U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, OFFICE OF SCIENCE INTEGRATED SUPPORT CENTER—CHICAGO OFFICE

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION NOTIFICATION FORM

To be completed by "Applicant," i.e., organization with responsibilities for a "Federal action" involving application to DOE for a permit, license, exemption or allocation, or other similar actions. For assistance with this Form, refer to "Instructions for Preparing ISC-CH F-560, Environmental Evaluation Notification Form."

Solicitation/Award No. (if applicable): DE-SC0020016

Organization Name: Battery Resourcers LLC Worcester, MA

Proposed Action Title: RECOVERY OF HIGH VALUE ANODE MATERIALS FOR A FULLY CLOSED LOOP LI-ION BATTERY RECYCLING PROCESS

Total DOE Funding/Total Funding: \$199,998.00

I. <u>Project Description</u>: (Use explanation pages if additional space is required)

A. <u>Proposed Project/Action (if applicable, delineate Federally funded/Non-Federally funded portions)</u>

The proposed work is to recover the anode materials (graphite) from spent lithium ion batteries and covert the graphite to battery grade graphite. Such that the recovered graphite could go back into a new battery. In the Battery Resourcers recycling process the graphite contains impurities known as ash which can be up to 20%. In order to be a precursor for new battery materials the purity must be less than 1-2% for anode materials. The federally funded work revolves around purifying the graphite after Battery Resourcers has leached the cathode materials from the black mass (mixture of cathode and anode materials).

B. Would the project proceed without Federal funding?

If "yes," use explanation page.

II. Description of Affected Environment: (Use explanation pages if additional space is required)

. Currently, graphite is not being reused in new battery from any lithium ion battery recycling process. The most common method of recycling is smelting the batteries which burns the graphite and produces CO2. In the Battery Resourcers process the graphite is recovered but used in as a reductant in the steel making process. Though the graphite is still ultimately ending up as CO2 it is doing so in the place of other carbon atoms that would otherwise be used to make steel and other metals. With this award BRs would directly recover a higher value graphite allowing lower value and lower energy input carbon atoms to be used in the steel making process. Additonally, it would provide more economic value and lower the cost of battery recycling.

Yes

No

 $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$

Is the DOE-funded work routinely administrative or *entirely* advisory or a "paper study?" Α.

If "Yes", ensure that the description in Section I reflects this and go directly to Section V.

Is there any potential whatsoever for: (Provide an explanation for each "Yes" response) Β.

1.	Work to be performed outdoors?		\checkmark
2.	Major modification of a building interior?		$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
3.	Threat of violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health?		\checkmark
4.	Siting, construction or major expansion of waste treatment, storage, or disposal facilities?		\checkmark
5.	Disturbance to hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants preexisting in the environment?		\checkmark
6.	The presence of any environmentally-sensitive resources?		$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
7.	Any potential whatsoever for high consequence impacts to human health or the environment?		\checkmark
8.	The work being connected to another existing/proposed activity that could potentially create a significant impact?		\checkmark
9.	Nearby past, present, and/or reasonably foreseeable future actions such that collectiv significant impacts could result?	ely	\checkmark
10.	Scientific or public controversy, uncertainty over potential impacts, or conflicts regardi resource usage?	ng 🗌	\checkmark

If "No" to ALL Section III.B. questions, go directly to Section V.

IV. Potential Environmental Effects: (Provide an explanation for each "Yes" response)

Α. Environmentally Sensitive Resources: Could the proposed action potentially result in changes and/or disturbances to any of the following resources?

		Yes	No
1.	Threatened/Endangered Species and/or Critical Habitats		
2.	Other Protected Species (e.g., Burros, Migratory Birds, Pollinators)		
3.	Sensitive Environments (e.g., Tundra/Coral Reefs/Rain Forests)		
4.	Cultural or Historic Resources		
5.	Important Farmland		
6.	Non-Attainment Areas for Ambient Air Quality Standards		
7.	Class I Air Quality Control Region		
8.	Special Sources of Groundwater (e.g. Sole Source Aquifer)		
9.	Navigable Air Space		
10.	Coastal Zones		
11.	Areas with Special National Designation (e.g. National Forests, Parks, Trails)		
12.	Floodplains and/or Wetlands		

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

- 13. Natural Resource Damage Assessments
- 14. Invasive Species or Exotic Organisms
- Noxious Weeds 15.
- Clearing or Excavation greater than one acre or Removal of Trees Governed by 16. Local Requirement
- 17. Dredge or Fill (under Clean Water Act, Section 404, greater than one acre)

Π \square

\checkmark
$\overline{\mathbf{N}}$
$\overline{\nabla}$
_

No

 $\overline{}$

Yes

 \square

Yes	No
Ħ	F
Π	

III.

Preliminary Questions:

- B. <u>Regulated Substances/Activities:</u> Would the proposed action involve any of the following regulated Items or <u>activities? (continued)</u>
- Yes No 18. Noise (in excess of regulations) Asbestos Removal 19. 20. Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) 21. Import, Manufacture, or Processing of Toxic Substances 22. Chemical Storage/Use 23. Pesticide Use 24. Hazardous, Toxic, or Criteria Pollutant Air Emissions 25. Liquid Effluents 26. Spill Prevention/Surface Water Protection 27. Underground Injection Hazardous Waste 28. 29. Underground Storage Tanks Radioactive or Radioactive Mixed Waste 30. 31. Radiation Exposure 32. Nanoscale Materials 33. Genetically Engineered Microorganisms/Plants or Synthetic Biology 34. **Ozone Depleting Substances** 35. Greenhouse Gas Generation/Sustainability 36. **Off-Road Vehicles** 37. Biosafety Level 3-4 Laboratory Research on Human Subjects or other Vertebrate Animals 38. 39. Facility footprint exceeds 5.000 Square Feet Other Relevant Information: Would the proposed action involve the following? C. Yes No 40. Disproportionate Nearby Presence of Minority and/or Low Income Populations 41. Existing, Modified, or New Federal/State Permits 42. Involvement of Another Federal Agency (e.g. license/permit, funding, approval) Action in a State with NEPA-type law 43. Expansion of Public Utilities/Services 44. 45. Depletion of a Non-Renewable Resources 46. Subject to an Existing Institutional Work Planning and Control Process Other Pertinent Information Which Could Impact Human Health or the Environment 47. Applicant certification that to the best of their knowledge all information provided on this form is accurate: Yes No Does this disclosure contain: classified, sensitive business, or other exempt information that DOE П would not be obligated to disclose pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act. Organization Official (Name and Title): Eric Gratz, CEO Α. brie Date: August 12 2019 Signature: e-mail: egratz@batteryresourcers.com 206.948.6325 Optional Secondary Approval (Name and Title): Β. Signature: _____ Date: _____ e-mail: Phone:

V.

DOE NEPA Tracking Number

Remainder to be completed by DOE

VI.	DO	E Concurrence/Recommendation/Determination:				
	Α.	DOE Project Director/Program Manager or Contract/Grant Manag	ement Sp	ecialist:	Yes	No
		Has the Applicant completed this Form correctly? Does an existing generic categorical exclusion apply? If yes, indicate:				
		Name and Title: Hannah Gill, Contract Specialist				
		Signature: <u>Hannah Gill</u>	_ Date:	08/12/2019		
	В.	<i>D</i> OE NEPA Team Review (if requested):				
		Is the class of action identified in the DOE NEPA Regulations (Ap Subpart D (10 CFR § 1021))? If yes, specify the class(es) of action: <u>B3.6</u>	pendices	A-D to	Yes X	No
		Name and Title:Peter Siebach, NCO				
		Signature: Peter Siebach	_ Date:	8/12/2019		
	C.	DOE Counsel (if requested):				
		Name and Title: Not Applicable				
		Signature:	_ Date:	8/12/2019		
	D.	DOE NEPA Compliance Officer:				
	The preceding pages are a record of documentation required under DOE Final NEPA Regulation, 10 CFR § 1021.410 .					
	X	Action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review. I have determined that the proposed action meets the requirements for Categorical Exclusion referenced above.				
	Action requires approval by Head of the Field Organization. Recommend preparation of an Environmental Assessment.			of an		
	Action requires approval by Head of the Field Organization or a Secretarial Officer. Recommend preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.			ecommend		
		Comments/limitations if any:				
		NEPA Compliance Officer:				
		Name:Peter Siebach				
		Signature: Peter Siebach		Date: 8/12/2	019	

Optional Additional Narrative: (add additional detail to description to Sections I and II or explanations to responses in Sections III and IV.

Explanation Page 2