section 7.5.2.8, and Appendix M, Section M.5.7.5). Ecology has also focused on closure of the single-shell tanks; specifically, in Waste Management Area C. More-detailed information on Ecology's permitting process in relation to the NEPA actions can be found in Section 7.1.

DOE invited EPA to be a cooperating agency in 2002 and to participate in model development in 2006 after the January 6, 2006, Settlement Agreement was signed. EPA was not able to participate as a cooperating agency until 2010. Information on EPA's role as a cooperating agency can be found in Appendix C, Section C.1.2.

EPA's comments on the draft EIS as part of their responsibility under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and DOE's responses can be found in the CRD, Section 3, commentor number 509, of this final EIS. DOE has made changes to this final EIS as a result of EPA's specific comments. EPA's foreword to this EIS indicates a limited timeframe for review of this final EIS. DOE appreciates EPA's focus on DOE's responses to their comments on the draft EIS.

EPA expressed concern regarding the impacts of sustained releases under Tank Closure Alternative 2B. To address this concern, DOE has added information regarding Alternative 2B to Chapter 5, Section 5.1.1.3.4, showing the potential impacts when discharges from the CERCLA [Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act] cribs and trenches (ditches) are excluded. This was done to more clearly show the impacts of the proposed actions separate from the impacts attributed to the adjacent CERCLA cribs and trenches (ditches). For example, Figure 5-87 shows the hydrogen-3 (tritium) results under Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 3 (Case 3 excludes cribs and trenches [ditches]), indicating that the tritium concentrations peak two to four orders of magnitude below the benchmark in this case, which highlights that the primary concentration of tritium originates from discharges to cribs and trenches (ditches). In addition, the CRD, Section 2.7, discusses impacts of alternatives based on whether a proposed action being evaluated has occurred, and how mitigation strategies and environmental compliance vary based on those factors.

EPA had comments regarding the EIS modeling that was developed as an outcome of the 2006 Settlement Agreement. DOE believes that its detailed responses to EPA's comments on this specific issue address this EPA concern. EPA also expressed concern about DOE's disclosure of uncertainty relative to future use of the model. DOE believes that discussion of uncertainty, comparison of model results to field data, and disclosure of data and model limitations are important aspects of the analysis presented in this final EIS, as required under NEPA. More-specific discussion on this point can be found in the CRD, Section 2.4. In addition, the groundwater model development process was reviewed by a Technical Review Group (TRG). The TRG was formed to evaluate conversion of the groundwater model from previous models used on site (see the Summary, Section S.1.4.1, and Chapter 1, Section 1.6.1.2). For more information, the report titled *MODFLOW Flow-Field Development: Technical Review Group Process and Results Report*, dated November 2007, can be found on the *TC & WM EIS* website at <http://www.hanford.gov/index.cfm?page=1117&>.

Table of Contents

List of Figures	xxiv
List of Tables	xcii
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	cxiii
Measurement Units	cxix
Conversions.....	cxx
Chapter 1 Proposed Actions: Background, Purpose and Need	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-1
1.2 Background	1-2
1.2.1 Hanford Regulatory Compliance Requirements	1-3
1.2.2 <i>Tank Waste Remediation System Environmental Impact Statement</i> and Record of Decision	1-4
1.2.3 Developments Since Issuing the <i>Tank Waste Remediation System Environmental Impact Statement</i> Record of Decision.....	1-5
1.2.4 Formal Evaluations of the Tank Waste Remediation Program.....	1-7
1.2.5 Fast Flux Test Facility Deactivation Decision and Record of Decision/Environmental Impact Statement for Deactivation Decision	1-9
1.2.6 <i>Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement</i> and Record of Decision	1-10
1.2.7 Developments Since Issuing the <i>Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement</i> Record of Decision.....	1-10
1.3 Purpose and Need for Agency Action.....	1-12
1.4 Decisions and Regulatory Framework	1-12
1.4.1 Decisions to Be Made	1-12
1.4.2 Decisions Not to Be Made	1-14
1.5 Scoping Process and Development of the <i>TC & WM EIS</i> Alternatives	1-16
1.6 Public Comments on the Proposed <i>TC & WM EIS</i> Scope	1-16
1.6.1 Public Meetings and Issues Identified During the <i>TC & WM EIS</i> Scoping Process	1-17
1.6.1.1 Public Meetings.....	1-17
1.6.1.2 Issues Identified During the <i>TC & WM EIS</i> Scoping Process.....	1-17
1.6.2 Public Meetings and Issues Identified During the “Tank Closure EIS” Scoping Process	1-18
1.6.2.1 Public Meetings.....	1-19
1.6.2.2 Issues Identified During the “Tank Closure EIS” Scoping Process.....	1-19
1.6.3 Public Meetings and Issues Identified During the “FFTF Decommissioning EIS” Scoping Process	1-21
1.6.3.1 Public Meetings.....	1-21
1.6.3.2 Issues Identified During the “FFTF Decommissioning EIS” Scoping Process.....	1-22
1.7 Public Hearings on the <i>Draft TC & WM EIS</i>	1-24
1.8 Changes Since the <i>Draft TC & WM EIS</i> Publication	1-25
1.8.1 Revisions to Preferred Alternative Discussion	1-25
1.8.2 Supplement Analysis of the <i>Draft TC & WM EIS</i>	1-25
1.8.3 Changes Made to the <i>Draft TC & WM EIS</i>	1-26
1.8.3.1 Changes to Methods of Analysis, Alternatives, or Impact Analyses	1-26
1.8.3.2 Updates to Technical Data, Additions, and Editorial Revisions	1-29

1.9	Alternatives Evaluated in this <i>TC & WM EIS</i>	1-29
1.9.1	Tank Closure Alternatives	1-29
1.9.1.1	Tank Closure Alternative 1: No Action.....	1-29
1.9.1.2	Tank Closure Alternative 2: Implement the <i>Tank Waste Remediation System EIS</i> Record of Decision with Modifications.....	1-30
1.9.1.3	Tank Closure Alternative 3: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technology; Landfill Closure	1-31
1.9.1.4	Tank Closure Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	1-33
1.9.1.5	Tank Closure Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	1-34
1.9.1.6	Tank Closure Alternative 6: All Waste as Vitrified HLW	1-35
1.9.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives.....	1-36
1.9.2.1	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1: No Action	1-36
1.9.2.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2: Entombment	1-37
1.9.2.3	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3: Removal	1-38
1.9.3	Waste Management Alternatives	1-38
1.9.3.1	Waste Management Alternative 1: No Action	1-39
1.9.3.2	Waste Management Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	1-39
1.9.3.3	Waste Management Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	1-39
1.10	Related NEPA Reviews	1-40
1.11	Structure of this <i>TC & WM EIS</i>	1-50
1.12	References	1-52
Chapter 2 Proposed Actions and Alternatives		2-1
2.1	Introduction	2-1
2.2	Hanford Tank Farm System Closure Actions	2-3
2.2.1	Tank Farm Operations and Facilities.....	2-5
2.2.1.1	Single-Shell Tanks	2-9
2.2.1.2	Double-Shell Tanks.....	2-10
2.2.1.3	DOE River Protection Project	2-11
2.2.2	Proposed Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposal of Tank Waste and Closure of the Single-Shell Tank System	2-12
2.2.2.1	Waste Retrieval and Storage	2-15
2.2.2.2	Waste Treatment.....	2-23
2.2.2.3	Waste Disposal.....	2-31
2.2.2.4	Tank System Closure and Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning.....	2-33
2.3	Fast Flux Test Facility Decommissioning Actions	2-39
2.3.1	Decommissioning of Fast Flux Test Facility and Auxiliary Buildings.....	2-41
2.3.1.1	Reactor Containment Building.....	2-41
2.3.1.2	Reactor Support and Auxiliary Buildings	2-42
2.3.2	Deactivation Activities	2-43
2.3.3	Proposed Fast Flux Test Facility and Auxiliary Building Disposition Activities	2-44
2.3.3.1	Facility Disposition	2-44
2.3.3.2	Disposition of Remote-Handled Special Components	2-45

Table of Contents

	2.3.3.3	Sodium Processing	2-47
2.4		Solid Waste Management Actions	2-51
	2.4.1	Existing Solid Waste Operations Complex.....	2-51
	2.4.1.1	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Burial Grounds	2-51
	2.4.1.2	Central Waste Complex.....	2-51
	2.4.1.3	T Plant	2-55
	2.4.1.4	Waste Receiving and Processing Facility.....	2-55
	2.4.1.5	Integrated Disposal Facility.....	2-56
	2.4.1.6	Solid Waste Operations Complex Process Flow	2-56
	2.4.2	Proposed Solid Waste Management Activities.....	2-57
	2.4.2.1	Use of Existing Low-Level Radioactive Waste Burial Grounds	2-57
	2.4.2.2	Expanded Central Waste Complex, T Plant, and Waste Receiving and Packaging Facility	2-58
	2.4.2.3	Integrated Disposal Facility.....	2-58
	2.4.2.4	River Protection Project Disposal Facility	2-58
	2.4.2.5	Closure of Integrated Disposal Facility and River Protection Project Disposal Facility	2-59
2.5		Description of the Alternatives	2-59
	2.5.1	Development of the Alternatives	2-61
	2.5.1.1	Tank Closure Alternatives.....	2-61
	2.5.1.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives	2-63
	2.5.1.3	Waste Management Alternatives.....	2-64
	2.5.2	Tank Closure Alternatives	2-65
	2.5.2.1	Tank Closure Alternative 1: No Action.....	2-66
	2.5.2.2	Tank Closure Alternative 2: Implement the <i>Tank Waste Remediation System EIS</i> Record of Decision with Modifications.....	2-67
	2.5.2.3	Tank Closure Alternative 3: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technology; Landfill Closure	2-75
	2.5.2.4	Tank Closure Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	2-87
	2.5.2.5	Tank Closure Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	2-91
	2.5.2.6	Tank Closure Alternative 6: All Waste as Vitrified HLW	2-95
	2.5.3	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives.....	2-107
	2.5.3.1	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1: No Action	2-107
	2.5.3.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2: Entombment	2-109
	2.5.3.3	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3: Removal	2-113
	2.5.4	Waste Management Alternatives	2-116
	2.5.4.1	Waste Management Alternative 1: No Action	2-118
	2.5.4.2	Waste Management Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only	2-120
	2.5.4.3	Waste Management Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	2-123
2.6		Technologies and Options Considered But Not Evaluated in Detail	2-126
	2.6.1	Tank Closure.....	2-126
	2.6.2	Fast Flux Test Facility	2-129
	2.6.3	Waste Management.....	2-130
	2.6.4	The Oregon Proposal	2-130

2.7	Comparison of Alternatives	2-131
2.7.1	Tank Closure Alternatives	2-131
2.7.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives	2-137
2.7.3	Waste Management Alternatives	2-139
2.7.4	Uncertainties	2-142
2.8	Summary of Short-Term Environmental Impacts	2-145
2.8.1	Tank Closure Alternatives: Short-Term Environmental Impacts	2-145
2.8.1.1	Land Resources	2-145
2.8.1.2	Infrastructure	2-146
2.8.1.3	Noise and Vibration.....	2-147
2.8.1.4	Air Quality.....	2-147
2.8.1.5	Geology and Soils	2-148
2.8.1.6	Water Resources.....	2-149
2.8.1.7	Ecological Resources	2-149
2.8.1.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	2-150
2.8.1.9	Socioeconomics.....	2-150
2.8.1.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Normal Operations	2-151
2.8.1.11	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Facility Accidents	2-153
2.8.1.12	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation.....	2-153
2.8.1.13	Environmental Justice	2-154
2.8.1.14	Waste Management	2-154
2.8.1.15	Industrial Safety	2-158
2.8.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives: Short-Term Environmental Impacts.....	2-173
2.8.2.1	Land Resources	2-173
2.8.2.2	Infrastructure	2-173
2.8.2.3	Noise and Vibration.....	2-174
2.8.2.4	Air Quality.....	2-174
2.8.2.5	Geology and Soils	2-175
2.8.2.6	Water Resources.....	2-176
2.8.2.7	Ecological Resources	2-177
2.8.2.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	2-177
2.8.2.9	Socioeconomics.....	2-177
2.8.2.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Normal Operations	2-178
2.8.2.11	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Facility Accidents	2-179
2.8.2.12	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation.....	2-179
2.8.2.13	Environmental Justice	2-180
2.8.2.14	Waste Management	2-180
2.8.2.15	Industrial Safety	2-181
2.8.3	Waste Management Alternatives: Short-Term Environmental Impacts	2-190
2.8.3.1	Land Resources	2-190
2.8.3.2	Infrastructure	2-190
2.8.3.3	Noise and Vibration.....	2-191
2.8.3.4	Air Quality.....	2-191
2.8.3.5	Geology and Soils	2-192
2.8.3.6	Water Resources.....	2-193
2.8.3.7	Ecological Resources	2-194
2.8.3.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	2-194

Table of Contents

	2.8.3.9	Socioeconomics.....	2-195
	2.8.3.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Normal Operations	2-195
	2.8.3.11	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Facility Accidents.....	2-196
	2.8.3.12	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation.....	2-197
	2.8.3.13	Environmental Justice	2-197
	2.8.3.14	Waste Management	2-198
	2.8.3.15	Industrial Safety	2-198
2.9	Summary	of Long-Term Environmental Impacts	2-208
	2.9.1	Tank Closure Alternatives: Long-Term Environmental Impacts.....	2-208
		2.9.1.1 Water Quality	2-208
		2.9.1.2 Human Health.....	2-221
		2.9.1.3 Ecological Risk.....	2-233
		2.9.1.4 Environmental Justice	2-237
	2.9.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives: Long-Term Environmental Impacts.....	2-237
		2.9.2.1 Water Quality	2-237
		2.9.2.2 Human Health.....	2-240
		2.9.2.3 Ecological Risk.....	2-244
		2.9.2.4 Environmental Justice	2-245
	2.9.3	Waste Management Alternatives: Long-Term Environmental Impacts	2-245
		2.9.3.1 Water Quality	2-245
		2.9.3.2 Human Health.....	2-260
		2.9.3.3 Ecological Risk.....	2-292
		2.9.3.4 Environmental Justice	2-294
2.10	Key Environmental Findings		2-295
	2.10.1	Tank Closure Alternatives	2-295
	2.10.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives.....	2-306
	2.10.3	Waste Management Alternatives	2-307
2.11	Cost of the Alternatives.....		2-312
	2.11.1	Tank Closure Alternatives	2-313
	2.11.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives.....	2-317
	2.11.3	Waste Management Alternatives	2-319
2.12	Preferred Alternatives		2-321
	2.12.1	Tank Closure.....	2-321
	2.12.2	FFTF Decommissioning	2-322
	2.12.3	Waste Management.....	2-322
2.13	References		2-323
Chapter 3 Affected Environment			3-1
3.1	Approach to Defining the Affected Environment		3-1
3.2	Hanford Site		3-1
	3.2.1	Land Resources.....	3-5
		3.2.1.1 Land Use	3-6
		3.2.1.2 Visual Resources	3-10
	3.2.2	Infrastructure.....	3-12
		3.2.2.1 Ground Transportation	3-13
		3.2.2.2 Electricity	3-14
		3.2.2.3 Fuel.....	3-16
		3.2.2.4 Water	3-17
	3.2.3	Noise and Vibration	3-18

	3.2.3.1	General Site Description	3-18
	3.2.3.2	200 Areas Description	3-19
	3.2.3.3	400 Area Description.....	3-19
	3.2.3.4	Borrow Area C Description.....	3-19
3.2.4		Air Quality	3-19
	3.2.4.1	General Site Description	3-19
	3.2.4.2	200 Areas Description	3-26
	3.2.4.3	400 Area Description.....	3-27
	3.2.4.4	Borrow Area C Description.....	3-27
3.2.5		Geology and Soils	3-27
	3.2.5.1	General Site Description	3-27
	3.2.5.2	200 Areas Description	3-37
	3.2.5.3	400 Area Description.....	3-38
	3.2.5.4	Borrow Area C Description.....	3-38
3.2.6		Water Resources	3-38
	3.2.6.1	Surface Water	3-38
	3.2.6.2	Vadose Zone.....	3-46
	3.2.6.3	Groundwater.....	3-49
3.2.7		Ecological Resources	3-56
	3.2.7.1	Terrestrial Resources	3-56
	3.2.7.2	Wetlands.....	3-64
	3.2.7.3	Aquatic Resources	3-66
	3.2.7.4	Threatened and Endangered Species	3-67
3.2.8		Cultural and Paleontological Resources	3-72
	3.2.8.1	Prehistoric Resources	3-73
	3.2.8.2	Historic Resources.....	3-75
	3.2.8.3	American Indian Interests	3-78
	3.2.8.4	Paleontological Resources.....	3-79
3.2.9		Socioeconomics	3-79
	3.2.9.1	Regional Economic Characteristics.....	3-80
	3.2.9.2	Demographic Characteristics.....	3-80
	3.2.9.3	Housing and Community Services	3-81
	3.2.9.4	Local Transportation	3-82
3.2.10		Existing Human Health Risk	3-86
	3.2.10.1	Radiological Exposure and Risk	3-86
	3.2.10.2	Chemical Environment.....	3-89
	3.2.10.3	Health Effects Studies	3-90
	3.2.10.4	Accident History.....	3-92
	3.2.10.5	Emergency Preparedness.....	3-94
3.2.11		Environmental Justice	3-95
	3.2.11.1	Minority Populations.....	3-96
	3.2.11.2	Low-Income Populations	3-105
3.2.12		Waste Management.....	3-111
	3.2.12.1	Waste Inventories and Activities.....	3-111
	3.2.12.2	Waste Minimization	3-119
	3.2.12.3	WM PEIS Records of Decision.....	3-119
3.2.13		Spent Nuclear Fuel.....	3-120
3.3		Idaho National Laboratory	3-121
	3.3.1	Land Resources.....	3-123
	3.3.1.1	Land Use	3-123
	3.3.1.2	Visual Resources	3-126

Table of Contents

3.3.2	Infrastructure.....	3-127
	3.3.2.1 Ground Transportation	3-127
	3.3.2.2 Electricity	3-128
	3.3.2.3 Fuel.....	3-129
	3.3.2.4 Water	3-129
3.3.3	Noise and Vibration.....	3-130
	3.3.3.1 General Site Description	3-130
	3.3.3.2 Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center	3-130
	3.3.3.3 Materials and Fuels Complex.....	3-130
3.3.4	Air Quality	3-130
	3.3.4.1 Nonradioactive Releases	3-131
	3.3.4.2 Radioactive Releases	3-134
3.3.5	Geology and Soils.....	3-135
	3.3.5.1 General Site Description	3-136
	3.3.5.2 Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center	3-142
	3.3.5.3 Materials and Fuels Complex.....	3-142
3.3.6	Water Resources	3-142
	3.3.6.1 Surface Water	3-142
	3.3.6.2 Vadose Zone.....	3-147
	3.3.6.3 Groundwater.....	3-147
3.3.7	Ecological Resources.....	3-152
	3.3.7.1 Terrestrial Resources	3-152
	3.3.7.2 Wetlands.....	3-154
	3.3.7.3 Aquatic Resources.....	3-154
	3.3.7.4 Threatened and Endangered Species	3-155
3.3.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	3-156
	3.3.8.1 Prehistoric Resources	3-157
	3.3.8.2 Historic Resources.....	3-157
	3.3.8.3 American Indian Interests	3-158
	3.3.8.4 Paleontological Resources.....	3-159
3.3.9	Socioeconomics	3-160
	3.3.9.1 Regional Economic Characteristics.....	3-160
	3.3.9.2 Demographic Characteristics.....	3-160
	3.3.9.3 Housing and Community Services	3-161
	3.3.9.4 Local Transportation	3-162
3.3.10	Existing Human Health Risk	3-163
	3.3.10.1 Radiological Exposure and Risk	3-163
	3.3.10.2 Chemical Environment.....	3-166
	3.3.10.3 Health Effect Studies.....	3-167
	3.3.10.4 Accident History.....	3-167
	3.3.10.5 Emergency Preparedness.....	3-169
3.3.11	Environmental Justice.....	3-169
	3.3.11.1 Minority Populations.....	3-169
	3.3.11.2 Low-Income Populations	3-178
3.3.12	Waste Management.....	3-183
	3.3.12.1 Waste Inventories and Activities.....	3-183
	3.3.12.2 Waste Minimization	3-186
	3.3.12.3 <i>WM PEIS</i> Records of Decision.....	3-186
3.4	References	3-187

Chapter 4 Short-Term Environmental Consequences	4-1
4.1 Tank Closure Alternatives.....	4-1
4.1.1 Land Resources.....	4-2
4.1.1.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-6
4.1.1.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-6
4.1.1.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-7
4.1.1.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-8
4.1.1.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-9
4.1.1.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-10
4.1.1.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-10
4.1.1.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-11
4.1.1.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-12
4.1.1.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-14
4.1.1.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-16
4.1.2 Infrastructure.....	4-17
4.1.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-20
4.1.2.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-20
4.1.2.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-21
4.1.2.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-22
4.1.2.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-22
4.1.2.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-23
4.1.2.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/ Landfill Closure.....	4-24
4.1.2.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-25
4.1.2.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-25
4.1.2.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-27
4.1.2.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-28
4.1.3 Noise and Vibration	4-29
4.1.3.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-29

Table of Contents

	4.1.3.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-30
	4.1.3.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-30
	4.1.3.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-30
	4.1.3.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-30
	4.1.3.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-31
	4.1.3.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-31
	4.1.3.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-31
	4.1.3.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-32
	4.1.3.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-32
	4.1.3.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-33
4.1.4	Air Quality	4-33
	4.1.4.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-39
	4.1.4.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-40
	4.1.4.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-41
	4.1.4.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-42
	4.1.4.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-43
	4.1.4.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-44
	4.1.4.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-45
	4.1.4.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-46
	4.1.4.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-47
	4.1.4.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-49
	4.1.4.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-51
4.1.5	Geology and Soils	4-51
	4.1.5.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-55
	4.1.5.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-56
	4.1.5.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-57

	4.1.5.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-58
	4.1.5.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-59
	4.1.5.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-59
	4.1.5.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-60
	4.1.5.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	4-61
	4.1.5.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-62
	4.1.5.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-64
	4.1.5.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-66
4.1.6	Water Resources	4-66
	4.1.6.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-68
	4.1.6.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-68
	4.1.6.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-70
	4.1.6.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-71
	4.1.6.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-72
	4.1.6.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-73
	4.1.6.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-74
	4.1.6.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	4-76
	4.1.6.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-77
	4.1.6.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-79
	4.1.6.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-80
4.1.7	Ecological Resources.....	4-82
	4.1.7.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-82
	4.1.7.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-82
	4.1.7.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-84
	4.1.7.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-86

4.1.7.5	Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-87
4.1.7.6	Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-88
4.1.7.7	Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-89
4.1.7.8	Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-91
4.1.7.9	Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-92
4.1.7.10	Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-94
4.1.7.11	Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-96
4.1.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	4-97
4.1.8.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-97
4.1.8.2	Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-98
4.1.8.3	Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-99
4.1.8.4	Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-100
4.1.8.5	Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-101
4.1.8.6	Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-101
4.1.8.7	Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-102
4.1.8.8	Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-103
4.1.8.9	Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-104
4.1.8.10	Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-105
4.1.8.11	Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-107
4.1.9	Socioeconomics	4-107
4.1.9.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-109
4.1.9.2	Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-110
4.1.9.3	Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-113
4.1.9.4	Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-115
4.1.9.5	Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-117

4.1.9.6	Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-118
4.1.9.7	Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-119
4.1.9.8	Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	4-122
4.1.9.9	Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-124
4.1.9.10	Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-127
4.1.9.11	Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-130
4.1.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Normal Operations	4-132
4.1.10.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-134
4.1.10.2	Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-135
4.1.10.3	Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-137
4.1.10.4	Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-139
4.1.10.5	Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-141
4.1.10.6	Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-143
4.1.10.7	Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-145
4.1.10.8	Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	4-147
4.1.10.9	Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-149
4.1.10.10	Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-153
4.1.10.11	Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-158
4.1.10.12	Worker Chemical Risks.....	4-159
4.1.11	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Facility Accidents.....	4-160
4.1.11.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-160
4.1.11.2	Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-161
4.1.11.3	Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-165
4.1.11.4	Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-167
4.1.11.5	Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-169
4.1.11.6	Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure	4-172

	4.1.11.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-175
	4.1.11.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-177
	4.1.11.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-180
	4.1.11.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-182
	4.1.11.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-184
	4.1.11.12 Intentional Destructive Acts	4-186
4.1.12	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation	4-187
	4.1.12.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-191
	4.1.12.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-191
	4.1.12.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-192
	4.1.12.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-193
	4.1.12.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-194
	4.1.12.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-195
	4.1.12.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-195
	4.1.12.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-196
	4.1.12.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-197
	4.1.12.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-198
	4.1.12.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-199
4.1.13	Environmental Justice	4-200
	4.1.13.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-200
	4.1.13.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-201
	4.1.13.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-202
	4.1.13.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-204
	4.1.13.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-205
	4.1.13.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-206
	4.1.13.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-208

	4.1.13.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	4-209
	4.1.13.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-210
	4.1.13.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-213
	4.1.13.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-216
4.1.14	Waste Management.....	4-217
	4.1.14.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-224
	4.1.14.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-227
	4.1.14.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-229
	4.1.14.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-232
	4.1.14.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-235
	4.1.14.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-238
	4.1.14.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-241
	4.1.14.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	4-244
	4.1.14.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-247
	4.1.14.10 Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-251
	4.1.14.11 Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-255
4.1.15	Industrial Safety	4-258
	4.1.15.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-261
	4.1.15.2 Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure	4-261
	4.1.15.3 Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	4-261
	4.1.15.4 Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	4-261
	4.1.15.5 Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure	4-262
	4.1.15.6 Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	4-262
	4.1.15.7 Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	4-262
	4.1.15.8 Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	4-262
	4.1.15.9 Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure	4-262

	4.1.15.10	Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	4-262
	4.1.15.11	Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure.....	4-263
4.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives		4-263
	4.2.1	Land Resources.....	4-264
		4.2.1.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-264
		4.2.1.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-266
		4.2.1.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-268
	4.2.2	Infrastructure.....	4-270
		4.2.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-272
		4.2.2.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-272
		4.2.2.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-274
	4.2.3	Noise and Vibration	4-275
		4.2.3.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-276
		4.2.3.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-276
		4.2.3.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-277
	4.2.4	Air Quality	4-278
		4.2.4.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-281
		4.2.4.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-281
		4.2.4.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-284
	4.2.5	Geology and Soils	4-286
		4.2.5.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-286
		4.2.5.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-288
		4.2.5.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-291
	4.2.6	Water Resources	4-292
		4.2.6.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-292
		4.2.6.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-293
		4.2.6.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-296
	4.2.7	Ecological Resources.....	4-297
		4.2.7.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-297
		4.2.7.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-298
		4.2.7.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-301
	4.2.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	4-303
		4.2.8.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-303
		4.2.8.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-304
		4.2.8.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-308
	4.2.9	Socioeconomics	4-310
		4.2.9.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-310
		4.2.9.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-311
		4.2.9.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-313
	4.2.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Normal Operations	4-315
		4.2.10.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-315
		4.2.10.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-317
		4.2.10.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-320
	4.2.11	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Facility Accidents.....	4-323
		4.2.11.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-324
		4.2.11.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-327
		4.2.11.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-332
		4.2.11.4 Intentional Destructive Acts	4-333
	4.2.12	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation	4-333
		4.2.12.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-335

*Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the
Hanford Site, Richland, Washington*

	4.2.12.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-336
	4.2.12.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-340
4.2.13	Environmental Justice	4-342
	4.2.13.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-342
	4.2.13.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-344
	4.2.13.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-351
4.2.14	Waste Management.....	4-352
	4.2.14.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-354
	4.2.14.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-354
	4.2.14.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-357
4.2.15	Industrial Safety	4-358
	4.2.15.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-360
	4.2.15.2 Alternative 2: Entombment	4-360
	4.2.15.3 Alternative 3: Removal	4-361
4.3	Waste Management Alternatives	4-362
4.3.1	Land Resources.....	4-362
	4.3.1.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-362
	4.3.1.2 Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-363
	4.3.1.3 Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-365
4.3.2	Infrastructure.....	4-367
	4.3.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-369
	4.3.2.2 Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-369
	4.3.2.3 Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-371
4.3.3	Noise and Vibration	4-372
	4.3.3.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-372
	4.3.3.2 Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-372
	4.3.3.3 Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-373
4.3.4	Air Quality	4-373
	4.3.4.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-377
	4.3.4.2 Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-378
	4.3.4.3 Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-381
4.3.5	Geology and Soils	4-384
	4.3.5.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-384
	4.3.5.2 Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-386
	4.3.5.3 Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-388
4.3.6	Water Resources	4-390
	4.3.6.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-390
	4.3.6.2 Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-390
	4.3.6.3 Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-393
4.3.7	Ecological Resources	4-394
	4.3.7.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-394
	4.3.7.2 Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-395
	4.3.7.3 Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-397
4.3.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	4-399
	4.3.8.1 Alternative 1: No Action	4-399

Table of Contents

	4.3.8.2	Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-399
	4.3.8.3	Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-401
4.3.9		Socioeconomics	4-402
	4.3.9.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-403
	4.3.9.2	Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-403
	4.3.9.3	Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-405
4.3.10		Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Normal Operations	4-406
	4.3.10.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-407
	4.3.10.2	Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-408
	4.3.10.3	Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-413
4.3.11		Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Facility Accidents.....	4-414
	4.3.11.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-414
	4.3.11.2	Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-417
	4.3.11.3	Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-420
	4.3.11.4	Intentional Destructive Acts	4-420
4.3.12		Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation	4-421
	4.3.12.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-423
	4.3.12.2	Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-424
	4.3.12.3	Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-426
4.3.13		Environmental Justice.....	4-428
	4.3.13.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-428
	4.3.13.2	Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-429
	4.3.13.3	Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-430
4.3.14		Waste Management.....	4-431
	4.3.14.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-432
	4.3.14.2	Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-434
	4.3.14.3	Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-434
4.3.15		Industrial Safety	4-435
	4.3.15.1	Alternative 1: No Action	4-435
	4.3.15.2	Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only.....	4-435
	4.3.15.3	Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	4-438
4.4		Combination of Alternatives	4-438
	4.4.1	Land Resources.....	4-439
		4.4.1.1 Land Use	4-439
		4.4.1.2 Visual Resources	4-441
	4.4.2	Infrastructure.....	4-442
	4.4.3	Air Quality	4-444
	4.4.4	Geology and Soils	4-446
	4.4.5	Water Resources	4-447
	4.4.6	Ecological Resources.....	4-448
		4.4.6.1 Terrestrial Resources	4-448
		4.4.6.2 Wetlands and Aquatic Resources	4-449
		4.4.6.3 Threatened and Endangered Species	4-449

4.4.7	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	4-450
4.4.7.1	Prehistoric Resources	4-450
4.4.7.2	Historic Resources.....	4-450
4.4.7.3	American Indian Interests	4-450
4.4.7.4	Paleontological Resources.....	4-451
4.4.8	Socioeconomics	4-451
4.4.9	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Normal Operations	4-453
4.4.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation	4-456
4.4.11	Environmental Justice.....	4-458
4.4.12	Waste Management.....	4-459
4.4.13	Industrial Safety	4-462
4.5	References	4-464

Chapter 5 Long-Term Environmental Consequences 5-1

5.1	Tank Closure Alternatives.....	5-4
5.1.1	Groundwater	5-4
5.1.1.1	Tank Closure Alternative 1: No Action.....	5-4
5.1.1.2	Tank Closure Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure.....	5-39
5.1.1.3	Tank Closure Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	5-73
5.1.1.4	Tank Closure Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	5-117
5.1.1.5	Tank Closure Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure.....	5-118
5.1.1.6	Tank Closure Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	5-119
5.1.1.7	Tank Closure Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	5-120
5.1.1.8	Tank Closure Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure	5-154
5.1.1.9	Tank Closure Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/No Separations; Clean Closure, Base and Option Cases.....	5-188
5.1.1.10	Tank Closure Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure, Base and Option Cases.....	5-250
5.1.1.11	Tank Closure Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure	5-312
5.1.2	Human Health Impacts	5-313
5.1.2.1	Tank Closure Alternative 1: No Action.....	5-314
5.1.2.2	Tank Closure Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure.....	5-320
5.1.2.3	Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	5-327
5.1.2.4	Tank Closure Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	5-343

	5.1.2.5	Tank Closure Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure.....	5-343
	5.1.2.6	Tank Closure Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	5-343
	5.1.2.7	Tank Closure Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	5-343
	5.1.2.8	Tank Closure Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	5-350
	5.1.2.9	Tank Closure Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/ No Separations; Clean Closure.....	5-356
	5.1.2.10	Tank Closure Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	5-369
	5.1.2.11	Tank Closure Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure	5-382
	5.1.2.12	Tank Closure Intruder Scenario	5-382
5.1.3		Ecological Risk	5-384
	5.1.3.1	Tank Closure Alternative 1: No Action.....	5-384
	5.1.3.2	Tank Closure Alternative 2A: Existing WTP Vitrification; No Closure.....	5-387
	5.1.3.3	Tank Closure Alternative 2B: Expanded WTP Vitrification; Landfill Closure.....	5-387
	5.1.3.4	Tank Closure Alternative 3A: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Bulk Vitrification); Landfill Closure.....	5-387
	5.1.3.5	Tank Closure Alternative 3B: Existing WTP Vitrification with Nonthermal Supplemental Treatment (Cast Stone); Landfill Closure.....	5-388
	5.1.3.6	Tank Closure Alternative 3C: Existing WTP Vitrification with Thermal Supplemental Treatment (Steam Reforming); Landfill Closure.....	5-388
	5.1.3.7	Tank Closure Alternative 4: Existing WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Selective Clean Closure/Landfill Closure	5-389
	5.1.3.8	Tank Closure Alternative 5: Expanded WTP Vitrification with Supplemental Treatment Technologies; Landfill Closure.....	5-389
	5.1.3.9	Tank Closure Alternative 6A: All Vitrification/ No Separations; Clean Closure.....	5-390
	5.1.3.10	Tank Closure Alternative 6B: All Vitrification with Separations; Clean Closure	5-391
	5.1.3.11	Tank Closure Alternative 6C: All Vitrification with Separations; Landfill Closure	5-392
5.1.4		Environmental Justice	5-392
5.2		FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives	5-394
	5.2.1	Groundwater	5-394
	5.2.1.1	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1: No Action	5-394
	5.2.1.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2: Entombment	5-403
	5.2.1.3	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3: Removal	5-408

5.2.2	Human Health Impacts	5-408
5.2.2.1	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1: No Action	5-410
5.2.2.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2: Entombment	5-412
5.2.2.3	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3: Removal	5-414
5.2.2.4	FFTF Decommissioning Intruder Scenario	5-414
5.2.3	Ecological Risk	5-415
5.2.3.1	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1: No Action	5-416
5.2.3.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2: Entombment	5-418
5.2.3.3	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3: Removal	5-418
5.2.4	Environmental Justice	5-420
5.3	Waste Management Alternatives	5-421
5.3.1	Groundwater	5-426
5.3.1.1	Waste Management Alternative 1: No Action	5-426
5.3.1.2	Waste Management Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only	5-447
5.3.1.3	Waste Management Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	5-734
5.3.3	Ecological Risk	5-1163
5.3.3.1	Waste Management Alternative 1: No Action	5-1163
5.3.3.2	Waste Management Alternative 2: Disposal in IDF, 200-East Area Only	5-1164
5.3.3.3	Waste Management Alternative 3: Disposal in IDF, 200-East and 200-West Areas	5-1166
5.3.4	Environmental Justice	5-1168
5.4	Combination of Alternatives	5-1169
5.4.1	Groundwater	5-1170
5.4.1.1	Alternative Combination 1	5-1170
5.4.1.2	Alternative Combination 2	5-1201
5.4.1.3	Alternative Combination 3	5-1239
5.4.2	Human Health Impacts	5-1279
5.4.2.1	Alternative Combination 1	5-1280
5.4.2.2	Alternative Combination 2	5-1283
5.4.2.3	Alternative Combination 3	5-1286
5.4.3	Ecological Risk	5-1289
5.4.4	Environmental Justice	5-1292
5.5	References	5-1293

Chapter 6 Cumulative Impacts..... 6-1

6.1	Methodology	6-1
6.2	Potential Cumulative Actions.....	6-4
6.3	Short-Term Cumulative Impacts.....	6-5
6.3.1	Land Resources.....	6-5
6.3.1.1	Land Use	6-6
6.3.1.2	Visual Resources	6-8
6.3.2	Infrastructure.....	6-9
6.3.3	Noise and Vibration	6-13
6.3.4	Air Quality	6-14
6.3.5	Geology and Soils.....	6-17
6.3.6	Water Resources	6-19
6.3.7	Ecological Resources.....	6-20
6.3.7.1	Terrestrial Resources	6-20
6.3.7.2	Threatened and Endangered Species	6-23

6.3.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	6-23
6.3.8.1	Prehistoric Resources	6-24
6.3.8.2	Historic Resources.....	6-24
6.3.8.3	American Indian Interests	6-24
6.3.8.4	Paleontological Resources.....	6-25
6.3.9	Socioeconomics	6-25
6.3.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Normal Operations	6-27
6.3.10.1	Cumulative Radiological Impacts	6-27
6.3.11	Public and Occupational Health and Safety—Transportation	6-32
6.3.11.1	Historical Shipments to Hanford.....	6-33
6.3.11.2	General Radioactive Material Transport	6-34
6.3.11.3	Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.....	6-34
6.3.11.4	Conclusions	6-34
6.3.12	Waste Management.....	6-35
6.3.12.1	<i>TC & WM EIS</i> Alternative Combinations	6-36
6.3.12.2	Other DOE Actions at Hanford	6-36
6.3.12.3	Other Possible Future DOE Actions at Hanford	6-39
6.3.12.4	Summary	6-40
6.3.13	Industrial Safety	6-40
6.4	Long-Term Cumulative Impacts	6-42
6.4.1	Groundwater Quality	6-42
6.4.1.1	Other Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions	6-42
6.4.1.2	Alternative Combination 1	6-44
6.4.1.3	Alternative Combination 2	6-80
6.4.1.4	Alternative Combination 3	6-120
6.4.2	Human Health Impacts	6-160
6.4.2.1	Other Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions	6-161
6.4.2.2	Alternative Combination 1	6-163
6.4.2.3	Alternative Combination 2	6-165
6.4.2.4	Alternative Combination 3	6-167
6.4.3	Ecological Risk	6-169
6.4.3.1	Air.....	6-170
6.4.3.2	Groundwater.....	6-172
6.4.4	Environmental Justice.....	6-175
6.5	Regional and Global Cumulative Impacts	6-176
6.5.1	Ozone Depletion	6-176
6.5.2	Global Climate Change.....	6-177
6.5.2.1	Impacts of Climate Change	6-177
6.5.2.2	Emissions of Greenhouse Gases.....	6-179
6.6	References	6-180

Chapter 7 Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Discussion 7-1

7.1	Mitigation.....	7-1
7.1.1	Land Resources.....	7-9
7.1.2	Infrastructure.....	7-10
7.1.3	Noise and Vibration	7-11
7.1.4	Air Quality	7-11
7.1.5	Geology and Soils.....	7-13
7.1.6	Water Resources	7-14
7.1.7	Ecological Resources.....	7-19

7.1.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	7-20
7.1.9	Socioeconomics	7-21
7.1.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety.....	7-22
7.1.11	Waste Management.....	7-24
7.1.12	Alternative Combinations	7-25
7.2	Unavoidable, Adverse Environmental Impacts.....	7-25
7.2.1	Land Resources.....	7-25
7.2.2	Infrastructure.....	7-26
7.2.3	Noise and Vibration	7-27
7.2.4	Air Quality	7-27
7.2.5	Geology and Soils.....	7-27
7.2.6	Water Resources	7-28
7.2.7	Ecological Resources.....	7-28
7.2.8	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	7-29
7.2.9	Socioeconomics	7-29
7.2.10	Public and Occupational Health and Safety.....	7-29
7.2.11	Waste Management.....	7-30
7.2.12	Alternative Combinations	7-31
7.3	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	7-36
7.3.1	Tank Closure Alternatives	7-36
7.3.1.1	Land Resources	7-37
7.3.1.2	Material Resources	7-38
7.3.1.3	Utility Resources	7-42
7.3.1.4	Labor Resources	7-43
7.3.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives.....	7-43
7.3.2.1	Land Resources	7-44
7.3.2.2	Material Resources.....	7-45
7.3.2.3	Utility Resources	7-47
7.3.2.4	Labor Resources.....	7-47
7.3.3	Waste Management Alternatives	7-48
7.3.3.1	Land Resources	7-48
7.3.3.2	Material Resources	7-50
7.3.3.3	Utility Resources	7-52
7.3.3.4	Labor Resources.....	7-52
7.3.4	Alternative Combinations	7-53
7.3.4.1	Land Resources	7-53
7.3.4.2	Material Resources.....	7-54
7.3.4.3	Utility Resources	7-55
7.3.4.4	Labor Resources.....	7-55
7.4	Relationship Between Short-Term Use of the Environment and Long-Term Productivity	7-56
7.4.1	Tank Closure Alternatives	7-56
7.4.2	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives.....	7-59
7.4.3	Waste Management Alternatives	7-62
7.4.4	Alternative Combinations	7-65
7.5	Long-Term Mitigation Strategies.....	7-67
7.5.1	Effects of Uncertainty on Long-Term Groundwater Predictions.....	7-69
7.5.2	Sensitivity Analyses Discussion	7-74
7.5.2.1	Sensitivity Analysis: Flux Reduction	7-74
7.5.2.2	Sensitivity Analysis: Offsite-Waste Acceptance.....	7-78
7.5.2.3	Sensitivity Analysis: Capture and Removal	7-82

7.5.2.4	Sensitivity Analysis: Cribs and Trenches (Ditches) Partial Clean Closure	7-84
7.5.2.5	Sensitivity Analysis: Iodine Recycle.....	7-85
7.5.2.6	Sensitivity Analysis: No Technetium-99 Removal	7-86
7.5.2.7	Sensitivity Analysis: Tank Waste Retrieval Losses	7-88
7.5.2.8	Sensitivity Analysis: Waste Form Performance	7-91
7.5.2.9	Sensitivity Analysis: Infiltration Rates.....	7-99
7.5.2.10	Sensitivity Analysis: Climate Change	7-101
7.5.3	Sensitivity Analyses Summary and Mitigation Strategies	7-102
7.6	References	7-104
 Chapter 8 Potentially Applicable Laws, Regulations, and Other Requirements.....		8-1
8.1	Environmental, Safety, and Health Laws, Regulations, Orders, and Other Requirements	8-1
8.1.1	Environmental Quality.....	8-5
8.1.2	Air Quality and Noise	8-7
8.1.3	Water Resources	8-10
8.1.4	Hazardous Waste and Materials Management.....	8-11
8.1.5	Radioactive Waste and Materials Management.....	8-17
8.1.6	Ecological Resources.....	8-20
8.1.7	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	8-21
8.1.8	Worker Safety and Health.....	8-24
8.1.9	Radiological Safety Oversight and Radiation Protection	8-25
8.1.10	Transportation.....	8-26
8.1.11	Emergency Planning, Pollution Prevention, and Conservation	8-28
8.1.12	Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	8-29
8.2	Permits.....	8-29
8.3	Consultations.....	8-33
8.4	References	8-36
 Chapter 9 Glossary		9-1
 Chapter 10 List of Preparers		10-1
 Chapter 11 Distribution List.....		11-1
 Chapter 12 Index.....		12-1

List of Figures

Figure 1–1.	National Environmental Policy Act Process	1–16
Figure 2–1.	Single-Shell Tanks Under Construction at the Hanford Site, 1947–1948.....	2–5
Figure 2–2.	Hanford Site High-Level Radioactive Waste Tank Farm System and Remediation Approaches.....	2–6
Figure 2–3.	200-West Area Tank Farm Location Map.....	2–7
Figure 2–4.	200-East Area Tank Farm Location Map.....	2–8
Figure 2–5.	Cross-Sectional Views of Representative Hanford Site Single-Shell Tanks.....	2–10
Figure 2–6.	Cross-Sectional View of Representative Hanford Site Double-Shell Tank	2–11
Figure 2–7.	200-West Area Proposed New Tank Closure Facility Locations	2–13
Figure 2–8.	200-East Area Proposed New Tank Closure Facility Locations	2–14
Figure 2–9.	Crystallized Salt Cake Inside One of the Hanford Site’s Waste Tanks.....	2–15
Figure 2–10.	Representative Single-Shell Tank and In-Tank Equipment	2–19
Figure 2–11.	Representative Double-Shell Tank and In-Tank Equipment.....	2–20
Figure 2–12.	Cross-Sectional View of Representative Waste Receiver Facility	2–22
Figure 2–13.	Waste Treatment Plant Facilities.....	2–25
Figure 2–14.	Aerial View of Waste Treatment Plant Construction Site, February 2008	2–25
Figure 2–15.	Preprocessing Waste Streams Associated with Tank Farm Clean Closure	2–37
Figure 2–16.	400 Area Fast Flux Test Facility Complex Location Map	2–40
Figure 2–17.	Fast Flux Test Facility Complex	2–41
Figure 2–18.	Location of the Hanford Site Sodium Reaction Facility and Sodium Storage Facility	2–49
Figure 2–19.	Sodium Processing Facility at Idaho National Laboratory.....	2–50
Figure 2–20.	200-West Area Waste Management Facility Locations	2–52
Figure 2–21.	200-East Area Waste Management Facility Locations	2–53
Figure 2–22.	Lined Disposal Trench in Low-Level Radioactive Waste Burial Ground 218-W-5	2–54
Figure 2–23.	Aerial View of the Central Waste Complex.....	2–54
Figure 2–24.	Aerial View of the T Plant Complex.....	2–55
Figure 2–25.	Waste Receiving and Processing Facility.....	2–56
Figure 2–26.	200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility.....	2–57
Figure 2–27.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Overview.....	2–66
Figure 2–28.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Proposed Schedule	2–67
Figure 2–29.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Primary Components	2–68
Figure 2–30.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Overview	2–69
Figure 2–31.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Proposed Schedule	2–69
Figure 2–32.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Primary Components.....	2–70
Figure 2–33.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Overview	2–72
Figure 2–34.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Proposed Schedule	2–73
Figure 2–35.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Primary Components.....	2–74
Figure 2–36.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Overview.....	2–76
Figure 2–37.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Proposed Schedule	2–77
Figure 2–38.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Primary Components.....	2–78
Figure 2–39.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Overview	2–80
Figure 2–40.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Proposed Schedule	2–81
Figure 2–41.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Primary Components.....	2–82
Figure 2–42.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Overview	2–84
Figure 2–43.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Proposed Schedule	2–85
Figure 2–44.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Primary Components.....	2–86
Figure 2–45.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Overview.....	2–88
Figure 2–46.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Proposed Schedule	2–89
Figure 2–47.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Primary Components	2–90

List of Figures

Figure 2-48.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Overview	2-92
Figure 2-49.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Proposed Schedule	2-93
Figure 2-50.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Primary Components	2-94
Figure 2-51.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A Overview	2-96
Figure 2-52.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A Proposed Schedule	2-97
Figure 2-53.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A Primary Components.....	2-98
Figure 2-54.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B Overview	2-100
Figure 2-55.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B Proposed Schedule	2-101
Figure 2-56.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B Primary Components.....	2-102
Figure 2-57.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Overview	2-104
Figure 2-58.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Proposed Schedule	2-105
Figure 2-59.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Primary Components.....	2-106
Figure 2-60.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Overview	2-108
Figure 2-61.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Proposed Schedule	2-109
Figure 2-62.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Primary Components.....	2-109
Figure 2-63.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Overview	2-110
Figure 2-64.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Proposed Schedule	2-111
Figure 2-65.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Primary Components.....	2-112
Figure 2-66.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 Overview	2-113
Figure 2-67.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 Proposed Schedule	2-114
Figure 2-68.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 Primary Components.....	2-115
Figure 2-69.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Overview.....	2-118
Figure 2-70.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Proposed Schedule.....	2-119
Figure 2-71.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Primary Components	2-119
Figure 2-72.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Overview.....	2-120
Figure 2-73.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Proposed Schedule.....	2-121
Figure 2-74.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Primary Components	2-122
Figure 2-75.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Overview.....	2-123
Figure 2-76.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Proposed Schedule.....	2-124
Figure 2-77.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Primary Components	2-125
Figure 2-78.	Core Zone and Barrier Boundaries.....	2-209
Figure 2-79.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Total Iodine-129 Released to the Vadose Zone.....	2-219
Figure 2-80.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Total Technetium-99 Released to the Vadose Zone.....	2-219
Figure 2-81.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Peak Iodine-129 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary	2-220
Figure 2-82.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Peak Technetium-99 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary	2-220
Figure 2-83.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2-224
Figure 2-84.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2-225
Figure 2-85.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2-226
Figure 2-86.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2-228
Figure 2-87.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2-229
Figure 2-88.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2-230
Figure 2-89.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary.....	2-231

Figure 2–90.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–232
Figure 2–91.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary.....	2–232
Figure 2–92.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Total Technetium-99 Released to the Vadose Zone.....	2–240
Figure 2–93.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Peak Technetium-99 Concentrations at the FFTF Barrier.....	2–240
Figure 2–94.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier.....	2–242
Figure 2–95.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier.....	2–243
Figure 2–96.	Waste Management Alternatives – Total Iodine-129 Released to the Vadose Zone.....	2–257
Figure 2–97.	Waste Management Alternatives – Total Technetium-99 Released to the Vadose Zone.....	2–258
Figure 2–98.	Waste Management Alternatives – Peak Iodine-129 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary	2–259
Figure 2–99.	Waste Management Alternatives – Peak Technetium-99 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary	2–259
Figure 2–100.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–262
Figure 2–101.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–264
Figure 2–102.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–265
Figure 2–103.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–267
Figure 2–104.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–268
Figure 2–105.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–269
Figure 2–106.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–270
Figure 2–107.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–271
Figure 2–108.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–272
Figure 2–109.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–274
Figure 2–110.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–274

List of Figures

Figure 2–111. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–276
Figure 2–112. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–276
Figure 2–113. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–280
Figure 2–114. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–281
Figure 2–115. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–282
Figure 2–116. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–283
Figure 2–117. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–284
Figure 2–118. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–286
Figure 2–119. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–287
Figure 2–120. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–288
Figure 2–121. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–289
Figure 2–122. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–290
Figure 2–123. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–291
Figure 2–124. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Summary of Long-Term Human Health Impacts on the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	2–292
Figure 2–125. Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary due to Releases from Tank Farm Sources Other Than Past Leaks	2–297
Figure 2–126. Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier due to Tank Closure Treatment Process-Generated Waste Forms.....	2–299
Figure 2–127. Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary due to Releases from the Six Sets of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	2–301
Figure 2–128. Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary due to Past Leaks at Single-Shell Tank Farms.....	2–302

Figure 2–129.	Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary due to Releases from Tank Farm Residuals and Ancillary Equipment and to Retrieval Leaks	2–305
Figure 2–130.	Waste Management Alternative 1 (No Action) Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary due to Low-Level Radioactive Waste Burial Ground 218-W-5, Trenches 31 and 34	2–308
Figure 2–131.	Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East and 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barriers.....	2–309
Figure 2–132.	Time Series of Radiological Risk for Non-Tank-Farm Sources at 200-East and 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barriers at an Infiltration Rate of 3.5 Millimeters per Year.....	2–310
Figure 2–133.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	2–311
Figure 2–134.	Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary from River Protection Project Disposal Facility Releases.....	2–312
Figure 3–1.	Generalized Land Use at the Hanford Site and Vicinity	3–3
Figure 3–2.	Extent of Area Burned During Recent Fires at the Hanford Site	3–8
Figure 3–3.	Wind Rose for the Hanford Meteorological Station at the 200 Area, 1997–2006 (9-Meter Elevation)	3–20
Figure 3–4.	Wind Rose for the Hanford Meteorological Station at the 200 Area, 1997–2006 (61-Meter Elevation)	3–20
Figure 3–5.	Wind Rose for the Fast Flux Test Facility Meteorological Station at the 400 Area, 1997–2006 (9-Meter Elevation)	3–20
Figure 3–6.	Wind Rose for the Fast Flux Test Facility Meteorological Station at the 400 Area, 1997–2006 (61-Meter Elevation)	3–20
Figure 3–7.	Physiographic Setting and General Structural Geology of the Pasco Basin and Hanford Site	3–28
Figure 3–8.	Surface Geology and Structural Features of the Pasco Basin and Hanford Site	3–29
Figure 3–9.	Stratigraphic Column of the Hanford Site.....	3–32
Figure 3–10.	Major Surface-Water Features on the Hanford Site	3–39
Figure 3–11.	Floodplains on the Hanford Site.....	3–44
Figure 3–12.	Hydrogeologic Cross Section Through the 200 Areas	3–48
Figure 3–13.	Water Table Elevations and Inferred Groundwater Flow for the Unconfined Aquifer System.....	3–50
Figure 3–14.	Distribution of Major Radionuclides and Hazardous Chemicals in the Unconfined Aquifer System During Reporting Period 2009	3–53
Figure 3–15.	Vegetation Communities on the Hanford Site.....	3–57
Figure 3–16.	Vegetation Communities In and Near the 200-East Area	3–62
Figure 3–17.	Vegetation Communities In and Near the 200-West Area	3–63
Figure 3–18.	Distribution of Vegetation Communities In and Near Borrow Area C.....	3–65
Figure 3–19.	Transportation Routes On and Near the Hanford Site.....	3–84
Figure 3–20.	Cumulative Larger-Scale Minority Populations Surrounding the 200 Areas at the Hanford Site as a Function of Distance	3–100
Figure 3–21.	Cumulative Smaller-Scale Minority Populations Surrounding the 200 Areas at the Hanford Site as a Function of Distance	3–100
Figure 3–22.	Meaningfully Greater Minority and Nonminority Populations Living in Block Groups Surrounding the 200 Areas at the Hanford Site	3–101
Figure 3–23.	Cumulative Larger-Scale Minority Populations Surrounding the 400 Area at the Hanford Site as a Function of Distance.....	3–103
Figure 3–24.	Cumulative Smaller-Scale Minority Populations Surrounding the 400 Area at the Hanford Site as a Function of Distance.....	3–103

List of Figures

Figure 3–25.	Meaningfully Greater Minority and Nonminority Populations Living in Counties Surrounding the 400 Area at the Hanford Site	3–104
Figure 3–26.	Cumulative Low-Income and Non-Low-Income Populations Surrounding the 200 Areas at the Hanford Site as a Function of Distance	3–107
Figure 3–27.	Meaningfully Greater Low-Income and Non-Low-Income Populations Living in Block Groups Surrounding the 200 Areas at the Hanford Site	3–108
Figure 3–28.	Cumulative Low-Income and Non-Low-Income Populations Surrounding the 400 Area at the Hanford Site as a Function of Distance.....	3–109
Figure 3–29.	Meaningfully Greater Low-Income and Non-Low-Income Populations Living in Block Groups Surrounding the 400 Area at the Hanford Site	3–110
Figure 3–30.	Idaho National Laboratory Vicinity	3–122
Figure 3–31.	Land Use at Idaho National Laboratory and Vicinity	3–124
Figure 3–32.	Wind Rose for the Materials and Fuels Complex Meteorological Station at Idaho National Laboratory, 1997–2006 (10-Meter Elevation).....	3–131
Figure 3–33.	Wind Rose for the Materials and Fuels Complex Meteorological Station at Idaho National Laboratory, 1997–2006 (75-Meter Elevation).....	3–131
Figure 3–34.	Major Geologic Features of Idaho National Laboratory	3–137
Figure 3–35.	Lithologic Logs of Deep Drill Holes at Idaho National Laboratory.....	3–139
Figure 3–36.	Surface-Water Features at Idaho National Laboratory	3–143
Figure 3–37.	Extent of Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) and Strontium-90 Plumes Within the Snake River Plain Aquifer at Idaho National Laboratory	3–149
Figure 3–38.	Vegetation Communities at Idaho National Laboratory.....	3–153
Figure 3–39.	Cumulative Larger-Scale Minority Populations Surrounding INTEC at Idaho National Laboratory as a Function of Distance	3–173
Figure 3–40.	Cumulative Smaller-Scale Minority Populations Surrounding INTEC at Idaho National Laboratory as a Function of Distance	3–173
Figure 3–41.	Meaningfully Greater Minority and Nonminority Populations Living in Block Groups Surrounding INTEC at Idaho National Laboratory	3–174
Figure 3–42.	Cumulative Larger-Scale Minority Populations Surrounding the Materials and Fuels Complex at Idaho National Laboratory as a Function of Distance.....	3–176
Figure 3–43.	Cumulative Smaller-Scale Minority Populations Surrounding the Materials and Fuels Complex at Idaho National Laboratory as a Function of Distance.....	3–176
Figure 3–44.	Meaningfully Greater Minority and Nonminority Populations Living in Block Groups Surrounding the Materials and Fuels Complex at Idaho National Laboratory	3–177
Figure 3–45.	Low-Income and Non-Low-Income Populations Surrounding INTEC at Idaho National Laboratory as a Function of Distance	3–179
Figure 3–46.	Meaningfully Greater Low-Income and Non-Low-Income Populations Living in Block Groups Surrounding INTEC at Idaho National Laboratory.....	3–180
Figure 3–47.	Low-Income and Non-Low-Income Populations Surrounding the Materials and Fuels Complex at Idaho National Laboratory as a Function of Distance.....	3–181
Figure 3–48.	Meaningfully Greater Low-Income and Non-Low-Income Populations Living in Block Groups Surrounding the Materials and Fuels Complex at Idaho National Laboratory	3–182
Figure 4–1.	200-East Area New Facility Locations and Affected Areas.....	4–4
Figure 4–2.	200-West Area New Facility Locations and Affected Areas	4–5
Figure 4–3.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–39
Figure 4–4.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–40
Figure 4–5.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–41
Figure 4–6.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–42
Figure 4–7.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–43

Figure 4–8.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–44
Figure 4–9.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–45
Figure 4–10.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–46
Figure 4–11.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–47
Figure 4–12.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–48
Figure 4–13.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–49
Figure 4–14.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–50
Figure 4–15.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–51
Figure 4–16.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Annual Workforce Estimates (2006–2200).....	4–109
Figure 4–17.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Annual Estimated Onsite Full-Time-Equivalent Workforce Requirements (2006–2096).....	4–111
Figure 4–18.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Annual Estimated Onsite Full-Time-Equivalent Workforce Requirements (2006–2046).....	4–113
Figure 4–19.	Tank Closure Alternatives 3A, 3B, and 3C Annual Estimated Onsite Full-Time-Equivalent Workforce Requirements (2006–2046)	4–116
Figure 4–20.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Annual Estimated Onsite Full-Time-Equivalent Workforce Requirements (2006–2046).....	4–120
Figure 4–21.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Annual Estimated Onsite Full-Time-Equivalent Workforce Requirements (2006–2046).....	4–123
Figure 4–22.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base/Option Case, Annual Estimated Onsite Full-Time-Equivalent Workforce Requirements (2006–2166)	4–125
Figure 4–23.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base/Option Case, Annual Estimated Onsite Full-Time-Equivalent Workforce Requirements (2006–2101)	4–128
Figure 4–24.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Annual Estimated Onsite Full-Time-Equivalent Workforce Requirements (2006–2046).....	4–130
Figure 4–25.	Total Recordable Cases and Labor Hours by Alternative	4–261
Figure 4–26.	400 Area Facility Location.....	4–265
Figure 4–27.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration at the Hanford Site.....	4–282
Figure 4–28.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration at the Hanford Site.....	4–285
Figure 4–29.	Total Recordable Cases and Labor Hours by Alternative	4–360
Figure 4–30.	Waste Management Alternative 1 PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–378
Figure 4–31.	Waste Management Alternative 2 (Treatment and Storage) PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–379
Figure 4–32.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–379
Figure 4–33.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–380
Figure 4–34.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–381
Figure 4–35.	Waste Management Alternative 3 (Treatment and Storage) PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration.....	4–382
Figure 4–36.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–382
Figure 4–37.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–383

List of Figures

Figure 4–38.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, PM ₁₀ Maximum 24-Hour Concentration	4–383
Figure 4–39.	Total Recordable Cases and Labor Hours by Alternative	4–437
Figure 5–1.	Groundwater Modeling Process	5–1
Figure 5–2.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–7
Figure 5–3.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–7
Figure 5–4.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–8
Figure 5–5.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–8
Figure 5–6.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–9
Figure 5–7.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–10
Figure 5–8.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–12
Figure 5–9.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–13
Figure 5–10.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–13
Figure 5–11.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–14
Figure 5–12.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–14
Figure 5–13.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–15
Figure 5–14.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–16
Figure 5–15.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–17
Figure 5–16.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–18
Figure 5–17.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–19
Figure 5–18.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–20
Figure 5–19.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–21
Figure 5–20.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–22
Figure 5–21.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–23
Figure 5–22.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–24
Figure 5–23.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–25
Figure 5–24.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–26
Figure 5–25.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–27
Figure 5–26.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–28
Figure 5–27.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–29
Figure 5–28.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–30

Figure 5–29.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–31
Figure 5–30.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–32
Figure 5–31.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–33
Figure 5–32.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–34
Figure 5–33.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–35
Figure 5–34.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–36
Figure 5–35.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–37
Figure 5–36.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–38
Figure 5–37.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–41
Figure 5–38.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–41
Figure 5–39.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–42
Figure 5–40.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–42
Figure 5–41.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–43
Figure 5–42.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–44
Figure 5–43.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–46
Figure 5–44.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–47
Figure 5–45.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–47
Figure 5–46.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–48
Figure 5–47.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–48
Figure 5–48.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–49
Figure 5–49.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–50
Figure 5–50.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–51
Figure 5–51.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–52
Figure 5–52.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–53
Figure 5–53.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–54
Figure 5–54.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–55
Figure 5–55.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–56
Figure 5–56.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–57
Figure 5–57.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–58

List of Figures

Figure 5–58.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–59
Figure 5–59.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–60
Figure 5–60.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–61
Figure 5–61.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–62
Figure 5–62.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–63
Figure 5–63.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–64
Figure 5–64.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–66
Figure 5–65.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–67
Figure 5–66.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–68
Figure 5–67.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–69
Figure 5–68.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–70
Figure 5–69.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–71
Figure 5–70.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–72
Figure 5–71.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–72
Figure 5–72.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–73
Figure 5–73.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–76
Figure 5–74.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–76
Figure 5–75.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–77
Figure 5–76.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–77
Figure 5–77.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–78
Figure 5–78.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–79
Figure 5–79.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 1, Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–83
Figure 5–80.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 1, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–84
Figure 5–81.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 1, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–84
Figure 5–82.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 1, Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–85
Figure 5–83.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 1, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–85
Figure 5–84.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 1, Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–86
Figure 5–85.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 1, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–86
Figure 5–86.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 2, Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–89

Figure 5–87.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 3, Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–89
Figure 5–88.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 2, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–90
Figure 5–89.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 3, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–90
Figure 5–90.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 2, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–91
Figure 5–91.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 3, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–91
Figure 5–92.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 2, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–92
Figure 5–93.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 3, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–92
Figure 5–94.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 2, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–93
Figure 5–95.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 3, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–93
Figure 5–96.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 2, Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–94
Figure 5–97.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Case 3, Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–94
Figure 5–98.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–96
Figure 5–99.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–97
Figure 5–100.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–98
Figure 5–101.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–99
Figure 5–102.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–100
Figure 5–103.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–101
Figure 5–104.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–102
Figure 5–105.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–103
Figure 5–106.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–104
Figure 5–107.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–105
Figure 5–108.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–106
Figure 5–109.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–107
Figure 5–110.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–108
Figure 5–111.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–109
Figure 5–112.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time.....	5–110
Figure 5–113.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time.....	5–110
Figure 5–114.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–111
Figure 5–115.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–112
Figure 5–116.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–113
Figure 5–117.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–114

List of Figures

Figure 5–118.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–115
Figure 5–119.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–116
Figure 5–120.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–117
Figure 5–121.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–122
Figure 5–122.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–122
Figure 5–123.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–123
Figure 5–124.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–123
Figure 5–125.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–124
Figure 5–126.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–125
Figure 5–127.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–126
Figure 5–128.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–127
Figure 5–129.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–128
Figure 5–130.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–128
Figure 5–131.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–129
Figure 5–132.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–129
Figure 5–133.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–130
Figure 5–134.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–131
Figure 5–135.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–132
Figure 5–136.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–133
Figure 5–137.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–134
Figure 5–138.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–135
Figure 5–139.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–136
Figure 5–140.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–137
Figure 5–141.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–138
Figure 5–142.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–139
Figure 5–143.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–140
Figure 5–144.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–141
Figure 5–145.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–142
Figure 5–146.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–143

Figure 5–147. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–144
Figure 5–148. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–145
Figure 5–149. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–146
Figure 5–150. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–147
Figure 5–151. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–148
Figure 5–152. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–149
Figure 5–153. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–150
Figure 5–154. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–151
Figure 5–155. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–152
Figure 5–156. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–153
Figure 5–157. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–153
Figure 5–158. Tank Closure Alternative 4 Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–154
Figure 5–159. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–157
Figure 5–160. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–157
Figure 5–161. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–158
Figure 5–162. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–158
Figure 5–163. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–159
Figure 5–164. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–160
Figure 5–165. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–162
Figure 5–166. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–162
Figure 5–167. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–163
Figure 5–168. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–163
Figure 5–169. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–164
Figure 5–170. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–165
Figure 5–171. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–165
Figure 5–172. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–167
Figure 5–173. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–168
Figure 5–174. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–169
Figure 5–175. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–170

List of Figures

Figure 5–176. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–171
Figure 5–177. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–172
Figure 5–178. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–173
Figure 5–179. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–174
Figure 5–180. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–175
Figure 5–181. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–176
Figure 5–182. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–177
Figure 5–183. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–178
Figure 5–184. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–179
Figure 5–185. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–180
Figure 5–186. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–181
Figure 5–187. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–182
Figure 5–188. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–183
Figure 5–189. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–184
Figure 5–190. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–185
Figure 5–191. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–186
Figure 5–192. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–187
Figure 5–193. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–187
Figure 5–194. Tank Closure Alternative 5 Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–188
Figure 5–195. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–191
Figure 5–196. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–191
Figure 5–197. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–192
Figure 5–198. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–192

Figure 5–199. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–193
Figure 5–200. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–193
Figure 5–201. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–194
Figure 5–202. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–195
Figure 5–203. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–196
Figure 5–204. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–196
Figure 5–205. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–197
Figure 5–206. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–198
Figure 5–207. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–200
Figure 5–208. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–200
Figure 5–209. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–201
Figure 5–210. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–202
Figure 5–211. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–202
Figure 5–212. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–203
Figure 5–213. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–204
Figure 5–214. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–204
Figure 5–215. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–205
Figure 5–216. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–205
Figure 5–217. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–206
Figure 5–218. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–207
Figure 5–219. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–207
Figure 5–220. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–208
Figure 5–221. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–210
Figure 5–222. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium), Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–211

List of Figures

Figure 5–223.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–212
Figure 5–224.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–213
Figure 5–225.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–214
Figure 5–226.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–215
Figure 5–227.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–216
Figure 5–228.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–217
Figure 5–229.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–218
Figure 5–230.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–219
Figure 5–231.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–220
Figure 5–232.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–221
Figure 5–233.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–222
Figure 5–234.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–223
Figure 5–235.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–224
Figure 5–236.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–225
Figure 5–237.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–226
Figure 5–238.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–227
Figure 5–239.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–228
Figure 5–240.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–229
Figure 5–241.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–230
Figure 5–242.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–231
Figure 5–243.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–232
Figure 5–244.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–233
Figure 5–245.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–234
Figure 5–246.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–235
Figure 5–247.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–236
Figure 5–248.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–237

Figure 5–249. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–238
Figure 5–250. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–239
Figure 5–251. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940.....	5–240
Figure 5–252. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–241
Figure 5–253. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–242
Figure 5–254. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940.....	5–243
Figure 5–255. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–244
Figure 5–256. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–245
Figure 5–257. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940.....	5–246
Figure 5–258. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–247
Figure 5–259. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time.....	5–247
Figure 5–260. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–248
Figure 5–261. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–248
Figure 5–262. Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–249
Figure 5–263. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–252
Figure 5–264. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–253
Figure 5–265. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–253
Figure 5–266. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Vadose Zone for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–254
Figure 5–267. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–254
Figure 5–268. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–255

List of Figures

Figure 5–269. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–256
Figure 5–270. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Groundwater for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–256
Figure 5–271. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–257
Figure 5–272. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–257
Figure 5–273. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Releases of Radioactive Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–258
Figure 5–274. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Releases of Chemical Constituent of Potential Concern Drivers to Columbia River for Entire 10,000-Year Analysis Period	5–258
Figure 5–275. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–261
Figure 5–276. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–261
Figure 5–277. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–262
Figure 5–278. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–262
Figure 5–279. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–263
Figure 5–280. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–263
Figure 5–281. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–264
Figure 5–282. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–264
Figure 5–283. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–265
Figure 5–284. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–265
Figure 5–285. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–266
Figure 5–286. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–267
Figure 5–287. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–267
Figure 5–288. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–268
Figure 5–289. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–269
Figure 5–290. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–270
Figure 5–291. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–271
Figure 5–292. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–272
Figure 5–293. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–273

Figure 5–294. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–274
Figure 5–295. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–275
Figure 5–296. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–276
Figure 5–297. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–277
Figure 5–298. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–278
Figure 5–299. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–279
Figure 5–300. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–280
Figure 5–301. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–281
Figure 5–302. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–282
Figure 5–303. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–283
Figure 5–304. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–284
Figure 5–305. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–285
Figure 5–306. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–286
Figure 5–307. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–287
Figure 5–308. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–288
Figure 5–309. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–289
Figure 5–310. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–290
Figure 5–311. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–291
Figure 5–312. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–292
Figure 5–313. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–293
Figure 5–314. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–294
Figure 5–315. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–295
Figure 5–316. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–296
Figure 5–317. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–297
Figure 5–318. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–298
Figure 5–319. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940	5–299

List of Figures

Figure 5–320.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–300
Figure 5–321.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–301
Figure 5–322.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940.....	5–302
Figure 5–323.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–303
Figure 5–324.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–304
Figure 5–325.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940.....	5–305
Figure 5–326.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–306
Figure 5–327.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–307
Figure 5–328.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,940.....	5–308
Figure 5–329.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–309
Figure 5–330.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time.....	5–309
Figure 5–331.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–310
Figure 5–332.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–310
Figure 5–333.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	5–311
Figure 5–334.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–320
Figure 5–335.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–327
Figure 5–336.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–328
Figure 5–337.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary for the Other Tank Farm Sources.....	5–329
Figure 5–338.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–350
Figure 5–339.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–356
Figure 5–340.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–362
Figure 5–341.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–363
Figure 5–342.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–369

Figure 5–343. Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–376
Figure 5–344. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Releases of Radioactive Constituents of Potential Concern to Vadose Zone from Sources Inside the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier.....	5–396
Figure 5–345. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Releases of Radioactive Constituents of Potential Concern to Groundwater from Sources Inside the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier.....	5–397
Figure 5–346. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Releases of Radioactive Constituents of Potential Concern to Columbia River from Sources Inside the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier.....	5–397
Figure 5–347. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–398
Figure 5–348. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–399
Figure 5–349. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2590.....	5–401
Figure 5–350. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–402
Figure 5–351. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Releases of Radioactive Constituents of Potential Concern to Vadose Zone from Sources Inside the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier.....	5–404
Figure 5–352. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Releases of Radioactive Constituents of Potential Concern to Groundwater from Sources Inside the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier.....	5–405
Figure 5–353. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Releases of Radioactive Constituents of Potential Concern to Columbia River from Sources Inside the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier.....	5–405
Figure 5–354. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–406
Figure 5–355. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2590.....	5–407
Figure 5–356. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier	5–412
Figure 5–357. FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Fast Flux Test Facility Barrier	5–414
Figure 5–358. Waste Management Alternative 1 Radionuclide Releases from Trenches 31 and 34 to Vadose Zone.....	5–428
Figure 5–359. Waste Management Alternative 1 Chemical Releases from Trenches 31 and 34 to Vadose Zone.....	5–428
Figure 5–360. Waste Management Alternative 1 Radionuclide Releases from Trenches 31 and 34 to Groundwater.....	5–429
Figure 5–361. Waste Management Alternative 1 Chemical Releases from Trenches 31 and 34 to Groundwater.....	5–429
Figure 5–362. Waste Management Alternative 1 Radionuclide Releases from Trenches 31 and 34 to Columbia River	5–430
Figure 5–363. Waste Management Alternative 1 Chemical Releases from Trenches 31 and 34 to Columbia River	5–430
Figure 5–364. Waste Management Alternative 1 Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–432
Figure 5–365. Waste Management Alternative 1 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–432
Figure 5–366. Waste Management Alternative 1 Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–433
Figure 5–367. Waste Management Alternative 1 Fluoride Concentration Versus Time.....	5–433

List of Figures

Figure 5–368. Waste Management Alternative 1 Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–434
Figure 5–369. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–435
Figure 5–370. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–436
Figure 5–371. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–437
Figure 5–372. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–438
Figure 5–373. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–439
Figure 5–374. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–440
Figure 5–375. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–441
Figure 5–376. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–442
Figure 5–377. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–443
Figure 5–378. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–444
Figure 5–379. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–445
Figure 5–380. Waste Management Alternative 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–446
Figure 5–381. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–449
Figure 5–382. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–449
Figure 5–383. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–450
Figure 5–384. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–450
Figure 5–385. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–451
Figure 5–386. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–451
Figure 5–387. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–452
Figure 5–388. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–452
Figure 5–389. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–453
Figure 5–390. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–453

Figure 5–391. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–454
Figure 5–392. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–454
Figure 5–393. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–455
Figure 5–394. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–456
Figure 5–395. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–456
Figure 5–396. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–457
Figure 5–397. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–459
Figure 5–398. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–460
Figure 5–399. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–461
Figure 5–400. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–462
Figure 5–401. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–463
Figure 5–402. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–464
Figure 5–403. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–465
Figure 5–404. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–466
Figure 5–405. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–467
Figure 5–406. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–468
Figure 5–407. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–469
Figure 5–408. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–470
Figure 5–409. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–472
Figure 5–410. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–473
Figure 5–411. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–473
Figure 5–412. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–474
Figure 5–413. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–475

List of Figures

Figure 5-414.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-475
Figure 5-415.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-476
Figure 5-416.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5-476
Figure 5-417.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-477
Figure 5-418.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5-477
Figure 5-419.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-478
Figure 5-420.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5-478
Figure 5-421.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-480
Figure 5-422.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-480
Figure 5-423.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-481
Figure 5-424.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5-481
Figure 5-425.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-482
Figure 5-426.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-484
Figure 5-427.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-485
Figure 5-428.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-486
Figure 5-429.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-487
Figure 5-430.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-488
Figure 5-431.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-489
Figure 5-432.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-490
Figure 5-433.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-491
Figure 5-434.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-492
Figure 5-435.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5-493
Figure 5-436.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5-494
Figure 5-437.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5-495

Figure 5-438. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-497
Figure 5-439. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-498
Figure 5-440. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-499
Figure 5-441. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-499
Figure 5-442. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-500
Figure 5-443. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-500
Figure 5-444. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-501
Figure 5-445. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5-501
Figure 5-446. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-502
Figure 5-447. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5-502
Figure 5-448. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-503
Figure 5-449. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5-503
Figure 5-450. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-505
Figure 5-451. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-505
Figure 5-452. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-506
Figure 5-453. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5-506
Figure 5-454. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Acetonitrile Concentration Versus Time.....	5-507
Figure 5-455. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-508
Figure 5-456. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-509
Figure 5-457. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-510
Figure 5-458. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-511
Figure 5-459. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-512
Figure 5-460. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-513

List of Figures

Figure 5-461. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-514
Figure 5-462. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-515
Figure 5-463. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-516
Figure 5-464. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-517
Figure 5-465. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5-518
Figure 5-466. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5-519
Figure 5-467. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5-520
Figure 5-468. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-522
Figure 5-469. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-523
Figure 5-470. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-524
Figure 5-471. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-524
Figure 5-472. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-525
Figure 5-473. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-526
Figure 5-474. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-526
Figure 5-475. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5-527
Figure 5-476. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-527
Figure 5-477. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5-528
Figure 5-478. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-528
Figure 5-479. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5-529
Figure 5-480. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-530
Figure 5-481. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-531
Figure 5-482. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-531

Figure 5–483. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–532
Figure 5–484. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–533
Figure 5–485. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–534
Figure 5–486. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–535
Figure 5–487. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–536
Figure 5–488. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–537
Figure 5–489. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–538
Figure 5–490. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–539
Figure 5–491. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–540
Figure 5–492. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–541
Figure 5–493. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–542
Figure 5–494. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–543
Figure 5–495. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–544
Figure 5–496. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–545
Figure 5–497. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–546
Figure 5–498. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–549
Figure 5–499. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–549
Figure 5–500. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–550
Figure 5–501. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–550
Figure 5–502. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–551
Figure 5–503. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–551
Figure 5–504. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–552
Figure 5–505. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–552

List of Figures

Figure 5–506. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radiolonuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–553
Figure 5–507. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–553
Figure 5–508. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–554
Figure 5–509. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–554
Figure 5–510. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–556
Figure 5–511. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–557
Figure 5–512. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chromium Concentration Versus Time	5–557
Figure 5–513. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–558
Figure 5–514. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–559
Figure 5–515. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–560
Figure 5–516. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–561
Figure 5–517. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–562
Figure 5–518. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–563
Figure 5–519. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–564
Figure 5–520. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–565
Figure 5–521. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–566
Figure 5–522. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–567
Figure 5–523. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–568
Figure 5–524. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–569
Figure 5–525. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–570
Figure 5–526. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–571
Figure 5–527. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–572
Figure 5–528. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–574

Figure 5–529.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–575
Figure 5–530.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–575
Figure 5–531.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–576
Figure 5–532.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–576
Figure 5–533.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–577
Figure 5–534.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–579
Figure 5–535.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–579
Figure 5–536.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–580
Figure 5–537.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–580
Figure 5–538.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–582
Figure 5–539.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–583
Figure 5–540.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–584
Figure 5–541.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–585
Figure 5–542.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–586
Figure 5–543.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–587
Figure 5–544.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–588
Figure 5–545.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–589
Figure 5–546.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–591
Figure 5–547.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–592
Figure 5–548.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–592
Figure 5–549.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–593
Figure 5–550.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–593
Figure 5–551.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–594

List of Figures

Figure 5–552. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–594
Figure 5–553. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–595
Figure 5–554. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–595
Figure 5–555. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–596
Figure 5–556. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–596
Figure 5–557. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–597
Figure 5–558. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–599
Figure 5–559. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–599
Figure 5–560. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–600
Figure 5–561. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–600
Figure 5–562. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–601
Figure 5–563. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–602
Figure 5–564. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–603
Figure 5–565. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–604
Figure 5–566. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–605
Figure 5–567. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–606
Figure 5–568. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–607
Figure 5–569. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–608
Figure 5–570. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–609
Figure 5–571. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–610
Figure 5–572. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–611
Figure 5–573. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–612
Figure 5–574. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–613

Figure 5–575. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–616
Figure 5–576. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–616
Figure 5–577. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–617
Figure 5–578. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–617
Figure 5–579. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–618
Figure 5–580. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–618
Figure 5–581. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–620
Figure 5–582. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–620
Figure 5–583. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–621
Figure 5–584. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–621
Figure 5–585. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–623
Figure 5–586. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–624
Figure 5–587. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–625
Figure 5–588. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–626
Figure 5–589. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–627
Figure 5–590. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–628
Figure 5–591. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–629
Figure 5–592. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–630
Figure 5–593. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–632
Figure 5–594. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–633
Figure 5–595. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–633
Figure 5–596. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–634

List of Figures

Figure 5–597. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–634
Figure 5–598. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–635
Figure 5–599. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–636
Figure 5–600. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–636
Figure 5–601. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–637
Figure 5–602. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–637
Figure 5–603. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–638
Figure 5–604. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–638
Figure 5–605. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–640
Figure 5–606. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–640
Figure 5–607. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–641
Figure 5–608. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–641
Figure 5–609. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–642
Figure 5–610. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–644
Figure 5–611. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–645
Figure 5–612. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–646
Figure 5–613. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–647
Figure 5–614. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–648
Figure 5–615. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–649

Figure 5–616. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–650
Figure 5–617. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–651
Figure 5–618. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–652
Figure 5–619. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–653
Figure 5–620. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–654
Figure 5–621. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885....	5–655
Figure 5–622. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–656
Figure 5–623. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–659
Figure 5–624. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–659
Figure 5–625. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–660
Figure 5–626. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–660
Figure 5–627. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–661
Figure 5–628. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–661
Figure 5–629. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–662
Figure 5–630. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–662
Figure 5–631. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–663
Figure 5–632. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–663
Figure 5–633. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–664

List of Figures

Figure 5–634. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–664
Figure 5–635. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–666
Figure 5–636. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–667
Figure 5–637. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–667
Figure 5–638. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–668
Figure 5–639. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–668
Figure 5–640. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–670
Figure 5–641. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–671
Figure 5–642. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–672
Figure 5–643. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–673
Figure 5–644. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–674
Figure 5–645. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–675
Figure 5–646. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–676
Figure 5–647. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–677
Figure 5–648. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–678
Figure 5–649. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–679
Figure 5–650. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–680
Figure 5–651. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–681
Figure 5–652. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–682

Figure 5–653.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–685
Figure 5–654.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–685
Figure 5–655.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–686
Figure 5–656.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–686
Figure 5–657.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–687
Figure 5–658.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–688
Figure 5–659.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–688
Figure 5–660.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–689
Figure 5–661.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–690
Figure 5–662.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–690
Figure 5–663.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–691
Figure 5–664.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–691
Figure 5–665.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–692
Figure 5–666.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–692
Figure 5–667.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radiolonuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–693
Figure 5–668.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–693
Figure 5–669.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–694
Figure 5–670.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–694
Figure 5–671.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–695
Figure 5–672.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–695
Figure 5–673.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–696
Figure 5–674.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–696
Figure 5–675.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–697
Figure 5–676.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–697
Figure 5–677.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–699

List of Figures

Figure 5-678. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-700
Figure 5-679. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-700
Figure 5-680. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-701
Figure 5-681. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-701
Figure 5-682. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-702
Figure 5-683. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5-703
Figure 5-684. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5-704
Figure 5-685. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-705
Figure 5-686. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-705
Figure 5-687. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-707
Figure 5-688. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-708
Figure 5-689. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-709
Figure 5-690. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-710
Figure 5-691. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-711
Figure 5-692. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-712
Figure 5-693. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-713
Figure 5-694. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-714
Figure 5-695. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-715
Figure 5-696. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5-716
Figure 5-697. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5-717
Figure 5-698. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5-718
Figure 5-699. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-719
Figure 5-700. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-720
Figure 5-701. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-721
Figure 5-702. Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-722

Figure 5–703.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–723
Figure 5–704.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–724
Figure 5–705.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–725
Figure 5–706.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–726
Figure 5–707.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–727
Figure 5–708.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–728
Figure 5–709.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–729
Figure 5–710.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–730
Figure 5–711.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–731
Figure 5–712.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–732
Figure 5–713.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–736
Figure 5–714.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–736
Figure 5–715.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–737
Figure 5–716.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–737
Figure 5–717.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–738
Figure 5–718.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–738
Figure 5–719.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–739
Figure 5–720.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–740
Figure 5–721.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–740
Figure 5–722.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–741
Figure 5–723.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–741
Figure 5–724.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–742

List of Figures

Figure 5–725. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–742
Figure 5–726. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–743
Figure 5–727. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–743
Figure 5–728. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–744
Figure 5–729. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–744
Figure 5–730. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–745
Figure 5–731. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–746
Figure 5–732. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–747
Figure 5–733. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–747
Figure 5–734. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–748
Figure 5–735. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–749
Figure 5–736. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–750
Figure 5–737. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–751
Figure 5–738. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–752
Figure 5–739. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–753
Figure 5–740. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–754
Figure 5–741. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99, Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–755
Figure 5–742. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–756
Figure 5–743. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–757
Figure 5–744. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–758
Figure 5–745. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–759
Figure 5–746. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–760
Figure 5–747. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–761

Figure 5-748. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-763
Figure 5-749. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-764
Figure 5-750. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-764
Figure 5-751. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-765
Figure 5-752. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-765
Figure 5-753. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-766
Figure 5-754. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-767
Figure 5-755. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-767
Figure 5-756. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-768
Figure 5-757. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-768
Figure 5-758. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-769
Figure 5-759. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-769
Figure 5-760. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-770
Figure 5-761. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5-770
Figure 5-762. Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5-771
Figure 5-763. Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5-771
Figure 5-764. Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5-772
Figure 5-765. Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5-772
Figure 5-766. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-774
Figure 5-767. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5-774
Figure 5-768. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-775
Figure 5-769. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5-775

List of Figures

Figure 5-770. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5-776
Figure 5-771. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-777
Figure 5-772. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-778
Figure 5-773. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-779
Figure 5-774. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-780
Figure 5-775. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-781
Figure 5-776. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-782
Figure 5-777. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5-783
Figure 5-778. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5-784
Figure 5-779. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5-785
Figure 5-780. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5-786
Figure 5-781. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5-787
Figure 5-782. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5-788
Figure 5-783. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-790
Figure 5-784. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-791
Figure 5-785. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-792
Figure 5-786. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5-792
Figure 5-787. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-793
Figure 5-788. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5-793
Figure 5-789. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-794
Figure 5-790. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5-794
Figure 5-791. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-795
Figure 5-792. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5-795

Figure 5–793. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–796
Figure 5–794. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–796
Figure 5–795. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–797
Figure 5–796. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–797
Figure 5–797. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–798
Figure 5–798. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–798
Figure 5–799. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–799
Figure 5–800. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–799
Figure 5–801. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–801
Figure 5–802. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–801
Figure 5–803. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–802
Figure 5–804. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–802
Figure 5–805. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–803
Figure 5–806. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–804
Figure 5–807. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–805
Figure 5–808. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–806
Figure 5–809. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–807
Figure 5–810. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–808
Figure 5–811. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–809
Figure 5–812. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–810
Figure 5–813. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–811
Figure 5–814. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–812
Figure 5–815. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–813

List of Figures

Figure 5–816. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–814
Figure 5–817. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–815
Figure 5–818. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–817
Figure 5–819. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–818
Figure 5–820. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–818
Figure 5–821. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–819
Figure 5–822. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–820
Figure 5–823. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–820
Figure 5–824. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–821
Figure 5–825. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–821
Figure 5–826. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–822
Figure 5–827. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–822
Figure 5–828. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–823
Figure 5–829. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–823
Figure 5–830. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–824
Figure 5–831. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–824
Figure 5–832. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–825
Figure 5–833. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–825
Figure 5–834. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–826
Figure 5–835. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–826
Figure 5–836. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–828

Figure 5–837. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–829
Figure 5–838. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–830
Figure 5–839. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–830
Figure 5–840. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–831
Figure 5–841. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–833
Figure 5–842. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–834
Figure 5–843. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–835
Figure 5–844. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–836
Figure 5–845. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–837
Figure 5–846. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–838
Figure 5–847. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–839
Figure 5–848. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–840
Figure 5–849. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–841
Figure 5–850. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–842
Figure 5–851. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–843
Figure 5–852. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–844
Figure 5–853. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–846
Figure 5–854. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–847
Figure 5–855. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–847
Figure 5–856. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–848
Figure 5–857. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–849
Figure 5–858. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–849
Figure 5–859. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–850

List of Figures

Figure 5–860.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–850
Figure 5–861.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–851
Figure 5–862.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–851
Figure 5–863.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–852
Figure 5–864.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–852
Figure 5–865.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–853
Figure 5–866.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–853
Figure 5–867.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–854
Figure 5–868.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–854
Figure 5–869.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–855
Figure 5–870.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–855
Figure 5–871.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–857
Figure 5–872.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–858
Figure 5–873.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–859
Figure 5–874.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–859
Figure 5–875.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–860
Figure 5–876.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–862
Figure 5–877.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–863
Figure 5–878.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–864
Figure 5–879.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–865
Figure 5–880.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–866
Figure 5–881.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–867
Figure 5–882.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–868

Figure 5–883. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–869
Figure 5–884. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–870
Figure 5–885. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–871
Figure 5–886. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–872
Figure 5–887. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–873
Figure 5–888. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–874
Figure 5–889. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–877
Figure 5–890. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–877
Figure 5–891. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–878
Figure 5–892. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–878
Figure 5–893. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–879
Figure 5–894. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–879
Figure 5–895. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–880
Figure 5–896. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–881
Figure 5–897. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–881
Figure 5–898. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–882
Figure 5–899. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–882
Figure 5–900. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–883
Figure 5–901. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–885
Figure 5–902. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–886
Figure 5–903. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–887
Figure 5–904. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–887

List of Figures

Figure 5–905.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–889
Figure 5–906.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–890
Figure 5–907.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–891
Figure 5–908.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–892
Figure 5–909.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–893
Figure 5–910.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–894
Figure 5–911.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–895
Figure 5–912.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–896
Figure 5–913.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–897
Figure 5–914.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–898
Figure 5–915.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–899
Figure 5–916.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–900
Figure 5–917.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–902
Figure 5–918.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–903
Figure 5–919.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–903
Figure 5–920.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–904
Figure 5–921.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–904
Figure 5–922.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–905
Figure 5–923.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–905
Figure 5–924.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–906
Figure 5–925.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–906
Figure 5–926.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–907

Figure 5–927. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–907
Figure 5–928. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–908
Figure 5–929. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–908
Figure 5–930. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–909
Figure 5–931. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–909
Figure 5–932. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–910
Figure 5–933. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–910
Figure 5–934. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–911
Figure 5–935. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–913
Figure 5–936. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–913
Figure 5–937. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–914
Figure 5–938. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–914
Figure 5–939. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–915
Figure 5–940. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–916
Figure 5–941. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–917
Figure 5–942. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–918
Figure 5–943. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–919
Figure 5–944. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–920
Figure 5–945. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–921
Figure 5–946. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–922
Figure 5–947. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–923
Figure 5–948. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–924
Figure 5–949. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–925

List of Figures

Figure 5–950.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–926
Figure 5–951.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–927
Figure 5–952.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–930
Figure 5–953.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–930
Figure 5–954.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–931
Figure 5–955.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–931
Figure 5–956.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–932
Figure 5–957.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–932
Figure 5–958.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–933
Figure 5–959.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–934
Figure 5–960.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–935
Figure 5–961.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–935
Figure 5–962.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–936
Figure 5–963.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–936
Figure 5–964.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–937
Figure 5–965.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–938
Figure 5–966.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–938
Figure 5–967.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–939
Figure 5–968.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–941
Figure 5–969.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–942
Figure 5–970.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–943
Figure 5–971.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–944
Figure 5–972.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–945

Figure 5–973. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–946
Figure 5–974. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–947
Figure 5–975. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–948
Figure 5–976. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–949
Figure 5–977. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–950
Figure 5–978. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–951
Figure 5–979. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–952
Figure 5–980. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–954
Figure 5–981. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–955
Figure 5–982. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–955
Figure 5–983. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–956
Figure 5–984. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–956
Figure 5–985. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–957
Figure 5–986. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–958
Figure 5–987. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–958
Figure 5–988. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–959
Figure 5–989. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–959
Figure 5–990. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–960
Figure 5–991. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–960

List of Figures

Figure 5–992. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–961
Figure 5–993. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–961
Figure 5–994. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–962
Figure 5–995. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–962
Figure 5–996. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–963
Figure 5–997. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–963
Figure 5–998. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–965
Figure 5–999. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–965
Figure 5–1000. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–966
Figure 5–1001. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–966
Figure 5–1002. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–967
Figure 5–1003. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–968
Figure 5–1004. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–969
Figure 5–1005. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–970
Figure 5–1006. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–971
Figure 5–1007. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–972
Figure 5–1008. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–973
Figure 5–1009. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–974
Figure 5–1010. Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–975

Figure 5–1011.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–976
Figure 5–1012.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–977
Figure 5–1013.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–978
Figure 5–1014.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–979
Figure 5–1015.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–980
Figure 5–1016.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–982
Figure 5–1017.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–983
Figure 5–1018.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–983
Figure 5–1019.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–984
Figure 5–1020.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–984
Figure 5–1021.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–985
Figure 5–1022.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–986
Figure 5–1023.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–986
Figure 5–1024.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–987
Figure 5–1025.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–987
Figure 5–1026.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–988
Figure 5–1027.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–988

List of Figures

Figure 5–1028.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–989
Figure 5–1029.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–989
Figure 5–1030.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–990
Figure 5–1031.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–990
Figure 5–1032.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–991
Figure 5–1033.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–991
Figure 5–1034.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–992
Figure 5–1035.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–993
Figure 5–1036.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–993
Figure 5–1037.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	5–994
Figure 5–1038.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–995
Figure 5–1039.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–996
Figure 5–1040.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–997
Figure 5–1041.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–998
Figure 5–1042.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–999
Figure 5–1043.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1000
Figure 5–1044.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1001
Figure 5–1045.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1002
Figure 5–1046.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1003

Figure 5–1047.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1004
Figure 5–1048.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1005
Figure 5–1049.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1006
Figure 5–1050.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1007
Figure 5–1051.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1008
Figure 5–1052.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1009
Figure 5–1053.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1010
Figure 5–1054.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1013
Figure 5–1055.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1013
Figure 5–1056.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1014
Figure 5–1057.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1014
Figure 5–1058.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–1015
Figure 5–1059.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–1015
Figure 5–1060.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1016
Figure 5–1061.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1016
Figure 5–1062.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1017
Figure 5–1063.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1017
Figure 5–1064.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–1018
Figure 5–1065.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–1018
Figure 5–1066.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1019
Figure 5–1067.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1019

List of Figures

Figure 5–1068.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1020
Figure 5–1069.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–1020
Figure 5–1070.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–1021
Figure 5–1071.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–1021
Figure 5–1072.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1022
Figure 5–1073.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–1023
Figure 5–1074.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1023
Figure 5–1075.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1024
Figure 5–1076.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–1025
Figure 5–1077.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1026
Figure 5–1078.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1027
Figure 5–1079.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1028
Figure 5–1080.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1029
Figure 5–1081.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1030
Figure 5–1082.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1031
Figure 5–1083.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1032
Figure 5–1084.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1033
Figure 5–1085.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1034
Figure 5–1086.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1035
Figure 5–1087.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1036
Figure 5–1088.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1037
Figure 5–1089.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1038

Figure 5–1090.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1041
Figure 5–1091.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1041
Figure 5–1092.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1042
Figure 5–1093.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1042
Figure 5–1094.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–1043
Figure 5–1095.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–1043
Figure 5–1096.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1044
Figure 5–1097.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–1044
Figure 5–1098.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1045
Figure 5–1099.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–1045
Figure 5–1100.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–1046
Figure 5–1101.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–1046
Figure 5–1102.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone.....	5–1047
Figure 5–1103.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Vadose Zone	5–1047
Figure 5–1104.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater.....	5–1048
Figure 5–1105.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Groundwater	5–1048
Figure 5–1106.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Radionuclide Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River	5–1049
Figure 5–1107.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chemical Releases from River Protection Project Disposal Facility to Columbia River.....	5–1049
Figure 5–1108.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1050
Figure 5–1109.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	5–1051
Figure 5–1110.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1051

List of Figures

Figure 5–1111.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1052
Figure 5–1112.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–1053
Figure 5–1113.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1054
Figure 5–1114.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1055
Figure 5–1115.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1056
Figure 5–1116.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1057
Figure 5–1117.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1058
Figure 5–1118.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1059
Figure 5–1119.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1060
Figure 5–1120.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1061
Figure 5–1121.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1062
Figure 5–1122.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1063
Figure 5–1123.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1064
Figure 5–1124.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution Year of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885..	5–1065
Figure 5–1125.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1066
Figure 5–1126.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1067
Figure 5–1127.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary.....	5–1071
Figure 5–1128.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1074
Figure 5–1129.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1074
Figure 5–1130.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1077
Figure 5–1131.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1077

Figure 5–1132.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1080
Figure 5–1133.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1080
Figure 5–1134.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1083
Figure 5–1135.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1084
Figure 5–1136.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1087
Figure 5–1137.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1088
Figure 5–1138.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1091
Figure 5–1139.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1092
Figure 5–1140.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1094
Figure 5–1141.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1095
Figure 5–1142.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1097
Figure 5–1143.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1098
Figure 5–1144.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1102
Figure 5–1145.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1103
Figure 5–1146.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1104
Figure 5–1147.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1105
Figure 5–1148.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1109

List of Figures

Figure 5–1149.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1110
Figure 5–1150.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1111
Figure 5–1151.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1112
Figure 5–1152.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1115
Figure 5–1153.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1116
Figure 5–1154.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1117
Figure 5–1155.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1120
Figure 5–1156.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1121
Figure 5–1157.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1124
Figure 5–1158.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1125
Figure 5–1159.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1128
Figure 5–1160.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1129
Figure 5–1161.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1132
Figure 5–1162.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1133
Figure 5–1163.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1136
Figure 5–1164.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1137
Figure 5–1165.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1140

Figure 5–1166.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1141
Figure 5–1167.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1144
Figure 5–1168.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1145
Figure 5–1169.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1149
Figure 5–1170.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1150
Figure 5–1171.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1151
Figure 5–1172.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1152
Figure 5–1173.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1156
Figure 5–1174.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1157
Figure 5–1175.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility Barrier	5–1158
Figure 5–1176.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Time Series of Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1159
Figure 5–1177.	Alternative Combination 1 Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–1173
Figure 5–1178.	Alternative Combination 1 Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–1174
Figure 5–1179.	Alternative Combination 1 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1174
Figure 5–1180.	Alternative Combination 1 Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1175
Figure 5–1181.	Alternative Combination 1 Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1175
Figure 5–1182.	Alternative Combination 1 Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–1176
Figure 5–1183.	Alternative Combination 1 Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–1177
Figure 5–1184.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1178
Figure 5–1185.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1179
Figure 5–1186.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1180
Figure 5–1187.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1181
Figure 5–1188.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1182
Figure 5–1189.	Alternative Combination 1 Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1183

List of Figures

Figure 5–1190.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–1184
Figure 5–1191.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1185
Figure 5–1192.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1186
Figure 5–1193.	Alternative Combination 1 Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1187
Figure 5–1194.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–1188
Figure 5–1195.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1189
Figure 5–1196.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1190
Figure 5–1197.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–1191
Figure 5–1198.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1192
Figure 5–1199.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1193
Figure 5–1200.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–1194
Figure 5–1201.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1195
Figure 5–1202.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1196
Figure 5–1203.	Alternative Combination 1 Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1197
Figure 5–1204.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–1198
Figure 5–1205.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1199
Figure 5–1206.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	5–1200
Figure 5–1207.	Alternative Combination 2 Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time....	5–1204
Figure 5–1208.	Alternative Combination 2 Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1205
Figure 5–1209.	Alternative Combination 2 Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1206
Figure 5–1210.	Alternative Combination 2 Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1206
Figure 5–1211.	Alternative Combination 2 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1207
Figure 5–1212.	Alternative Combination 2 Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1208
Figure 5–1213.	Alternative Combination 2 Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1208
Figure 5–1214.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–1210
Figure 5–1215.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	5–1211
Figure 5–1216.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	5–1213
Figure 5–1217.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	5–1214
Figure 5–1218.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	5–1215

Figure 5–1219.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1216
Figure 5–1220.	Alternative Combination 2 Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1217
Figure 5–1221.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1218
Figure 5–1222.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1219
Figure 5–1223.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1220
Figure 5–1224.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1221
Figure 5–1225.	Alternative Combination 2 Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1222
Figure 5–1226.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1223
Figure 5–1227.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1224
Figure 5–1228.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1225
Figure 5–1229.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1226
Figure 5–1230.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1227
Figure 5–1231.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1228
Figure 5–1232.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1229
Figure 5–1233.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1230
Figure 5–1234.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1232
Figure 5–1235.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1233
Figure 5–1236.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1234
Figure 5–1237.	Alternative Combination 2 Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1235
Figure 5–1238.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1236
Figure 5–1239.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1237
Figure 5–1240.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1238
Figure 5–1241.	Alternative Combination 3 Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	5–1243
Figure 5–1242.	Alternative Combination 3 Chromium Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1244
Figure 5–1243.	Alternative Combination 3 Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1244
Figure 5–1244.	Alternative Combination 3 Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	5–1245
Figure 5–1245.	Alternative Combination 3 Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time.....	5–1245
Figure 5–1246.	Alternative Combination 3 Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	5–1246
Figure 5–1247.	Alternative Combination 3 Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	5–1247

List of Figures

Figure 5–1248.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1248
Figure 5–1249.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1249
Figure 5–1250.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1250
Figure 5–1251.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1251
Figure 5–1252.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1252
Figure 5–1253.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1253
Figure 5–1254.	Alternative Combination 3 Total Area of Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1254
Figure 5–1255.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1255
Figure 5–1256.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1256
Figure 5–1257.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1257
Figure 5–1258.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1258
Figure 5–1259.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1259
Figure 5–1260.	Alternative Combination 3 Total Area of Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1260
Figure 5–1261.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1261
Figure 5–1262.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1262
Figure 5–1263.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1263
Figure 5–1264.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1264
Figure 5–1265.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1265
Figure 5–1266.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	5–1266
Figure 5–1267.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1267
Figure 5–1268.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	5–1268
Figure 5–1269.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1269
Figure 5–1270.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1270
Figure 5–1271.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1272
Figure 5–1272.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1273
Figure 5–1273.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1274

Figure 5–1274.	Alternative Combination 3 Total Area of Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time....	5–1275
Figure 5–1275.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	5–1276
Figure 5–1276.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	5–1277
Figure 5–1277.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	5–1278
Figure 5–1278.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Time Series of Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1282
Figure 5–1279.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Time Series of Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1282
Figure 5–1280.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Time Series of Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the FFTF Barrier	5–1283
Figure 5–1281.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Time Series of Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1285
Figure 5–1282.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A Time Series of Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1285
Figure 5–1283.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Time Series of Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the FFTF Barrier	5–1286
Figure 5–1284.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Time Series of Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1288
Figure 5–1285.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Time Series of Lifetime Radiological Risk for the Drinking-Water Well User at the Core Zone Boundary	5–1288
Figure 6–1.	Richland Operations Industrial Safety Total Recordable Cases and Incident Rate, 1993–2006	6–41
Figure 6–2.	Alternative Combination 1 Cumulative Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	6–49
Figure 6–3.	Alternative Combination 1 Cumulative Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	6–49
Figure 6–4.	Alternative Combination 1 Cumulative Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	6–50
Figure 6–5.	Alternative Combination 1 Cumulative Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration Versus Time	6–50
Figure 6–6.	Alternative Combination 1 Cumulative Chromium Concentration Versus Time	6–51
Figure 6–7.	Alternative Combination 1 Cumulative Nitrate Concentration Versus Time	6–51
Figure 6–8.	Alternative Combination 1 Cumulative Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	6–53
Figure 6–9.	Alternative Combination 1 Cumulative Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	6–53
Figure 6–10.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6–55
Figure 6–11.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6–56
Figure 6–12.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6–57
Figure 6–13.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	6–58
Figure 6–14.	Alternative Combination 1 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6–59

List of Figures

Figure 6–15.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	6–60
Figure 6–16.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6–61
Figure 6–17.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	6–62
Figure 6–18.	Alternative Combination 1 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6–63
Figure 6–19.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	6–64
Figure 6–20.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6–65
Figure 6–21.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	6–66
Figure 6–22.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6–67
Figure 6–23.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	6–68
Figure 6–24.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6–69
Figure 6–25.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6–70
Figure 6–26.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	6–71
Figure 6–27.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6–72
Figure 6–28.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	6–73
Figure 6–29.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6–74
Figure 6–30.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	6–75
Figure 6–31.	Alternative Combination 1 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6–76
Figure 6–32.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	6–77
Figure 6–33.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6–78
Figure 6–34.	Alternative Combination 1 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	6–79
Figure 6–35.	Alternative Combination 2 Cumulative Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	6–85
Figure 6–36.	Alternative Combination 2 Cumulative Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	6–86
Figure 6–37.	Alternative Combination 2 Cumulative Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	6–86
Figure 6–38.	Alternative Combination 2 Cumulative Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration Versus Time	6–87
Figure 6–39.	Alternative Combination 2 Cumulative Chromium Concentration Versus Time	6–87
Figure 6–40.	Alternative Combination 2 Cumulative Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	6–88
Figure 6–41.	Alternative Combination 2 Cumulative Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	6–89

Figure 6-42.	Alternative Combination 2 Cumulative Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	6-89
Figure 6-43.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6-91
Figure 6-44.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	6-92
Figure 6-45.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6-93
Figure 6-46.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	6-94
Figure 6-47.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	6-95
Figure 6-48.	Alternative Combination 2 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6-96
Figure 6-49.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	6-97
Figure 6-50.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6-98
Figure 6-51.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	6-99
Figure 6-52.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	6-100
Figure 6-53.	Alternative Combination 2 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6-101
Figure 6-54.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6-102
Figure 6-55.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6-103
Figure 6-56.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	6-104
Figure 6-57.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	6-105
Figure 6-58.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6-106
Figure 6-59.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6-107
Figure 6-60.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	6-108
Figure 6-61.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	6-109
Figure 6-62.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6-110
Figure 6-63.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	6-111
Figure 6-64.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6-112
Figure 6-65.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135.....	6-113
Figure 6-66.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6-114

List of Figures

Figure 6-67.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	6-115
Figure 6-68.	Alternative Combination 2 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6-116
Figure 6-69.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	6-117
Figure 6-70.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6-118
Figure 6-71.	Alternative Combination 2 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	6-119
Figure 6-72.	Alternative Combination 3 Cumulative Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration Versus Time	6-125
Figure 6-73.	Alternative Combination 3 Cumulative Iodine-129 Concentration Versus Time	6-126
Figure 6-74.	Alternative Combination 3 Cumulative Technetium-99 Concentration Versus Time	6-126
Figure 6-75.	Alternative Combination 3 Cumulative Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration Versus Time	6-127
Figure 6-76.	Alternative Combination 3 Cumulative Chromium Concentration Versus Time	6-127
Figure 6-77.	Alternative Combination 3 Cumulative Nitrate Concentration Versus Time.....	6-128
Figure 6-78.	Alternative Combination 3 Cumulative Uranium-238 Concentration Versus Time	6-129
Figure 6-79.	Alternative Combination 3 Cumulative Total Uranium Concentration Versus Time	6-129
Figure 6-80.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Hydrogen-3 (Tritium) Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6-131
Figure 6-81.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	6-132
Figure 6-82.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6-133
Figure 6-83.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	6-134
Figure 6-84.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	6-135
Figure 6-85.	Alternative Combination 3 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6-136
Figure 6-86.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	6-137
Figure 6-87.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6-138
Figure 6-88.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	6-139
Figure 6-89.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885.....	6-140
Figure 6-90.	Alternative Combination 3 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6-141
Figure 6-91.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 2010.....	6-142
Figure 6-92.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890.....	6-143
Figure 6-93.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 7140.....	6-144

Figure 6–94.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Chromium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	6–145
Figure 6–95.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6–146
Figure 6–96.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6–147
Figure 6–97.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 7140	6–148
Figure 6–98.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Nitrate Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	6–149
Figure 6–99.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 2010	6–150
Figure 6–100.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	6–151
Figure 6–101.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6–152
Figure 6–102.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	6–153
Figure 6–103.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6–154
Figure 6–104.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	6–155
Figure 6–105.	Alternative Combination 3 Total Area of Cumulative Groundwater Uranium-238 Concentrations Exceeding the Benchmark Concentration as a Function of Time	6–156
Figure 6–106.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 2135	6–157
Figure 6–107.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 3890	6–158
Figure 6–108.	Alternative Combination 3 Spatial Distribution of Cumulative Groundwater Total Uranium Concentration, Calendar Year 11,885	6–159
Figure 7–1.	Mitigation and Adaptive Management Processes	7–68
Figure 7–2.	Typical Concentration-Versus-Time Plot.....	7–69
Figure 7–3.	Conceptual Range of Potential Concentrations with Variance Band	7–70
Figure 7–4.	Effects of Reducing Uncertainty on Concentration Plots.....	7–71
Figure 7–5.	Example of Individual Contributors and Aggregation of Multiple Sources.....	7–73
Figure 7–6.	Availability of COPCs for Recovery from Vadose Zone.....	7–76
Figure 7–7.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration Without Offsite Waste.....	7–79
Figure 7–8.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentration with 3 Curies of Iodine-129 in Offsite Waste.....	7–80
Figure 7–9.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration Without Offsite Waste.....	7–81
Figure 7–10.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration with 1,500 Curies of Technetium-99 in Offsite Waste.....	7–81
Figure 7–11.	Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration Versus Time at the Core Zone Boundary, Capture-and-Removal Scenario Comparison	7–83
Figure 7–12.	Carbon Tetrachloride Concentration Versus Time at the Columbia River, Capture-and-Removal Scenario Comparison	7–83
Figure 7–13.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary, TC & WM EIS Case.....	7–86

List of Figures

Figure 7–14.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary, Iodine Recycle Sensitivity Case	7–86
Figure 7–15.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary	7–87
Figure 7–16.	Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration at the Core Zone Boundary, No Technetium-99 Removal Case	7–88
Figure 7–17.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration at the Core Zone Boundary and the Columbia River, Retrieval Loss Sensitivity Case	7–90
Figure 7–18.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration at the Core Zone Boundary and the Columbia River, No-Retrieval-Losses Sensitivity Case	7–90
Figure 7–19.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentration at the Core Zone Boundary	7–92
Figure 7–20.	Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary, Bulk Vitriification EIS Case.....	7–93
Figure 7–21.	Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary, Bulk Vitriification Sensitivity Case 1	7–94
Figure 7–22.	Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary, Bulk Vitriification Sensitivity Case 2	7–95
Figure 7–23.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary, EIS Performance Case.....	7–97
Figure 7–24.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Groundwater Iodine-129 Concentrations at the Core Zone Boundary, Sensitivity Grout Case.....	7–97
Figure 7–25.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations at a Background Infiltration Rate of 0.9 Millimeters per Year.....	7–100
Figure 7–26.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations at a Background Infiltration Rate of 3.5 Millimeters per Year.....	7–100
Figure 7–27.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Tank Closure Alternative 2B, Groundwater Technetium-99 Concentrations at a Background Infiltration Rate of 5.0 Millimeters per Year.....	7–101

List of Tables

Table 2–1.	Fast Flux Test Facility and Support Facilities	2–42
Table 2–2.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Summary by Mission Component	2–65
Table 2–3.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Summary by Mission Component	2–107
Table 2–4.	Waste Management Alternatives – Summary by Mission Component.....	2–117
Table 2–5.	Comparison of the Tank Closure Alternatives	2–132
Table 2–6.	Comparison of the FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives.....	2–138
Table 2–7.	Comparison of the Waste Management Alternatives	2–140
Table 2–8.	Comparison of Disposal Groups by Waste Management Alternative.....	2–142
Table 2–9.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Summary of Short-Term Environmental Impacts	2–159
Table 2–10.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Summary of Short-Term Environmental Impacts.....	2–182
Table 2–11.	Waste Management Alternatives – Summary of Short-Term Environmental Impacts	2–200
Table 2–12.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the A Barrier	2–211
Table 2–13.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the B Barrier	2–212
Table 2–14.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the S Barrier.....	2–213
Table 2–15.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the T Barrier.....	2–214
Table 2–16.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the U Barrier	2–215
Table 2–17.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Core Zone Boundary.....	2–216
Table 2–18.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Columbia River Nearshore	2–217
Table 2–19.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Summary of Radiation Dose at Year of Peak Dose for the Drinking-Water Well User.....	2–223
Table 2–20.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Summary of the Hazard Index at Year of Peak Hazard Index for the Drinking-Water Well User	2–223
Table 2–21.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Air on Terrestrial Receptors at the Onsite Maximum-Impact Location	2–234
Table 2–22.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Air on Aquatic and Riparian Receptors at the Columbia River.....	2–235
Table 2–23.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Groundwater on Aquatic and Riparian Receptors at the Columbia River.....	2–236
Table 2–24.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the FFTF Barrier	2–238
Table 2–25.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Columbia River Nearshore.....	2–239
Table 2–26.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Summary of Radiation Dose at Year of Peak Dose for the Drinking-Water Well User.....	2–241
Table 2–27.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Summary of Hazard Index at Year of Peak Hazard Index for the Drinking-Water Well User	2–242
Table 2–28.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Air on Terrestrial Receptors	2–244
Table 2–29.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Groundwater on Aquatic and Riparian Receptors at the Columbia River	2–245

List of Tables

Table 2–30.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at Trenches 31 and 34	2–247
Table 2–31.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility	2–248
Table 2–32.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the River Protection Project Disposal Facility	2–249
Table 2–33.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the 200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility	2–250
Table 2–34.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the 200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility	2–251
Table 2–35.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the River Protection Project Disposal Facility	2–252
Table 2–36.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Core Zone Boundary	2–253
Table 2–37.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Core Zone Boundary	2–254
Table 2–38.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Columbia River Nearshore.....	2–255
Table 2–39.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Columbia River Nearshore.....	2–256
Table 2–40.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Summary of Radiation Dose at Year of Peak Dose for the Drinking-Water Well User.....	2–261
Table 2–41.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Summary of Hazard Index at Year of Peak Hazard Index for the Drinking-Water Well User	2–261
Table 2–42.	Waste Management Alternative 2, All Disposal Groups and Subgroups, Summary of Radiation Dose at Year of Peak Dose for the Drinking-Water Well User.....	2–263
Table 2–43.	Waste Management Alternative 2, All Disposal Groups and Subgroups, Summary of Hazard Index at Year of Peak Hazard Index for the Drinking-Water Well User.....	2–263
Table 2–44.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Summary of Radiation Dose at Year of Peak Dose for the Drinking-Water Well User.....	2–278
Table 2–45.	Waste Management Alternative 3 Summary of Hazard Index at Year of Peak Hazard Index for the Drinking-Water Well User	2–278
Table 2–46.	Waste Management Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Air on Terrestrial Receptors	2–293
Table 2–47.	Waste Management Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Groundwater on Aquatic and Riparian Receptors at the Columbia River	2–294
Table 2–48.	Waste Management Alternatives 2 and 3 – Maximum Concentrations of Technetium-99 and Iodine-129 in the Peak Year at the IDF-East and IDF-West Barriers	2–310
Table 2–49.	Waste Management Alternative 2 – Maximum Concentrations of Technetium-99 and Iodine-129 in the Peak Year at the IDF-East Barrier With and Without Offsite Waste	2–311
Table 2–50.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Summary of Cost Estimates, Excluding Waste Form Disposal Costs	2–314
Table 2–51.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Costs for Final-Waste-Form Disposal	2–316
Table 2–52.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Total Cost Projections, Including Waste Disposal Costs	2–317
Table 2–53.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Summary Cost Estimates, Excluding Waste Form Disposal Costs.....	2–318
Table 2–54.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Waste Form Disposal Cost Estimates	2–318

Table 2–55.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Total Cost Projections, Including Waste Disposal Costs	2–319
Table 2–56.	Waste Management Alternatives – Summary Cost Estimates, Excluding Waste Form Disposal Costs.....	2–320
Table 2–57.	Waste Management Alternatives – Waste Form Disposal Costs	2–320
Table 2–58.	Waste Management Alternatives – Total Cost Projections, Including Waste Disposal Costs	2–321
Table 3–1.	General Regions of Influence for the Affected Environment.....	3–2
Table 3–2.	Hanford Sitewide Infrastructure Characteristics	3–13
Table 3–3.	Modeled Nonradioactive Ambient Air Pollutant Concentrations from Hanford Site Sources and Ambient Air Quality Standards	3–22
Table 3–4.	Nonradioactive Constituents Emitted to the Atmosphere at the Hanford Site, 2005.....	3–23
Table 3–5.	Radionuclides Discharged to the Atmosphere at the Hanford Site, 2009	3–23
Table 3–6.	Prevention of Significant Deterioration Increments for the Hanford Site	3–24
Table 3–7.	Maximum Waste Treatment Plant Contributions to Ambient Air Concentrations as Analyzed for the Revised Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Application	3–25
Table 3–8.	Hanford Site Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Species	3–68
Table 3–9.	Demographic Profile of Populations in the Hanford Site Socioeconomic Region of Influence, 2010.....	3–81
Table 3–10.	Income Information for the Hanford Site Region of Influence, 2010	3–81
Table 3–11.	Housing and Community Services in the Hanford Site Region of Influence, 2010	3–82
Table 3–12.	Sources of Radiological Exposure of Individual Doses Unrelated to Hanford Site Operations	3–86
Table 3–13.	Radiation Doses to the Public from Hanford Site Operations, 2009 (Total Effective Dose Equivalent).....	3–87
Table 3–14.	Radiation Doses to Workers from Hanford Site Normal Operations (Total Effective Dose Equivalent).....	3–88
Table 3–15.	Cancer Incidence Rates for Washington State and Counties Adjacent to the Hanford Site, 2003–2007.....	3–91
Table 3–16.	Populations in the Potentially Affected 10-County Area Surrounding the Hanford Site and the Two-State Region of Washington and Oregon, 1990.....	3–96
Table 3–17.	Populations in the Potentially Affected 10-County Area Surrounding the Hanford Site and the Two-State Region of Washington and Oregon, 2000.....	3–97
Table 3–18.	Populations in the Potentially Affected 10-County Area Surrounding the Hanford Site and the Two-State Region of Washington and Oregon, 2010.....	3–98
Table 3–19.	Populations Within 80 Kilometers of the 200 Areas at the Hanford Site, 2010.....	3–99
Table 3–20.	Populations Within 80 Kilometers of the 400 Area at the Hanford Site, 2010	3–102
Table 3–21.	Total and Low-Income Populations in the Potentially Affected 10-County Area Surrounding the Hanford Site and in the Two-State Region of Washington and Oregon, 1989	3–105
Table 3–22.	Total and Low-Income Populations in the Potentially Affected 10-County Area Surrounding the Hanford Site and in the Two-State Region of Washington and Oregon, 1999	3–105
Table 3–23.	Total and Low-Income Populations in the Potentially Affected 10-County Area Surrounding the Hanford Site and in the Two-State Region of Washington and Oregon, 2006–2010.....	3–106
Table 3–24.	Total and Low-Income Populations Within 80 Kilometers of the 200 Areas at the Hanford Site, 2006–2010.....	3–106

List of Tables

Table 3–25.	Total and Low-Income Populations Within 80 Kilometers of the 400 Area at the Hanford Site, 2006–2010.....	3–107
Table 3–26.	Quantities of Solid Waste Generated on the Hanford Site, 2000–2006	3–111
Table 3–27.	Quantities of Liquid Waste Generated and Stored Within the Tank Farm System on the Hanford Site, 2000–2006.....	3–112
Table 3–28.	Projected Waste Generation, 2006–2035	3–112
Table 3–29.	Preferred Treatment of Various Hanford Wastes as Stipulated in the <i>WM PEIS</i> Records of Decision	3–120
Table 3–30.	Idaho National Laboratory Sitewide Infrastructure Characteristics	3–127
Table 3–31.	Modeled Nonradioactive Ambient Air Pollutant Concentrations from Idaho National Laboratory Sources and Ambient Air Quality Standards	3–132
Table 3–32.	Air Pollutant Emissions at Idaho National Laboratory, 2006.....	3–133
Table 3–33.	PSD Increment Consumption at Craters of the Moon Wilderness Area (Class I) by Existing (1996) and Projected Sources Subject to PSD Regulation.....	3–134
Table 3–34.	PSD Increment Consumption at Idaho National Laboratory Area (Class II) by Existing (1996) and Projected Sources Subject to PSD Regulation.....	3–134
Table 3–35.	Airborne Radionuclide Releases to the Environment at Idaho National Laboratory, 2008	3–135
Table 3–36.	Idaho National Laboratory Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Species.....	3–156
Table 3–37.	Distribution of Employees by Place of Residence in the Idaho National Laboratory Region of Influence, 2008	3–160
Table 3–38.	Demographic Profile of Populations in the Idaho National Laboratory Socioeconomic Region of Influence, 2009.....	3–161
Table 3–39.	Income Information for the Idaho National Laboratory Region of Influence, 2010.....	3–161
Table 3–40.	Housing and Community Services in the Idaho National Laboratory Region of Influence, 2010.....	3–162
Table 3–41.	Sources of Radiological Exposure of Individual Doses Unrelated to Idaho National Laboratory Operations	3–164
Table 3–42.	Radiation Doses to the Public from Idaho National Laboratory Operations, 2008 (Total Effective Dose Equivalent).....	3–165
Table 3–43.	Radiation Doses to Workers from Idaho National Laboratory Normal Operations (Total Effective Dose Equivalent).....	3–166
Table 3–44.	Populations in Potentially Affected Counties Surrounding the Idaho National Laboratory and in the State of Idaho, 1990	3–170
Table 3–45.	Populations in Potentially Affected Counties Surrounding the Idaho National Laboratory and in the State of Idaho, 2000	3–170
Table 3–46.	Populations in Potentially Affected Counties Surrounding the Idaho National Laboratory and in the State of Idaho, 2010	3–171
Table 3–47.	Populations Within 80 Kilometers of INTEC at Idaho National Laboratory, 2010.....	3–172
Table 3–48.	Populations Within 80 Kilometers of the Materials and Fuels Complex at Idaho National Laboratory, 2010.....	3–175
Table 3–49.	Total and Low-Income Populations in the Potentially Affected 15-County Area Surrounding Idaho National Laboratory and in the State of Idaho, 1989	3–178
Table 3–50.	Total and Low-Income Populations in the Potentially Affected 15-County Area Surrounding Idaho National Laboratory and in the State of Idaho, 1999	3–178
Table 3–51.	Total and Low-Income Populations in the Potentially Affected 15-County Area Surrounding Idaho National Laboratory and in the State of Idaho, 2006–2010.....	3–178
Table 3–52.	Total and Low-Income Populations Within 80 Kilometers of INTEC at Idaho National Laboratory, 2006–2010.....	3–179

Table 3–53.	Total and Low-Income Populations Within 80 Kilometers of the Materials and Fuels Complex at Idaho National Laboratory, 2006–2010	3–181
Table 3–54.	Waste Generation Rates and Inventories at Idaho National Laboratory, 2006	3–183
Table 3–55.	Waste Management Facilities at Idaho National Laboratory	3–184
Table 3–56.	<i>WM PEIS</i> Records of Decision Affecting Idaho National Laboratory	3–187
Table 4–1.	Summary of Major New Facilities Required to Support Tank Closure Alternatives	4–2
Table 4–2.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Summary of Utility Infrastructure Requirements	4–17
Table 4–3.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum Incremental Criteria Pollutant Concentrations	4–34
Table 4–4.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Maximum Incremental Toxic Chemical Concentrations	4–37
Table 4–5.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Nonradioactive Airborne Toxic Chemical Hazard Index for the Nearest Noninvolved Worker	4–38
Table 4–6.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Nonradioactive Airborne Toxic Chemical Cancer Risk for the Nearest Noninvolved Worker	4–38
Table 4–7.	Summary of Major Geologic and Soil Resource Impact Indicators and Requirements	4–53
Table 4–8.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–109
Table 4–9.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–111
Table 4–10.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–114
Table 4–11.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–115
Table 4–12.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–118
Table 4–13.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–119
Table 4–14.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–120
Table 4–15.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–122
Table 4–16.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base/Option Case, Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–125
Table 4–17.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base/Option Case, Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–128
Table 4–18.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Peak Annual Estimated Workforce Requirements	4–130
Table 4–19.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–134
Table 4–20.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Worker	4–135
Table 4–21.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–136
Table 4–22.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–137
Table 4–23.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–138
Table 4–24.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–139
Table 4–25.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–140
Table 4–26.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–141
Table 4–27.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–142
Table 4–28.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–143

List of Tables

Table 4–29.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–144
Table 4–30.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–145
Table 4–31.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–146
Table 4–32.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers ...	4–147
Table 4–33.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–148
Table 4–34.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers ...	4–149
Table 4–35.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–150
Table 4–36.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–151
Table 4–37.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers.....	4–152
Table 4–38.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers.....	4–153
Table 4–39.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–154
Table 4–40.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–155
Table 4–41.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers.....	4–156
Table 4–42.	Tank Closure, Alternative 6B, Option Case, Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers.....	4–157
Table 4–43.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Normal Operations Public Health Impacts of Atmospheric Radionuclide Releases	4–158
Table 4–44.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Normal Operations Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–159
Table 4–45.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–161
Table 4–46.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–161
Table 4–47.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–162
Table 4–48.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–163
Table 4–49.	Tank Closure Alternatives Chemical Impacts of Accidents.....	4–164
Table 4–50.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–165
Table 4–51.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–166
Table 4–52.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–168
Table 4–53.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–169
Table 4–54.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–170
Table 4–55.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–171
Table 4–56.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–173
Table 4–57.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–174
Table 4–58.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–176
Table 4–59.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–177
Table 4–60.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–178
Table 4–61.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–179
Table 4–62.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–180
Table 4–63.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–181
Table 4–64.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–182
Table 4–65.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–183
Table 4–66.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–185

*Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the
Hanford Site, Richland, Washington*

Table 4-67.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4-186
Table 4-68.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Estimated Number of Radioactive Waste Shipments.....	4-189
Table 4-69.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Risks of Transporting Radioactive Waste	4-190
Table 4-70.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Estimated Impacts of Construction and Operational Material Transport	4-191
Table 4-71.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Average Individual Total Dose from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project.....	4-200
Table 4-72.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Average Individual Total Dose from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-202
Table 4-73.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-203
Table 4-74.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-204
Table 4-75.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-206
Table 4-76.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-207
Table 4-77.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-208
Table 4-78.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-210
Table 4-79.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-211
Table 4-80.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project.....	4-212
Table 4-81.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-214
Table 4-82.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project.....	4-215
Table 4-83.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Average Individual Cumulative Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4-216
Table 4-84.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Waste Generation Volumes	4-226
Table 4-85.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Waste Generation Volumes.....	4-228
Table 4-86.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Waste Generation Volumes.....	4-230
Table 4-87.	Tank Closure Alternative 3A Waste Generation Volumes.....	4-233
Table 4-88.	Tank Closure Alternative 3B Waste Generation Volumes.....	4-236
Table 4-89.	Tank Closure Alternative 3C Waste Generation Volumes.....	4-239
Table 4-90.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Waste Generation Volumes	4-242
Table 4-91.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Waste Generation Volumes	4-245
Table 4-92.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Waste Generation Volumes	4-248
Table 4-93.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Waste Generation Volumes.....	4-249
Table 4-94.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Waste Generation Volumes	4-252
Table 4-95.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Waste Generation Volumes	4-253
Table 4-96.	Tank Closure Alternative 6C Waste Generation Volumes.....	4-256
Table 4-97.	Total Recordable Cases and Fatality Incident Rates	4-258
Table 4-98.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Industrial Safety Impacts.....	4-259
Table 4-99.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives and Options – Summary of Utility Infrastructure Requirements	4-271
Table 4-100.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Maximum Incremental Criteria Pollutant Concentrations at the Hanford Site.....	4-279
Table 4-101.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Maximum Incremental Toxic Chemical Concentrations at the Hanford Site.....	4-280

List of Tables

Table 4–102.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Nonradioactive Airborne Toxic Chemical Hazard Index for the Nearest Noninvolved Worker.....	4–281
Table 4–103.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Nonradioactive Airborne Toxic Chemical Cancer Risk for the Nearest Noninvolved Worker.....	4–281
Table 4–104.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Maximum Incremental Criteria Pollutant Concentrations from Disposition of Bulk Sodium at Idaho National Laboratory	4–283
Table 4–105.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Maximum Incremental Toxic Chemical Concentrations from Disposition of Bulk Sodium at Idaho National Laboratory	4–284
Table 4–106.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Summary of Major Geologic and Soil Resource Impact Indicators and Requirements	4–287
Table 4–107.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives and Options – Summary of Peak Estimated Socioeconomic Indicators	4–310
Table 4–108.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–316
Table 4–109.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Radiological Impacts on the Public	4–317
Table 4–110.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–319
Table 4–111.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 Radiological Impacts on the Public	4–321
Table 4–112.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 3 Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–322
Table 4–113.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–324
Table 4–114.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–325
Table 4–115.	Chemical Impacts of Fast Flux Test Facility Accidents at Hanford.....	4–326
Table 4–116.	Radiological Consequences of Accidents Under the Hanford Option for Disposition of Remote-Handled Special Components	4–327
Table 4–117.	Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents Under the Hanford Option for Disposition of Remote-Handled Special Components.....	4–327
Table 4–118.	Radiological Consequences of Accidents Under the Idaho Option for Disposition of Remote-Handled Special Components.....	4–328
Table 4–119.	Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents Under the Idaho Option for Disposition of Remote-Handled Special Components.....	4–329
Table 4–120.	Radiological Consequences of Accidents Under the Idaho Reuse Option for Disposition of Bulk Sodium	4–330
Table 4–121.	Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents Under the Idaho Reuse Option for Disposition of Bulk Sodium	4–330
Table 4–122.	Chemical Impacts of Accidents Under the Idaho Reuse Option for Disposition of Bulk Sodium.....	4–331
Table 4–123.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Estimated Number of Shipments	4–334
Table 4–124.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Risks of Transporting Radioactive Waste.....	4–335
Table 4–125.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Estimated Impacts of Construction and Operational Material Transport	4–336
Table 4–126.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Average Individual Total Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4–343
Table 4–127.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2, Facility Disposition, Average Individual Total Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4–345
Table 4–128.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2, Hanford Option, Disposition of Remote-Handled Special Components, Average Individual Total Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4–346
Table 4–129.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2, Idaho Option, Disposition of Remote-Handled Special Components, Average Individual Total Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4–347
Table 4–130.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2, Hanford Option, Disposition of Bulk Sodium, Average Individual Total Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4–349

Table 4–131.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2, Idaho Option, Disposition of Bulk Sodium, Average Individual Total Doses from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4–350
Table 4–132.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives and Options – Summary of Waste Generation Volumes.....	4–355
Table 4–133.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Industrial Safety Impacts	4–359
Table 4–134.	Waste Management Alternatives – Summary of Utility Infrastructure Requirements.....	4–367
Table 4–135.	Waste Management Alternatives – Maximum Incremental Criteria Pollutant Concentrations at the Hanford Site.....	4–374
Table 4–136.	Waste Management Alternatives – Maximum Incremental Toxic Chemical Concentrations at the Hanford Site.....	4–376
Table 4–137.	Waste Management Alternatives – Nonradioactive Airborne Toxic Chemical Hazard Index for the Nearest Noninvolved Worker at the Hanford Site.....	4–377
Table 4–138.	Waste Management Alternatives – Nonradioactive Airborne Toxic Chemical Cancer Risk for the Nearest Noninvolved Worker at the Hanford Site	4–377
Table 4–139.	Waste Management Alternatives – Summary of Major Geologic and Soil Resource Impact Indicators and Requirements	4–385
Table 4–140.	Waste Management Alternatives and Options – Summary of Peak Estimated Socioeconomic Indicators	4–403
Table 4–141.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Radiological Impacts on Workers.....	4–408
Table 4–142.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Radiological Impacts on the Public	4–409
Table 4–143.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Radiological Impacts on Workers.....	4–409
Table 4–144.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–410
Table 4–145.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–411
Table 4–146.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Radiological Impacts on Workers	4–412
Table 4–147.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Radiological Consequences of Accidents.....	4–415
Table 4–148.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents.....	4–416
Table 4–149.	Waste Management Alternatives 2 and 3 Radiological Consequences of Accidents	4–418
Table 4–150.	Waste Management Alternatives 2 and 3 Annual Cancer Risks from Accidents	4–419
Table 4–151.	Waste Management Alternatives – Estimated Number of Shipments.....	4–421
Table 4–152.	Waste Management Alternatives – Risks of Transporting Radioactive Waste	4–422
Table 4–153.	Waste Management Alternatives – Estimated Impacts of Construction and Operational Material Transport	4–423
Table 4–154.	Waste Management Alternative 2 Average Individual Total Dose from Radioactive Air Emissions over the Life of the Project	4–429
Table 4–155.	Waste Management Alternatives – Summary of Waste Generation Volumes.....	4–433
Table 4–156.	Waste Management Alternatives – Industrial Safety Impacts.....	4–436
Table 4–157.	Combined Hanford Site Land Use Requirements	4–440
Table 4–158.	Combined Utility Infrastructure Requirements	4–443
Table 4–159.	Combined Criteria Air Pollutant Concentrations	4–445
Table 4–160.	Combined Geologic and Soil Resource Requirements.....	4–446
Table 4–161.	Combined Hanford Ecological Resource Disturbance	4–448
Table 4–162.	Combined Socioeconomic Impact Measures	4–452
Table 4–163.	Combined Public Health Impacts—Normal Operations	4–453
Table 4–164.	Combined Worker Health Impacts—Normal Operations	4–455
Table 4–165.	Combined Transportation Risks	4–457

List of Tables

Table 4–166.	Combined Waste Generation Volumes	4–460
Table 4–167.	Combined Industrial Safety Impacts	4–463
Table 5–1.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–11
Table 5–2.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–45
Table 5–3.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Contribution of Releases from Cribs and Trenches (Ditches) to Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–80
Table 5–4.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Contribution of Past Leaks to Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–80
Table 5–5.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Contribution of Unplanned Releases to Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–81
Table 5–6.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Contribution of Releases from Tank Residuals to Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–81
Table 5–7.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Contribution of Retrieval Leaks to Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–82
Table 5–8.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Contribution of Releases from Ancillary Equipment to Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–82
Table 5–9.	Tank Closure Alternative 2B Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–83
Table 5–10.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–126
Table 5–11.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–161
Table 5–12.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–199
Table 5–13.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–199
Table 5–14.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–259
Table 5–15.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Tank Farm Barriers, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–260
Table 5–16.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches)	5–315
Table 5–17.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–315
Table 5–18.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks	5–316
Table 5–19.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–317

Table 5–20.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–318
Table 5–21.	Tank Closure Alternative 1 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–319
Table 5–22.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches)	5–321
Table 5–23.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–321
Table 5–24.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks	5–322
Table 5–25.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–323
Table 5–26.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary.....	5–324
Table 5–27.	Tank Closure Alternative 2A American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–325
Table 5–28.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–330
Table 5–29.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches)	5–330
Table 5–30.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks	5–331
Table 5–31.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks	5–332
Table 5–32.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–333
Table 5–33.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–334
Table 5–34.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Unplanned Releases.....	5–335
Table 5–35.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Unplanned Releases.....	5–336
Table 5–36.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Retrieval Leaks	5–337
Table 5–37.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Retrieval Leaks	5–338
Table 5–38.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Releases from Ancillary Equipment	5–339
Table 5–39.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Releases from Ancillary Equipment.....	5–340
Table 5–40.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Releases from Tank Residuals	5–341

List of Tables

Table 5–41.	Tank Closure Alternatives 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, and 6C American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Releases from Tank Residuals.....	5–342
Table 5–42.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches)	5–344
Table 5–43.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–344
Table 5–44.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks	5–345
Table 5–45.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–346
Table 5–46.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary.....	5–347
Table 5–47.	Tank Closure Alternative 4 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–348
Table 5–48.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches)	5–351
Table 5–49.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–351
Table 5–50.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks	5–352
Table 5–51.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–353
Table 5–52.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary.....	5–354
Table 5–53.	Tank Closure Alternative 5 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–355
Table 5–54.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–357
Table 5–55.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–357
Table 5–56.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–358
Table 5–57.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–359
Table 5–58.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–360
Table 5–59.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–361
Table 5–60.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–364
Table 5–61.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches)	5–364
Table 5–62.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–365

Table 5–63.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–366
Table 5–64.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–367
Table 5–65.	Tank Closure Alternative 6A, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–368
Table 5–66.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–370
Table 5–67.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–371
Table 5–68.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–372
Table 5–69.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–373
Table 5–70.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–374
Table 5–71.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–375
Table 5–72.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches).....	5–377
Table 5–73.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Cribs and Trenches (Ditches)	5–377
Table 5–74.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–378
Table 5–75.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impacts of Past Leaks.....	5–379
Table 5–76.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–380
Table 5–77.	Tank Closure Alternative 6B, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–381
Table 5–78.	Doses to an American Indian Engaged in Residential Agriculture Following Well Drilling at the Tank Farms.....	5–383
Table 5–79.	Doses to a Well-Drilling Worker at the Tank Farms.....	5–383
Table 5–80.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Chemical COPC Releases to Air on Terrestrial Resources at the Onsite Maximum-Exposure Location	5–385
Table 5–81.	Tank Closure Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Groundwater on Aquatic and Riparian Receptors at the Columbia River.....	5–386
Table 5–82.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the FFTF Barrier and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–399
Table 5–83.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the FFTF Barrier and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–406
Table 5–84.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–411

List of Tables

Table 5–85.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 1 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–411
Table 5–86.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–413
Table 5–87.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternative 2 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–413
Table 5–88.	Doses to a Well-Drilling Worker and an American Indian Engaged in Residential Agriculture Following Well Drilling at the FFTF Area	5–415
Table 5–89.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Chemical COPC Releases to Air on Terrestrial Resources at the Onsite Maximum-Exposure Location.....	5–416
Table 5–90.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Groundwater on Aquatic and Riparian Receptors at the Columbia River	5–417
Table 5–91.	Comparison of Peak Annual Emission Rates at INL Under FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives 2 and 3 and at Hanford Under Tank Closure, FFTF Decommissioning, and Waste Management Alternatives.....	5–419
Table 5–92.	Waste Management Action Alternative Subgroupings	5–422
Table 5–93.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at Trenches 31 and 34, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore	5–431
Table 5–94.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–457
Table 5–95.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–482
Table 5–96.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–504
Table 5–97.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–530
Table 5–98.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–556
Table 5–99.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–578
Table 5–100.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–598
Table 5–101.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–619
Table 5–102.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–639
Table 5–103.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2B, Option Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–665

Table 5–104.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–698
Table 5–105.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–698
Table 5–106.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–745
Table 5–107.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–773
Table 5–108.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–800
Table 5–109.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–827
Table 5–110.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–856
Table 5–111.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–884
Table 5–112.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–912
Table 5–113.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–939
Table 5–114.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–964
Table 5–115.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–994
Table 5–116.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–1024
Table 5–117.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at IDF-East, IDF-West, and the RPPDF, Core Zone Boundary, and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–1052
Table 5–118.	Waste Management Alternative 1 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1070
Table 5–119.	Waste Management Alternative 1 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1070
Table 5–120.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1073
Table 5–121.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1073

List of Tables

Table 5–122.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1076
Table 5–123.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1076
Table 5–124.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1079
Table 5–125.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1079
Table 5–126.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1082
Table 5–127.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1082
Table 5–128.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1086
Table 5–129.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1086
Table 5–130.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1090
Table 5–131.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1090
Table 5–132.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1093
Table 5–133.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1093
Table 5–134.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1096
Table 5–135.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1096
Table 5–136.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1100
Table 5–137.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary.....	5–1100
Table 5–138.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1101

Table 5–139.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1101
Table 5–140.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1107
Table 5–141.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1107
Table 5–142.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1108
Table 5–143.	Waste Management Alternative 2, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1108
Table 5–144.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1114
Table 5–145.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-A, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1114
Table 5–146.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1119
Table 5–147.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-B, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1119
Table 5–148.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1123
Table 5–149.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-C, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1123
Table 5–150.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1127
Table 5–151.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-D, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1127
Table 5–152.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1131
Table 5–153.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-E, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1131
Table 5–154.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1135
Table 5–155.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-F, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1135

List of Tables

Table 5–156.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1139
Table 5–157.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 1, Subgroup 1-G, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1139
Table 5–158.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1143
Table 5–159.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-A, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1143
Table 5–160.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1147
Table 5–161.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1147
Table 5–162.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1148
Table 5–163.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 2, Subgroup 2-B, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1148
Table 5–164.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1154
Table 5–165.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Base Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1154
Table 5–166.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1155
Table 5–167.	Waste Management Alternative 3, Disposal Group 3, Option Case, American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1155
Table 5–168.	Doses by Tank Closure Waste Type to an American Indian Engaged in Residential Agriculture Following Well Drilling at an Integrated Disposal Facility	5–1161
Table 5–169.	Doses by Tank Closure Waste Type to a Well-Drilling Worker at an Integrated Disposal Facility	5–1161
Table 5–170.	Doses by Tank Closure Waste Type to an American Indian Engaged in Residential Agriculture and a Well-Drilling Worker at the RPPDF	5–1162
Table 5–171.	Doses by Waste Management Waste Type to an American Indian Engaged in Residential Agriculture and a Well-Drilling Worker at an Integrated Disposal Facility	5–1162
Table 5–172.	Waste Management Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Chemical COPC Releases to Air on Terrestrial Resources at the Onsite Maximum-Exposure Location	5–1164
Table 5–173.	Waste Management Alternatives – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Groundwater on Aquatic and Riparian Receptors at the Columbia River Nearshore	5–1165
Table 5–174.	Alternative Combination 1 Releases of COPC Drivers to Vadose Zone	5–1171

*Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the
Hanford Site, Richland, Washington*

Table 5–175.	Alternative Combination 1 Releases of COPC Drivers to Groundwater	5–1171
Table 5–176.	Alternative Combination 1 Releases of COPC Drivers to the Columbia River	5–1172
Table 5–177.	Alternative Combination 1 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Core Zone Boundary and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–1172
Table 5–178.	Alternative Combination 2 Releases of COPC Drivers to Vadose Zone	5–1202
Table 5–179.	Alternative Combination 2 Releases of COPC Drivers to Groundwater	5–1202
Table 5–180.	Alternative Combination 2 Releases of COPC Drivers to the Columbia River	5–1203
Table 5–181.	Alternative Combination 2 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Core Zone Boundary and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–1203
Table 5–182.	Alternative Combination 3 Releases of COPC Drivers to Vadose Zone	5–1240
Table 5–183.	Alternative Combination 3 Releases of COPC Drivers to Groundwater	5–1241
Table 5–184.	Alternative Combination 3 Releases of COPC Drivers to Columbia River	5–1241
Table 5–185.	Alternative Combination 3 Maximum COPC Concentrations in the Peak Year at the Core Zone Boundary and Columbia River Nearshore.....	5–1242
Table 5–186.	Alternative Combination 1 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary.....	5–1281
Table 5–187.	Alternative Combination 1 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1281
Table 5–188.	Alternative Combination 2 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary.....	5–1284
Table 5–189.	Alternative Combination 2 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1284
Table 5–190.	Alternative Combination 3 Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary.....	5–1287
Table 5–191.	Alternative Combination 3 American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer Long-Term Human Health Impact Summary	5–1287
Table 5–192.	Alternative Combinations – Long-Term Impacts of Chemical COPC Releases to Air on Terrestrial Resources at the Onsite Maximum-Exposure Location	5–1291
Table 5–193.	Alternative Combinations – Long-Term Impacts of Contaminant Releases to Groundwater on Aquatic and Riparian Receptors at the Columbia River.....	5–1291
Table 6–1.	Cumulative Land Area Disturbed.....	6–7
Table 6–2.	Potential Cumulative Utility Infrastructure Requirements	6–11
Table 6–3.	Cumulative Impacts of Criteria Air Pollutants	6–15
Table 6–4.	Potential Cumulative Geologic and Soil Resource Requirements	6–18
Table 6–5.	Cumulative Area of Terrestrial Habitat Disturbed	6–22
Table 6–6.	Cumulative Socioeconomic Impacts	6–26
Table 6–7.	Cumulative Radiological Impacts on Hanford Site Workers and the Public	6–27
Table 6–8.	Cumulative Transportation Impacts	6–33
Table 6–9.	Cumulative Waste Volumes	6–35
Table 6–10.	Estimated Industrial Safety Cumulative Impacts	6–41
Table 6–11.	Maximum Groundwater COPC Concentrations for Non- <i>TC & WM EIS</i> Sources	6–43
Table 6–12.	Alternative Combination 1 Releases of COPC Drivers to Vadose Zone	6–45
Table 6–13.	Alternative Combination 1 Releases of COPC Drivers to Groundwater	6–46
Table 6–14.	Alternative Combination 1 Releases of COPC Drivers to Columbia River	6–46
Table 6–15.	Alternative Combination 1 Maximum Cumulative Groundwater COPC Concentrations.....	6–47
Table 6–16.	Alternative Combination 2 Releases of COPC Drivers to Vadose Zone	6–81
Table 6–17.	Alternative Combination 2 Releases of COPC Drivers to Groundwater	6–82
Table 6–18.	Alternative Combination 2 Releases of COPC Drivers to the Columbia River	6–82
Table 6–19.	Alternative Combination 2 Maximum Cumulative Groundwater COPC Concentrations.....	6–83

List of Tables

Table 6–20.	Alternative Combination 3 Releases of COPC Drivers to Vadose Zone	6–121
Table 6–21.	Alternative Combination 3 Releases of COPC Drivers to Groundwater	6–122
Table 6–22.	Alternative Combination 3 Releases of COPC Drivers to Columbia River	6–122
Table 6–23.	Alternative Combination 3 Maximum Cumulative Groundwater COPC Concentrations.....	6–123
Table 6–24.	Summary of Peak Impacts of Releases (Non- <i>TC</i> & <i>WM EIS</i> Sources) on Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer	6–162
Table 6–25.	Summary of Peak Impacts of Releases (Non- <i>TC</i> & <i>WM EIS</i> Sources) on American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer.....	6–162
Table 6–26.	Alternative Combination 1 Summary of Peak Cumulative Impacts on Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer	6–164
Table 6–27.	Alternative Combination 1 Summary of Peak Cumulative Impacts on American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer	6–164
Table 6–28.	Alternative Combination 2 Summary of Peak Cumulative Impacts on Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer	6–166
Table 6–29.	Alternative Combination 2 Summary of Peak Cumulative Impacts on American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer	6–166
Table 6–30.	Alternative Combination 3 Summary of Peak Cumulative Impacts on Drinking-Water Well User and Resident Farmer	6–168
Table 6–31.	Alternative Combination 3 Summary of Peak Cumulative Impacts on American Indian Resident Farmer and American Indian Hunter-Gatherer	6–168
Table 6–32.	Potential Cumulative Impacts of Releases to Air on Ecological Receptors	6–170
Table 6–33.	Toxicity Benchmark Concentrations for Ecological Receptors Exposed to Chemicals in Soil, Water, and Sediment	6–171
Table 6–34.	Summary of Long-Term Impacts of Alternative Combinations and Cumulative Impacts on Aquatic and Riparian Resources at the Columbia River Resulting from Contaminant Releases to Groundwater.....	6–173
Table 6–35.	Cumulative Impact Risk Indices for Aquatic and Riparian Receptors and Selected Chemical and Radioactive Constituents of Potential Concern Under Alternative Combinations 1, 2, and 3.....	6–174
Table 6–36.	Summary of Long-Term Impacts of Alternative Combinations and Cumulative Impacts on Aquatic and Riparian Resources at the Columbia River Resulting from Contaminant Releases to Groundwater.....	6–175
Table 6–37.	Estimated Cumulative Carbon Dioxide Emissions	6–179
Table 7–1.	Summary of Potential Mitigation Measures	7–4
Table 7–2.	Alternative Combinations Unavoidable, Adverse Environmental Impacts.....	7–33
Table 7–3.	Tank Closure Alternatives Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Land Resources.....	7–37
Table 7–4.	Tank Closure Alternatives Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Construction Materials	7–40
Table 7–5.	Tank Closure Alternatives Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Nonconstruction Materials	7–41
Table 7–6.	Tank Closure Alternatives Utility Resource Commitments	7–42
Table 7–7.	Tank Closure Alternatives Labor Resource Commitments	7–43
Table 7–8.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Land Resources	7–44
Table 7–9.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Materials.....	7–46
Table 7–10.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives Utility Resource Commitments.....	7–47
Table 7–11.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives Labor Resource Commitments	7–48

Table 7–12.	Waste Management Alternatives Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Land Resources	7–49
Table 7–13.	Waste Management Alternatives Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Materials	7–51
Table 7–14.	Waste Management Alternatives Utility Resource Commitments	7–52
Table 7–15.	Waste Management Alternatives Labor Resource Commitments	7–53
Table 7–16.	Alternative Combinations Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Land Resources	7–53
Table 7–17.	Alternative Combinations Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Materials	7–54
Table 7–18.	Alternative Combinations Utility Resource Commitments	7–55
Table 7–19.	Alternative Combinations Labor Resource Commitments	7–55
Table 7–20.	Tank Closure Alternatives Short-Term Life Cycles	7–57
Table 7–21.	Tank Closure Alternatives Short- and Long-Term Commitments of Land	7–58
Table 7–22.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives Short-Term Life Cycles	7–60
Table 7–23.	FFTF Decommissioning Alternatives Short- and Long-Term Commitments of Land	7–61
Table 7–24.	Waste Management Alternatives Short-Term Life Cycles	7–63
Table 7–25.	Waste Management Alternatives Short- and Long-Term Commitments of Land	7–63
Table 7–26.	Alternative Combinations Short-Term Life Cycles	7–65
Table 7–27.	Alternative Combinations Short- and Long-Term Commitments of Land	7–66
Table 7–28.	Locations of Details Regarding Sensitivity Analyses in This <i>Final TC & WM EIS</i>	7–102
Table 7–29.	Other Potential Long-Term Mitigation Strategies	7–103
Table 8–1.	Potentially Applicable Environmental, Safety, and Health Laws, Regulations, Orders, and Other Requirements	8–1
Table 8–2.	Potential Permits and Approvals Needed for <i>TC & WM EIS</i> Activities	8–32
Table 8–3.	Organizations Contacted During the Consultation Process for the “Tank Closure EIS”	8–33
Table 8–4.	Organizations Contacted During the Consultation Process for This <i>TC & WM EIS</i>	8–34

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

°C	degree(s) Celsius
°F	degree(s) Fahrenheit
AADT	annual average daily traffic
AEA	Atomic Energy Act
AEGL	Acute Exposure Guideline Level
AERMOD	American Meteorological Society/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model
ALARA	as low as is reasonably achievable
AMWTP	Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project
ANL-W	Argonne National Laboratory-West
ATRC	Advanced Test Reactor Complex
BLM	U.S. Bureau of Land Management
BRC	Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future
<i>BRMaP</i>	<i>Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan</i>
CAIRS	Computerized Accident/Incident Reporting System
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	<i>Code of Federal Regulations</i>
CH	contact-handled
COPC	constituent of potential concern
CSB	Canister Storage Building
CTR	commute trip reduction
CWC	Central Waste Complex
CY	calendar year
D&D	decontamination and decommissioning
dBA	decibels A-weighted
DNFSB	Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOE-ID	U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office
DOE-RL	U.S. Department of Energy Richland Operations Office
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
<i>Draft GTCC EIS</i>	<i>Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste</i>
DST	double-shell tank
EA	environmental assessment
EBR-II	Experimental Breeder Reactor II

Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
EIS	environmental impact statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERDF	Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility
ERPG	Emergency Response Planning Guideline
ETF	Effluent Treatment Facility
Fermi	Enrico Fermi Nuclear Generating Station
FFTF	Fast Flux Test Facility
<i>FFTF Deactivation EA</i>	<i>Environmental Assessment, Sodium Residuals Reaction/Removal and Other Deactivation Work Activities, Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) Project, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington</i>
“FFTF Decommissioning EIS”	“Environmental Impact Statement for the Decommissioning of the Fast Flux Test Facility at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington”
<i>Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan and EIS</i>	<i>Hanford Reach National Monument Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Adams, Benton, Grant and Franklin Counties, Washington</i>
FMEF	Fuels and Materials Examination Facility
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FTE	full-time equivalent
Gable Gap	Gable Mountain–Gable Butte Gap
<i>Green Book</i>	<i>Recommendations for the Preparation of Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements</i>
GTCC	greater-than-Class C
<i>GTCC EIS</i>	<i>Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal of Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) Low-Level Radioactive Waste and GTCC-Like Waste</i>
Hanford	Hanford Site
<i>Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan EIS</i>	<i>Final Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement</i>
<i>Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan EIS SA</i>	<i>Supplement Analysis, Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement</i>
<i>Hanford Defense Waste EIS</i>	<i>Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Hanford Defense High-Level, Transuranic and Tank Wastes, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington</i>
<i>Hanford NEPA Characterization Report</i>	<i>Hanford Site National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Characterization</i>

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

<i>Hanford Site Environmental Report</i>	<i>Hanford Site Environmental Report for Calendar Year 2010 (Including Some Early 2011 Information)</i>
<i>HCRMP</i>	<i>Hanford Cultural Resources Management Plan</i>
HEDR	Hanford Environmental Dose Reconstruction
HEPA	high-efficiency particulate air
HIHTL	hose-in-hose transfer line
HLW	high-level radioactive waste
<i>HSW EIS</i>	<i>Final Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement, Richland, Washington</i>
IC	<i>Idaho Code</i>
IDAPA	Idaho Administrative Procedures Act
IDEQ	State of Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
IDF	Integrated Disposal Facility
IDF-East	200-East Area Integrated Disposal Facility
IDF-West	200-West Area Integrated Disposal Facility
IHLW	immobilized high-level radioactive waste
ILAW	immobilized low-activity waste
INEEL	Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory
INL	Idaho National Laboratory
INTEC	Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LAW	low-activity waste
LCF	latent cancer fatality
LERF	Liquid Effluent Retention Facility
LIGO	Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory
LLBG	low-level radioactive waste burial ground
LLW	low-level radioactive waste
LOS	level of service
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MEI	maximally exposed individual
MFC	Materials and Fuels Complex
MLLW	mixed low-level radioactive waste
MMI	Modified Mercalli Intensity
MODFLOW	modular three-dimensional finite-difference groundwater flow model
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRS	mobile retrieval system
MUST	miscellaneous underground storage tank
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards

National Register	National Register of Historic Places
NDA	nondestructive assay
NDE	nondestructive examination
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAPs	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
<i>NI PEIS</i>	<i>Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Accomplishing Expanded Civilian Nuclear Energy Research and Development and Isotope Production Missions in the United States, Including the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility</i>
NNS	Nevada National Security Site
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRDWL	Nonradioactive Dangerous Waste Landfill
ORP	Office of River Protection
ORR	Oak Ridge Reservation
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
P.L.	Public Law
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PM	particulate matter
PM _n	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to <i>n</i> micrometers
PNNL	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
PPA	Property Protected Area
ppb	part(s) per billion
PPF	Preprocessing Facility
ppm	part(s) per million
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PUREX	Plutonium-Uranium Extraction
<i>Quality Review</i>	<i>Report of the Review of the "Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)" Data Quality, Control and Management Issues</i>
R&D	research and development
RCB	Reactor Containment Building
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RCW	<i>Revised Code of Washington</i>
REDOX	Reduction-Oxidation
RH	remote-handled
RH-SC	remote-handled special component
ROD	Record of Decision

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ROI	region of influence
RPP	River Protection Project
RPPDF	River Protection Project Disposal Facility
RTC	Reactor Technology Complex
RTP	Remote Treatment Project
RWMC	Radioactive Waste Management Complex
SA	supplement analysis
SALDS	State-Approved Land Disposal Site
SC	special component
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SNF	spent nuclear fuel
<i>SNF PEIS</i>	<i>Department of Energy Programmatic Spent Nuclear Fuel Management and Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Programs Final Environmental Impact Statement</i>
SPF	Sodium Processing Facility
SRE	Sodium Reactor Experiment
SRF	Sodium Reaction Facility
SRS	Savannah River Site
SSF	Sodium Storage Facility
SST	single-shell tank
STOMP	Subsurface Transport Over Multiple Phases
STTS	Supplemental Treatment Technology Site
STTS-East	200-East Area Supplemental Treatment Technology Site
STTS-West	200-West Area Supplemental Treatment Technology Site
SWIFT	Solid Waste Integrated Forecast Technical
SWITS	Solid Waste Information and Tracking System
SWL	Solid Waste Landfill
SWOC	Solid Waste Operations Complex
<i>T&ESMP-SS</i>	<i>Threatened and Endangered Species Management Plan, Salmon and Steelhead</i>
“Tank Closure EIS”	“Environmental Impact Statement for Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposal of Tank Waste and Closure of Single-Shell Tanks at the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington”
<i>TC & WM EIS</i>	<i>Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington</i>
TCP	traditional cultural property
<i>Technical Guidance Document</i>	<i>Technical Guidance Document for Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement Vadose Zone and Groundwater Revised Analyses</i>
TEDF	Treated Effluent Disposal Facility
TMC	theoretical maximum capacity

TPA	Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (Tri-Party Agreement)
TRAGIS	Transportation Routing Analysis Geographic Information System
TRC	total recordable cases
TRIDEC	Tri-City Development Council
TRU	transuranic
TSD	treatment, storage, and disposal
TWRS	Tank Waste Remediation System
<i>TWRS EIS</i>	<i>Tank Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington, Final Environmental Impact Statement</i>
U.S.C.	<i>United States Code</i>
US Ecology	US Ecology Commercial Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VBR	vacuum-based retrieval
VRM	Visual Resource Management
WAC	<i>Washington Administrative Code</i>
WESF	Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
<i>WIPP SEIS-II</i>	<i>Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Disposal Phase Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement</i>
WLAP	Wastewater-Land Application Permit
<i>WM PEIS</i>	<i>Final Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Managing Treatment, Storage, and Disposal of Radioactive and Hazardous Waste</i>
WRAP	Waste Receiving and Processing Facility
WRF	waste receiver facility
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation
WTP	Waste Treatment Plant
<i>Yucca Mountain EIS</i>	<i>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</i>

Measurement Units

The principal measurement units used in this *Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement for the Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (TC & WM EIS)* are SI units (the abbreviation for the *Système international d'unités*). The SI system is an expanded version of the metric system that was accepted as the legal standard by the International Organization for Standardization. In this system, most units are made up of combinations of seven basic units, of which length in meters, mass in kilograms, and volume in liters are of most importance in this *TC & WM EIS*. Exceptions are radiological units that use the English system (e.g., rem, millirem).

Scientific (Exponential) Notation

Numbers that are very small or very large are often expressed in scientific, or exponential, notation as a matter of convenience. For example, the number 0.000034 may be expressed as 3.4×10^{-5} or 3.4E-05, and 65,000 may be expressed as 6.5×10^4 or 6.5E+04. In this *TC & WM EIS*, numerical values that are less than 0.001 or greater than 9,999 are generally expressed in scientific notation, i.e., 1.0×10^{-3} and 9.9×10^3 , respectively.

Multiples or submultiples of the basic units are also used. A partial list of prefixes that denote multiples and submultiples follows, with the equivalent multiplier values expressed in scientific notation.

Prefix	Symbol	Multiplier	
atto	a	0.000 000 000 000 000 001	1×10^{-18}
femto	f	0.000 000 000 000 001	1×10^{-15}
pico	p	0.000 000 000 001	1×10^{-12}
nano	n	0.000 000 001	1×10^{-9}
micro	μ	0.000 001	1×10^{-6}
milli	m	0.001	1×10^{-3}
centi	c	0.01	1×10^{-2}
deci	d	0.1	1×10^{-1}
deca	da	10	1×10^1
hecto	h	100	1×10^2
kilo	k	1,000	1×10^3
mega	M	1,000,000	1×10^6
giga	G	1,000,000,000	1×10^9
tera	T	1,000,000,000,000	1×10^{12}
peta	P	1,000,000,000,000,000	1×10^{15}
exa	E	1,000,000,000,000,000,000	1×10^{18}

The following symbols are occasionally used in conjunction with numerical expressions:

- < less than
- ≤ less than or equal to
- > greater than
- ≥ greater than or equal to

Conversions

English to Metric			Metric to English		
Multiply	by	To get	Multiply	by	To get
Area			Area		
square inches	6.4516	square centimeters	square centimeters	0.155	square inches
square feet	0.092903	square meters	square meters	10.7639	square feet
square yards	0.8361	square meters	square meters	1.196	square yards
acres	0.40469	hectares	hectares	2.471	acres
square miles	2.58999	square kilometers	square kilometers	0.3861	square miles
Length			Length		
inches	2.54	centimeters	centimeters	0.3937	inches
feet	30.48	centimeters	centimeters	0.0328	feet
feet	0.3048	meters	meters	3.281	feet
yards	0.9144	meters	meters	1.0936	yards
miles	1.60934	kilometers	kilometers	0.6214	miles
Temperature			Temperature		
degrees Fahrenheit	Subtract 32, then multiply by 0.55556	degrees Celsius	degrees Celsius	Multiply by 1.8, then add 32	degrees Fahrenheit
Volume			Volume		
fluid ounces	29.574	milliliters	milliliters	0.0338	fluid ounces
gallons	3.7854	liters	liters	0.26417	gallons
cubic feet	0.028317	cubic meters	cubic meters	35.315	cubic feet
cubic yards	0.76455	cubic meters	cubic meters	1.308	cubic yards
Weight			Weight		
ounces	28.3495	grams	grams	0.03527	ounces
pounds	0.4536	kilograms	kilograms	2.2046	pounds
short tons	0.90718	metric tons	metric tons	1.1023	short tons

Note: The use of the SI system of units as the principal system of measurement in this *TC & WM EIS*, combined with the use of significant figures or rounding when presenting numerical data, may cause some conversions to appear to be incorrect throughout this environmental impact statement (EIS). This is generally more common when the original value was in English units and was subsequently converted to the SI system for presentation in this EIS. The rounding error may be more noticeable when the corresponding measurement units in the English and SI systems are not relatively comparable in magnitude (e.g., feet and meters). For example, for the “2.9-million-liter (758,000-gallon) capacity” values presented in Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1.1, the original value of 758,000 gallons was converted to 2,869,000 liters (rounded to 2.9 million liters). However, converting 2.9 million liters to gallons yields 766,000 gallons, which is different from the original value. In another example, for the values “22 by 29 meters (72 by 94 feet)” presented in Section 2.3.3.2.2, the original value of 94 feet was converted to 28.6 meters (rounded to 29 meters). Converting 29 meters to feet yields 95 feet, which is slightly different from the original value of 94 feet. In this *TC & WM EIS*, the original value in English units is preserved, whereas, in many instances, the SI unit is actually the converted number.