Renovation would take approximately 6 months and would involve approximately 5 workers on and administrative tasks, with a peak of up to 150 workers. Truck trips expected to be transported to a permitted Class 2 landfill. Welcome Center construction is expected to involve 50-75 onsite workers, on average, with a peak of up to 150 workers. Truck trips – mainly to haul debris and transport in building materials, concrete, and equipment – are expected to number around 1,800; averaged over the lifetime of the project, this would be approximately 2-3 truck trips per workday. A stormwater construction project permit would be secured from the State Water Board and Regional Water Quality Control Board (including a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan), and a wastewater discharge permit from the East Bay Municipal Utility District might be needed to manage accumulated ground and rainwater.

Building 48 (the Firehouse) is a two-story, approximately 6,600-square-foot building that houses firefighter sleeping quarters on the second floor and administrative offices on the first floor (emergency vehicles are stationed in an adjacent garage building). The seismically substandard second floor walls would be reinforced to increase shear strength; the first floor was similarly reinforced about five years prior. Building 48 was constructed in 1981 and has been found, with State Historic Preservation Officer concurrence in 2003, to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP. Renovation would take approximately 6 months and would involve approximately 5 workers on site at any one time.
Building 26 (Health Services Center) is an approximately 10,500-square-foot, two-story building with an occupancy of about 45 staff (health services and EH&S staff) that would be vacated by the project. It is rated seismically “poor” and would not be reoccupied in its current condition; instead, it would be put into “cold and dark” status by closing off its utilities, securing access, etc. Building 26 was constructed in 1964 and has been found to be ineligible for NRHP listing.

Building 54 and its parking area reside on leased Parcel 21, which is owned by the University of California Regents and leased to the DOE. The proposed action would renew the Parcel 21 lease—which is currently approved through May 31, 2020—for a 50-year term. All applicable LBNL “Standard Project Features” (SPFs) to avoid or minimize environmental impacts would be employed as an integral part of the proposed Action project description scope.

Categorical Exclusion(s) Applied:
B1.13 – Pathways, short access roads, and rail lines
B1.15 – Support buildings
B1.6 – Asbestos removal
B1.23 – Demolition and disposal of buildings
B1.24 – Property transfers
B1.27 – Disconnection of utilities
B1.28 – Placing a facility in an environmentally safe condition
B1.33 – Stormwater runoff control
B1.34 – Lead-based paint containment, removal, and disposal
B2.5 – Facility safety and environmental improvements
B3.1 – Site characterization and environmental monitoring

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 Part 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.
I concur that the above description accurately describes the proposed action.

LBNL Environmental Planner: ___________________________ Date Determined: 6/19/19

I concur that the above description accurately describes the proposed action.

BASO NEPA Program Manager: ___________________________ Date Determined: 6/21/19

BASO MIP Division Director: ___________________________ Date Determined: 6/21/19

Based on my review of the proposed action, as NEPA Compliance Officer (as authorized under DOE Order 451.1 B), I have determined that the proposed action fits within the specified class(es) of action, the other regulatory requirements set forth above are met, and the proposed action is hereby categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

NEPA Compliance Officer: ___________________________ Date Determined: 6/25/2019

Peter R. Siebach
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Figure 3: Welcome Center Rendering from Southwest Viewpoint