

**NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM (NRSF) 3A**  
**Categorically Excluded Actions**

**Document ID #:**  
DOE/CX-00192

**I. Project Title:**

Activity-Specific Categorical Exclusion for Project Z-248, HAMMER Modular Classroom Building

**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. 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.**

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Richland Operations Office (RL), Infrastructure and Services Division (ISD) proposes to construct a modular classroom building east of the 6096 and 6097 buildings at the "Volpentest Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training and Education Center" (HAMMER) located in the 600 Area of the Hanford Site, north of Horn Rapids Road (see Figure 1). The project would install utilities for water, sewer, electricity, telephones, and computers (Hanford Local Area Network). In addition, the project would install sidewalks to connect the modular classroom building to the existing parking lot and a new lift station that would discharge wastewater into the existing City of Richland sewer system. The modular classroom building would measure 42-feet by 66-feet (2,772 square feet) and require excavations up to 4-feet for the foundation. Installation of utilities would require excavations up to 10-feet and sidewalks would require excavations up to 2-feet.

ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES REVIEW (ECR-2019-609). DOE-RL Ecological Monitoring and Environmental Surveillance (EM&ES) performed a field survey of the project area on December 18, 2018. The majority of the project area is highly disturbed and contains buildings, parking lots, roads, sidewalks, and ornamental lawns and vegetation. The "Hanford Site Biological Resources Management Plan" (BRMP, DOE/RL-96-32, Revision 2) identifies the project area as a Level 0 habitat. Management goals and actions for BRMP Level 0 habitats are limited to those needed for regulatory compliance, such as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and no compensatory mitigation is required.

The native vegetation to the north and east of the project area is a BRMP Level 2 habitat, which contains an upland stand of sparse climax or successional shrub overstory with a non-native understory. Diffuse knapweed, a Washington State listed Class B noxious weed, was observed in the project area. Wildlife observed in the project area include various bird species and signs of coyote. The management goal for BRMP Level 2 habitats is conservation and the preferred management action is to avoid or minimize impacts. Compensatory mitigation would be required at a replacement ratio of 1:1 if the impact to the BRMP Level 2 habitat were greater than 1.2-acres. EM&ES would instruct project personnel to avoid or minimize impacts to native habitats adjacent to the project area to reduce compensatory mitigation requirements. Project personnel would wash the undercarriages of all equipment to remove noxious weed seeds prior to moving equipment between work sites.

Birds can nest within the project area on the ground, buildings, or equipment and the nesting season is typically from mid-March to mid-July. EM&ES would instruct project personnel to watch for nesting birds. If project personnel encounter or suspect nesting birds or observe bird defensive behaviors, then they would contact EM&ES to evaluate the situation.

EM&ES would perform a nesting bird survey if ground-disturbing activities were conducted during the nesting season. Project personnel would contact EM&ES at least one week prior to initiating activities that disturb the ground.

Project personnel would revegetate all disturbed land areas not needed for continued project use, access, or safety with locally derived native plant species in accordance with the "Hanford Site Revegetation Manual" (DOE/RL-2011-116 Revision 1), which provides guidance regarding species mix, planting rates, and methods. EM&ES anticipates no adverse ecological resource impacts from the Proposed Action.

CULTURAL RESOURCES REVIEW (HCRC-2019-600-004). DOE-RL Cultural and Historic Resources Program (CHRP) conducted a cultural resources review (CRR) of the project area and sent an Area of Potential Effects (APE) notification to the Washington State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and regional Tribes on January 7, 2019. The APE was surveyed in 1993 as part of the CRR for HCRC-93-600-040, "Cultural Resources Review of the Hammer Training Facility Project." The undisturbed portion of the APE was re-surveyed in 2011 as part of the CRR for HCRC-2011-600-051, "Extension of the HAMMER Complex Perimeter Fence for Future Construction and Infrastructure at the HAMMER Site in the 600 Area of the Hanford Site, Benton County, Washington." CHRP used results

**NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM 3A**  
**Categorically Excluded Actions (Continued)**

**Document ID #:**  
**DOE/CX-00192**

from the HCRC-2011-600-051 field survey and CRR to evaluate the Proposed Action.

CHRP transmitted a CRR with a finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" to the SHPO and regional Tribes for a 30-day comment period on March 26, 2019. The SHPO concurred with the findings of the CRR on April 1, 2019. CHRP provided a notice of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act on May 1, 2019. CHRP anticipates no adverse cultural resource impacts from the Proposed Action.

CONCLUSION. 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B, CX B1.15, "Support Buildings," addresses the Proposed Action. This CX provides for the siting, construction or modification, and operation of support buildings and structures for education and training. This includes trailers and prefabricated or modular buildings within or contiguous to developed areas where active utilities and roads are readily accessible.

In addition, 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B, CX B3.14, "Small-Scale Educational Facilities," addresses the Proposed Action. This CX provides for the siting, construction, modification, operation, and decommissioning of small-scale educational facilities (including, but not limited to, conventional teaching laboratories, libraries, classroom facilities, auditoriums, museums, visitor centers, exhibits, and associated offices) within or contiguous to a previously disturbed or developed area (where active utilities and currently used roads are readily accessible).

Any changes to the Proposed Action would require DOE-RL NEPA Compliance Officer approval.

**III. Existing Evaluations (Provide with NRSF to DOE NCO):**

**Ecological Review Report No. and Title:**

MSA-1805390, "Ecological Clearance for Z-248 Installation of a Modular Building at HAMMER in the 600 Area of the Hanford Site (ECR-2019-609)," dated December 19, 2018, Mission Support Alliance, Richland, Washington.

**Cultural Review Report No. and Title:**

MSA-1901840, "Cultural Resource Clearance for Z-248 Installation of a Modular Building at HAMMER in the 600 Area of the Hanford Site, Benton County, Washington (HCRC-2019-600-004), dated May 8, 2019, Mission Support Alliance, Richland, Washington.

**Maps:**

N/A

**Other Attachments:**

Figure 1. Proposed Location of HAMMER Modular Classroom Building and Area of Potential Effects.

**NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM 3A**  
**Categorically Excluded Actions (Continued)**

**Document ID #:**  
 DOE/CX-00192

**IV. List applicable CX(s) from Appendix B to Subpart D of 10 CFR 1021:**

- 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B, B1.15, "Support Buildings"  
 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B, B3.14, "Small-Scale Educational Facilities"

<b>V. Integral Elements and Extraordinary Circumstances (See 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, B. Conditions that are Integral Elements of the Class of Actions in Appendix B; and 10 CFR 1021.410(b)(2) under Application of Categorical Exclusions)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Are there extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposed action? If yes, describe them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Is the proposed action connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts, or that could result in cumulatively significant impacts? If yes, describe them.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
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?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Would the proposed action require siting, construction, or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
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?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
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.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
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?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
If "No" to all questions above, complete Section VI, and provide NRSF and any attachments to DOE NCO for review. If "Yes" to any of the questions above, contact DOE NCO for additional NEPA review.		

**VI. Responsible Organization's Signatures:**

**Initiator:**  
 Jerry W. Cammann, MSA NEPA-SME Jerry W Cammann 5/21/2019  
Print First and Last Name Signature Date

**Cognizant Program/Project Representative:**  
 Douglas (Chris) Smith, DOE-RL/ISD D. Smith 6/20/2019  
Print First and Last Name Signature Date

**VII. DOE NEPA Compliance Officer Approval/Determination:**

Based on my review of information conveyed to me concerning the proposed action, the proposed action fits within the specified CX(s):  Yes  No

Diori L. Kreske, DOE-RL/NCO Diori Kreske 6/20/19  
Print First and Last Name Signature Date

NCO Comments:

Figure 1. Proposed Location of HAMMER Modular Classroom Building and Area of Potential Effects

