Facility Alteration or Construction Project
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Review Form

United States Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC 20460

I. General Information

Title of Project		Project Number
Upgrade and Installation of the UPS and Emergency Generator Systems		
Project Officer's Name	**Project Officer's Title**	**Phone Number**
Lance Swanhorst	Civil Engineer	202-564-3015

Project Location *(street address/city/state/ZIP code)*	Conducted on EPA Facility? ☒ YES ☐ NO *(if yes, provide name of facility)*
2890 Woodbridge Ave., Edison, NJ 08337-3679	Edison, NJ Facility, Region 2 Laboratory, Building 209

Project Description *(attach pages as needed)*

Upgrade of existing Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) and Emergency Generator Systems serving Building 209.

II. Responsible Official for NEPA Review

For projects funded and managed by the Architecture, Engineering, and Asset Management Branch (AEAMB), the Responsible Official is the Chief of AEAMB; otherwise, the Responsible Official is the individual who authorizes/funds and manages the project administratively at the Division, Regional, Program, or Facility level (e.g., Division Director, Laboratory Director).

Name	Title	Phone Number
Diane Dixon	Acting Chief, SMD PISB	202-564-2154

III. EPA Contact for Environmental Review on this Project (If different from Responsible Official)

Name	Title	Phone Number
Lance Swanhorst	Civil Engineer	202-564-3015

IV. Categorical Exclusion (CX)

☐ **Action is not eligible for CX.** Check this box if the proposed action is not eligible for a Categorical Exclusion (CX) either because the action involves significant new construction or is considered a major project (i.e., not minor); therefore, an EA or EIS is the appropriate level of review planned. If this box is checked, skip the remainder of Section IV and complete Section V.B, *EA or EIS Determination*. If this box is not checked, answer the following questions in Sections IV.A through IV.C to document the proposed action is eligible for a CX. After completion of Section IV, obtain the Responsible Official's Signature in Section V.

IV.A. CX Eligibility *(Check YES or NO)* If the answer to either of the following questions is **YES** and no Extraordinary Circumstances are identified (determined by completing Section IV.B. of this form), then the action is eligible for a CX pursuant to 40 CFR § 6.204(a)(1). If the answer to both of the following questions is **NO**, it is recommended the preparer reference the attached guidelines to determine whether the action falls into one of the categorical exclusions identified under 40 CFR § 6.204(a)(2).

YES	NO		
☒	☐	a.	Does the action involve routine facility maintenance, repair, and grounds-keeping; minor rehabilitation, restoration, renovation, or revitalization of existing facilities; functional replacement of equipment; acquisition and installation of equipment; or construction of new minor ancillary facilities adjacent to or on the same property as existing facilities? (*See* 40 CFR §6.204(a)(1)(i)).
☐	☒	b.	Does the action involve: existing infrastructure systems (such as sewer systems; drinking water supply systems; and stormwater systems, including combined sewer overflow systems) that involve minor upgrading, or minor expansion of system capacity or rehabilitation (including functional replacement) of the existing system and system components (such as the sewer collection network and treatment system; the system to collect, treat, store and distribute drinking water; and stormwater systems, including combined sewer overflow systems) or construction of new minor ancillary facilities adjacent to or on the same property as existing facilities? This category does not include actions that: involve new or relocated discharges to surface or ground water; will likely result in the substantial increase in the volume or the loading of pollutant to the receiving water; will provide capacity to serve a population 30% greater than the existing population; are not supported by the state or other regional growth plan or strategy; or directly or indirectly involve or relate to upgrading or extending infrastructure systems primarily for the purposes of future development. (*See* 40 CFR § 6.204(a)(1)(ii)).

IV.B. Extraordinary Circumstances Evaluation *(Check YES or NO)* In selecting a response to the following questions, the preparer must have sufficient knowledge and/or data to support the answer with certainty. If the preparer is unsure of the answer to any of the following questions, an Environmental Professional should be consulted to conduct additional research.

YES	NO		
☐	☒	a.	Is the action known or expected to have potentially significant environmental impacts on the quality of the human environment either individually or cumulatively over time?
☐	☒	b.	Is the action known or expected to have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on any community, including minority communities, low-income communities, or federally-recognized Indian tribal communities?
☐	☒	c.	Is the action known or expected to significantly affect federally listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat?
☐	☒	d.	Is the action known or expected to significantly affect national natural landmarks or any property with naturally significant historic, architectural, prehistoric, archeological, or cultural value, including but not limited to, property listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places?
☐	☒	e.	Is the action known or expected to significantly affect environmentally important natural resource areas such as wetlands, floodplains, significant agricultural lands, aquifer recharge zones, coastal zones, barrier islands, wild and scenic rivers, and significant fish or wildlife habitat?

YES	NO		
☐	☒	f.	Is the action known or expected to cause significant adverse air quality effects?
☐	☒	g.	Is the action known or expected to have a significant effect on the pattern and type of land use (industrial, commercial, agricultural, recreational, residential) or growth and distribution of population, including altering the character of existing residential areas or may not be consistent with state or local government, or federally-recognized Indian tribe approved land use plans or federal land management plans?
☐	☒	h.	Is the action known or expected to cause significant public controversy about potential environmental impacts of the proposed action?
☐	☒	i.	Is the action known or expected to be associated with providing financial assistance to a federal agency through an interagency agreement for a project that is known or expected to have potentially significant environmental impacts?
☐	☒	j.	Is the action known or expected to conflict with federal, state or local government, or federally-recognized Indian tribe environmental resource-protection, or land-use laws or regulations?

IV.C. Extraordinary Circumstances Statement *(Check ONLY ONE box)* If a **NO** response was recorded for each of the questions in Section IV.B., then no Extraordinary Circumstances are present pursuant to 40 CFR § 6.204(b) and one of the following statements should be selected. If a **YES** response was indicated for one or more Extraordinary Circumstance in Section IV.B., skip this section and proceed to Section V.

☐ a. To the best of my knowledge and with a strong level of certainty, **no extraordinary circumstances apply** to the proposed action pursuant to 40 CFR §§ 6.204(a)(1) and 6.204(b). This statement is based on either past experience with similar actions **at the proposed action site** resulting in a CX and/or information gathered as part of previous NEPA or environmental due diligence review conducted **at the proposed action site**.

☒ b. A statement and supporting documentation is attached explaining why no extraordinary circumstances exist or apply to the proposed action pursuant to 40 CFR §§ 6.204(a)(1) and 6.204(b).

V. NEPA Review Determination and Responsible Official Signature

Sections I. through IV. must be completed to satisfy EPA's documentation requirements for CX eligibility. If completion of this form indicates that a CX does apply, the Responsible Official must sign under Section V.A. If completion of this form indicates that a CX does not apply, the Responsible Official must sign under Section V.B. below and indicate whether an EA or EIS is required. It is recommended that an Environmental Professional be retained or consulted to determine the appropriate level of NEPA review for the action under Section V.B.

V.A. Categorical Exclusion Determination As the Responsible Official, I have determined that this action **is eligible for a Categorical Exclusion** per the substantive environmental review requirements under EPA regulations at 40 CFR § 6.204. Section IV.C. of this form has been completed providing the required extraordinary circumstances statement.

Signature of Responsible Official	Title	Date
Dave Dixon	Acting Chief, SMD PISB	1-10-2011

V.B. EA or EIS Determination (Check the appropriate box below) This action is not eligible for a CX based on the substantive environmental review requirements under EPA regulations at 40 CFR § 6.204, therefore:

☐ *As the Responsible Official, I have determined that an **Environmental Assessment (EA)** should be prepared for this project pursuant to the substantive environmental review requirements under EPA regulations at 40 CFR § 6.205.*

☐ *As the Responsible Official, I have determined that an **Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)** should be prepared for this project pursuant the substantive environmental review requirements under EPA regulations at 40 CFR §6.207.*

Signature of Responsible Official	Title	Date

NEPA Categorical Exclusion – Extraordinary Circumstances Statement
Upgrade and Installation of the UPS and Emergency Generator Systems
at
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Building 209, Region 2 Laboratory, Edison, New Jersey
January 12, 2011

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) ensures that environmental impacts and associated public concerns are considered in making decisions on federal actions. EPA proposes to upgrade and install uninterruptible power supply (UPS) and emergency generator systems for Building 209 at the EPA Region 2 Laboratory at 2890 Woodbridge Avenue, Edison, New Jersey. The intent of this document is to explain why no extraordinary circumstances exist or apply to the proposed action pursuant to 40 CFR §§6.204(a)(1) and 6.204(b).

Project details and other information were obtained by reviewing the documents listed at the end of this document and via a meeting between Booz Allen Hamilton's Lisa Costa Urie, Bradley Decker and Jeff Furr and EPA's Lance Swanhorst on December 21, 2010.

Extraordinary Circumstances Statement

The following satisfies the extraordinary circumstances statement requirement of Section IV.C.b. in the attached *Facility Alteration or Construction Project NEPA Review Form* for the upgrade of the UPS and emergency generator systems, including installation of the new systems and demolition of the existing systems, at the Region 2 Laboratory, Building 209. No extraordinary circumstances exist or apply to the proposed action because of the following:

1. The UPS upgrade consists of replacing the existing 60 kVA UPS unit with a new 80 kVA UPS unit. This is a functional replacement of electrical equipment and will not change the existing building foot print nor will the upgrade result in increased emissions or discharges to the environment.

2. The existing emergency generator system is 100 kW/125 kVA with 15 gallon day tank located adjacent to the generator set and will be replaced with a 200 kW/250 kVA system with internal 739-gallon fuel storage tank. The generator will only run intermittently for testing and emergency situations and will only service Building 209. The generator upgrade will not change the building footprint and will not include any new underground pipelines or any underground pipeline removal. The generator will only receive fuel from its day tank. The existing underground pipelines to the existing emergency generator will be capped and will remain in place. The existing underground storage tank (UST) will remain in place since it currently provides fuel for the operating boilers in nearby Building 210. In addition, the new internal 739-gallon fuel storage tank will be equipped with secondary containment.

3. Because the new generator is replacing a 25-year old generator, air emissions will be reduced. New generators are cleaner as demonstrated through the regulatory requirements applicable to manufacturers, owners and operators in 40 CFR Part 60, Subpart IIII—Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines. Emission standards are more restrictive for engines with a model year of 2007 or later or engines reconstructed after July 11, 2005 (40 CFR §60.4200(a)).

4. The proposed upgrade would not directly or indirectly affect cultural resource areas including historic buildings or buildings eligible for historic listing, endangered or threatened species, environmentally important natural resource areas, wetlands, or floodplains.

5. The proposed upgrade would not cause significant public controversy and is cost effective.

6. The operation of the UPS and emergency generator systems would not significantly impact the human environment.

Documents Reviewed

The following documents were reviewed and assisted in this NEPA determination:

1. *Evaluation and Recommendation for Upgrade of Existing UPS System and Emergency Generator System for USEPA – Edison New Jersey Facility Region 2 Laboratory Building 209,* dated August 18, 2010, prepared by AKF, Princeton, NJ.

2. *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Proposed Solar Photovoltaic System at the EPA Edison Facility, Final Environmental Assessment,* dated August 2009, prepared by U.S. EPA Facilities Management and Services Division, Washington, D.C.