# NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM 3A Actions Likely to be Categorically Excluded

Document ID #:
DOE/CX-00070Rev6

#### I. Project Title:

Annual Categorical Exclusion for PNNL Projects involving Siting, Modifying and Operating Support Buildings on the Hanford Site. (B1.15)

II. Describe the proposed action, including location, time period over which proposed action will occur, project dimension (e.g., acres displaced/disturbed, excavation length/depth), and area/location/number of buildings. Attach narratives, maps and drawings of proposed action if doing so will assist in DOE's evaluation. Describe existing environmental conditions and potential for environmental impacts from the proposed action. If the proposed action is not a project, describe the action or plan.

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) and its contractors perform siting, construction or modification, and operation of support buildings and support structures (including, but not limited to, trailers and prefabricated and modular buildings) within or contiguous to an already developed area (where active utilities and currently used roads are readily accessible). Covered support buildings and structures include, but are not limited to, those for office purposes; parking; cafeteria services; education and training; visitor reception; computer and data processing services; health services or recreation activities; routine maintenance activities; storage of supplies and equipment for administrative services and routine maintenance activities; security (such as security posts); fire protection; small-scale fabrication (such as machine shop activities), assembly, and testing of non-nuclear equipment or components; and similar support purposes, but exclude facilities for nuclear weapons activities and waste storage activities. Modification activities would generally be limited to small-scale changes to existing facilities and structures that would not substantially alter the intended use. Construction of larger-scale, complex buildings or more extensive modifications would require additional NEPA review. Construction of waste management facilities would also require additional NEPA review.

Construction or modification activities might involve hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, and antifreeze, and result in minor amounts of waste such as excess paint, epoxy, and cleaning fluids. Such materials and waste would be minimized and re-used, recycled, or disposed of appropriately in accordance with applicable regulations.

Construction or modification activities also might involve minor air emissions such as localized dust or fumes from construction equipment, or water effluents such as construction rinse water, hydrotest water, dust suppression, or water used for soil compaction. In all instances, environmental impacts are expected to be temporary. The proposed action would include reasonably foreseeable actions necessary to implement the proposed activities, such as excavation, equipment and material staging, waste management, equipment maintenance, office and furniture moves, and award of grants and contracts.

Actions performed under this Annual CX will primarily occur within the 300 Area at or near buildings and facilities that include, but are not limited to, those listed in Table 2 of the Operational Agreement between the Office of Science, Pacific Northwest Site office, and the Office of Environmental Management, Richland Operations Office, Revision 2, December 2015. If PNNL proposes similar activities at other locations on the Hanford Site, it will follow the Site Evaluation and inter-contractor coordination procedures described in the Operational Agreement.

Actions performed under this Annual CX shall not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. This Annual CX shall only be applied to actions that meet the requirements (i.e., 10 CFR 1021.410) and conditions that are "integral elements" (i.e., 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B) for categorically excluding actions under the provisions of the NEPA regulations. There shall be no extraordinary circumstances where normally excluded actions may have significant effects on the human environment.

To avoid extraordinary circumstances potentially affecting ecological resources, ecological resources reviews shall be performed in accordance with established protocols, policies, and procedures to identify plant and animal species for protection under the Endangered Species Act, candidates for protection, or listing by federal or state agencies as threatened or endangered consistent with DOE/RL-96-32, "Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan" or other applicable guidance documents and agreements. Caution shall be exercised during the bird nesting season (mid-March to mid-July). If nesting birds, pair of birds of the same species, or bird defensive behaviors is observed, then work shall stop and a qualified Ecological Resources Specialist shall be contacted for guidance. Actions that potentially affect ecological resources shall require a resources review and clearance before proceeding. This includes, but may not be limited to, actions that require an excavation permit; disturb the ground; remove or modify dead

### **NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM 3A**

## Actions Likely to be Categorically Excluded (Continued)

Document ID #:

DOE/CX-00070Rev6

or living vegetative cover; occur within a Bald Eagle exclusion zone; expand roadways/parking lots; require off-road travel; involve unusual noise, light, or chemicals that may affect wildlife; located on the Hanford Reach National Monument; located in a posted ecologically sensitive area; conducted on the outside of structures; conducted in abandoned structures; and have the potential to alter or affect the living environment. If an ecological resources review determines potentially adverse impacts, then appropriate mitigation actions shall be identified and implemented to avoid, minimize, eliminate, rectify, or compensate the impacts.

To avoid extraordinary circumstances potentially affecting cultural resources, cultural resources reviews shall be performed in accordance with established protocols, policies, and procedures to identify resource protection consistent with the "Programmatic Agreement among the U.S. Department of Energy, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and Washington State Historic Preservation Office for Maintenance, Deactivation, Alteration, and Demolition of the Built Environment on the Hanford Site" (DOE/RL-96-77); the "Hanford Site Manhattan Project and Cold War Era Historic District Treatment Plan (DOE/RL-97-56); the "Cultural Resources Management Plan" (DOE/RL-98-10), and other applicable guidance documents and agreements (e.g. "Gable Mountain and Gable Butte Management Plan" [DOE/RL-2008-17]). Cultural sensitivity shall be determined using site location topographic maps, geographic information system databases, and/or pedestrian surveys to identify proximity to cultural resources (i.e., historic buildings, traditional cultural properties, artifacts, and previously recorded archaeological sites).

Actions located within the geographic boundary of a significant cultural resource or historic property, Traditional Cultural Property (including but not limited to Rattlesnake Mountain, Gable Mountain, Gable Butte, Mooli Mooli, and other undocumented areas), cemetery or burial sites, or within 400 meters of the Columbia River may be located in culturally sensitive areas.

DOE/RL-96-77 exempts from cultural resources review certain actions that take place indoors or do not affect certain facilities identified in Tables A.5 through A.7 of DOE/RL-97-56. These actions are listed in Stipulation III of DOE/RL-96-77 and include, but may not be limited to, routine maintenance; replacement in kind; refinishing in kind; energy conservation measures; security and personal safety systems; actions associated with post- cold war buildings and structures; asbestos abatement actions; and facility transition actions to deactivate, de-energize, or isolate systems. Exemptions are also provided for mobile trailers, modular buildings, subsurface structures, storage tanks, wells/boreholes, and towers. If the action affects a facility that appears in Tables A.5 or A.6 of DOE/RL-97-56 and the undertaking is not exempt based on Section III.B of DOE/RL-96-77, then a cultural resources review shall be performed.

Historic structures or locations that require cultural resources review and clearance include, but may not be limited to, The Hanford Site Manhattan Project National Historic Park, including the Bruggeman Agricultural Complex Warehouse, White Bluffs Bank, Hanford High School, B Reactor and Hanford Irrigation District Pump House. Other historic structures and locations include, the White Bluffs Log Cabin, Hanford Townsite, Hanford Substation, White Bluffs Townsite, AAA Military Camps, NIKE Missile Base, and selected historic buildings.

Workers shall be directed to watch for cultural materials (i.e., bones, stone tools, mussel shells, cans, bottles, etc.). If encountered, then work near the discovery shall stop until a qualified Cultural Resource Specialist is contacted, the significance of the find determined, appropriate Tribes notified, and mitigation arranged and implemented, as needed.

PNNL uses an Electronic Prep and Risk (EPR) System to screen project impacts. It shall be incumbent upon the Environmental Compliance Officers, NEPA Subject Matter Expert, or other NEPA trained individuals to assure that the requirements and conditions discussed herein are met prior to applying this Annual CX to PNNL actions. They shall also be responsible for assuring that no extraordinary circumstances exist where normally excluded actions may have significant effects on the human environment.

This Annual CX is approved pursuant to 10 CFR 1021.410(f) which states that "proposed recurring actions undertaken during a specified time period such as routine maintenance for a year, may be addressed in a single categorical exclusion determination after considering the potential aggregated impacts" to assure no extraordinary circumstances exist. This Annual CX will expire one year from the date authorized by the Hanford NEPA Compliance Officer and will require reauthorization on an annual basis.

#### III. Existing Evaluations (Attach them):

NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM 3A Docu		Document	ument ID #:	
Actions Likely to be Categorically Excluded (Continued)  DOE/CX-		DOE/CX-0	00070Rev6	
Ecological Review Report No. and Title:				
Cultural Review Report No. and Title:				
Maps:				
Other Attachments:				
IV. Integral Elements and Extraordinary Circumsta	inces		Yes	No
Does the proposed action fall within one or more of the actions listed in Appendixes A or B to Subpart D of 10 CFR 1021 and is thus categorically excluded (CX)? List applicable CX(s):			•	0
B1.15 Support Buildings				
Are there extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal, such as those set forth in 10 CFR 1021.410(2)? If yes, describe them.			0	•
Is the proposal connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts, or that could result in cumulatively significant impacts? If yes, describe them.			0	•
Would the proposed action threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements related to the environment, safety, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders?			0	•
Would the proposed action require siting, construction, or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities?			0	•
Would the proposed action disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or natural gas products already in the environment such that there might be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases?			0	•
Would the proposed action have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources? See examples in Appendix B(4) to Subpart D of 10 CFR 1021.			0	•
Would the proposed action involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or invasive species, such that the action is not contained or confined in a manner designed, operated, and conducted in accordance with applicable requirements to prevent unauthorized release into the environment?			0	•
If "No" to all questions above, complete Section V, and provide NRSF to DOE NCO for review.  If "Yes" to any of the questions above, contact DOE NCO for additional NEPA review.				
V. Responsible Organization's Signatures: Initiator:	Millen	addression and the		
Michael R. Sackschewsky Print First and Last Name Signature			/26/18 Date	
Cognizant Program/Project Representative:				
Print First and Last Name	Signature		Date	
VI. DOE NEPA Compliance Officer Approval/Determ	nination:			
Based on my review of information conveyed to me cor CX(s): Yes No		within the spo	ecified	
Diori Kreske  Print First and Last Name  Signature  6/2			7 (   8 Date	
NCO Comments:				