OCT 23 2013

Ms. Victoria A. White
Chief Operating Officer
Fermilab
P.O. Box 500
Batavia, IL 60510

Dear Ms. White:

SUBJECT: NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) DETERMINATION AT FERMI NATIONAL ACCELERATOR LABORATORY (FERMILAB) – LAB 8

Reference: Letter, from V. White to M. Weis, dated October 17, 2013, Subject: NEPA Environmental Evaluation Notification Form (EENF) for Lab 8

I have reviewed the Fermilab EENF for Lab 8. Based on the information provided in the EENF, I have approved the following categorical exclusion (CX):

Project Name	Approved	CX
Lab 8	10/22/2013	B2.5

I am returning a signed copy of the EENF for your records. No further NEPA review is required. This project falls under categorical exclusions provided in 10 *CFR* 1021, as amended in November 2011.

Sincerely,

– S –

Michael J. Weis
Site Manager

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc: N. Lockyer, w/o encl.
M. Michels, w/encl.
T. Dykhuis, w/encl.
A. Aparicio, w/o encl.

bc: P. Siebach, CH-STS, w/encl.
M. McKown, CH-OCC, w/o encl.
J. Scott, FSO, w/o encl.
R. Hersemann, FSO, w/encl.

FERMILAB ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION NOTIFICATION FORM (EENF) for documenting compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), DOE NEPA Implementing Regulations, and the DOE NEPA Compliance Program of DOE Order 451.1B

Project/Activity Title: Lab 8
ES&H Tracking Number: 01112

I hereby verify, via my signature, the accuracy of information in the area of my contribution for this document and that every effort would be made throughout this action to comply with the commitments made in this document and to pursue cost-effective pollution prevention opportunities. Pollution prevention (source reduction and other practices that eliminate or reduce the creation of pollutants) is recognized as a good business practice which would enhance site operations thereby enabling Fermilab to accomplish its mission, achieve environmental compliance, reduce risks to health and the environment, and prevent or minimize future Department of Energy (DOE) legacy wastes.

Fermilab Action Owner: David Butler (X3370)
Signature and Date David Butler 10/15/2013

Fermilab ES&H Officer: Angela Aparicio (X3701)
Signature and Date Angela Aparicio 10/17/2013

I. Description of the Proposed Action and Need

Purpose and Need:

Laboratory 8 in the Fermilab Village would provide CNC (Computer Numerical Control) services for experiments, such as the Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS), Mu2e, and Long Baseline Neutrino Experiment (LBNE), to name a few. CNC routing would create many different specialized parts needed for the R&D activities in which Fermilab is involved. The ability to create these specialized parts in-house is needed because the activities are Research and Development (R&D) and often do not have drawings and then changes are often made 'on the fly' so private industry would not be able to fulfill the requirements.

Proposed Action:
The Lab 8 facility would have three CNC router machines for cutting, drilling, and milling. Materials processed would consist of Garolite, carbon fiber, wood or plastic. The lab would use water and power supplied to the village.

Each machine would be equipped with a dust collector. The dust would be collected in 55-gallon drums, then bagged and disposed of through the general waste stream. Alcohols would be occasionally used for wipe cleaning materials and equipment. An example would be the cleaning of CMS panels after the routing which leaves a coat of dust on the surface. Lab 8 would also have a machine shop used for cutting general materials for either R&D parts or maintenance items.

Alternatives Considered:
Few CNC services could be provided by private industry due to the work often being R&D, where changes are made on the fly, and activities often do not have drawings. The No Action alternative would not fulfill the purpose and need stated above.

II. Description of the Affected Environment

Each machine would be equipped with a dust collector. The dust would be collected in 55-gallon drums, then bagged and disposed of through the general waste stream. Alcohols would occasionally be used for wipe cleaning materials and equipment.

III. Potential Environmental Effects (If the answer to the questions below is "yes", provide comments for each checked item and where clarification is necessary.)

A. Sensitive Resources: Would the proposed action result in changes and/or disturbances to any of the following resources?

- ☐ Threatened or endangered species
- ☐ Other protected species
- ☐ Wetland/Floodplains
- ☐ Archaeological or historical resources
- ☐ Non-attainment areas

B. Regulated Substances/Activities: Would the proposed action involve any of the following regulated substances or activities?

- ☐ Clearing or Excavation
- ☐ Demolition or decommissioning
- ☐ Asbestos removal
- ☐ PCBs
- ☒ Chemical use or storage
- ☐ Pesticides
- ☒ Air emissions
- ☐ Liquid effluents
- ☐ Underground storage tanks
- ☒ Hazardous or other regulated waste (including radioactive or mixed)
- ☐ Radioactive exposures or radioactive emissions
- ☐ Radioactivation of soil or groundwater

C. Other Relevant Disclosures: Would the proposed action involve any of the following actions/disclosures?

- ☐ Threatened violation of ES&H permit requirements
- ☐ Siting/construction/major modification of waste recovery or TSD facilities
- ☐ Disturbance of pre-existing contamination
- ☐ New or modified permits
- ☐ Public controversy
- ☐ Action/involvement of another federal agency
- ☐ Public utilities/services
- ☐ Depletion of a non-renewable resource

IV. Comments on checked items in section III.

Chemical Use or Storage
Solvent wipes (alcohols) would be occasionally used.

Air Emissions
Dust collected from cutting, drilling, and milling activities would be disposed of through the general trash.

Hazardous or Other Regulated Waste
Used solvent wipes would be collected and disposed of as hazardous waste through the Environment Safety, Health and Quality Section Hazard Control Technology Team (HCTT).

V. NEPA Recommendation

Fermilab staff has reviewed this proposed action and believe a Categorical Exclusion is appropriate. It is believed that the proposed action meets the description found in DOE's NEPA Implementation Procedures, 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B2.5 which states:

B2.5 Safety and environmental improvements of a facility (including, but not limited to, replacement and upgrade of facility components) that do not result in a significant change in the expected useful life, design capacity, or function of the facility and during which operations may be suspended and then resumed. Improvements include, but are not limited to, replacement/upgrade of control valves, in-core monitoring devices, facility air filtration systems, or substation transformers or capacitors; addition of structural bracing to meet earthquake standards and/or sustain high wind loading; and replacement of aboveground or belowground tanks and related piping, provided that there is no evidence of leakage, based on testing in accordance with applicable requirements (such as 40 CFR part 265, "Interim status Standards for Owners and Operators of Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities" and 40 CFR part 280, "Technical Standards and Corrective Action Requirements for Owners and Operators of Underground Storage Tanks"). These actions do not include rebuilding or modifying substantial portions of a facility (such as replacing a reactor vessel).

Fermilab NEPA Program Manager: Teri L. Dykhuis
Signature and Date Teri L. Dykhuis 10/17/2013

VI. DOE/FSO NEPA Coordinator Review

Concurrence with the recommendation for determination:

Fermi Site Office (FSO) Manager: Michael J. Weis
Signature and Date 10/23/2013

FSO NEPA Coordinator: Rick Hersemann
Signature and Date Rick Hersemann 10/22/2013