



U.S. Department of Energy

Categorical Exclusion Determination Form

Proposed Action Title: Lease Amendment and Operation of Advanced Biofuels Process Development Unit, California, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (**LB-CX-20-05**)

Program or Field Office: Bay Area Site Office

Location(s) (City/County/State): Berkeley, California

Proposed Action Description:

The Department of Energy (DOE) proposes to exercise a lease extension option for approximately 16,500 rentable square feet of research and storage space at 5885 Hollis Street in the City of Emeryville. The space is used in support of the ongoing Advanced Biofuels Process Development Unit (ADPDU) research operations. There would be no changes to on-going ABPDU operations or staffing levels. ABPDU is a user facility for scaling up and demonstrating (at small scale) newly developed biofuel processes and technologies. These include biofuels made from woody and grassy cellulose materials. Biofuels are typically transferred to the Combustion Research Facility at Sandia National Laboratory in Livermore, California, for testing.

Description of Affected Environment:

The 5885 Hollis Street building is a Class A science research building that was constructed in 2007. It provides state-of-the-art heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC); chilled and hot water; specialty controls and piping; and life safety and telecommunication systems highly suitable for ABPDU research activities. The building includes two levels of structured parking.

Categorical Exclusion(s) Applied:

B1.24 – Property transfers

B3.6 – Small-scale research and development, laboratory operations, and pilot projects

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:



Jeff Philliber

08/19/20

Date Determined

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

BASO Project Manager



Rick Chapman

08/19/2020

The above description accurately describes the proposed action, which reflects the requirements of the CX cited above. Therefore, I recommend that the proposed action be categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation.

Date Determined:

BASO MIP Division Director

Mary Gross

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:

Peter Siebach

Date Determined