## NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM for Actions Included in CXs

Document ID #: DOE/CX-00152

I. Proje	ct Title:
----------	-----------

Treatability Test to remove solids and cesium from Tank Waste

II. Describe the proposed action, including: location, time period over which proposed action will occur, project dimension (e.g., acres displaced/disturbed, excavation length/depth), area/location/number of buildings. Attach maps and drawings, as applicable. Describe existing environmental conditions and potential for environmental impacts from the proposed action. If the proposed action is not a project, describe the action or plan.

This activity falls under CXB6.1 Cleanup activities "Small-scale, short term cleanup actions under RCRA, Atomic Energy Act, or other authorities, less than approximately 10 million dollars in cost (in 2011 dollars), to reduce risk to human health or the environment from the release or threat of a hazardous substance other than high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, including treatment (such as incineration, encapsulation, physical or chemical separation, and compaction), recovery, storage or disposal of wastes at existing facilities currently handling the type of waste involved in the action"

The purpose of the test is to take up to 3 gallons of archived sample material stored at 222S laboratory and have 222S laboratory process the material. After processing Permafix (Richland location) will stabilized the material and then it will be shipped to WCS in Texas. All activities will occur within existing facilities and are allowed under the permits and licenses of the respective facilities. Facilities (222S, Permafix, etc) will not be shipping waste if the waste form does not meet another facilities waste acceptance criteria. The objective is not to generate a waste form with no disposal path.

The scope of the small scale, short term cleanup activity is to be completed in 6-9 months from the start of sample preparation to shipment to Texas. The total cost is expected to be under 8.5 Million dollars (in 2011 dollars). Since this is Hanford tank waste DOE HQ is doing the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing approval required under DOE Order 435.1.

Related to comment V 3 below related to significant or cumulative impacts, it is understood that this activity only applies to the 2-3 gallons of previously pulled tank samples that have been archived at 222S laboratory and that any future activities related to Hanford tank waste would have to go through their own separate NEPA review.

III. Applicable Reviews (atta	ich to NRSF):		
Biological Review Report #:	N/A		
Cultural Review Report #:	N/A		
Additional Attachments:			
H H			
IV: Existing Documentation			
Are the impacts of the propose	ed action evaluated in a previous EA, EIS, or CERCLA document?	☐ Yes	No
If "YES", use	Site Form A-6006-948, Actions Adequately Evaluated in NEPA or CERCLA Docum	ment	

NEPA REVIEW SCREENING FORM		ocument ID #:		
for Actions Included In CXs (Continued)	DOE	E/CX-00152		
V. Categorical Exclusion:				
Does the proposed action fall within a category of actions that is listed in Appendixes A or B to Subpart D of 10 CFR 1021? If extraordinary circumstances or integral elements would preclude the use of a CX, check "No".		Yes	□ No	
Are there extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal?		☐ Yes	⊠ No	
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	
List CX to be applied and complete Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements (where an action might fit within that best fits the proposed action):	mult	iple CXs, u	se the CX	
CXB6.1 Clean up Activities				
Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements:				
Would 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	
Would the proposed action require siting, construction, or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities?		Yes	⊠ No	
Would the proposed action disturb hazardous substances, poliutants, contaminants, or CERCLA-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases?			⊠ No	
Would the proposed action adversely affect environmentally sensitive resources?			⊠ No	
Would the proposed action involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or invasive species such that the action is not contained or confined in a manner designed, operated, and conducted in accordance with applicable requirements to prevent unauthorized release into the environment?			⊠ No	
If "NO" to all Integral Elements questions above, complete Section VI, and provide NRSF to DOE NCO for review.  If "YES" to any of the Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements questions above, contact DOE NCO for additional NEPA Review.				
VI. Responsible Contractor Signatures:				
Initiator:				
N/A			-	
Name Print Signature		Date		
Cognizant Environmental Compliance Officer:				
Mary Burandt Mary Burandt		9/16/2016		
Name Print Signature		Da	te	
VII. DOE Approval/Determination				
DOE NEPA Compliance Officer: Diori L. Kreske, NEPA Compliance Officer (NCO)				
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), the proposed action fits within the specified class of action:				
NCO Determination: X CX *NCO Recommendation: EA EI	S			
Diopi KRESKE Din Hush Print Signature	<u></u>	9/20	/ (5 te	
*NRSF A-6006-950 would be completed by responsible contractor				