

Process for RFTS at NON-FACILITY site

Logistics:

TEAMER Open Water Facilities. “Facilities” are locations where technology developers and researchers can test their technologies. Approved open water TEAMER Facilities will have clear and defined boundaries of what type of testing is allowed at the site.

TEAMER Open Water Capability Providers. “Capability Providers” offer support and assistance in open water testing, either at TEAMER Open Water Facilities or another site.

TEAMER will accept open water applications for Facilities or Capability Providers at any time and do not follow the quarterly review process of non-open water applications. Applicants are required to discuss projects with Facilities and/or Capability Providers before completing an application.

Application Process

1. Applicant consults with the open water Capability Provider (i.e. approved facility in the TEAMER network).
2. Capability Provider sends TEAMER Network Director details of project via email.
 - a. Location
 - b. Timing
 - c. General details of proposed RFTS
3. NETWORK DIRECTOR forwards details to TEAMER-approved environmental consultants (H.T. Harvey & Associates or 48 North Solutions, Inc.). The consultant will review the details and make a preliminary assessment of whether they expect that the project will have any effect on Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed species, their critical habitats, or Essential Fish Habitat.
 - a. TEAMER will pay for this initial environmental review.
 - b. If the environmental consultant expects that the potential impact of the proposed project would result in a finding of “No Effect” or “Not Likely to Adversely Affect” under Section 7 of the ESA, then the applicant is encouraged to submit an application to TEAMER.
 - i. This is not a final NEPA determination regarding potential impact. DOE will make that decision as part of the BE and test plan review process (see below).

- ii. This is a preliminary step to discourage applications that are unlikely to complete environmental review at reasonable cost and in a reasonable time.
 - c. If the environmental consultant expects that the scope should result in a “Likely to Adversely Affect”, then the applicant is discouraged from submitting an application to TEAMER.
 - i. This may not be an appropriate TEAMER project.
 - ii. Alternatively, the consultant may suggest methods or changes to the project scope that could reduce potential impacts such that the modified proposed project would result in a finding of “No Effect” or “Not Likely to Adversely Affect”.
 1. The applicant is encouraged to discuss the proposed changes with the Capability Provider and adjust the project scope prior to submitting an application.
 2. If the project scope is not adjusted, the TEAMER application is unlikely to be successful.
4. Letter of Response (LoR) requested from:
 - a. Open water Capability Provider
 - b. Environmental consultant describing level of effort to complete required documentation
5. Application package sent to one (1) Review Team Lead
 - a. Three (3) external reviewers will review application and submit scoring
 - b. Team Lead will make final recommendation to Network Director
6. If application is:
 - a. Declined – STOP. Incorporate review feedback and reapply.
 - b. Conditionally Approved – move on to next step.
7. Test Plan
 - a. Test plan must be final before completing environmental documentation.
 - i. Any changes to test plan must be communicated to DOE NEPA for approval before testing begins.
 - b. Capability Provider submits finalized test plan to Network Director via Submittable for Technical Board review and approval.
 - i. If approved on first review, environmental documentation to commence as described in step 8.
 - ii. If comments/revisions required, Network Director sends back to Capability Provider to update; iterate until approved.
8. Environmental consultant will meet with the DOE NEPA team to discuss the proposed project and the potential ESA determination. Once an agreement on the likely

determination is reached between DOE and the environmental consultant, the Capability Provider, applicant (now Technical Support Recipient, TSR), and environmental consultant complete documentation for Biological Evaluation (if necessary) (BE) based on approved test plan details.

- a. Cost of consultant's time to complete the BE to be included in the TEAMER project budget (\$250k maximum for open water testing)
 - b. Capability Provider and TSR to ensure they have all necessary permits and authorizations to conduct work. This includes all federal (e.g. USACE), state and local agencies, and local/county level permits that are not part of the ESA process.
 - i. Consultant who prepares BE could also handle permitting. This should be discussed with the environmental consultant. TEAMER funds are available for the consultant's time to acquire permits; however it is the responsibility of the TSR to pay for the permits if necessary.
9. Documentation developed in step 8 is then submitted for review.
- a. Capability Provider submits BE to Network Director via email. Network Director then submits the BE to DOE. DOE will work with the environmental consultant to make necessary changes to the BE prior to submittal to consulting agencies (i.e. National Marine Fisheries Service and/or US Fish and Wildlife Service).
 - b. DOE will engage with consulting agencies (NMFS and/or USFWS) as necessary to discuss, consult, and obtain concurrence. The environmental consultant will remain available to answer all questions proposed by the consulting agencies.
 - c. DOE issues NEPA determination. The NEPA determination may include specific requirements to which the Capability Provider and TSR must adhere.
10. Once TSR & Capability Provider obtain all required approvals, technical support may begin.