PFMD Chicago Office NEPA Tracking Number
FILE Copy

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICE OF SCIENCE -- CHICAGO OFFICE

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION NOTIFICATION FORM

To be completed by "financial assistance award" organization receiving Federal funding. For assistance (including a point of contact), see "Instructions for Preparing SC-CH F-560, Environmental Evaluation Notification Form".

Solicitation/Award No. (if applicable): CH=09CH 11561
Organization Name: California State University - San Bernardino
Title of Proposed Project/Research: Reaching for the Stars - Cal State University San Bernardino Observatory Project
Total DOE Funding/Total Project Funding: \$554,915/\$3,396,500
Project Description (use additional pages as necessary):
A. Proposed Project/Action (delineate Federally funded/Non-Federally funded portions) The proposed project involves construction of the first educational astronomical observatory in southern California. The DOE funds, when joined with other contributed funding, will support the construction of two domed structures and the public restroom facility on Little Badger Hill on the CSU San Bernardino campus. Each domed facility will be 480 sq. ft. with a lower level of 1187 sq. ft. for storage. The separate restroom and electrical room facility will be 742 sq. ft with a transformer pad of 139 sq. ft. The gross building area will be 3028 sq. ft. The balance of the project includes a concrete plaza area, fire truck turnaround, concrete paved road and parking. One domed structure will be equipped with an optical telescope coupled with a CCD camera and the second domed structure will house a larger aperture reflecting telescope equipped with UBVR filters.
DOE funding was provided by Congressional mandate in Public Law 111-8 and was made available in the Chicago Financial Plan.
B. Would the project proceed without Federal funding? Yes No
If "yes", describe the impact to the scope:

II. <u>Description of Affected Environment:</u>

The project site is located within the campus of California State University, San Bernardino on a western knoll of Badger Hill in the northeast quadrant of the campus (see attached campus map and photographs of the site). The site is currently undisturbed except for a few dirt roads. The gross building area is expected to cover 3028 sq. ft. CSU has performed a comprehensive evaluation of the potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures for this project in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines. The University submitted a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project in April 2002. The State Clearinghouse submitted the Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review and no state agencies submitted comments. The State Clearinghouse letter of May 2002 indicates that CSU has complied with the review requirements pursuant to CEQA. A copy of this letter is attached. Also attached is an e-mail notification from the Fish and Wildlife Service agreeing with the protocol proposed to protect migratory birds and ensure consistency with the MIgratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

			OC 1501	
		Chicag	go Office NEPA Tracking	, Numbe
III.	<u>Pre</u>	eliminary Questions:	V	
	A.	Is the DOE-funded work entirely a "paper study"?	Yes	No ⊠
		If "Yes", ensure that the description in Section I reflects this and go directly	y to Section V.	
	B.	Will the work to be performed take place entirely in existing buildings?		\boxtimes
		And NOT:		
		 Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requiren environment, safety, and health? 	nents for	
		 Require the siting, construction or major expansion of waste treatment, si disposal facilities? 	torage, or	
		3. Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants preexisting in environment?	the 🖂	
		 Adversely affect environmentally-sensitive resources identified in Section Be connected to another existing/proposed activity that could potentially cumulatively significant impact? 		
		6. Have an inherent <i>possibility</i> for high consequence impacts to human hea environment (e.g., Biosafety Level 3-4 laboratories, activities involving hi radiation)?		
IV.		ential Environmental Effects: ach/insert an explanation for each "Yes" response.		
	A.	Sensitive Resources: Will the proposed action result in changes and/or disturbate resources?	nces to any of the follo	wing
			Yes	No
		Threatened/Endangered Species and/or Critical Habitats		\boxtimes
		 Other Protected Species (e.g., Burros, Migratory Birds) Sensitive Environments (e.g., Tundra/Coral Reefs/Rain Forests) 		
		 Sensitive Environments (e.g., Tundra/Coral Reefs/Rain Forests) Archaeological/Historic Resources 	₩ P	
		5. Important Farmland	₽	
		6. Non-Attainment Areas for Ambient Air Quality Standards		X
		7. Class I Air Quality Control Region		Ħ
		8. Special Sources of Groundwater (e.g. Sole Source Aquifer)		Ħ
		9. Navigable Air Space		\boxtimes
		10. Coastal Zones		\boxtimes
		11. Areas with Special National Designation (e.g. National Forests, Parks, Tra12. Floodplains and Wetlands	ails)	
	В.	Regulated Substances/Activities: Will the proposed action involve any of the folloactivities?	owing regulated items	<u>or</u>
			Yes	No
		13. Natural Resource Damage Assessments		\boxtimes
		14. Exotic Organisms		\boxtimes
		15. Noxious Weeds		1.

Clearing or Excavation (indicate if greater than one acre) See Attacust Dredge or Fill (under Clean Water Act, Section 404, indicate if greater than ten

16. 17.

acres)

В.	Regulated Substances/Activities: Will the proposed action involve any of the following regulated Items or			
	activities? (continued) 18. Noise (in excess of regulations) 19. Asbestos Removal 20. PCB's 21. Import, Manufacture, or Processing of Toxic Substances 22. Chemical Storage/Use 23. Pesticide Use 24. Hazardous, Toxic, or Criteria Pollutant Air Emissions 25. Liquid Effluents 26. Underground Injection 27. Hazardous Waste 28. Underground Storage Tanks 29. Radioactive Mixed Waste 30. Radioactive Waste 31. Radiation Exposure 32. Surface Water Protection 33. Pollution Prevention Act 34. Ozone Depleting Substances 35. Off-Road Vehicles 36. Biosafety Level 3-4 Laboratory	Yes No		
C.	Other Relevant Information: Will the proposed action involve the following? 37. Potential Violation of Environment, Safety, or Health Regulations/Permits 38. Siting/Construction/Major Modification of Waste Recovery, or Waste Treatment, Storage, or Disposal Facilities 39. Disturbance of Pre-existing Contamination 40. New or Modified Federal/State Permits 41. Public Controversy 42. Environmental Justice 43. Action/Involvement of Another Federal Agency (e.g. license, funding, approval) 44. Action of a State Agency in a State with NEPA-type law. (Does the State Environmental Quality Review Act apply?) 45. Public Utilities/Services 46. Depletion of a Non-Renewable Resource 47. Extraordinary Circumstances 48. Connected Actions 49. Exclusively Bench-top Research 50. Only a Laboratory Setting	Yes SON NAME OF THE PROPERTY O		
Fina	ancial Assistance Award Organization Concurrence: Organization Official (Name and Title): Charles Stanley			
	a september 1	W HI LOVERS COMMITTEE COMM		
	Signature: Date:	6/1/09		
	e-mail: cstanley@csusb.edu Phone: 909-537-3914			
В.	Optional Concurrence (Name and Title): B. Robert Carlson			
	Signature: Bhobert Carlson Date:	6/1/09		
٠,	e-mail: carlson@csusb.edu Phone: 909-537-5300			

٧.

Remainder to be completed by SC-CH

VI.

<u>SC.</u>	-CH Concurrence/Recommendation/Determination:
A.	SC-CH Office of Acquisition and Assistance or Office of Safety, Technical & Infrastructure Services:
	Project Director or Contract Specialist (Name and Title): PARTET DIRECTOR Signature: Date: 01/14/2010
	Signature: Date: 01/14/2010
B.	SC-CH NEPA Team Review:
	Is the project/activity appropriate for a determination or a recommendation to the Head of the Field Organization by the NEPA Compliance Officer (NCO) under Subpart D of the DOE NEPA Regulations?
	Yes X No □ B1.15
	Specific class(es) of action from Appendices A-D to Subpart D (10 CFR 1021):
	Name and Title:
	Name and Title: JAMES OPRZEDE L Signature: Date: 1/27/10
C.	SC-CH Counsel (if necessary):
	Name and Title:
	Signature: Date:
D.	SC-CH NEPA Compliance Officer:
The 102	preceding pages are a record of documentation required under DOE Final NEPA Regulation, 10 CFR 1.400.
A	Action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review. I have determined that the proposed action meets the requirements for Categorical Exclusion referenced above.
	Action requires approval by Head of the Field Organization. Recommend preparation of an Environmental Assessment.
	Action requires approval by Head of the Field Organization or a Secretarial Officer. Recommend preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.
Com	nments/Limitations if necessary:
Sign	Peter R. Siebach Date: 1/27/10
	SC-CH NEPA Compliance Officer

California State University (CSU) San Bernardino EENF Corrections

The university's EENF form has been updated to provide clarification on the following checklist items that were initially marked "No".

Item #4, Archeological/Historic Resources

This item should have been marked "YES". Because this project involves construction, CSU was advised by DOE to engage a consultant to perform a cultural resources investigation of the proposed Observatory project area in order to satisfy the federal requirements under Section 106. This investigation was completed in October 2009, with a finding of no adverse effects on cultural resources. The State of California SHPO was then notified by DOE of the determination.

Item #16, Clearing or Excavation

This item should have been checked "YES" because the project site is located on an area of approximately five acres. The area is described in detail in the grantee's Biological Assessment document that was part of the grantee's application for federal assistance.

Item #44, Action of a State Agency in a State with NEPA-type law

The State of California does have a NEPA-type law. The university followed State CEQA guidelines when evaluating the potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures for their project and contacted the State Clearinghouse upon completion of their review with the submittal of a Negative Declaration of impacts.

I have corrected the university's EENF form and signed as the DOE project director.

Patrice Brewington

Program Support Services

Chicago Office

Department of Energy

January 27, 2010