

**PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD (PSNS) &
INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE FACILITY (IMF)
ADDENDUM J
OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS
CHANGE CONTROL LOG**

Change Control Logs ensure that changes to this unit are performed in a methodical, controlled, coordinated, and transparent manner. Each unit addendum will have its own change control log with a modification history table. The “**Modification Number**” represents Ecology’s method for tracking the different versions of the permit. This log will serve as an up to date record of modifications and version history of the unit.

Modification History Table

Modification Date	Modification Number
03/18/2022	PSNS.2021.1F

This page intentionally left blank.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

**PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD (PSNS) &
INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE FACILITY (IMF)
ADDENDUM J
OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS**

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**ADDENDUM J
OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

J. Other Federal and State Laws..... 5

Attachment J-1 Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact for the Proposed Construction of a Mixed
Waste Storage Facility at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington..... J-1.i

Attachment J-2 State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Checklist (2016) J-2.i

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

1 J. OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS

2 The Mixed Waste Storage Facility (MWSF) is located within a federal enclave. The Washington
3 Department of Ecology (Ecology) approved the demonstration of compliance with the siting criteria for
4 the mixed waste storage unit on October 18, 1994. No other construction approvals were obtained for the
5 MWSF. Building construction was completed in 1996 in compliance with applicable laws and
6 regulations. Mixed waste operations began in 1996 and continue to date in compliance with applicable
7 laws and regulations. This application is for renewal of the Hazardous Waste Management Act Permit for
8 Dangerous and Mixed Waste Management at Naval Base Kitsap–Bremerton (NBK–Bremerton)
9 (Permit number WA2170023418).

10 Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility (PSNS & IMF) performed a
11 regulatory review of Federal, State, and Local laws that may apply to the issuance of permits to ensure the
12 MWSF complies with applicable requirements. PSNS & IMF did not identify any additional approvals or
13 permits that would require action by Ecology for the MWSF. Attachment J-1 contains the *National*
14 *Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) original Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact for the MWSF.
15 Attachment J-2 contains the *State Environmental Policy Act* (SEPA) Checklist for this permit renewal
16 application.

17 The major federal environmental laws evaluated include the following, all as amended.

- 18 a. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968: Operation of the MWSF does not affect any rivers presently
19 designated under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
- 20 b. National Historic Preservation Act of 1966: Operation of the MWSF does not affect an area
21 eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places or any area that contains
22 cultural or archaeological resources.
- 23 c. Endangered Species Act: Operation of the MWSF will not impact endangered or threatened
24 species. The MWSF is located on Farragut Avenue within the Controlled Industrial Area of PSNS
25 & IMF. This area has been developed extensively in support of naval ship maintenance and
26 repair. This area cannot be considered an undisturbed area or habitat for native plant and animal
27 species.
- 28 d. Coastal Zone Management Act: MWSF operations do not affect land or water use in a coastal
29 zone.
- 30 e. Clean Water Act: Operation of the MWSF will not result in the discharge of any liquid effluents
31 that would require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit; therefore, no
32 permits or reviews pursuant to the *Clean Water Act* are applicable.
- 33 f. Toxic Substances Control Act: The *Toxic Substances Control Act* was enacted to protect human
34 health and the environment by requiring that specific chemicals be tested and that regulations
35 restricting their processing and use be implemented. The objectives of the Act include the
36 development of adequate data to determine the human health and environmental effects of
37 chemicals and to control any chemicals that present an unreasonable risk of injury. The section of
38 the Act most relevant to the MWSF involves the storage and handling of chemical substances or
39 mixtures that could present an unreasonable risk of injury to human health or the environment,
40 specifically polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB). The regulation promulgated to prescribe the
41 *Toxic Substances Control Act* methods for storage and handling of polychlorinated biphenyls is
42 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 761. The MWSF meets all of the requirements for storage
43 of PCBs in 40 CFR 761.65(b)(2)(iii).
- 44 g. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934: Operation of the MWSF does not involve the
45 impoundment, diversion, or other control or modification of any body of water. Therefore, no
46 permits or reviews pursuant to this statute are applicable.

- 1 h. Atomic Energy Act: Activities at NBK–Bremerton related to the generation, handling, and
2 storage of radioactive material resulting from Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP)
3 activities are regulated under the *Atomic Energy Act of 1954* (42 United States Code [U.S.C.]
4 2011 et seq.). Executive Order 12344, which was promulgated into law in 50 U.S.C. 2406 and
5 2511, relates.
- 6 i. Clean Air Act: No processing occurs at the MWSF to provide routine emissions. Storage involves
7 sealed mixed waste. Other than a catastrophic event, no upset conditions internal or external to
8 the MWSF would result in release concentrations outside the storage unit that exceeds levels that
9 Occupational Safety and Health Administration defines as immediately dangerous to life and
10 health. Airborne releases from upset conditions would continue only until recovery actions were
11 taken. Based on the above, airborne emissions from the storage unit would not include
12 contaminants at concentrations or in sufficient amounts that currently require an air quality permit
13 from any agency.
- 14 State Laws: Aside from this permit application submitted pursuant to the Dangerous Waste regulations
15 (Washington Administrative Code [WAC] 173-303), there are no State environmental permits or
16 approvals required for the operation of the MWSF. State water and air protection permits are not required
17 for the same reasons discussed in paragraph 3 item e and 3 item i above.
- 18 Local Laws: No local permits or approvals were required for the construction of the MWSF as it was
19 constructed within a federal enclave and does not discharge to the City of Bremerton sewage treatment
20 plant.
- 21 NBK–Bremerton holds the following environmental permits:
- 22 a. Air Operating Permit issued on 11/10/2011 by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Permit
23 number 21177.
- 24 b. Radioactive Air Emissions License issued on 11/10/2011 by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.
25 License number FF005.
- 26 c. National Pollutant Discharge Permit effective since 4/1/1994 and issued by the Environmental
27 Protection Agency. Permit number WA0002062.
- 28 d. State Waste Discharge Permit issued on 12/31/2003 by Ecology. Permit number ST0007374.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

ATTACHMENT J-1
NOTICE OF FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE PROPOSED
CONSTRUCTION OF A MIXED WASTE STORAGE FACILITY AT PUGET SOUND NAVAL
SHIPYARD, BREMERTON, WASHINGTON

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

NOTICE OF FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE PROPOSED
CONSTRUCTION OF A MIXED WASTE STORAGE FACILITY AT PUGET SOUND
NAVAL SHIPYARD, BREMERTON, WASHINGTON

Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) implementing procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Navy gives notice that an Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared and an Environmental Impact Statement is not being prepared for the proposed construction and operation of a Mixed Waste Storage Facility (MWSF) at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard (PSNS), Bremerton, Washington.

The proposed action is the construction and operation of a 2,268 square foot facility for accumulation and storage of mixed waste. Mixed waste is waste containing both hazardous waste regulated by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (or authorized state implementing statute) and source, special nuclear or by-product material regulated by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In addition, wastes containing polychlorinated biphenyls (regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) and source, special nuclear or by-product material would be stored in this facility. Only accumulation and storage will take place in this facility. Mixed waste will be packaged in a separate facility and will arrive at the Mixed Waste Storage Facility in sealed packages.

PSNS presently operates an interim Mixed Waste Storage Area which meets State of Washington siting, construction, and management criteria; however, improvements can be made. Construction of a dedicated facility for mixed waste storage would incorporate improved health and safety features, spill prevention, containment, and security. Further, the warehouse building currently housing the existing interim storage facility, PSNS Building 368, could be more efficiently used for supply storage.

Consistent with the provisions of NEPA, alternatives to the proposed action were analyzed and included a review of existing PSNS assets which are similar in nature or function to the proposed facility and meet Washington State siting criteria for such a facility. This review analyzed three existing facilities and concluded there are no existing assets held by PSNS which would provide a reasonable alternative over the proposed facility. The no action alternative would involve the continued use of the interim mixed waste storage area which would inhibit efficient operation of the warehouse.

The proposed facility will meet all State of Washington siting, construction and management criteria to store mixed waste. It will be designed and operated to minimize the risk of any uncontrolled release of radioactive and/or hazardous waste. Even

though nearly all the material stored will be solid in form, the facility floor will be designed to contain the largest potential spill.

All mixed waste at PSNS is stringently controlled and managed in accordance with longstanding and successful Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program radiological requirements which have been in place since the 1950s and have evolved over time. These requirements have been demonstrated to protect the environment and public health and safety by independent monitoring and review by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and detailed audits by the U.S. General Accounting Office.

Construction activities will result in temporary increases in noise levels and temporary decreases in air quality due to construction equipment operation. One existing building on the proposed site of the MWSF will require demolition. Prior to demolition, the existing building will be surveyed for asbestos. If found, it will be removed and disposed of in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local regulations.

New construction associated with the proposed action will not affect archeological, cultural, or historical resources listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. No federally listed endangered or threatened species will be impacted by this action. No appreciable change in long term environmental productivity is expected.

Based on information gathered during preparation of the Environmental Assessment, the Navy finds that the proposed construction and operation of a mixed waste storage facility at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, will have no significant impact on the environment.

Single copies of the EA may be obtained from Mr. Robert Minnitti, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, 1400 Farragut Avenue, Bremerton, WA 98314-5001, (206) 476-7111.

3-31-94
Date



B. DeMARS
Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion

1
2
3
4
5

ATTACHMENT J-2
STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA) CHECKLIST (2016)

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.

1
2 **STATE ENVIRONMENT POLICY ACT (SEPA) ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST (2016)**
3
4

5 Purpose of Checklist:

6 Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your
7 proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance,
8 minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an
9 environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

10 Instructions for Applicants:

11 This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please
12 answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult
13 with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use “not applicable” or “does
14 not apply” only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You
15 may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to
16 these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

17 The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of
18 time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your
19 proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to
20 explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be
21 significant adverse impact.

22 Instructions for Lead Agencies:

23 Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate
24 the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The
25 checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an
26 adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible
27 for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

28 Use of Checklist for Nonproject Proposals:

29 For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable
30 parts of sections A and B plus the Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions (Part D). Please completely
31 answer all questions that apply and note that the words “project,” “applicant,” and “property or site”
32 should be read as “proposal,” “proponent,” and “affected geographic area,” respectively. The lead agency
33 may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements – that do not contribute
34 meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

35 **A. Background**

- 36 1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
37 Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility (PSNS & IMF) Mixed
38 Waste Storage Facility Part B Permit for the Storage of Mixed Waste - Renewal
39 2. Name of applicant:
40 Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility

- 1 3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
 2 PSNS & IMF
 3 1400 Farragut Ave
 4 Bremerton, WA 98314
 5 Contact Person for this Proposal - L. Craig Cassels, Mixed Waste Program Manager,
 6 (360) 476-0579
- 7 4. Date checklist prepared:
 8 January 22, 2016
- 9 5. Agency requesting checklist:
 10 Washington Department of Ecology – Richland Office (Ecology)
- 11 6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
 12 Part B Permit is expected to be renewed in July of 2016.
- 13 7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or
 14 connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
 15 Allow storage of up to 120 gallons of ignitable wastes.
- 16 8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared,
 17 directly related to this proposal.
 18 Part B Permit Renewal Application.
- 19 9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals
 20 directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.
 21 Yes, Part B Permit Renewal Application is being reviewed by Ecology and will go to public
 22 comment by the end of 2016.
- 23 10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
 24 Ecology Part B Permit for Storage of Mixed Waste Renewal
- 25 11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of
 26 the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe
 27 certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead
 28 agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project
 29 description.)
 30 Renewal of Part B Permit.
 31 Allow storage of up to 120 gallons of ignitable waste.
- 32 12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise
 33 location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and
 34 range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries
 35 of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if
 36 reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not
 37 required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to
 38 this checklist.
 39 All proposed activities will occur at 1400 Farragut Ave., Bremerton, WA 98314 at the existing
 40 Mixed Waste Storage Facility.

41 **B. Environmental Elements**

42 **1. Earth**

- 43 a. General description of the site:

44 The site is primarily flat landfill with steep slopes and hills at the borders.

- 1 b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?
2 The steepest slope on the site is a section with vertical walls. Besides the vertical wall, the
3 steepest slope on site is 230%.
- 4 c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat,
5 muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any
6 agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in
7 removing any of these soils.
8 The site is primarily built on sand and gravel fill. Approximately 85% of the site is covered
9 by an impervious surface. The proposal does not remove any soil.
- 10 d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so,
11 describe.
12 No.
- 13 e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of
14 any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.
15 No filling, excavation, or grading will be accomplished for this proposal.
- 16 f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
17 No.
- 18 g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project
19 construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
20 There will be no change in the percentage of impervious surfaces.
- 21 h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:
22 There are no changes to the site for this proposal.

23 **2. Air**

- 24 a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction,
25 operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and
26 give approximate quantities if known.
27 There are no emissions to the air as a result of this proposal.
- 28 b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so,
29 generally describe.
30 No.
- 31 c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:
32 There are no emissions to the air as a result of this proposal.

33 **3. Water**

- 34 a. Surface Water:
- 35 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including
36 year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe
37 type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
38 Yes, the site is located on Sinclair Inlet, a saltwater arm of Puget Sound.
- 39 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described
40 waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
41 No.

- 1 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed
 2 from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected.
 3 Indicate the source of fill material.
 4 None.
- 5 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general
 6 description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
 7 No.
- 8 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
 9 No.
- 10 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so,
 11 describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.
 12 No.
- 13 b. Ground Water:
- 14 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so,
 15 give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities
 16 withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general
 17 description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
 18 No.
- 19 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or
 20 other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the
 21 following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the
 22 number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the
 23 number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.
 24 None.
- 25 c. Water runoff (including storm-water):
- 26 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and
 27 disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this
 28 water flow into other waters? If so, describe.
 29 There is an existing sewer system that discharges into Sinclair Inlet.
- 30 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.
 31 Waste materials could enter ground or surface waters if a large volume spill occurred at
 32 the site.
- 33 3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site?
 34 If so, describe.
 35 No.
- 36 d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage
 37 pattern impacts, if any:
 38 PSNS & IMF has an extensive Contingency Plan for spill response along with control
 39 measures that are designed to protect surface, ground, and runoff water.

40 4. Plants

- 41 a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:
- 42 deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
- 43 evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
- 44 shrubs

- 1 grass
 2 _____pasture
 3 _____crop or grain
 4 _____Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
 5 _____wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
 6 _____water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
 7 other types of vegetation

8 b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

9 None.

10 c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

11 None.

12 d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance
 13 vegetation on the site, if any:

14 None.

15 e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

16 Scotch broom.

17 5. Animals

18 a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known
 19 to be on or near the site.

20 Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, seagull, crow, pigeon, duck, Canadian geese.

21 Mammals: sea lion.

22 Fish: salmon, herring, shellfish.

23 b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

24 Puget Sound Chinook Salmon, Steelhead, Southern Resident Killer Whale, Bocaccio
 25 Rockfish, Yelloweye Rockfish, Canary Rockfish, and Bull Trout.

26 c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

27 Sinclair Inlet contains a salmon migration route to a tribal hatchery near Gorst,
 28 Washington.

29 d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

30 None.

31 e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

32 None.

33 6. Energy and Natural Resources

34 a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the
 35 completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating,
 36 manufacturing, etc.

37 No additional energy will be required for this proposal.

38 b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so,
 39 generally describe.

40 No.

- 1 c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List
 2 other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:
 3 None.

4 **7. Environmental Health**

- 5 a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of
 6 fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If
 7 so, describe.

8 The proposal is to renew the permit for the existing Mixed Waste Storage Facility and to
 9 add ignitable waste to the list of mixed wastes allowed for storage. There is additional risk
 10 associated with storage of ignitable wastes that are mitigated within the Part B Permit
 11 Renewal Application associated with this proposal. There will otherwise be no change to
 12 the on site management practices.

- 13 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

14 Known or possible contamination of the site from present and past uses is described in
 15 detail in the Part B Permit Renewal Application associated with this proposal.

- 16 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project
 17 development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas
 18 transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

19 This proposal will not have any existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that affect it.

- 20 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced
 21 during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating
 22 life of the project.

23 The Part B Permit Renewal Application for the Mixed Waste Storage Facility at
 24 Naval Base Kitsap – Bremerton contains details on the mixed wastes that will be
 25 stored based on this proposal.

- 26 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

27 Fire and emergency services, medical services, safety, and public health.

- 28 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

29 Proposed measure to reduce or control environmental health hazards are included in the
 30 Part B Permit Renewal Application.

- 31 b. Noise

- 32 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example:
 33 traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

34 None.

- 35 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a
 36 short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)?
 37 Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

38 None. The site is an industrial facility and no noise increase will occur based on this
 39 proposal.

- 40 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

41 None.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

The area is zoned for industrial use. The project is on a United States Naval Base within a Controlled Industrial Area and is currently a Part B Permitted Storage Facility. To the North of the Facility is a combination of residential and commercial properties. To the East is the Bremerton Ferry Terminal, commercial, recreational, and residential properties. To the South is Sinclair Inlet. To the West is residential and commercial properties. This proposal will not affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties.

- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or non-forest use?

No, the project site has not been used as working farmlands or working forest lands. The proposal is on a United States Naval Base. No conversion of land will occur based on this proposal.

- 1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

No.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Buildings and dry docks supporting Naval ship maintenance and overhaul.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

No.

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

Industrial.

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The City of Bremerton Official Land Use Map designates the site as "Puget Sound Naval Shipyard."

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

The Bremerton shoreline master program designation of the site is "Industrial."

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

No.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

No people would reside in the completed project. 2-10 people would work at the completed project intermittently.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

None.

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

None.

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

None.

- 1 m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest
2 lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

3 None.

4 **9. Housing**

- 5 a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle,
6 or low-income housing.

7 None.

- 8 b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high,
9 middle, or low-income housing.

10 None.

- 11 c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

12 None.

13 **10. Aesthetics**

- 14 a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the
15 principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

16 Not applicable, no new structures are proposed.

- 17 b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

18 None.

- 19 c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

20 None.

21 **11. Light and Glare**

- 22 a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly
23 occur?

24 There will be no change to the light or glare that would be used or produced at the site from
25 this proposal.

- 26 b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

27 No.

- 28 c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

29 None.

- 30 d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

31 None.

32 **12. Recreation**

- 33 a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

34 There are no recreational facilities in the immediate vicinity of the proposal.

- 35 b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

36 No.

- 37 c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation
38 opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

39 None.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.

The Shipyard area east of the west edge of dry dock 5 is a National Historic Landmark district. The area north of Farragut Avenue is a National Register Historic district. See Part B Permit Renewal Application for map of Naval Base Kitsap – Bremerton.

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

None have been identified. A Cultural Resources Survey was completed by Larson Anthropological Archaeological Services (LAAS) on 25 October 2002. The LAAS archeologist did not identify hunter-fisher-gatherer or historic period archeological resources in shovel probes or on the ground surface of NBK - Bremerton. A probability map prepared by LAAS in the survey report does not include the proposal location in the areas on-site identified as low probability, moderate probability, or high probability for such resources.

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

There are no physical changes to the site based on this proposal.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

Nothing will be disturbed with this proposal.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

Naval Base Kitsap – Bremerton is served by Highway 304, Naval Avenue, Pacific Avenue, and Burwell Street. No changes to site access are required with this proposal.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Yes. PSNS & IMF has a partnership with Kitsap Transit to provide transportation to and from work for PSNS & IMF employees. Due to the size of the site, Kitsap Transit also has multiple bus stops along the perimeter of the site. The Bremerton – Seattle Ferry, the Port Orchard – Bremerton Ferry, and the Annapolis – Bremerton Ferry all dock to the east of the site.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

No parking changes are associated with this proposal.

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

No.

- 1 e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air
2 transportation? If so, generally describe.
3 No.
- 4 f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or
5 proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the
6 volume would be trucks (such as commercial and non-passenger vehicles). What data or
7 transportation models were used to make these estimates?
8 No change from current vehicular traffic based on proposal.
- 9 g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and
10 forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.
11 No.
- 12 h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:
13 None.

15. Public Services

- 15 a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire
16 protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally
17 describe.
18 No.
- 19 b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.
20 None.

16. Utilities

- 22 a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:
23 electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,
24 other: Steam
- 25 b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and
26 the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be
27 needed.
28 No additional utilities are proposed or required for this proposal.

C. Signature

30 The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead
31 agency is relying on them to make its decision.

32 Signature: /s/ _____

33 Name of signee Bruce M. Bordenick _____

34 Position and Agency/Organization Executive Director of Radiological Controls, Puget Sound
35 Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility _____

36 Date Submitted: 1/26/2016 _____

D. Supplemental Sheet for Non-Project Actions

38 (IT IS NOT NECESSARY to use this sheet for project actions)

39 Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the
40 list of the elements of the environment.

- 1 When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities
2 likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate
3 than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.
- 4 1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production,
5 storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?
6 The proposal is not likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or
7 release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise.
8 a. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:
9 Not applicable.
- 10 2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?
11 The proposal is not likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life.
12 a. Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:
13 Not applicable.
- 14 3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?
15 The proposal is not likely to deplete energy or natural resources.
16 a. Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:
17 Not applicable.
- 18 4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas
19 designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild
20 and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands,
21 floodplains, or prime farmlands?
22 The proposal is not likely to affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible
23 or under study) for governmental protection.
24 a. Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:
25 Not applicable.
- 26 5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow
27 or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?
28 The proposal is not likely to affect land or shoreline use.
29 a. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:
30 Not applicable.
- 31 6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and
32 utilities?
33 The proposal is not likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities.
34 a. Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:
35 Not applicable.
- 36 7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or
37 requirements for the protection of the environment.
38 The proposal will not conflict with any local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the
39 protection of the environment. The Part B Permit Renewal Application has undergone extensive
40 review to ensure compliance.

1
2
3
4
5

This page intentionally left blank.