I. Project Title:
Proposed 6 acre expansion of Pit 6 into a previously disturbed area.

II. Project Description and Location (including Time Period over which proposed action will occur and Project Dimensions - e.g., acres displaced/disturbed, excavation length/depth, area/location/number of buildings, etc.):
LOCATION: Pit 6 is located approximately 1/2 mile west of the 300 Area on the west side of Route 4 South. Because of its close proximity to the 300 Area, Pit 6 has been the primary, source of fill material for ongoing remediation activities in the 300 Area.

PROPOSED ACTION: Site contractor(s) are proposing to expand Pit 6 to continue to supply fill material for 300 and 600 Area remediation sites. The expansion would excavate approximately 6 acres of previously disturbed land along the western boundary of Pit 6. The use of Pit 6, and 23 other sand and gravel pits were analyzed in the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Use of Existing Borrow Areas, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EA-1403) DATED October 2001.

EA-1403 quantified the total disturbed surface area of 24 sand and gravel pits as 3.0 square kilometers (1.0 square miles), including Pit 6, with an associated disturbed surface area of 0.10 square kilometers (0.04 square miles) (26.2 acres) at Pit 6. In addition, the EA and FONSI considered the expansion of the pit disturbed surface areas assuming a 10% or 0.3 square kilometer (0.12 square mile) expansion. The EA did not provide any explanation, graphic or photo to describe the disturbed surface areas. For visualization, the disturbed surface areas in the EA have been compared to photos in the Draft Industrial Mineral Resources Management Plan (MRMP) (DOE/RJ-2000-61), October 2001 and recent aerial photos taken in 2011.

The MRMP established the management and operational criteria for established borrow pits and quarries on the Hanford site. It also established the boundaries for approximately 35 pits and 5 quarries through aerial photos. The attached photo of Pit 6 from the MRMP shows a rectangular box labeled "proposed extent" with an interior Figure labeled "Pit 6". The photo shows that the surface area immediately west of Pit 6 (area for proposed expansion) had been disturbed.

The attached recent aerial photo with GPS mapping shows that the MRMP Pit 6 boundary encompasses approximately 0.0845 square kilometers (20.1 acres). The same photo shows that the disturbed surface area encompasses about 0.1059 square kilometers (26.2 acres). The difference appears to be the disturbed surface area immediately west of Pit 6 which encompasses about 0.0214 square kilometers (6.1 acres). The table below summarizes these values and compares them to the total disturbed surface area of Pit 6 assessed in EA-1403.

See Continuation Page

III. Reviews (if applicable):
Biological Review Report #: 10-ER-007a-1 (Dated 02/21/2011)
Cultural Review Report #: HCRC # 2003-600-029 (Dated 02/21/2011)
Additional Attachments:

IV. Existing NEPA Documentation
Is the proposed action evaluated in a previous EA, EIS, or under CERCLA? [ ] YES [ ] NO
If "NO," proceed to Section V. If "YES," List EA, EIS, or CERCLA Document(s) Title and Number:
EA for Use of Existing Borrow Areas, Hanford Site, Richland, Washington (DOE/EA-1403)
October 2001
And then complete Section VI. Provide electronic copy of Initiator/ECO signed NRSF to DOE NCO for information only. DOE NCO signature is not required.
V. Categorical Exclusion

Does the proposed action fall within a class of actions that is listed in Appendixes A or B to Subpart D of 10 CFR Part 1021?  YES  NO

Are there extraordinary circumstances related to the proposal that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal?  YES  NO

Is the proposal connected to other actions with potentially significant impacts or result in cumulatively significant impacts (not precluded by 40 CFR 1506.1 or 10 CFR 1021.211)?  YES  NO

List CX to be applied and complete Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements (where an action might fit within multiple CXs, use the CX that best fits the proposed action):

**Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed action threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environmental, safety, or health, including DOE and/or Executive Orders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed action require siting, construction, or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed action disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed action adversely affect environmentally sensitive resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed action involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or invasive species such that the action is NOT contained or confined in a manner designed, operated, and conducted in accordance to applicable requirements to prevent unauthorized release into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "NO" to all Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements questions above, complete Section VI, and provide to DOE NCO for final Approval/Determination and signature in Section VII.

If "YES" to any of the Categorical Exclusion Integral Elements questions above, contact DOE NCO for additional NEPA Review.

VI. Responsible Contractor Signatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Printed)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognizant Environmental Compliance Officer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Approval/Determination

DOE NEPA Compliance Officer: Woody Russell

Based on my review of information conveyed to me and in my possession (or attached) concerning the proposed action, as NEPA Compliance Officer (as authorized under DOE Order 451.1B), I have determined that the proposed action fits within the specified class of action:

NCO Determination -  ☑  CX  ☑  EA  □  EIS

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 5/3/12
II. Project Description and Location (including Time Period over which proposed action will occur and Project Dimensions – e.g., acres displaced/disturbed, excavation length/depth, area/location/number of buildings, etc.):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Pit 6 disturbed surface area</th>
<th>Pit 6 allowed 10% expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment (DOE/EA-1403)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial Photo</td>
<td>0.1059 km² (26.2 Acres)</td>
<td>0.01059 km² (2.62 Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.10 km² (26.2 acres)</td>
<td>0.01 km² (2.62 acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pit 6 disturbed surface area

Pit 6 Boundary from Mineral Resource Management Plan

Difference between Pit 6 Boundary and Disturbed Surface Area

Pit 6 allowed 10% expansion

It is this 0.0214 square kilometers (6.1 acres) that is the subject of the proposed expansion. The comparison of past and recent aerial photos substantiate that the area of proposed expansion was included in the disturbed surface area of Pit 6 and considered in EA-1403; therefore, no further NEPA documentation is necessary. In addition, EA-1403 considered a 10% expansion of disturbed surface areas, whereupon, Pit 6 has available 0.01059 square kilometers (2.62 acres) for possible expansion on lands outside, but adjacent to or bordering the Pit 6 boundary.

This NEPA determination for the expansion of Pit 6 does not relieve the contractor(s) from satisfying other site requirements such as ecological and cultural resource reviews, excavation permit, and/or other measures identified in the HCP-EIS (DOE/EIS-0222) or its management plans. Further, the excavation shall maintain the bottom of the borrow site at an elevation 2-meters above the water table.

This NRSF was prepared by the NEPA Compliance Officer as a point of clarification to EA-1403.
Figure B-3. Borrow Pit 6 and Proposed Extent

Figure B-4. Borrow Pit 7