PMC-EF2a

(2.0 (.02)

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY EERE PROJECT MANAGEMENT CENTER NEPA DETERMINATION



RECIPIENT: Area Substance Abuse Council, Inc (a SEP subrecipient of the Iowa Office of Energy STATE: Independence)

**PROJECT** 

TITLE:

Clinton Community Human Service Campus Project

Funding Opportunity Announcement Number

Procurement Instrument Number NEPA Control Number CID Number

DE FOA 000052

EE0000162

GFO-0000162-015

EE162

Based on my review of the information concerning the proposed action, as NEPA Compliance Officer (authorized under DOE Order 451.1A), I have made the following determination:

## CX. EA. EIS APPENDIX AND NUMBER:

Description:

B5.1 Actions to conserve energy, demonstrate potential energy conservation, and promote energy-efficiency that do not increase the indoor concentrations of potentially harmful substances. These actions may involve financial and technical assistance to individuals (such as builders, owners, consultants, designers), organizations (such as utilities), and state and local governments. Covered actions include, but are not limited to: programmed lowering of thermostat settings, placement of timers on hot water heaters, installation of solar hot water systems, installation of efficient lighting, improvements in generator efficiency and appliance efficiency ratings, development of energy-efficient manufacturing or industrial practices, and small-scale conservation and renewable energy research and development and pilot projects. The actions could involve building renovations or new structures in commercial, residential, agricultural, or industrial sectors. These actions do not include rulemakings, standard-settings, or proposed DOE legislation.

## Rational for determination:

The lowa Office of Energy Independence proposes to provide \$250,454 of SEP funds to the Area Substance Abuse Council, Inc, (ASAC), doing business as New Directions in Clinton, Iowa. ASAC proposes to develop the former Horace Mann Elementary School building into a Community Human Service Campus to house a variety of non-profit human service providers from the community. When completed, the new Campus would house a community daycare and preschool, a substance abuse treatment program, a community substance abuse prevention agency, a local self help group, and services to the disabled.

The scope of this project would involve the total renovation of a 1960's era school building. The proposed renovations include remodeling the interior, weatherization improvements, and demolition of 1970's era steam boilers and old steam heating systems. ASAC would install a new energy efficient Heating, Ventilating, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system, sensor controls, lighting, insulation and windows to make the bullding energy efficient, and a 63-ton, vertical, closed-loop ground source heat pump (GSHP) system.

The proposed GSHP system consists of drilling about 50 boreholes to a depth of 300 feet each. The total area of the borefield would be 9,500 square feet on the north side of the building. Supply/return lines between the borefield and the building would circulate water through High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) piping. The boreholes would be entirely encased with thermally enhanced grout. The system would use a mix of potable water from the local municipal water supply system and propylene glycol. ASAC would use an International Ground Source Heat Pump Association (IGSHPA) certified installer with a minimum of three years experience installing closed-loop GSHP systems.

Drill fluid and water produced by drilling would be disposed of in a manner that does not interfere with structures, roads, utilities, or parking lots. The ASAC contractor would protect land areas adjacent to the work site from sedimentation by installation of sediment basins and traps, perimeter barriers, and other measures intended to deter erosion and transport of sediment associated with construction.

ASAC intends to restore the area disturbed by the installation of the proposed well field to its natural state, i.e., green space. The area would be regraded for proper drainage, reseeded and landscaped to produce a usable green space area similar to the way the property currently sits. ASAC's intention is to maintain this area long-term as a park like

The lowa State Historic Preservation Office has determined that no historic properties would be adversely affected by the proposed project.

The US Fish and Wildlife endangered species program website lists five threatened, endangered and candidate federally listed species that may occur in Clinton County, lowa including a clam, two plants, a snake and a snail. These species require riverine habitat, wet to moist tallgrass prairie and sedge meadows, or north facing talus slopes. The project site is in a developed urban area and there is no suitable habitat for threatened and endangered species; therefore, no impacts are expected.

The US Fish and Wildlife's on-line mapping tool was used to determine that the property is not located in a wetland.

According to FEMA floodplain maps currently available for Clinton, lowa, the building and the proposed GSHP system are within a 100- year floodplain. The GSHP and appurtenant equipment would be installed at a height equal to or slightly above the existing grade. The presence of this GSHP would cause no detectable change in flood elevations and would not obstruct the flow of flood water. The Iowa DNR, Water Resources Section and the Clinton City Engineering Department have determined that a floodplain permit is not required. Therefore, DOE concludes that installation of the proposed GSHP would have no adverse impacts on the natural and beneficial values of the floodplain, would not affect lives or property in the surrounding areas, and would be compatible with applicable floodplain protection standards.

In March 2008, Terracon completed a limited site investigation to evaluate the on-site soils and groundwater for the presence of hazardous substances resulting from a potential release from the fuel oil underground storage tank (UST). Based on the laboratory analysis, the groundwater was impacted. In December 2008, the UST was removed and in October 2009, the lowa DNR determined the levels reported were below established action limits and no further work was required by the DNR.

ASAC has stated there is no asbestos. All waste generated by the proposed project would be handled and disposed of in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and Local regulations and requirements.

DOE has reviewed the information for the proposed projects and determined that these projects do not pose a significant impact to human health and/or environment. Therefore these projects are Categorically Excluded under B5.1 "Actions to Conserve Energy".

NEPA PROVISION  DOE has made a final NEPA determination for this award  Insert the following language in the award:  Note to Specialist:  Prepared by Chris Paulsen  SIGNATURE OF THIS MEMORANDUM CONSTITUTES A RECORD OF THIS DECISION.  NEPA Compliance Officer Signature:  NEPA Compliance Officer Signature:  NEPA Compliance Officer  Field Office Manager review required  NCO REQUESTS THE FIELD OFFICE MANAGER REVIEW FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:
Note to Specialist:  Prepared by Chris Paulsen  SIGNATURE OF THIS MEMORANDUM CONSTITUTES A RECORD OF THIS DECISION.  NEPA Compliance Officer Signature:  NEPA Compliance Officer  FIELD OFFICE MANAGER DETERMINATION  Field Office Manager review required  NCO REQUESTS THE FIELD OFFICE MANAGER REVIEW FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:
Prepared by Chris Paulsen  SIGNATURE OF THIS MEMORANDUM CONSTITUTES A RECORD OF THIS DECISION.  NEPA Compliance Officer Signature:  NEPA Compliance Officer  FIELD OFFICE MANAGER DETERMINATION  Field Office Manager review required  NCO REQUESTS THE FIELD OFFICE MANAGER REVIEW FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:
SIGNATURE OF THIS MEMORANDUM CONSTITUTES A RECORD OF THIS DECISION.  NEPA Compliance Officer Signature:  NEPA Compliance Officer  FIELD OFFICE MANAGER DETERMINATION  Field Office Manager review required  NCO REQUESTS THE FIELD OFFICE MANAGER REVIEW FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:
NEPA Compliance Officer Signature:  NEPA Compliance Officer  FIELD OFFICE MANAGER DETERMINATION  Field Office Manager review required  NCO REQUESTS THE FIELD OFFICE MANAGER REVIEW FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:
☐ Field Office Manager review required  NCO REQUESTS THE FIELD OFFICE MANAGER REVIEW FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:
NCO REQUESTS THE FIELD OFFICE MANAGER REVIEW FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:
The state of the second to the first of the second the state of the second th
<ul> <li>□ Proposed action fits within a categorical exclusion but involves a high profile or controversial issue that warrants Field Office Manager's attention.</li> <li>□ Proposed action falls within an EA or EIS category and therefore requires Field Office Manager's review and determination.</li> </ul>
BASED ON MY REVIEW I CONCUR WITH THE DETERMINATION OF THE NCO:
Field Office Manager's Signature: Date: