RL-721	
REV 3	

NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM

Document ID Number:

JOE/0X - 90063

I. Project Title:

Explosives Research Capability Expansion, 300 Area, Hanford Site.

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.):

PNNL proposes to install a self-contained (mobile) Explosives Laboratory on an existing concrete slab in the 300 Area to expand the explosives research capability in the 300 area. Currently, PNNL is authorized for the use of 2.5 grams of explosives for work being conducted in the 331 Building. PNNL also has an existing magazine in the 300 Area authorized for a maximum of 70 lbs of explosives. The proposed mobile laboratory would used for indoor bench scale research. It would be be located approximately 930 feet south of the 331 Building. The existing concrete slab is approximately 75 feet long by 25 feet wide, and the mobile laboratory is small enough to fit on the southern half of this slab. The northern half of the slab would be used for parking. Equipment and materials would be staged on other concrete pads or gravel parking areas. There is an existing road to this slab and no road upgrades would be needed. No other utilities (e.g., water, sewer) are required. The types of impacts associated with this project include: 1) placement of a mobile laboratory on a pre-existing concrete slab, 2) clearance of 50 feet of vegetation around the slab for a fire zone, and 3) minor disturbance for electrical upgrades. The mobile laboratory would be authorized for 25 grams of explosives.

Construction is scheduled to begin in early February 2012.

The proposed action would include reasonably foreseeable actions necessary to implement the proposed action, such as equipment and materials staging, laboratory equipment setup and calibration, and award of grants and contracts.

III. Reviews (if applicable):		***************************************					
Biological Review Report #: ECR 2012-300-002							
Cultural Review Report#: HCRC 2012-300-002							
Additional Attachments:							
Biological Review completed November 16, 2012 - ECR 2012-300-002; Cultural Resource Review							
completed and submitted to SPHO January 10, 2012 - HCRC+2012-300-002							
IV. Existing NEPA Documentation (see Steps 3 and 4 of Contractor Screening Process)	YES	NO					
Is the proposed action evaluated in a previous EA, EIS, or under CERCLA?							
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 Initiator/ECO 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 porposed action fit within the scope of actions identified in a DOE Hanford NCO-approved sitewide categorical exclusion?		Ø					
If "NO," proceed to Section VI.		***************************************					
If "YES," list Sitewide Categorical Exclusion to be applied and complete Sitewide Categorical Exclusion Criteria:							

RL-721 REV 3 NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM (continued) Document ID No.				ımber:			
				*			
Sitewide Categorical Exclusion Criteria			YES	NO			
Does the action fail to meet the eligibility requirements for Appendix B categorical exclusion ("integral elements") of 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D. Appendix B, B(1) through B(4)?							
Is the action connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts (see 40 CFR 1508.25(a)(1)) or result in cumulatively significant impacts (see 40 CFR 1508.25(a)(2))?							
Are there extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal?							
Does the action involve or disturb the Hanford Reach National Monument, Rattlesnake Mountain, Gable Butte or other Traditional Cultural Properties or properties of historic, archaeological or architectural significance, or occur within one-fourth mile of the Columbia River?							
Does the proposed action impact sensitive species or their habitats?							
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 Sitew NRSF to DOE NCO; DOE	ide Categorical Exclusion Criteria questions ab nitiates DOE NEPA Review Screening Process	iove, attach appropriate explana s - Step 1 by completing Section	atory information a VI and VIII, as a	nd provid propriate	ie >,		
VI. Categorical Exclusion					NO		
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?							
List CX to be applied and o	omplete Categorical Exclusion Criteria (based	on Eligibility Criteria of the NEP	A Determination F	rocedure):		
CX B3.6, Indoor Be	nch-Scale and Small-Scale Resea	rch and Development					
Categorical Exclusion Criteria					NO		
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?					Ø		
Does the proposed action require siting, construction, or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities?					Ø		
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?					図		
Does the proposed action adversely affect environmentally sensitive resources?					\boxtimes		
Are there extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal?					Ø		
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)?				Ø			
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 Categ Screening Process - Step 1	orical Exclusion Criteria questions above, DOI , and initiates DOE NEPA Review Screening F	ENCO complies with Step 5 of Process - Step 2.	the DOE NEPA R	aview			
VII. Approvals/Determina							
***************************************	Name (Printed)	Signature		Date			
Initiator	Art Stithem	iem (2-14-		1/10/12			
Cognizant Environmental Compliance Officer	Amanda Stegen	Complete		1/11/12			
VIII. Approval/Determinal	lion						
DOE NEPA Compliance Of	Mcer 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							
Signature: Woody brussell Date: 3/1/12							
The state of the s							