



National Nuclear Security Administration Categorical Exclusion Determination Form



NEPA ID#: OER 16-001

Proposed Action Title: NC-135 Site Demolition

Program or Field Office: NNSA/OST

Location(s) (City/County/State): Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, NM

Proposed Action Description:

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Kansas City Field Office proposes to demolish all structures, pavement, concrete, and utilities associated with Department of Energy operations at the NC-135 Site on Kirtland Air Force Base (KAFB), Albuquerque, New Mexico. The NC-135 Site consists of 18.32 fenced acres of developed land with over 53,000 square feet of single story, prefabricated buildings and trailers. The site includes a salvage yard, paved driveways and parking areas, three concrete aircraft pads, and landscaping. The buildings, which are currently vacant, are an assortment of administrative offices; material storage areas; various electronic fabrication, maintenance and testing labs; engineering and drafting areas; a facility maintenance building; and storage, testing and maintenance shop for mock firearms. The New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer has concurred with NNSA's finding that the proposed activities would have no adverse effect on historic properties or potential historic districts.

Categorical Exclusion(s) Applied:

- B1.23 Demolition and disposal of buildings
- B1.15 Support buildings

For the complete DOE National Environmental Policy Act regulations regarding categorical exclusions including the full text of each categorical exclusion, see Subpart D of 10 CFR 1021.

Regulatory Requirements in 10 CFR 1021.410(b): (See full text in regulation)

The proposal fits within a class of actions that is listed in Appendix A or B to 10 CFR Part 1021, Subpart D.

To fit within the classes of actions listed in 10 CFR Part 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B, a proposal must be one that would not: (1) threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders; (2) require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators), but the proposal may include categorically excluded waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment actions or facilities; (3) disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases; (4) have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources, including, but not limited to, those listed in paragraph B(4) of 10 CFR Part 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B; (5) involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or invasive species) unless the proposed activity would be contained or confined in a manner designed and operated to prevent unauthorized release into the environment and conducted in accordance with applicable requirements, such as those listed in paragraph B(5) of 10 CFR Part 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B.

There are no extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal.

The proposal has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion. This proposal is not connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.25(a)(1)), is not related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7)), and is not precluded by 40 CFR 1506.1 or 10 CFR 1021.211 concerning limitations on actions during preparation of an environmental impact statement.

Based on my review of information conveyed to me and in my possession 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(es) of action and that other regulatory requirements set forth above are met. Therefore, the application of a categorical exclusion is appropriate.