NEPA SCREENING FORM

DOE/CX-00030

I. Project Title:

Project T-222 HAMMER Training Facility Water Main Extension for Fire Protection

II. Project Description and Location (including time period over which proposed action will occur and project dimensions - e.g., acres displaced/disturbed, excavation length/depth, etc.):

The proposed project is located at the Hazardous Materials Management Emergency Response Training Facility (HAMMER), situated in the 600 Area of the Hanford Site, Benton County, Washington. The proposed action will excavate a trench and install a water pipeline to connect the City of Richland water main (located south of Horn Rapids Road) with the existing HAMMER water system. Facilities like HAMMER are required by the Department of Energy (DOE) to have two sources of water for fire protection. HAMMER currently has only a single source of water for fire protection and has been operating under a DOE exemption. Now that the City of Richland has constructed a water tank to the west of HAMMER. DOE has directed the facility to make a second connection to the city water system for fire protection. The "Area of Potential Effect" (APE) for the proposed action includes a buffer zone for equipment access in addition to the area required for the actual excavation and installation of the water pipeline. The area required for the excavation and installation of the water pipeline is 122 meters (400 feet) long by 1.5 meters (5 feet) wide and 1.5 meters (5 feet) deep, for a total of 274.5 square meters (10,000 square feet). The area for access will include a 10 meter (33 foot) buffer zone around the water pipeline route. The total APE is approximately 0.33 hectare (0.82 acre). If any staging or laydown areas are needed, an existing Hazmat pad or another area already covered in gravel (both previously disturbed areas) will be used. Most of the work will be done by track hoe, although water trucks and pickup trucks will be employed.

Ecological resources review #2011-600-011 was completed in January of 2011. Vegetation within the APE is primarily with Russian thistle and cheatgrass, with a few grey rabbitbrush and big sagebrush. Approximately 75 percent of the APE is covered with gravel or paved roadways. No birds were observed during the survey and no mammal activity was noted. No plant or animal species protected under the Endangered Species Act, candidates for such protection, or species listed by Washington State as threatened or endangered were observed. The ecological resources review was conducted outside the migratory bird nesting season (March through July). Work may be performed until mid-March with little potential to affect migratory birds. If any nesting birds (if not a nest, then a pair of birds of the same species or a single bird that will not leave the construction area when disturbed) are encountered or bird defensive behaviors (flying at workers, refusal to leave the area, strident vocalizations) are observed, then a biological resource specialist will be contacted for further consultation. Particular attention will be paid to gravel/rock areas which are preferred nesting habitat for Killdeer. The use of heavy earth-moving equipment has the potential for spreading noxious weeds. When feasible, off-road travel will be minimized and wheels and undercarriages of vehicles will be cleaned to minimize spread of noxious weeds. Any areas cleared of vegetation, excavated, or bladed will be revegetated using a native plant seed mixture as directed by the biological resource specialist. No adverse impacts to protected species, priority habitats, or other biological resources of concern are expected to result from the proposed action. The ecological resource review is valid until March 15, 2011.

Hanford cultural resources review HCRC#2011-600-011 was completed in February of 2011. The extent of disturbance required for the installation of the water pipeline required a full cultural resources field survey of the APE. The pedestrian survey did not locate any cultural resources. The geologic features suggested a high potential for Holocene deposits (i.e., potential for cultural resources). Due to the proposed depth of disturbance, subsurface testing was conducted to determine if buried cultural materials or deposits were present. No cultural materials were discovered during shovel/auger testing. The APE was found to have moderate ground disturbance, with evidence of previous excavations (i.e., underground utility lines). Additionally, Horn Rapids Road crosses the southern portion of the APE resulting in a high degree of disturbance associated with construction and maintenance activities. No historic properties

were identified. The installation of the water pipeline will result in no historic properties being affected. Based on archaeological survey and subsurface testing, no cultural resources are anticipated. However, during construction activities workers will be directed to watch for cultural resources (e.g., bones, stone tools, arrowheads, rock features, hearths, historic footings, foundations, ceramics, bottles, cans, etc.). If cultural materials are encountered, then work in the vicinity of the discovery will stop until a cultural resource specialist has been notified, the significance of the find accessed, and if necessary, arrangements made for mitigation of the find. III. Reviews (if applicable): Biological Review Report #: 2011-600-011 Cultural Review Report #: HCRC-2011-600-011 No Potential to Cause Effect (NPCE) Determination: [X] YES [] NO IV. Existing NEPA Documentation (Steps 3 and 4 of Contractor Screening Process) YES NO Is the proposed action evaluated in a previous EA, EIS, or under CERCLA? [X]If "NO." proceed to Section V. If "YES," List EA, EIS, or CERCLA Document(s) Title and Number: And then complete Section VII and provide electronic copy of signed NRSF to DOE NCO for information (see Step 6 of Contractor Screening Process). V. Sitewide Categorical Exclusion (see Step 5 of Contractor Screening Process) YES NO Does the proposed action fall within the scope of a Hanford Sitewide Categorical [X] Exclusion? If "YES," list Sitewide Categorical Exclusion to be applied and complete Sitewide Categorical Exclusion Sitewide Categorical Exclusion Criteria YES NO Are there extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the [][]significance of the environmental effects of the proposal? Is the action connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts [see 40 CFR YES NO 1508.25(a)(1)] or result in cumulatively significant impacts [see 40 CFR 1508.25(a)(2)]? YES NO Does the proposed action impact sensitive species or their habitats? []Does the action involve or disturb the Hanford Reach National Monument, Rattlesnake Mountain, Gable Mountain, Gable Butte or other Traditional Cultural Properties or YES NO properties of historic, archaeological or architectural significance, or occur within one-[] [] fourth mile of the Columbia River? If "NO" to all Sitewide Categorical Exclusion Criteria questions above, complete Section VII and provide electronic copy of Initiator/ECO signed NRSF to DOE NCO for information (see Step 6 of Contractor Screening Process). If "YES" to any of the Sitewide Categorical Exclusion Criteria questions above, attach appropriate explanatory information and provide NRSF to DOE NCO; DOE initiates DOE NEPA Review Screening Process - Step 1 by completing Section VI and VIII, as appropriate.

VI. Categorical Exclusion

Does the proposed action fall within a class of actions that is listed in Appendixes A or B to Subpart D of 10 CFR Part 1021?

Via CVA to Line 1 to Cotton in 1 Evaluation Criteria (based on Elicibility Criteria)

List CX to be applied and complete Categorical Exclusion Criteria (based on Eligibility Criteria of the NEPA Determination Procedure):

B1.3 - Routine maintenance activities and custodial services for buildings, structures, rights-of-way,

infrastructures (e.g., pathways, roads, and railroads), vehicles and equipment, and localized vegetation and pest control, during which operations may be suspended and resumed; (k) erosion control and soil stabilization measures (such as reseeding and revegetation).

B1.15 - Siting, construction (or modification), and operation of support buildings and support structures (including, but not limited to, trailers and prefabricated 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 those for fire protection.

Categorical Exclusion Criteria	
Does the proposed action threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environmental, safety, or health, including DOE and/or Executive Orders?	YES NO
Does the proposed action require siting, construction, or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities?	YES NO [] [X]
Does the proposed action disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases?	YES NO
Does the proposed action adversely affect environmentally sensitive resources?	YES NO [] [X]
Are there extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal?	YES NO [] [X]
Is the proposal connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts or result in cumulatively significant impacts (not precluded by 40 CFR 1506.1 or 10 CFR 1021.211)?	YES NO

If "NO" to all Categorical Exclusion Criteria questions above, DOE NCO completes Section VIII, provides electronic copy of signed NRSF to contractor, and otherwise complies with Step 4 of the DOE NEPA Review Screening Process - Step 1.

If "YES" to any of the Categorical Exclusion Criteria questions above, DOE NCO complies with Step 5 of the DOE NEPA Review Screening Process - Step 1, and initiates DOE NEPA Review Screening Process - Step 2.

VII. Approvals	N. open		
Title	Name (Printed)	Signature	Date
Environmental Compliance Officer or NEPA-SME	Jerry W. Cammann	J.W. Cammann	3/1/11

VIII. Approval/Determination

DOE NEPA Compliance Officer: Woody Russell

Based on my review of information conveyed to me and in my possession (or attached) concerning the proposed action, as NEPA Compliance Officer (as authorized under DOE Order 451.1B), I have determined that the proposed action fits within the specified class of action:

NCO Determination	: [X] CX _	[]EA	[] EIS			
Signature: Wo	ody Kuss	M	17	_ Date:	3-1-11	
	7,		ε ά .			