

3.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Action

3.1 Retrieval Alternatives

3.1.1 No-Action

Under this alternative, the existing TRU waste inventory in Trench 4C-T04 would continue to be stored in a retrievable configuration. Current waste management practices would be followed. Monitoring, surveillance, and maintenance of TRU solid waste would continue until a decision is made to retrieve. Existing onsite monitoring functions would continue with activities such as site surveys, groundwater analyses, atmospheric sampling, and biotic surveys. Based on monitoring results, maintenance would include such activities as erosion and subsidence control, maintenance of trench vent pipes, and control of plant and animal access.

This alternative would maintain the waste containers in a retrievably stored condition well beyond the intended design life of the waste containers, which could mean an increasing potential for loss of structural integrity. As a result of container deterioration, potential releases of TRU waste to the environment could occur.

The No-Action Alternative does not support the purpose and need.

3.2 Storage Facility Alternatives

3.2.1 No-Action

The Storage Facility would not be built. Without the Storage Facility, waste retrieval and treatment for final processing within the WRAP Facility would be inefficient and there would be insufficient RCRA compliant storage for retrieved TRU and newly generated TRU, GTC3, mixed waste, and for the processed waste awaiting shipment to the permanent disposal site.

This alternative does not support the purpose and need.

3.2.2 Use of an Existing Onsite Storage Facility

Under this alternative, an existing facility on the Hanford Site would be used for storage of waste and the Storage Facility would not be built. Retrievably stored and newly generated TRU, mixed, and GTC3 waste would be moved to this facility for storage awaiting processing and/or disposal.

Existing facilities on the Hanford Site were evaluated that could be utilized for storage of solid waste with sufficient capacity to support WRAP Facility processing and storage of processed waste awaiting disposal. A 9,300-square-meter (100,000-square-foot) building constructed in the 200 East Area in the early 1950's, the 2101-M Building, was identified as the best potential onsite storage alternative. The facility is presently occupied and would have to undergo extensive modifications to serve as a storage facility. Using this facility would be less efficient, because waste would have to be stored in the 200 East Area but processed in the 200 West Area. Costs to modify the 2101-M Building to RCRA standards were estimated at about \$106 per square foot, while new construction would cost about \$44 per square foot.

Although this alternative would greatly reduce impacts to priority shrub-steppe habitat, cost and schedule consideration make this alternative unacceptable. The CWC is currently at 75 percent of available storage capacity and will run out of capacity in early 1997. This alternative would not provide the needed additional RCRA compliant storage capacity in a timely manner. No other suitable facilities were identified (WHC 1993b).

3.2.3 Alternate Construction Site of Storage Facility within SWOC

Under this alternative, the Storage Facility would be located within SWOC but sited in an area that has been previously disturbed from prior solid waste activities. Based on the results of the biological review, other sites within the SWOC would disturb a larger area of habitat (Appendix B).

This alternative does not meet the purpose and need.

3.3 Infrastructure Upgrades Alternatives

3.3.1 No-Action

The infrastructure upgrades would not be provided as part of the proposed action. Existing utilities would continue to be used and no upgrades would be made to support the planned retrieval activity and WRAP Facility processing. Access to the planned SWOC to support future transport and shipment of TRU waste would be restricted to inadequate existing roadways.

The No-Action Alternative would not provide the site upgrades at the SWOC to effectively implement the Retrieval activities, Storage Facility activities, and eventual WRAP Facility processing and does not support the purpose and need.

3.4 Central Waste Support Complex Alternatives

3.4.1 No-Action

Under this alternative, a centralized waste support complex consisting of two administrative buildings and one operation and maintenance facility would not be built. Solid Waste administrative and operational personnel would continue to be scattered around the Hanford Site at various locations and would continue to travel between these scattered offices to work on assigned tasks.

The No-Action Alternative does not support the purpose and need.

3.4.2 Use of Available Onsite Administration and Maintenance Facilities

Under this alternative, existing facilities on the Hanford Site would be used to house the CWSC administrative and maintenance personnel versus construction of new pre-engineered buildings.

This alternative would support the square footage requirements to house the planned personnel but would not provide for centralized solid waste management operation in the 200 West Area. Without this centralized operation, the estimated 400 solid waste management, maintenance, and engineering personnel would continue to be spread throughout the Hanford Site and would not provide for the desired operational efficiency of the support functions. Office space outside the 200 Areas does not meet the need to reduce operational costs of the SWOC.

Because of other ongoing activities in the 200 Area (e.g., actions necessary for the safe interim storage of Hanford tank wastes; spent nuclear fuel management; Hanford cleanup actions; and actions related to tank waste remediation) and the projected growth in the 200 Area population (DOE-RL 1993), administrative and maintenance facilities are not currently available to fully support waste management needs. If practical, a sharing of facilities would be undertaken to accommodate office space needs. This alternative would neither provide the needed administrative and maintenance office area, nor support the operational efficiency of waste management operations.

This alternative does not support the purpose and need.