

*3,600 rail shipments to transport treated HLW canisters from INTEC to a national geologic repository. An additional 130 truck shipments or 26 rail shipments would be needed to transport the HLW canisters produced from electrometallurgical treatment of accumulated sodium-bonded fuel at ANL-W.*

## 5.5 Mitigation Measures

As required by the Council on Environmental Quality, *DOE* considered mitigation measures that could reduce or offset the potential environmental consequences of waste management activities that are not integral to the alternatives analyzed in this EIS. *Under any of the alternatives analyzed in this EIS standard management controls, engineering, safety and health practices, cultural and biological surveys and site restoration requirements would be uniformly implemented. No impact resulting from normal operations under any of the alternatives or options analyzed in this EIS would require a specifically designed mitigation measure. If future connected actions have the potential to lead to impacts beyond those described in Chapter 5 of this EIS, mitigation action planning would begin concurrent with consideration of the need for appropriate National Environmental Policy Act documentation.* Appendix C.8 discusses mitigation measures that could reduce or offset potential impacts at Hanford under the Minimum INEEL Processing Alternative.

## 5.6 Unavoidable Adverse Environmental Impacts

This section summarizes potential unavoidable adverse environmental impacts associated with the alternatives analyzed in this EIS. Unavoidable impacts are *those* that would occur after implementation of all *standard management controls, engineering, safety and health practices, cultural and biological surveys and site restoration requirements and* feasible miti-

gation measures. *Appendix C.8* contains a discussion of potential unavoidable adverse impacts at Hanford associated with the Minimum INEEL Processing Alternative.

### 5.6.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES

*Existing facilities or facilities constructed under the alternatives analyzed in this EIS as well as the institutional controls that would be necessary following facilities disposition could occupy INEC and adjacent areas for an indefinite period of time. Even after remediation, the appearance and presence of institutional controls would likely preclude the INTEC area from ever being returned to its natural cultural setting or to a condition where the effects of industrial activities were not the most evident feature of the landscape.*

### 5.6.2 AESTHETIC AND SCENIC RESOURCES

INTEC is distant from points along U.S. Highways 20 and 26 where the facility is visible to the public. Changes in the specific configuration of facilities within the INTEC *under the alternatives analyzed in this EIS* would change the viewscape to some degree, but those changes would *not* likely be noticed *by* the casual observer.

Emission rates for pollutants under the waste processing alternatives are not expected to exceed levels currently or previously *emitted* by INEEL sources; therefore, the “visual impact” of these alternatives is already reflected in existing baseline conditions. Nevertheless, conservative visibility screening analysis has been performed to evaluate the relative potential for visibility impacts between alternatives. The views analyzed were at Craters of the Moon Wilderness Area and Fort Hall Indian Reservation. The results of the visibility analysis indicate that emissions *under* the waste processing alternatives *analyzed in this EIS* would not result in deleterious impacts on scenic views at Craters of the Moon Wilderness Area or Fort Hall Indian Reservation (including the view to Middle Butte,