

## **Department of Energy**

Argonne Site Office 9800 South Cass Avenue Argonne, Illinois 60439

JUL 1 7 2015

Dr. Peter B. Littlewood Director, Argonne National Laboratory President, UChicago Argonne, LLC 9700 South Cass Avenue Argonne, IL 60439

Dear Dr. Littlewood:

SUBJECT: NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) DETERMINATION FOR ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY (ARGONNE)

The Argonne Site Office (ASO) has approved the following as a categorical exclusion (CX) under Appendix B (to 10 CFR Part 1021, Subpart D, Integrated DOE NEPA Implementing Procedures, December 1996), Category B 3.1 "Site Characterization and Environmental Monitoring."

---Wind Forecast Improvement Project 2 (WFIP2), Yakima (Monitoring Trailer), ASO-CX-314

Therefore, no further NEPA review is required. However, if any modification or an expansion of the scope is made to the above project, additional NEPA review will be necessary.

Enclosed please find a copy of the approved Environmental Review Form (ERF) for the project. If you have any questions, please contact Kaushik Joshi of my staff at (630) 252-4226.

Sincerely,

Joanna M. Livengood

ivengood

Manager

Enclosure: As Stated

cc: J. Stauber, ANL, w/encl.

- D. Cook, ANL, w/encl.
- D. Rodi, ANL, w/encl.
- K. Joshi, ASO, w/encl.
- M. McKown, SC-CH, w/encl.
- P. Siebach, SC-CH, w/encl.



## **Environmental Review Form for Argonne National Laboratory**

Project/A	ctivity Title: WFIP2 Yakima	
ASO NEPA	Tracking No. ASO-CX-314 Type of Funding:	
	B&R Code	
Identifyin	g number: 2006 WFO proposal # CRADA pro	posal #
Work Proj	ect # ANL accounting # (item 3a in Field Work Prop	osal)
Other (exp	olain)	
Project Ma	anager: David R. Cook Signature: David Helong	Date: 6/10/10/
NEPA Owr	ner: Diane J. Rodi Signature: Mane Allette	Date: 6/10/201
ANI NFPA	Reviewer: Joel V. Stauber Signature: pul V. Stautry	Date: 6/11/15
sodar acou throughou variations.	are, humidity, wind speed and direction, barometric pressure on a 3 m to a stic sensing of the atmosphere up to 1500 m. 3) microwave sensing of a the atmospheric boundary layer. 4) microbarograph to measure baronessering of the atmospheric boundary layer. 4) microbarograph to measure baronessering of Affected Environment: Grassed area within the airport grassed area within the airport grassed area.	the atmosphere metric pressure
II. Potential Environmental Effects: (Attach explanation for each "yes" response.)		onse.)
A.	Complete Section A for all projects.	
1.	<ul> <li>Project evaluated for Pollution Prevention and Waste Minimization opportunities and details provided under items 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 16, and 2 below, as applicable</li> </ul>	Yes No <u>X</u>
2.	Air Pollutant Emissions	Yes No _X
3.	Noise	Yes X No
	Noise from the sodar is minimal and is not loud enough to disturb any nearby.	residential areas

4.	Chemical/Oil Storage/Use Yes No_X			No X
5.	Pesticide Use		Yes	No X
6.	Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)		Yes	No X
7.	The state of the s		Yes	No X
8.	Effluent/Wastewater (If yes, see question #12 and contact  Yes No X  Gregg Kulma (FMS-SEP) at 2-9147 or gkulma@anl.gov		No X	
9.	Was	te Management		
	a)	Construction or Demolition Waste	Yes	No X
	b)	Hazardous Waste	Yes	No X
	c)	Radioactive Mixed Waste	Yes	No X
	d)	Radioactive Waste	Yes	No X
	e)	PCB or Asbestos Waste	Yes	No X
	f)	Biological Waste	Yes	No X
	g)	No Path to Disposal Waste	Yes	No X
	h)	Nano-material Waste	Yes	No X
10.	Rad	ation	Yes X	No
	Electromagnetic microwave radiation is directed vertically up into the atmosphere and cannot harm anything on the ground. There is some danger if a person poked their head over the clutter barrier. The airport areas will be fenced and all sites will have warning signs describing the hazard.			
11. Threatened Violation of ES&H Regulations or Permit Requirements Yes No_X				
12. New or Modified Federal or State Permits  Yes No X				
13. Siting, Construction, or Major Modification of Facility to Recover, Yes No X  Treat, Store, or Dispose of Waste				
14. Public Controversy Yes No X				
15.	15. Historic Structures and Objects			No X

	16.	Disturbance of Pre-existing Contamination	Yes	No X
	17.	Energy Efficiency, Resource Conserving, and Sustainable Design Features	Yes	No X
	B.	For projects that will occur outdoors, complete Section B as well as Secti	on A.	
,	18.	Threatened or Endangered Species, Critical Habitats, and/or other Protected Species	Yes	No X
	19.	Wetlands	Yes	No X
	20.	Floodplain	Yes	No X
	21.	Landscaping	Yes	No X
	22.	Navigable Air Space	Yes X	No
		The sodar and microwave profiler will send signals into the atmosphere ab instrumentation, at altitudes where small aircraft may fly, but pose no haz aircraft.		ose
	23.	Clearing or Excavation	Yes	No X
	24.	Archaeological Resources	Yes	No X
	25.	Underground Injection	Yes	No X
	26.	Underground Storage Tanks	Yes	No X
	27.	Public Utilities or Services	Yes	No X
	28.	Depletion of a Non-Renewable Resource	Yes	No X
	C.	For projects occurring outside of ANL complete Section C as well as Secti	ons A and	В.
	29.	Prime, Unique, or Locally Important Farmland	Yes	No X
	30.	Special Sources of Groundwater (such as sole source aquifer)	Yes	No X
	31.	Coastal Zones	Yes	No X
	32.	Areas with Special National Designations (such as National Forests, Parks, or Trails)	Yes	No X
	33.	Action of a State Agency in a State with NEPA-type Law	Yes	No X

	34. Class I Air Quality Control Region	Yes No X
III.	Subpart D Determination: (to be completed by DOE/ASO)	
	Are there any extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal?	Yes No
	Is the project connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts or related to other proposed action with cumulatively significant impacts?	Yes * No X
	If yes, is a categorical exclusion determination precluded by 40 CFR 1506.1 or 10 CFR 1021.211?	Yes No
	Can the project or activity be categorically excluded from preparation of an Environment Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement under Subpart D of the DOE NEPA Regulations?	Yes No
	If yes, indicate the class or classes of action from Appendix A or B of Subpart D project may be excluded. Appendix B, B 3.1 Site and environmental monitor of the notion indicate the NEPA recommendation and class(es) of action from Append Subpart D to Part 1021 of 10 CFR.	<u>characteriza</u> ring.
	NEPA Coordinator Review: Kaushik Joshi ture: Date: 7-13	3-2015
SO I	NCO Approval of CX Determination:	
urthe	receding pages are a record of documentation that an action may be categoric er NEPA review under DOE NEPA Regulation 10 CFR Part 1021.400. I have deseed action meets the requirements for the Categorical Exclusion identified above ture:  Date: 15	termined that the

ANL-985 (12/06/2012)

Peter R. Siebach

Argonne Site Office NCO

ASO NCO EA or EIS Recommendation:		
Class of Action:	,	
Signature:	Date:	
Peter R. Siebach		
Argonne Site Office NCO		
Concurrence with EA or EIS Recommendation:		
CH GLD:		
Signature:	Date:	
ASO Manager Approval of EA or EIS Recommendation:		
An EA EIS shall be prepared for the proposed	and	
shall serve as the document manager.		
Signature:	Date:	
Dr. Joanna M. Livengood		
Manager		