Draft Environmental Assessment Airfield BASH Mitigation Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota

March 2024



Prepared for: United States Air Force 319th Reconnaissance Wing



PRIVACY ADVISORY

This Environmental Assessment (EA) is provided for public comment in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500–1508), and 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)*.

The EIAP provides an opportunity for public input on Air Force decision-making, allows the public to offer inputs on alternative ways for the Air Force to accomplish what it is proposing, and solicits comments on the Air Force's analysis of environmental effects.

Public commenting allows the Air Force to make better, informed decisions. Letters or other written or oral comments provided may be published in the EA. As required by law, comments provided will be addressed in the EA and made available to the public. Providing personal information is voluntary. Any personal information provided will be used only to identify your desire to make a statement during the public comment portion of any public meetings or hearings or to fulfill requests for copies of the EA or associated documents. Private addresses will be compiled to develop a mailing list for those requesting copies of the EA; however, only the names of the individuals making comments and specific comments will be disclosed. Personal home addresses and phone numbers will not be published in the EA.

COMPLIANCE

This document has been certified that it does not exceed 75 pages, not including appendices, as defined in 40 CFR § 1501.5(f). In accordance with 40 CFR § 1508.1(v), a "page" means 500 words and does not include maps, diagrams, graphs, tables, and other means of graphically displaying quantitative or geospatial information.

ACCESSIBILITY NOTICE

This document is compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. This allows assistive technology to be used to obtain the available information from the document. Due to the nature of graphics, figures, tables, and images occurring in the document, accessibility is limited to a descriptive title for each item.

COVER SHEET Draft Environmental Assessment for Airfield BASH Mitigation Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota

- a. Responsible Agency: United States Air Force
- b. Location: Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota
- c. Designation: Draft Environmental Assessment
- *d. Point of Contact:* Robert Greene, 319 CES/CEIEC, 525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd., Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, <u>robert.greene.13@us.af.mil</u>.

Abstract:

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared pursuant to provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42 *United States Code*, §§ 4321 et seq., implemented by Council on Environmental Quality Regulations at Title 40, *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Parts 1500–1508, and 32 CFR Part 989, *Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP)*. Potentially affected environmental resources were identified in coordination with local, state, and federal agencies. Specific environmental resources water resources, geology and soils, cultural resources, hazardous material and waste, and infrastructure, including transportation and utilities.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to improve ground maintenance accessibility and operations to preserve war-fighting capabilities and support mission requirements. Vegetative cover within the project area must be maintained at a height between 7 and 14 inches and be converted to locally adapted vegetation species deemed unattractive to birds and other wildlife. The Proposed Action also includes replacement of the Installation's west perimeter fence.

The analysis of the affected environment and environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Action concluded that by implementing standing environmental protection measures and best management practices, there would be no significant adverse impacts from the actions at Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB) on the environmental resources. Grand Forks AFB is an active installation with equipment operations, demolition, and new construction actions currently underway as well as future development currently in the planning phase. Impacts associated with reconstructing the ground topography and the natural and man-made water features would be minor; therefore, significant cumulative impacts are not anticipated with implementation of the Proposed Action when considered in conjunction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends or future actions at Grand Forks AFB.

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.1 INTRODUCTON 1-1 1.2 PURPOSE OF THE ACTION 1-3 1.3 NEED FOR THE ACTION 1-3 1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS PROCESS 1-3 1.4.1 Intergovernmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation 1-3 1.4.2 Government-to-Government Consultation 1-3 1.4.3 Agency Consultations and Coordination 1-4 1.5 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW 1-4 1.6 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 1.6 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS 1-5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-3 3.1 TREMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 3.2 Mitingation and Environmental Consequences 2-3 3.2 S	CHAPTER 1	PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION	1-1
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE ACTION 1-3 1.3 NEED FOR THE ACTION 1-3 1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS PROCESS 1-3 1.4.1 Intergovernmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation 1-3 1.4.2 Government-to-Government Consultation 1-4 1.4.3 Agency Consultations and Coordination 1-4 1.5 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW 1-4 1.6 Scope of THE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS 1-4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS 1-5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2 2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.2.3 Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.3 Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 Trainfinition o	1.1 INTE		1-1
13 NEED FOR THE ACTION 1-3 14 Environmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation 1-3 1.4.1 Intergovernmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation 1-3 1.4.2 Government-to-Government Consultation 1-3 1.4.3 Agency Consultations and Coordination, 1-4 1.5 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW 1-4 1.6 Scope of The Environmental Assessment 1-4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2 ALTERNATIVES COREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Relained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 Alternatives Relained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 3.4 MITGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resou	1.2 Pur	POSE OF THE ACTION	
1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS PROCESS 1-3 1.4.1 Intergovernment Consultation 1-3 1.4.2 Government-to-Government Consultation 1-4 1.4.3 Agency Consultations and Coordination 1-4 1.5 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW 1-4 1.6 Scope of THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 1.6 Scope of THE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS 1-5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2.1 2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CLARING TERM PROD 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CLARING TERM PROD 3-1 3.4 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource <td< td=""><td>1.3 NEE</td><td>D FOR THE ACTION</td><td>1-3</td></td<>	1.3 NEE	D FOR THE ACTION	1-3
1.4.1 Intergovernmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation. 1-3 1.4.2 Government-to-Government Consultation. 1-3 1.4.3 Agency Consultations and Coordination. 1-4 1.5 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW. 1-4 1.6 Scope of The ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS. 1-5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2 Alternatives Screening PROCESS 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 <td>1.4 Env</td> <td>IRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS PROCESS</td> <td>1-3</td>	1.4 Env	IRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS PROCESS	1-3
1.4.2 Government-Consultation 1-3 1.4.3 Agency Consultations and Coordination 1-4 1.5 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW 1-4 1.6 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS 1-5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 Nather Resource 2-1 2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.3 Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.4 Miternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUTMENTS 2-6 CHAPTER 3 ELSISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5	1.4.1	Intergovernmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation	
1.4.3 Agency Consultations and Coordination 1-4 1.5 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW 1-4 1.6 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS. 1-5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CARRIED FORM AND FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORM AND FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-3 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-5 </td <td>1.4.2</td> <td>Government-to-Government Consultation</td> <td></td>	1.4.2	Government-to-Government Consultation	
1.5 PUBLIC AND ÅGENCY REVIEW 1.4 1.6 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1.4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS 1.5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2.1 2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2.1 2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2.1 2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2.1 2.2.3 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2.1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2.3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCUENCES 2.3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCUENCES 2.3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCUENCES 3.1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3.1 3.2 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3.1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3.2 3.4 NOBE 3.2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3.2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3.5 3.5.1 Definintion of the Resource 3.4 <td>1.4.3</td> <td>Agency Consultations and Coordination</td> <td></td>	1.4.3	Agency Consultations and Coordination	
1.6 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 1-4 1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS 1-5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.3 Stenatives 2-1 2.2.3 Stenatives 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences	1.5 Pub	LIC AND AGENCY REVIEW	1-4
1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS. 1-5 CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 RROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternatives 2-1 2.2.2 Screening of Alternatives 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS 2-6 CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CLARINED FOR WARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CLARINED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource	1.6 Sco	PE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	1-4
CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES 2-1 2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.2 Screening of Alternatives 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMSEQUENCES 2-3 3.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definition	1.7 App	LICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS	1-5
2.1 PROPOSED ACTION 2-1 2.2.1 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.2 Screening of Alternatives 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS 2-6 CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-12 3.7.5 Sherey 3-12 3.7.6 Definition of	CHAPTER 2	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	2-1
2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS 2-1 2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening 2-1 2.2.2 Screening of Alternatives 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-5 3.5.4 Environmental Consequences 3-11 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-14	2.1 Pro	POSED ACTION	2-1
2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternatives Screening 2-1 2.2.2 Screening of Alternativess 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS 2-6 CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-5 3.5.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.5 Existing Conditions 3-6 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-11 3.7 BioLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource 3-20 3.7 BioLOGICAL RESOURCE	2.2 ALT	ERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS	
2.2 Screening of Alternatives 2-1 2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS 2-6 CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definitions 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definitions of the Resource 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource<	2.2.1	Selection Standards for Alternative Screening	
2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis 2-3 2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS 2-6 CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions 3-6 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions 3-11 3.7 BioLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource 3-14 3.7.2 Existing Conditions 3-14 3.7.3 Environmental Conseq	2.2.2	Screening of Alternatives	
2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 2-3 2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS. 2-6 CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS. 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES CARRIED FORMARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS. 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions. 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions. 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences. 3-6 3.5.4 Definition of the Resource. 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions. 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences. 3-11 3.6.4 Definition of the Resource. 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-14 3.7.1 BioLoGICAL RESOURCES. 3-14	2.2.3	Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis	
2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS. 2-6 CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS. 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS. 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS. 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions. 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences. 3-3 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions. 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences. 3-6 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences. 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-14 3.7.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. 3-14 3.7.4 Environmental Consequences. 3-20 3.8 MATER RESOURCES. 3-24 3.8.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-24 <	2.3 SUM	IMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	2-3
CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1 3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-8 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-12 3.7 BioLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource 3-14 3.7.2 Existing Conditions 3-16 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-24 3.8.1 Definition	2.4 MITI	GATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS	
3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS. 3-1 3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-8 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-11 3.6.4 IR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.7 Existing Conditions 3-11 3.6.8 Environmental Consequences 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource 3-14 3.7.2 Existing Conditions 3-14 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-20<	CHAPTER 3	EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	
3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-1 3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-8 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-12 3.7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource 3-14 3.7.2 Existing Conditions 3-16 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-24 3.8 WATER RESOURCES 3-24 3.8.1 Definition of the Resource 3-	3.1 FRA		3-1
3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS 3-2 3.4 NOISE 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-8 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-11 3.6.4 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-14 3.7.1 BioLoGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.2 Existing Conditions 3-16 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-24 3.8.1 Definition of the Resource 3-24 3.8.2 Existing Conditions 3-24 3.8.3 Environmental Consequences 3-24 <td>3.2 RES</td> <td>OURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS</td> <td></td>	3.2 RES	OURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS	
3.4 Noise 3-2 3.4.1 Definition of the Resource 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions. 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5 SAFETY. 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions. 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-8 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions. 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-12 3.7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource 3-16 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-20 3.8 WATER RESOURCES 3-24 3.8.1 Definition of the Resource 3-24 3.8.2 Existing Conditions 3-24 3.8.3 Environmental Consequences 3-24 3.8.4 Definition of the Resource 3-24	3.3 RES	OURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS	3-2
3.4.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-2 3.4.2 Existing Conditions. 3-3 3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5 SAFETY. 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions. 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-8 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions. 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-12 3.7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-14 3.7.2 Existing Conditions. 3-16 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-20 3.8 WATER RESOURCES 3-24 3.8.1 Definition of the Resource 3-24 3.8.2 Existing Conditions. 3-25 3.8.3 Environmental Consequences 3-37 </td <td>3.4 Nor</td> <td></td> <td>3-2</td>	3.4 Nor		3-2
3.4.2 Existing Conditions	341	Definition of the Resource	3-2
3.4.3 Environmental Consequences 3-3 3.5 SAFETY 3-5 3.5.1 Definition of the Resource 3-5 3.5.2 Existing Conditions 3-5 3.5.3 Environmental Consequences 3-8 3.6 AIR QUALITY 3-9 3.6.1 Definition of the Resource 3-9 3.6.2 Existing Conditions 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-11 3.6.3 Environmental Consequences 3-12 3.7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.2 Existing Conditions 3-14 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-14 3.7.4 3.7.3 2-20 3.8 WATER RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-20 3.8 NATER RESOURCES 3-24 3.8.1 Definition of the Resource 3-24 3.8.2 Existing Conditions 3-25 3.8.3 Environmental Consequences 3-37 3.9 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 3-40 3.9.1	342	Existing Conditions	3-3
3.5SAFETY3-53.5.1Definition of the Resource3-53.5.2Existing Conditions3-53.5.3Environmental Consequences3-83.6AIR QUALITY3-93.6.1Definition of the Resource3-93.6.2Existing Conditions3-113.6.3Environmental Consequences3-113.6.4In Definition of the Resource3-93.6.5Existing Conditions3-113.6.7BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES3-143.7.1Definition of the Resource3-143.7.2Existing Conditions3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.2Existing Conditions3-243.8.3Environmental Consequences3-243.8.4Definition of the Resource3-243.8.3Environmental Consequences3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-443.10Cultural Resource3-443.10.1Definition of the Resource3-453.10.2Existing Conditions3-453.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-453.10.4Environmental Consequences3-453.10.2Existi	343	Environmental Consequences	3-3
3.5.1Definition of the Resource3-53.5.2Existing Conditions3-53.5.3Environmental Consequences3-83.6AIR QUALITY3-93.6.1Definition of the Resource3-93.6.2Existing Conditions3-113.6.3Environmental Consequences3-123.7BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES3-143.7.1Definition of the Resource3-143.7.2Existing Conditions3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences3-203.8WATER RESOURCES3-203.8WATER RESOURCES3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.2Existing Conditions3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences3-253.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource3-453.10.2Existing Conditions3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource3-463.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-463.10.4Environmental Consequences3-463.10.5Environmental Consequences3-463.10.4Environmental Cons	3.5 SAF		
3.5.2Existing Conditions.3-53.5.3Environmental Consequences3-83.6AIR QUALITY3-93.6.1Definition of the Resource.3-93.6.2Existing Conditions.3-113.6.3Environmental Consequences3-123.7BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.3-143.7.1Definition of the Resource.3-143.7.2Existing Conditions.3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences3-203.8WATER RESOURCES.3-203.8WATER RESOURCES.3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.2Existing Conditions.3-243.8.3Environmental Consequences3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions.3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-413.9.43.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-453.10.4Senvironmental Consequences3-463.10.5GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-463.10.6GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-463.10.7Definition of the Resource3-463.10.8Environmental Consequences3-463.10.1D	351	Definition of the Resource	3-5
3.5.3Environmental Consequences3-83.6AIR QUALITY3-93.6.1Definition of the Resource3-93.6.2Existing Conditions3-113.6.3Environmental Consequences3-123.7BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES3-143.7.1Definition of the Resource3-143.7.2Existing Conditions3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences3-203.8WATER RESOURCES3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.2Existing Conditions3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-413.9.43.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions3-443.9.3Environmental Consequences3-463.10.1Definition of the Resource3-463.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-463.10.4Environmental Consequences3-463.10.5Environmental Consequences3-463.10.6Environmental Consequences3-463.10.7Environmental Consequences3-463.10.1Definition of the Resource	352	Existing Conditions	3-5
3.6AIR QUALITY3-93.6.1Definition of the Resource.3-93.6.2Existing Conditions.3-113.6.3Environmental Consequences.3-123.7BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.3-143.7.1Definition of the Resource.3-143.7.2Existing Conditions.3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences.3-203.8WATER RESOURCES.3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource.3-243.8.2Existing Conditions.3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences.3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource.3-403.9.2Existing Conditions.3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences.3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES.3-443.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.4Source.3-453.10.5Source.3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.4Source.3-453.10.5Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.6Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.7Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.3Environmenta	353	Environmental Consequences	3-8
3.6.1Definition of the Resource.3-93.6.2Existing Conditions.3-113.6.3Environmental Consequences.3-123.7BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.3-143.7.1Definition of the Resource.3-143.7.2Existing Conditions.3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences.3-203.8WATER RESOURCES.3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource.3-243.8.2Existing Conditions.3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences.3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource.3-403.9.2Existing Conditions.3-403.9.3Environmental Consequences.3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES.3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES.3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.4Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.5Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.6Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.7Environm	36 AIR	Diality	
3.6.2Existing Conditions.3-113.6.3Environmental Consequences.3-123.7BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.3-143.7.1Definition of the Resource.3-143.7.2Existing Conditions.3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences.3-203.8WATER RESOURCES.3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource.3-243.8.2Existing Conditions.3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences.3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences.3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource.3-403.9.2Existing Conditions.3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences.3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES.3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.4Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.5Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.4Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-47	361	Definition of the Resource	3-0
3.6.2 Environmental Consequences 3-11 3.7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES 3-14 3.7.1 Definition of the Resource 3-14 3.7.2 Existing Conditions 3-16 3.7.3 Environmental Consequences 3-20 3.8 WATER RESOURCES 3-24 3.8.1 Definition of the Resource 3-24 3.8.2 Existing Conditions 3-25 3.8.3 Environmental Consequences 3-37 3.9 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 3-40 3.9.1 Definition of the Resource 3-40 3.9.2 Existing Conditions 3-44 3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES 3-44 3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES 3-45 3.10.1 Definition of the Resource 3-45 3.10.2 Existing Conditions 3-45 3.10.2 Existing Conditions 3-45 3.10.3 Environmental Consequences 3-45 3.10.3 Environmental Consequences 3-45 3.10.4 Senvironmental Consequences 3-45 3.10.5 Environmental Consequences	362	Existing Conditions	3_11
3.7BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES3-143.7.1Definition of the Resource3-143.7.2Existing Conditions3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences3-203.8WATER RESOURCES3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.2Existing Conditions3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource3-453.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences3-453.10.3Environmental Consequences3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-46	363	Environmental Consequences	3-12
3.7.1Definition of the Resource.3-143.7.2Existing Conditions.3-163.7.3Environmental Consequences.3-203.8WATER RESOURCES.3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource.3-243.8.2Existing Conditions.3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences.3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource.3-403.9.2Existing Conditions.3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences.3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES.3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-453.10.4Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.5S-10.53-453.10.6Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-47	3.7 Bioi	OGICAL RESOURCES	3-14
3.7.1Definition of the Resource3-163.7.2Existing Conditions3-203.8WATER RESOURCES3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.2Existing Conditions3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource3-453.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-453.10.4Definition of the Resource3-453.10.5Existing Conditions3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-47	371	Definition of the Resource	3_14
3.7.3Environmental Consequences3-203.8WATER RESOURCES3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.2Existing Conditions3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-413.9.43.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource3-453.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-47	372	Existing Conditions	3-16
3.8WATER RESOURCES3-243.8.1Definition of the Resource3-243.8.2Existing Conditions3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource3-403.9.2Existing Conditions3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences3-413.9.43.10CULTURAL RESOURCES3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource3-453.10.2Existing Conditions3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences3-47	373	Environmental Consequences	3-20
3.8.1Definition of the Resource.3-243.8.2Existing Conditions.3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences.3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource.3-403.9.2Existing Conditions.3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences.3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES.3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-46	3.8 WAT	TER RESOURCES	3-24
3.8.2Existing Conditions.3-253.8.3Environmental Consequences.3-373.9GEOLOGY AND SOILS.3-403.9.1Definition of the Resource.3-403.9.2Existing Conditions.3-413.9.3Environmental Consequences.3-443.10CULTURAL RESOURCES.3-453.10.1Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3Environmental Consequences.3-46	381	Definition of the Resource	3-24
3.8.3 Environmental Consequences 3-37 3.9 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 3-40 3.9.1 Definition of the Resource 3-40 3.9.2 Existing Conditions 3-41 3.9.3 Environmental Consequences 3-44 3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES 3-45 3.10.1 Definition of the Resource 3-45 3.10.2 Existing Conditions 3-46 3.10.3 Environmental Consequences 3-46	382	Existing Conditions	3-25
3.9 GEOLOGY AND SOILS. 3-40 3.9.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-40 3.9.2 Existing Conditions. 3-41 3.9.3 Environmental Consequences. 3-44 3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES. 3-45 3.10.1 Definition of the Resource. 3-45 3.10.2 Existing Conditions. 3-46 3.10.3 Environmental Consequences. 3-47	383	Environmental Consequences	3-37
3.9.1 Definition of the Resource.3-403.9.2 Existing Conditions.3-413.9.3 Environmental Consequences.3-443.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES.3-453.10.1 Definition of the Resource.3-453.10.2 Existing Conditions.3-463.10.3 Environmental Consequences.3-47	39 G⊨∩	DI OGY AND SOILS	
3.9.2Existing Conditions	391	Definition of the Resource	
3.9.3 Environmental Consequences 3-44 3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES 3-45 3.10.1 Definition of the Resource 3-45 3.10.2 Existing Conditions 3-46 3.10.3 Environmental Consequences 3-47	392	Existing Conditions	
3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES 3-45 3.10.1 Definition of the Resource 3-45 3.10.2 Existing Conditions 3-46 3.10.3 Environmental Consequences 3-47	393	Environmental Consequences	
3.10.1 Definition of the Resource	3 10 Cur		3-45
3.10.2 Existing Conditions	3 10 1	Definition of the Resource	
3.10.3 Environmental Consequences	3 10 2	Existing Conditions	
	3.10.3	Environmental Consequences	

CHAPTER 5	REFERENCES	5-1
4.1 Gov	ERNMENT CONTRIBUTORS	4-2
CHAPTER 4	LIST OF PREPARERS	3-58
3.12.3	Environmental Consequences	3-56
3.12.2	Existing Conditions	3-55
3.12.1	Definition of the Resource	
3.12 INFR	ASTRUCTURE, INCLUDING TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES	
3.11.3	Environmental Consequences	3-52
3.11.2	Existing Conditions	
3.11.1	Definition of the Resource	3-48
3.11 HAZ	ARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTES, TOXIC SUBSTANCES, AND CONTAMINATED SITES	

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. APPENDIX B. APPENDIX C. APPENDIX D.	Intergovernmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation Public Notices Draft Wetlands Mitigation Plan Air Quality Analysis Resources, Methodologies, and Record of Conformity Applicability
	Applicability

LIST OF FIGURES

2-2
3-18
3-31
3-43
3-51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1.	Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences	2-4
Table 3-1.	Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Environmental Trends and Planned	
	Actions	3-2
Table 3-2.	Peak Sound Pressure Level of Construction Equipment from a Distance of 50	
	Feet	3-4
Table 3-3.	National and North Dakota Ambient Air Quality Standards	3-10
Table 3-4.	Annual Emissions under the Proposed Action Compared with Insignificance	
	Indicator	3-13
Table 3-5.	Estimated GHG Emissions from Proposed Projects	3-14
Table 3-6.	Species of High Priority for Base Conservation	3-21
Table 3-7.	Wetlands – Flight Line North	3-28
Table 3-8.	Wetlands – Flight Line South	3-28
Table 3-9.	Wetlands – Flight Line East	3-29
Table 3-10.	Wetlands – Flight Line West	3-30
Table 3-11.	Soil Types Associated with Project Area at Grand Forks AFB	3-42
Table 3-12.	Environmental Restoration Program Sites	3-50
Table 3-13.	Aqueous Film Forming Foam Areas	3-53

This page intentionally left blank

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

319 RW	319th Reconnaissance Wing
ACAM	Air Conformity Applicability Model
AFB	Air Force Base
AFCEC	Air Force Civil Engineer Center
AFFF	aqueous film forming foam
Air Force	United States Air Force
AFPD	Air Force Policy Directive
AMSL	above mean sea level
APZ	accident potential zone
AQCRs	Air Quality Control Regions
AST	aboveground storage tank
BASH	Bird/wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard
BGEPA	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation
CES	Civil Engineer Squadron
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
СО	Carbon monoxide
CO ₂ e	Carbon dioxide equivalent
CWA	Clean Water Act
CZ	clear zone
DAFI	Department of the Air Force Instruction
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DNL	Day-Night Average Sound Level
DoD	Department of Defense
DoDI	Department of Defense Instruction
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIAP	Environmental Impact Analysis Process
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007
EO	Executive Order
ERP	Environmental Restoration Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESQD	explosives safety quantity-distance
°F	degree Fahrenheit
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FLE	Flight Line East
FLN	Flight Line North
FLS	Flight Line South
FLW	Flight Line West
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act
FFRMP	Federal Flood Risk Management Standard
FONPA	Finding of No Practicable Alternative
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
ft ²	square feet/foot
GHG	greenhouse gas
GWP	global warming potential
HAZMAT	hazardous materials
µg/m³	micrograms per cubic meter
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act

NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NDDEQ	North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality
NDDH	North Dakota Department of Health
NDGFD	North Dakota Game and Fish Department
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSR	New Source Review
NWR	National Wildlife Refuge
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PEM	palustrine emergent
PFAS	per- and polyfluorinated substances
PEQA	perfluorooctanoic acid
PEOS	perfluorooctane sulfonic acid
PM ₁₀	particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter
PM ₂	particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 microns in diameter
nnm	nart ner million
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PSS	nalustrine scrub-shrub
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
ROAA	Record of Air Analysis
ROL	Region of influence
SAD	satellite accumulation point
	Superfund Amondmonte and Resultherization Act
	species of conservation priority
	State Historic Preservation Office
	State Instance Freservation Dince
	spill provention control and countermeasures
SFCC	
	stormwater pollution provention plan
	Traditional Cultural Dreporty
	Traditional Cultural Property
	United States
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
	United States Code
	United States Department of Agriculture
	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USEWS	United States FISH and Wildlife Service
	underground storage tank
	Volatile organic compound
WUTUS	waters of the US

CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The 319th Reconnaissance Wing (319 RW) at Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), North Dakota, is proposing to reconstruct the ground topography and the natural and man-made water features within the Aircraft Movement Area plus 500 feet and all areas inside the AFB airfield security fence (hereinafter, "project area"). The United States (US) Air Force (Air Force) prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed changes to the project area in compliance with the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969* (Title 42 of the United States Code [USC] § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA); the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations that implement NEPA (Title 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500–1508);¹ and Air Force's Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) regulations at <u>32 CFR Part 989</u>, Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP).

The scope of the Proposed Action includes construction activities across the project area, to include largescale modification of landscape topography and hydrologic features, wetlands, structures, and infrastructure to provide adequate access for successful grounds maintenance and operational control functions. Specifically, the Air Force is proposing to resolve standing water and accumulation issues for the project area by improving and tiling problematic drainage areas as well as filling and leveling wetland areas. In addition, the Proposed Action would reconstruct the project area landscape (1,291 acres) by conducting field regrading and grubbing, replacing the west perimeter fence, and re-seeding with appropriate plant species adapted to local ecotype and unattractive to wildlife that will thrive under required control-ofvegetation height management between 7 and 14 inches, in accordance with Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 91-212, *Bird/Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) Management Program* (2023)

The 319 RW is made up of the 319th Operations Group, 319th Mission Support Group, 319th Medical Group, 14 squadrons, and 3 detachments. The Grand Forks AFB vision is to generate world-class support for the Global Hawk high-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance mission and seamlessly operate and sustain the High Frequency Global Communication System. The Grand Forks AFB mission is to provide decisional advantage to the Nation's warfighters and leaders through support of the Global Hawk high-altitude intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance mission; ensure strategic command and control through operation of the High Frequency Global Communication System; afford Combatant Commanders with mission-ready Airmen anytime and anywhere; and provide Airmen and families of the Grand Forks AFB team—including geographically separated units—with responsive, tailored, and mission-focused support. The 319 RW also provides facilities and equipment support to the US Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection, and the Space Development Agency. The 319 RW is one of only two locations worldwide operating the High Frequency Global Communications System, providing operational support of senior leadership communications for all Department of Defense (DoD) agencies, including for the President of the United States.

Grand Forks AFB is in Grand Forks County, North Dakota, near the city of Grand Forks and the North Dakota-Minnesota state boundary (**Figure 1-1**). Grand Forks AFB encompasses 5,745 acres in an otherwise rural area. The southern edge of Grand Forks AFB is bounded by US Highway 2, which also separates the Base from the city of Emerado, a small community of an estimated 443 people (US Census Bureau, 2020).

¹ This EA was prepared in accordance with the 14 September 2020 version of CEQ NEPA regulations (see Volume 85 of the *Federal Register*, page 43304; 16 July 2020), as modified by the CEQ NEPA Implementing Regulations Revisions Final Rule that became effective 20 May 2022.





1.2 PURPOSE OF THE ACTION

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to improve ground maintenance accessibility and operations to preserve war-fighting capabilities and support mission requirements. Vegetative cover within the project area must be maintained at a height between 7 and 14 inches and be converted to locally adapted vegetation species deemed unattractive to birds and other wildlife. The Proposed Action also includes replacement of the Installation's west perimeter fence.

1.3 NEED FOR THE ACTION

Grand Forks AFB needs to remove standing water, improve drainage, create unattractive habitat for wildlife, replace the western perimeter fence, control vegetation heights to bring the project area into compliance with DAFI 91-202, *The US Air Force Mishap Prevention Program* (2023), and DAFI 91-212, *Bird/Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) Management Program*. Grand Forks AFB needs to reduce standing water and improve drainage in order to access and maintain airfield grounds, which is made difficult by rough terrain and wet saline soils.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS PROCESS

NEPA, which is implemented through the CEQ regulations, requires federal agencies to consider alternatives to the Proposed Action and to analyze potential impacts of alternative actions. Potential impacts of the Proposed Action and Alternatives described in this EA will be assessed in accordance with the CEQ regulations, which require that federal agencies analyze the potentially affected environment and degree of the effects of the action.

1.4.1 Intergovernmental Coordination, Public and Agency Participation

The EIAP, in compliance with NEPA guidance, includes public and agency review of information pertinent to a proposed action and alternatives. The Air Force's compliance with the requirement for intergovernmental coordination and agency participation begins with the scoping² process (40 CFR § 1501.9). Accordingly, and per Executive Order (EO) 12372, *Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs*, the Air Force notified federal, state, and local agencies and tribal governments with jurisdiction that could potentially be affected by the Proposed Action and Alternatives via written correspondence throughout development of this EA. A mailing list of the recipients of this correspondence as well as a sample of the outgoing letters and all responses are included in **Appendix A**.

1.4.2 Government-to-Government Consultation

The National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (54 USC § 300101, et seq.) (NHPA) and its implementing regulations (36 CFR Part 800) direct federal agencies to consult with federally recognized Indian tribes when a proposed action or alternative may have an effect on tribal lands or on properties of religious and cultural significance to a tribe. Consistent with the NHPA, DoD Instruction (DoDI) 4710.02, DoD Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes, and DAFI 90-2002, Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes, the Air Force has invited federally recognized tribes that are historically affiliated with lands in the vicinity of the Proposed Action and Alternatives to consult on all proposed undertakings that have a potential to affect properties of cultural, historical, or religious significance to the tribes. The tribal consultation process is distinct from NEPA consultation and requires separate notification of all relevant tribes. The timelines for tribal consultation are also distinct from those of other consultations. The Grand Forks AFB point of contact for Indian tribes is the 319 RW Vice Commander. The point of contact for the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer is the Installation Tribal Liaison Officer. A mailing list of the tribal government recipients of this invitation as well as a sample of the outgoing correspondence and all responses are included in **Appendix A**.

² Scoping is a process for determining the extent of issues to be addressed and analyzed in a NEPA document.

1.4.3 Agency Consultations and Coordination

Implementation of the Proposed Action involves coordination with several organizations and agencies. Compliance with Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act of 1973*, as amended (<u>16 USC § 1531</u> et seq.) (ESA), and implementing regulations (<u>50 CFR Part 402</u>) requires federal agencies to consider the potential impacts of their proposed actions on ESA-listed threatened and endangered species or habitat considered essential to their recovery, otherwise defined and designated as "critical habitat" under the ESA.

Consultations initiated under ESA Section 7 must be completed prior to the issuance of a NEPA decision document. Federal agencies must consult with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, as applicable, for actions that may affect federally listed threatened and endangered species or their critical habitat. The primary focus of this consultation is to request a determination of whether any of these species occur or has the potential to occur in the project area. If any of these species is present or has the potential to occur, a determination is made of any potential adverse effects on the species. Should no ESA-protected species be affected by the Proposed Action or Alternatives, no additional consultation is required. Copies of correspondence with the USFWS are included in **Appendix A**.

Other federal agencies the Air Force might coordinate with include the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, US Forest Service, and Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Coordination with appropriate North Dakota State government agencies and planning districts will occur during scoping and beyond as necessary. Compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA and implementing regulations (<u>36 CFR Part 800</u>) will be accomplished through the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Similarly, the Air Force will coordinate with the North Dakota Department of Environmental Quality (NDDEQ) for potential impacts to air and water quality, and the North Dakota Game and Fish Department (NDGFD) for concerns related to habitat and species of concern. A sample of agency correspondence and all responses are included in **Appendix A**.

1.5 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW

The Air Force invites the public and other interested stakeholders to review and comment on this EA. Accordingly, a notice of availability of the Draft EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) were published in the *Grand Forks Herald* and the *Fargo Forum* on 20 March 2024 to commence a 30-day public comment period.

The public comment period of the Draft EA and FONSI concludes on 22 April 2024. During the public comment period, copies of the Draft EA and FONSI are available upon request (see **Cover Sheet**) and placed at the following public libraries:

- Grand Forks Public Library, Grand Forks, ND
- University of North Dakota Legal Library (Thormodsgard Law Library), Grand Forks, ND
- North Dakota State University Library, Fargo, ND

The Final EA will address all substantive comments received on the Draft EA and Draft FONSI; written comments will be included as an appendix to the Final EA. If appropriate, the Air Force will subsequently issue a Final (signed) FONSI to comply with NEPA.

1.6 SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

This EA evaluates the potential environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed Action or Alternatives and associated BASH management procedures at Grand Forks AFB, as described in **Section 1.1**. This EA has been prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ regulations, and the EIAP. NEPA ensures that environmental information, including the anticipated environmental consequences of a proposed

action, is available to the public, federal and state agencies, and the decision-maker before decisions are made and actions are taken.

The information presented in this document will serve as the basis for deciding whether the Proposed Action or Alternatives would result in a significant impact on the human environment, requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), or whether no significant impacts would occur, in which case a FONSI would be issued. Because the Proposed Action or Alternatives would unavoidably affect floodplains and wetlands subject to EO 11988, *Floodplain Management*; EO 13690, *Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input*, as reinstated by EO 14030, *Climate-Related Financial Risk*, or EO 11990, *Protection of Wetlands* (see **Section 1.7**), a Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA) was prepared in conjunction with the proposed FONSI.

To comply with the EOs noted above, the Air Force placed an early public notice in the *Grand Forks Herald* on 2 and 5 August 2023 regarding the Proposed Action and its potential to affect floodplain and wetland resources on Grand Forks AFB (**Appendix B**). No public comments in response to the notice were received.

1.7 APPLICABLE LAWS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

EO 11988 directs federal agencies to determine whether a Proposed Action would occur within a floodplain and to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on floodplains. If an agency considers avoiding adverse impacts on a floodplain and determines that no practicable alternative to undertaking the action is feasible, EO 11988 requires minimizing impacts by design or modification. In such cases, agencies must also prepare and circulate a notice to explain how avoidance was not practicable and describe minimization measures. The planning and evaluation steps required by EO 11988 also apply to EO 11990, a similar directive requiring federal agencies to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on wetlands.

To implement EO 11988, processes for evaluating the impacts of federal actions in or affecting floodplains (and wetlands) are in place. EO 13690 creates a new flood risk reduction standard for federally funded projects, the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard (FFRMP). The FFRMP is a flexible framework for increasing resilience against flooding and preserving the natural-function benefits of floodplains. The incorporation of the FFRMP will expand federal management of actions that affect floodplains from the current base flood level to a higher vertical elevation and corresponding horizontal extent. EO 13690 also sets forth a process for further solicitation and consideration of public input.

Other laws and regulations applicable to the Proposed Action include:

- Clean Water Act (33 USC § 1251 et seq.) (CWA)
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 USC § 6901 et seq.) (RCRA)
- Section 438 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140) (EISA)
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 USC § 9601 et seq.) (CERCLA)
- Federal Clean Air Act (42 USC § 7401 et seq., as amended) (CAA)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC § 703 et seq.) (MBTA)
- Toxic Substances Control Act (15 USC § 2601 et seq.) (TSCA)
- EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (1994)
- EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks (1997), as amended by EO 13296 (2003)
- EO 14096, Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (2023)

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 **PROPOSED ACTION**

The 319 RW at Grand Forks AFB is proposing to reconstruct the ground topography and the natural and man-made water features within the project area totaling 1,291 acres (Figure 2-1). Grand Forks AFB would cultivate airfield vegetation unattractive to wildlife and maintain vegetation height between 7 and 14 inches within the project area to comply with DAFI 91-202, The US Air Force Mishap Prevention Program, and DAFI 91-212, Bird/Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) Management Program. Grand Forks AFB intends to remove standing water by regrading the airfield's West Ditch (up to 14,000 linear feet), conducting perimeter drainage maintenance, installing up to 35 acres of drain tile, and mitigating wetlands/floodplains. Reconstructing ground topography includes filling, clearing, grubbing, regrading (via heavy-equipment operation), landscaping, cultivating, and re-seeding no less than 150 acres of the project area to create both accessibility and functional grounds maintenance operations and unattractive wildlife habitat. Approximately 3,700 cubic yard of fill material, which could be acquired from off-Base sources, would be delivered with heavy trucks and used to fill the project area. The Proposed Action also would include replacement of the Installation's west perimeter fence (22,240 feet of fence line). Fence posts would be driven into the ground to a depth of 8 feet and 10 feet apart, with no digging or trenching required. Seed selection for the project area would include species adapted to the local area, deemed unattractive for wildlife, and that can thrive in the local ecotype withstanding repeated mowing to successfully meet DAFI compliance.

2.2 ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS

NEPA requires federal agencies to objectively explore and evaluate reasonable alternatives to a proposed action. Alternatives not found to be reasonable can be eliminated from evaluation provided the EA or EIS includes a brief rationale for their elimination ($40 \text{ CFR} \S 1502.14(a)$).

2.2.1 Selection Standards for Alternative Screening

In accordance with <u>32 CFR § 989.8(c)</u>, selection standards were developed to establish a means for determining the reasonableness of an alternative and whether an alternative should be carried forward for analysis in the EA. Consistent with 32 CFR § 989.8(c), the following selection standards meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action:

- 1) Comply with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 to be consistent with land use requirements, force protection, and planning concepts identified in the 2017 Installation Development Plan and other Air Force guidance.
- 2) Remove standing water/improve drainage.
- 3) Cultivate vegetation unattractive to wildlife.

2.2.2 Screening of Alternatives

The Air Force identified two action alternatives for evaluation and screening. These alternatives are described below.

2.2.2.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action

Alternative 1 is the Proposed Action, as described in **Section 2.1**. The 319 RW at Grand Forks AFB would reconstruct the ground topography and the natural and man-made water features within the project area (1,291 acres). The Proposed Action also would include replacement of the Installation's west perimeter fence. Alternative 1 meets all selection standards listed in Section 2.2.1 above.





2.2.2.2 Alternative 2 – Hay Lease

Historically, Grand Forks AFB has provided various vegetation maintenance strategies to support the BASH program, including use of a hay lease on a portion of the airfield, occasional airfield controlled burning of a portion of the west airfield area, and a grounds maintenance contract for the infield areas plus 200 feet from all airfield pavements.

Under Alternative 2, the Air Force would renew airfield use of the hay lease to provide vegetation maintenance. Under terms of the traditional hay lease, grasses usually grew until mid-summer and then would be cut, baled, and removed. The lessee typically accomplished bailing actions once a year due to the clay and wet saline soils present, which prohibited appropriate maintenance functions to DAFI standards. Portions of the airfield located close to taxiways and runways would continue to be provided vegetation maintenance under the Base grounds contract and mowed frequently. Remaining western portions of the airfield contain rough, rocky, uneven terrain and thus would not be covered by either the grounds contract or the hay lease. This western portion would have no sustained annual vegetation control and would instead utilize only occasional controlled burning. In addition, limited tree and shrub removal would be conducted by either occasional contract funding or by in-house shop personnel as available in this area. Alternative 2 was eliminated from further consideration for the following reasons:

- Alternative 2 does not meet selection standards 1, 2, or 3. This alternative would provide some vegetation control and maintenance but would not satisfactorily comply with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212, as declared by the denied Grand Forks AFB waiver request from the Air Force Safety Center.
- Alternative 2 also would not provide improved drainage, would not remove ponding or standing water to DAFI standards, would not reconstruct landscape topography to create habitat unattractive to wildlife, and would not adequately provide access for grounds maintenance operations.

2.2.3 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis

NEPA and CEQ regulations mandate the consideration of reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action. "Reasonable alternatives" are those that also could be utilized to meet the purpose of and need for the agency action. The NEPA process is intended to support flexible, informed decision-making. The analysis provided in this EA and feedback from the public and other agencies will inform decisions made about whether, when, and how to execute the Proposed Action.

2.2.3.1 Proposed Action

Alternative 1 at Grand Forks AFB is the preferred alternative (as described in **Section 2.1**). No other action alternatives were carried forward for analysis.

2.2.3.2 No Action Alternative

CEQ regulations require evaluation of the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative serves as a baseline for evaluating the impacts of the Proposed Action and Alternatives.

Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. The No Action Alternative would result in no potential adverse effects to wetland, floodplains, and wildlife; however, it would leave approximately 1,200 acres out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation as well as perpetuate an elevated risk of wildlife-caused aircraft mishaps due to the attractiveness of vegetation to preyed and predatory animals. Leaving the airfield in its current condition would greatly hinder the Wing's ability to preserve present and future war-fighting capabilities through the reduction of wildlife hazards to aircraft operations.

2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Table 2-1 summarizes the potential impacts associated with Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative. The summary is based on information discussed in detail in **Chapter 3** of this EA and provides a concise

description of the issues addressed and the potential environmental impacts for each resource area under each analyzed alternative.

Resource Area	Proposed Action	No Action Alternative
Noise	Noise in the area would not change from current conditions, and no significant impacts on noise-sensitive receptors would be anticipated.	Under the No Action Alternative, no project activities would occur on Grand Forks AFB. Noise in the area would not change from current conditions, and no significant impacts on noise-sensitive receptors would be anticipated.
Safety	The Proposed Action would have a beneficial impact to BASH safety, reducing the overall presence of birds and wildlife in the airfield. Improvements in BASH safety and a reduction of birds and wildlife in the airfield would help to minimize strikes, crashes, and other incidents related to the interaction of birds, wildlife, and aircraft.	Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. There would be no changes to safety beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.
Air Quality	The effects of the Proposed Action on regional air quality would be expected to be minor. The estimated project emissions would not be anticipated to result in significant emissions of criteria pollutant air emissions, and thus, no adverse impacts would be expected to occur.	The No Action Alternative would not generate any new construction emissions and would not change emissions from current emissions levels in the ROI. As a result, no impacts would occur to regional air quality under the No Action Alternative.
Biological Resources	No federally listed threatened or endangered species have been observed on Grand Forks AFB, nor does critical habitat exist within Grand Forks AFB. The Proposed Action would not adversely affect any federally threatened or endangered species or their habitat. The Proposed Action would eliminate existing grassland habitat and would regrade and replace existing grasslands and wetlands with airfield vegetation unattractive to wildlife such as a monoculture of an herbaceous species adapted to drier conditions and tolerant to periodic mowing. As a result, the abundance of common mammals and bird species inhabiting the existing grasslands would be reduced. Many bird species and larger mobile mammal species would likely relocate to other areas of similar habitat in the vicinity of Grand Forks AFB. Birds that are obligate wetland species would be displaced from the project area to other similar habitats in the region.	Under the No Action Alternative, no reconstruction and replacement activities would occur. There would be no changes to biological resources beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would result in no potential adverse effects to vegetation, wildlife, or protected species; however, it would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation. In the short term, military training and operations would continue at Grand Forks AFB in accordance with the status quo.
Water Resources	Under the Proposed Action, approximately 93 acres of wetlands would be filled and leveled to resolve standing water and reduce habitat in the airfield and vicinity, resulting in a permanent adverse impact to affected wetlands. Wetland removal would decrease habitat, landscape diversity, and connectivity among aquatic resources.	Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. There would be no changes to water resources beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.

 Table 2-1.

 Summary of Potential Environmental Consequences

Resource Area	Proposed Action	No Action Alternative
	Common indirect impacts of wetland removal include influx of surface water and sediments or changes in local drainage patterns. Increase in soil erosion and sedimentation could impact Turtle River. The process of regrading the West Ditch would include soil compaction, which would stabilize the soil and reduce its vulnerability to future erosion and sedimentation in the floodplain. The Proposed Action would also result in minor, long-term, beneficial impacts to floodplains due to more effective storm and floodwater conveyance that would be associated with the improved drainage environment.	
Soils	The underlying geology of the area occupied by Grand Forks AFB would not change under the Proposed Action. No direct or indirect impacts to geology would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action. Topography reconstruction activities would be limited to those necessary to maintain efficient drainage. Therefore, the Proposed Action would result in long-term, minor impacts to topography. Ground-disturbing activities under the Proposed Action would disturb soils in the project area; primarily, Gilby loam, Antler silty clay loam, Embden fine sandy loam, and Glyndon silt loam.	Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the proposed project area would be undertaken. There would be no changes to geological resources beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.
Cultural Resources	No archaeological resources within the project area have been identified as eligible for NRHP listing. Project activities would occur on land that has been previously disturbed. In the event that unidentified archaeological sites occur within these areas, standard operating procedures for the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources or human remains detailed in the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan would be followed. No impacts to architectural properties would be anticipated to result from the Proposed Action.	Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. The No Action Alternative would result in no change to cultural resources on the Installation. Taking no action would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.
Hazardous Materials and Wastes, Toxic Substances, and Contaminated Sites	Short-term, negligible-to-minor, adverse impacts would be anticipated to result from the use of hazardous materials and petroleum products during proposed project activities. No impacts to fuel storage would occur. No impacts on the Environmental Restoration Program would be anticipated in response to proposed projects. Herbicides would be used during the project activities.	Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. There would be no changes to HAZMAT and hazardous wastes management beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.
Infrastructure, including Transportation and Utilities	The Proposed Action would not impact the transportation systems on the Installation.	Under the No Action Alternative, no projects under the Proposed Action would occur. The No Action Alternative would

Resource Area	Proposed Action	No Action Alternative
	Vehicular traffic would not increase as part of the Proposed Action	result in no change to the infrastructure and utilities systems on the Installation.
	The Proposed Action would not impact the communications systems on the Installation. The communications system is in good condition and meets current and future mission needs	
	The Proposed Action would not impact the electricity and natural gas systems on the Installation. No impacts to the electricity and natural gas systems would be expected. The electricity and natural gas systems are in good condition and meet current and future mission needs.	
	The Proposed Action would not impact the potable water systems on the Installation. No impacts to the potable water systems would be expected.	
	The Proposed Action would not impact the sewage system on the Installation. No impacts to the potable water systems would be expected. The Proposed Action would not impact the solid waste management systems on the Installation. No impacts to the solid waste management systems would be expected.	

2.4 MITIGATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

Because there is no practicable alternative for the Grand Forks AFB BASH project, mitigation would be required for potential impacts of the project on wetlands. Due to the location of several project components within existing wetland boundaries, the project would directly impact wetlands. As part of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) permitting process, compensatory mitigation would be required for the unavoidable loss of jurisdictional wetlands to ensure the project would not result in a net loss of wetlands. Mitigation would be in the form of a purchase of credits from an off-site mitigation bank at a minimum 1:1 ratio.

Based upon the expected impacts to wetlands, a Section 404 CWA permit would be required prior to the commencement of project activities. The acquisition of the Section 404 permit would be part of the design and construction process. The Section 404 permit would be obtained prior to any ground-disturbing activities. Mitigation for wetlands impacts would be required. Mitigation could include constructing new wetlands or purchasing wetland credits from an approved wetland bank.

A Wetlands Mitigation Plan is provided as **Appendix C** of this document. The Wetlands Mitigation Plan was completed in accordance with the USACE and USEPA Compensatory Mitigation Final Rule, entitled *Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources* (<u>73 FR 19594</u>, 10 April 2008), which established a preference hierarchy for compensatory mitigation options.

CHAPTER 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

To provide a framework for the analyses in this EA, the Air Force defined a study area specific to each resource or sub-resource area. Referred to as a Region of Influence (ROI), these areas delineate a boundary where possible effects from the considered alternatives would have a reasonable likelihood to occur. Beyond these ROIs, potential adverse effects on resources would not be anticipated. For the purposes of analysis, potential effects are described as follows:

- **Beneficial** positive effects that improve or enhance resource conditions
- **Adverse –** negative or harmful results
- **Negligible –** effects likely to occur but at levels not readily observable by evaluation
- **Minor** observable, measurable, tangible effects qualified as below one or more significance threshold(s)
- **Moderate** tangible effects that are readily apparent, qualified as below one or more significance threshold(s)
- **Significant** obvious, observable, verifiable effects qualified as above one or more significance threshold(s); not mitigable to below significance

When relevant to the analyses in this EA, potential effects are further defined as direct or indirect; short- or long-term; and temporary, intermittent, or permanent.

Based upon the nature of the Proposed Action and the affected environment, both qualitative and quantitative thresholds were used as benchmarks to qualify effects. Further, each resource analysis section (i.e., **Sections 3.4–3.12**) concludes with a cumulative effects analysis considering the Proposed Action in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB.

Table 3-1 briefly describes the proposed or planned projects identified for consideration of potential cumulative impacts when combined with the Proposed Action at Grand Forks AFB and on a regional scale. Projects associated with the Proposed Action would all be located within the boundaries of Grand Forks AFB. The area immediately surrounding Grand Forks AFB is rural and agricultural in nature and development is minimal. Projects approved by the City of Grand Forks occur primarily within the city boundaries, located approximately 12 miles east of Grand Forks AFB. It is therefore unlikely that potential impacts associated with City projects would cause cumulative effects when combined with Proposed Action that would occur on the Installation.

3.2 RESOURCES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

CEQ regulations state that federal agencies should "identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant, or which have been covered by prior environmental review(s)" (<u>40 CFR §</u> <u>1501.9(f)(1)</u>). Accordingly, the Air Force considered but eliminated from further analysis the following resource areas: land use, visual resources, socioeconomics, and environmental justice and protection of children. The Proposed Action would occur entirely within the Installation and would be consistent with existing land use and visual landscapes. No permanent change in personnel would occur, resulting in no socioeconomic impacts. No local populations or communities with environmental justice concerns would be impacted by the Proposed Action or Alternative.

 Table 3-1.

 Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Environmental Trends and Planned Actions

Name	Description	Timeframe	Approximate Distance from Base
Federal Projects			
Multiple projects at Grand Forks AFB as part of the Installation Development Plan	Demolition of existing facilities, renovation projects, and construction projects	NEPA complete, ongoing construction	On Base
Nodak Electric Cooperative Facility on Grand Forks AFB	Construction of a 5,000-square-foot building	NEPA complete, ongoing construction	On Base
Kelly Slough National Wildlife Refuge	Refuge includes 1,207 acres of land and water. Ongoing wetlands management.	Ongoing activity	Approximately 2 miles
Non-Federal Projects			
Mixed-Use Business Park on Enhanced Use Lease at GrandSKY Business Park	Development of a business park to support research, testing and evaluation, and operations of unmanned aerial systems, as well as activities centered on the development of sensor technology and data management	NEPA ongoing; ongoing construction	Leased Grand Forks AFB property
Grand Forks Airport Runway Construction Grand Forks Airport Runway		Ongoing	Approximately 8 miles

AFB = Air Force Base; NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act

3.3 RESOURCES CARRIED FORWARD FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS

The Air Force considered Grand Forks AFB and its environs as the ROI for each environmental resource. None of the projects under the Proposed Action or Alternative would occur outside the boundaries of Grand Forks AFB. The following resources were carried forward for analysis: noise; safety; air quality; biological resources; water resources; geology and soils; cultural resources; hazardous materials and waste, toxic substances, and contaminated sites; and infrastructure, including transportation and utilities.

3.4 Noise

3.4.1 Definition of the Resource

Sound is a physical phenomenon consisting of minute vibrations exhibited as waves, measured in frequency and amplitude, which travel through a medium, such as air or water, and are sensed by the human ear. Noise is generally described as unwanted sound. Unwanted sound can be based on objective effects (such as hearing loss or damage to structures) or subjective judgments (community annoyance). Noise analysis thus requires assessing a combination of physical measurement of sound, physical and physiological effects, and psycho- and socio-acoustic effects. The response of different individuals to similar noise events is diverse and influenced by the type of noise, the perceived importance of the noise, its appropriateness in the setting, the time of day, the type of activity during which the noise occurs, and the sensitivity of the individual. Noise may also affect wildlife through disruption of nesting, foraging, migration, and other life-cycle activities.

The ROI for noise is Grand Forks AFB.

Noise Metrics

Noise and sound levels are expressed in logarithmic units measured by decibels (dB). A sound level of 0 dB is approximately the threshold of human hearing and is barely audible under extremely quiet listening conditions. Normal speech equates to a sound level of approximately 60 dB; sound levels above 120 dB begin to be felt inside the human ear as discomfort, and sound levels between 130 and 140 dB are felt as pain (Berglund and Lindvall, 1995).

All sound contains a spectral content, which means the magnitude or level differs by frequency, where frequency is measured in cycles per second, or hertz. To mimic the human ear's non-linear sensitivity and perception of different frequencies of sound, the spectral content is weighted. For example, environmental noise measurements usually employ an "A-weighted" scale, denoted as dBA, that de-emphasizes very low and very high frequencies to better replicate human sensitivity. All sound levels presented in this document are A-weighted unless otherwise noted.

Leq is defined as the equivalent steady state sound level which in a stated period of time contains the same acoustic energy as the time varying sound level during the same time period. Leq(h) is defined as the hourly value of Leq in dBA is often used for construction noise analysis. A Leq(h) over 67 dBA would require mitigation measures for certain noise sensitive receptors (Department of Transportation, 2006).

3.4.2 Existing Conditions

The primary sources of noise on Grand Forks AFB are airfield operations, industrial activities, and vehicular traffic. Noise-sensitive receptors on the Base include the Medical Clinic; Education Center; Nathan Twining Elementary and Middle School; Dakota Lanes Bowling Alley; the Military and Family Readiness Center; and the residential communities, dormitories, administrative buildings, library, aquatic and fitness centers, playgrounds, and recreation trails. No noise sensitive off-base receptors are located within 1 mile of the project area.

Typical ambient sound levels on the Base have been modeled previously for a noise effects assessment as part of the *Final Supplemental EA* for the Relocation of the North Dakota Air Branch to Grand Forks Air Force Base (Air Force, 2017). Modeling results for that assessment indicate an existing DNL range from 65 to 75 dBA DNL across Grand Forks AFB.

3.4.3 Environmental Consequences

3.4.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

When evaluating noise effects, several aspects are examined:

- the degree to which noise levels generated by training and operations, as well as construction, demolition, and renovation activities, would be higher than the ambient noise levels;
- the degree to which there would be hearing loss and/or annoyance; and
- the proximity of noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., residences, schools, hospitals, parks) to the noise source.

An environmental analysis of noise includes the potential effects on the local population and estimates the extent and magnitude of the noise generated by the Proposed Action and Alternatives.

3.4.3.2 Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, all project activities would occur entirely on Grand Forks AFB property. The affected environment for noise effects from these activities and ongoing operations is narrowly focused and compact, and generally would include the area lying within 0.5 mile to 1 mile of the proposed projects. Most noise-sensitive receptors are located on the opposite side of the runway from the proposed project area and would be unlikely to experience noise impacts associated with reconstruction and fence replacement activities.

The Proposed Action would cause short-term, localized noise impacts during construction activities. Sound would be generated from construction equipment and traffic. Sound levels of typical construction equipment are listed in **Table 3-2**. However, the equipment would be operated intermittently during construction, and potential noise impacts would be short term and limited to daylight hours during the construction period. Noise from the operation of construction equipment would be generally short term, intermittent, and highly localized, with the loudest machinery typically producing peak sound pressure levels ranging from 86 to 95 dBA at a 50-foot distance from the source (**Table 3-2**). Sound typically attenuates at approximately 6 dBA per every doubling of the distance from the sound source. The presence of existing buildings also would help attenuate the sound level. At a distance of 1600 feet, the sound generated from construction equipment would be less than 67 dBA as recommend by the Department of Transportation (2006). Additionally, adherence to standard Air Force Occupational Safety and Health regulations that require hearing protection along with other personnel protective equipment and safety training would minimize the risk of hearing loss to construction workers. Therefore, noise associated with construction projects under the Proposed Action would not be anticipated to result in any significant direct or indirect impacts on noise-sensitive receptors.

Equipment	Sound Pressure Level (dBA)	
Bulldozer	85	
Scraper	85	
Front Loader	80	
Backhoe	80	
Grader	85	
Crane	85	
Source: Department of Transportation, 2006		
Note:		
dBA = A-weighted decibel		

 Table 3-2.

 Peak Sound Pressure Level of Construction Equipment from a Distance of 50 Feet

There would be no increases in operational noise with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.4.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

Project activities associated with the Proposed Action would result in temporary, localized noise increases. Noise could be compounded by other construction projects occurring concurrently. All development would be implemented in areas already subject to a high level of noise from aircraft operations, which is the primary source of noise on Grand Forks AFB. In order to minimize disturbance to local residences, workplaces, and sensitive receptors, noise attenuation measures would be incorporated into design and implementation. No reconstruction or fence replacement activities would take place after 10 p.m. or prior to 7 a.m.

No operational change to the noise environment would occur as a result of the Proposed Action or any past, present, or reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB. Aircraft operations would continue to be the dominant source of noise. When considered in conjunction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB, no significant cumulative impacts on the noise environment would be anticipated with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.4.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no project activities would occur on Grand Forks AFB. Noise in the area would not change from baseline conditions, and no significant impacts on noise-sensitive receptors would be anticipated.

3.5 SAFETY

3.5.1 Definition of the Resource

This section discusses safety concerns associated with ground, explosives, and flight activities. Ground safety considers issues associated with ground operations and maintenance activities that support unit operations including arresting gear capability, jet blast/maintenance testing, and safety danger. Aircraft maintenance testing occurs in designated safety zones. Ground safety also considers the safety of personnel and facilities on the ground that may be placed at risk from flight operations in the vicinity of the airfield. Clear zones (CZs) and accident potential zones (APZs) around the airfield restrict the public's exposure to areas where there is a higher accident potential. Although ground and flight safety are addressed separately, in the immediate vicinity of the runway, risks associated with safety-of-flight issues are interrelated with ground safety concerns.

Explosives safety relates to the management and safe use of ordnance and munitions. Flight safety considers aircraft flight risks such as midair collision, BASH, and in-flight emergency. The Air Force adheres to safety procedures and aircraft-specific emergency procedures produced by the original equipment manufacturer. Basic airmanship procedures also exist for handling any deviations to air traffic control procedures due to an in-flight emergency; these procedures are defined in Volume 3 of DAFI 11-202, *General Flight Rules*, and established aircraft flight manuals. The Flight Crew Information File is a safety resource for Aircrew day-to-day operations and contains air and ground operation rules and procedures.

The primary federal statute addressing occupational hazards is the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* (29 <u>USC §§ 651–678</u>) which created the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. The Air Force is required to ensure the occupational health and safety of all personnel through implementation of Department of the Air Force Manual 91-203, *Air Force Occupational Safety, Fire, and Health Standards* (2022), and DAFI 91-202, *The US Air Force Mishap Prevention Program* (2023), which implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 91-2, *Safety Programs* (2019).

The ROI for safety is Grand Forks AFB.

3.5.2 Existing Conditions

3.5.2.1 Flight Safety

The primary safety concern for military aircraft activity is the potential for aircraft accidents. Research in accident potential conducted by the Air Force found that the majority of accidents occurred during takeoff or landing and were clustered along the runway and its extended centerline. This resulted in the designation of safety zones around airfields and restriction of incompatible land uses to reduce the public's exposure to safety hazards. CZs and APZs are designated rectangular safety zones extending outward from the ends of active military airfields that delineate areas recognized as having the greatest risk of aircraft accidents (**Figure 3-1**). Project activities under the Proposed Action would be located within the CZ and APZ I; therefore, APZ II is not analyzed further.

Clear Zones

The CZ extends to the north and south of the runway and has the highest accident potential of airfield safety zones, with 27 percent of airfield accidents studied occurring in this zone (Grand Forks AFB, 2018a). The CZ is a 3,000 x 3,000 square-foot area centered on and abutting each end of the north-south oriented runway, as required under Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 3-260-01, *Airfield and Helicopter Planning and Design*, which provides standardized airfield and airspace criteria for geometric layout, design, and construction (**Figure 3-1**). Open space (undeveloped) and agricultural uses (excluding raising livestock) are the only uses deemed compatible in a CZ; development within the 413 acres of CZ is prohibited, in accordance with UFC 3-260-01 (Grand Forks AFB, 2017).





Accident Potential Zone I

APZ I is an area with less accident potential than the CZ, with 10 percent of accidents studied occurring in this zone. While the potential for aircraft accidents in APZ I does not warrant land acquisition by the Air Force, land use planning and controls are strongly encouraged in these areas for the protection of the public.

APZ I extends across the Base boundary north and south of the Base, beginning where the CZ ends and extending an additional 5,000 feet. An Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study conducted in 1995 indicated that land use within the APZs is undeveloped or in agricultural production, and current conditions are similar (Grand Forks AFB, 2017, 2018b).

Bird/Wildlife Air Strike Hazard

BASH constitutes a safety concern because of the potential for damage to aircraft or injury to aircrews or local populations should an aircraft crash occur in a populated area. The number of air strikes annually reported nationwide to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has increased from 1990 to 2018. The increase in reporting is partly due to education initiatives by the FAA and technology upgrades making it easier to report such strikes. The number of damaging strikes has declined during this same time. It is noteworthy that the percentage of damaging wildlife strikes has averaged 8 percent over the same 29-year period; this number has declined from 20 percent in 1990 to 4 percent in 2018. It is suggested that the decline is due to mitigating efforts made at airports. Nationwide, waterfowl, gulls, and raptors are the species groups of birds with the most damaging strikes. Management actions at airports are prioritized based on the hazard level of species observed in the aircraft operating area (FAA and US Department of Agriculture [USDA], 2021).

From January 2010 through August 2023, Grand Forks AFB reported 28 wildlife strikes. These strikes have a tendency to peak at certain times of year, particularly in the spring and summer months (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). This can be attributed to migrations of birds and peaks in overall populations due to natural reproduction. Gull species account for more than 20 percent of strikes at both Grand Forks International Airport and all North Dakota airports. Unknown bird species strikes account for the largest category of strikes in North Dakota. The wildlife struck at Grand Forks AFB from 2010 to 2023 comprise the following 18 species: passerines (15 strikes), shorebird (4 strikes), raptor (1 strike), upland (2 strikes), gulls (1 strike), icterid (2 strikes), apodiformes (1 strike), mammal (1 strike), and unknown (1 strike) (Grand Forks, 2023).White-tailed deer are also a potential hazard to aircraft operations.

Dispersal of wildlife from the airfield at Grand Forks AFB is currently accomplished using a variety of harassment techniques including pyrotechnics, firearms, and vehicles. In 2019, the BASH program added permitted trapping of raptors to the BASH prevention toolkit and was able to trap and relocate 17 raptors in a 3-month period during the first year (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b).

3.5.2.2 Explosives Safety

Defense Explosives Safety Regulation 6055.09_AFMAN 91-201, *Explosives Safety Standards*, establishes the size of the clearance zone around facilities used to store, handle, and maintain munitions based on the quantity-distance criteria. Defined distances are maintained between munitions storage areas and a variety of other types of facilities. These distances, called explosives safety quantity-distance (ESQD) arcs, are associated with the munitions storage and hot cargo pads, the CZs associated with the runway, and the noise zones associated with airfield operations (Grand Forks AFB, 2017). Within these ESQD arcs, development is either restricted or prohibited.

3.5.2.3 Construction Safety

Under <u>40 CFR § 989.27</u>, the EIAP for an action must assess direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action and alternatives on the safety and health of Air Force employees and others at a work site. AFPD 91-2, *Safety Programs,* is implemented by DAFI 91-202, which manages risks to protect Air Force personnel from occupational deaths, injuries, or illnesses and minimize loss of Air Force resources. These standards, in addition to adherence to the Air Force's Mishap Prevention Program, serve to ensure that all Air Force workplaces meet federal safety and health requirements, and applies to all Air Force activities.

All construction contractors at Grand Forks AFB must follow ground safety regulations and worker's compensation programs to avoid posing any risks to workers or personnel on or off Base. Construction contractors are responsible for reviewing potentially hazardous workplace operations, monitoring exposure to workplace chemicals (e.g., asbestos, lead, hazardous materials), physical hazards (e.g., noise propagation, slips, trips, falls), and biological agents (e.g., infectious waste, wildlife, poisonous plants). Construction contractors are required to recommend and evaluate controls (e.g., preventative, administrative, engineering) to ensure that personnel are properly protected and to implement a medical surveillance program to perform occupational health physicals for those workers subject to any accidental chemical exposures.

3.5.3 Environmental Consequences

3.5.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Impacts from the Proposed Action and Alternative are assessed according to the potential to increase or decrease safety risks to personnel, the public, property, or the environment. For the purposes of this EA, an impact is considered significant if Air Force OSHA criteria are exceeded or if established or proposed safety measures are not be properly implemented, resulting in unacceptable safety risk to personnel.

3.5.3.2 Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, project activities would not result in a change to existing CZs, APZs, or ESQD arcs; therefore, no impacts to CZs, APZs, or ESQD arcs would be expected.

The Proposed Action would have a beneficial impact to BASH safety by meeting DAFI regulations and standards and would remove the noncompliance issue associated with the Installation's requested vegetation height waiver. Such actions would have the potential to help to minimize the risk of strikes, crashes, and other incidents related to the interaction of birds, wildlife, and aircraft. Grand Forks AFB primarily operates unmanned aerial vehicles/drones that cost millions of dollars to manufacture. Reducing the potential risk for bird and wildlife strikes would likewise reduce costs of replacing unmanned aerial vehicles damaged from bird/wildlife strikes.

Construction activities can potentially expose personnel to health and safety hazards from heavyequipment operation, construction safety, hazardous materials and chemicals use, and working in noisy environments. Therefore, short-term, negligible-to-minor, adverse impacts on construction contractor health and safety would be anticipated as a result of proposed construction projects under the Proposed Action. To minimize health and safety risks, contractors would be required to use appropriate personal protective equipment and establish and maintain site-specific health and safety programs that follow all applicable OSHA regulations for their employees. Additionally, all construction contractors at Grand Forks AFB would be required to follow ground safety regulations and worker's compensation programs to avoid posing any risks to workers or personnel on or off Base.

3.5.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

When considered in conjunction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB, the Proposed Action would not be expected to adversely impact ground safety, safety zones, explosives safety, and emergency response. Of the projects listed in **Table 3-1**, none would have long-term safety impacts within the ROI. Construction activities that would occur under the projects in **Table 3-1** would follow appropriate guidelines for the safety of construction workers and the public. Nearby construction at GrandSKY business park would have no cumulative impacts with construction safety at Grand Forks AFB.

Beneficial cumulative impacts to flight safety would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action. If future actions increase the number of planes and sorties, flight safety could be impacted proportionally to the increase in operations. Future actions would need to be evaluated for those impacts.

3.5.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. There would be no changes to safety beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.

Aircraft operations are expected to increase over time at Grand Forks AFB. The Base has grown from solely RQ-4 Global Hawk operations to include University of North Dakota flights with approximately 30 different types of small, unmanned aircraft systems flown by 10 different agencies and operators, as well as transient aircraft. This does not include any future Air Force aircraft that may become the primary mission after the projected divestment of the RQ-4 Global Hawk over the next 5 years. Under the No Action Alternative, an increased number of flights would increase potential flight safety concerns associated with BASH because airfield vegetation would not be removed. Therefore, the risk of an aircraft crash would continue to increase as the number of flights per day increases under the No Action Alternative.

3.6 AIR QUALITY

3.6.1 Definition of the Resource

Ambient air quality in a specified area or region is measured by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. Pollutant concentrations in the air are affected by the amount of pollutants in the atmosphere and the extent to which these pollutants can be transported and diluted in the air.

3.6.1.1 Criteria Pollutants

Under the CAA, the USEPA is required to develop, implement, and enforce strong regulations to ensure clean and healthy ambient air quality. In response, the USEPA developed numerical concentration-based standards known as the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) (<u>40 CFR Part 50</u>) to determine pollutant impacts to human health and the environment.

NAAQS are currently established for six criteria air pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, respirable particulate matter (i.e., particulates equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter [PM₁₀] and particulates equal to or less than 2.5 microns in diameter [PM_{2.5}]), and lead. The USEPA has established standards for both primary and secondary NAAQS. The primary NAAQS represent maximum levels of background air pollution that are considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety to protect public health. Secondary NAAQS represent the maximum pollutant concentration necessary to protect vegetation, crops, and other public resources in addition to maintaining visibility standards. The USEPA and NDDEQ regulate air quality in North Dakota. States can adopt standards stricter than those established by the USEPA. **Table 3-3** presents the USEPA NAAQS for federally listed criteria pollutants that the state follows, as well as the additional state-only standards as provided in North Dakota Administrative Code Chapter 33.1-15.02-07.

Ozone is not usually emitted directly into the air, but rather is formed in the atmosphere by photochemical reactions involving sunlight and previously emitted pollutants or "ozone precursors." Such ozone precursors consist primarily of nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds that are directly emitted from a wide range of emissions sources. For this reason, regulatory agencies limit atmospheric ozone concentrations by controlling volatile organic compound pollutants (also identified as reactive organic gases) and nitrogen oxides.

The USEPA has recognized that particulate matter emissions can have different health effects depending on particle size and, therefore, developed separate NAAQS for coarse particulate matter (PM_{10}) and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$). The pollutant $PM_{2.5}$ can be emitted from emission sources directly as very fine dust and/or liquid mist or formed secondarily in the atmosphere as condensable particulate matter typically forming nitrate and sulfate compounds. Secondary (indirect) emissions vary by region depending upon the predominant emission sources located there and thus which precursors are considered significant for $PM_{2.5}$ formation and identified for ultimate control.

3.6.1.2 Air Quality Control Regions

The USEPA has divided the country into geographical regions known as Air Quality Control Regions (AQCRs) to evaluate compliance with NAAQS. When a region exceeds the NAAQS for a pollutant, it is classified as nonattainment for that pollutant. Where the air quality within the area is better than the NAAQS, or if there is not enough information to appropriately classify the area, the area is designated as attainment. Areas that have transitioned from nonattainment to attainment are designated as maintenance areas, and are required to follow requirements in the state's maintenance plans to ensure continued compliance with NAAQS. Grand Forks AFB, located in Grand Forks County, North Dakota, is situated within the North Dakota AQCR. This region is designated by USEPA as attainment/unclassifiable for all criteria pollutants (<u>40 CFR § 81.335</u>).

The ROI for air quality includes Grand Forks AFB and its surrounding areas within the North Dakota AQCR.

Dellutert	NAAQ							
Pollutant	Primary	Secondary	North Dakota AAQS					
Carbon Monoxide								
8-hour average	9 ppm	-	9 ppm					
1-hour average	35 ppm	-	35 ppm					
Nitrogen Dioxide								
Annual arithmetic mean	0.053 ppm	0.053 ppm	0.053 ppm					
1-hour average ^a	0.100 ppm	-	0.100 ppm					
Ozone								
8-hour average ^b	0.070 ppm	0.070 ppm	0.070 ppm					
Lead								
3-month average ^c	0.15 μg/m³	0.15 µg/m³	0.15 µg/m³					
Particulate <10 Micrometers								
24-hour average ^d	150 µg/m³	150 µg/m³	150 µg/m³					
Particulate <2.5 Micrometers								
Annual arithmetic mean ^d	12 µg/m³	15 µg/m³	12 µg/m³					
24-hour average ^d	35 µg/m³	35 µg/m³	35 μg/m³					
Sulfur Dioxide								
1-hour average ^e	0.075 ppm	-	0.075 ppm					
3-hour average ^e	-	0.5 ppm	0.5 ppm					
Hydrogen Sulfide								
Instantaneous	-	- 10 ppm						
1-hour average	-	- 0.2 ppm						
24-hour average	-	-	0.1 ppm					
Quarter (over 3-consecutive months)	-	-	- 0.02 ppm					

Table 3-3. National and North Dakota Ambient Air Quality Standards

Source: USEPA NAAQS table; NDDEQ AAQS table

AAQS = ambient air quality standards; NAAQS = National Ambient Air Quality Standards; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter with a diameter equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers; PM₁₀ = particulate matter with a diameter equal or less than 10 micrometers; μg/m³ = microgram(s) per cubic meter; mg/m³ = milligram(s) per cubic meter; ppb = part(s) per billion; ppm = part(s) per million; USEPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency

Notes:

a In February 2010, the USEPA established a new 1-hour standard for nitrogen dioxide at a level of 0.100 ppm, based on the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the yearly distribution concentration, to supplement the then-existing annual standard.

b In October 2015, the USEPA revised the level of the 8-hour standard to 0.070 ppm, based on the annual 4th highest daily maximum concentration, averaged over 3 years; the regulation became effective on 28 December 2015. The previous (2008) standard of

0.075 ppm remains in effect for some areas. A 1-hour standard no longer exists effective June 15, 2005, for all areas in North Dakota.

- c In November 2008, USEPA revised the primary lead standard to 0.15 μg/m³. USEPA revised the averaging time to a rolling 3-month average.
- d In October 2006, USEPA revised the level of the 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard to 35 μg/m³ and retained the level of the annual PM_{2.5} standard at 15 μg/m³. In 2012, USEPA split standards for primary & secondary annual PM_{2.5}. All are averaged over 3 years, with the 24-hour average determined at the 98th percentile for the 24-hour standard. USEPA retained the 24-hour primary standard and revoked the annual primary standard for PM₁₀.
- e In 2012, the USEPA retained a secondary 3-hour standard, which is not to be exceeded more than once per year. In June 2010, USEPA established a new 1-hour sulfur dioxide standard at a level of 75 ppb, based on the 3-year average of the annual 99th percentile of 1-hour daily maximum concentrations.

3.6.1.3 General Conformity

Under the CAA, the USEPA established the General Conformity Rule (<u>40 CFR Part 93</u>) which applies to federal actions occurring in nonattainment or maintenance areas. The rule is designed to ensure that federal actions do not impede local efforts to achieve or maintain attainment with the NAAQS.

Federal actions are evaluated to determine if the total indirect and direct net emissions from the project are below *de minimis* levels for each of the pollutants as specified in 40 CFR § 93.153. If *de minimis* levels are not exceeded for any of the pollutants, no further evaluation is required. However, if net emissions from the project exceed the *de minimis* thresholds for one or more of the specified pollutants, a demonstration of conformity, as prescribed in the General Conformity Rule, is required.

3.6.1.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. These emissions are generated by both natural processes and human activities. The accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere helps regulate the earth's temperature, and increases in GHG emissions due to human activities is believed to contribute to elevated global temperatures. GHGs include water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, ozone, and several hydrocarbons and chlorofluorocarbons. Direct GHG emissions result from the operation of equipment and vehicles that burn fuels such as natural gas, diesel fuel, or gasoline. Purchased electricity that emits GHG emissions during energy generation is termed indirect GHG emissions.

Each GHG has an estimated global warming potential (GWP), which is a function of its atmospheric lifetime and its ability to absorb and radiate infrared energy emitted from the earth's surface. The GWP of a particular gas provides a relative basis for calculating its carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e). Carbon dioxide has a GWP of 1 and is, therefore, the standard by which all other GHGs are measured. The GHGs are multiplied by their GWP, and the resulting values are added together to estimate the total equivalent emissions of carbon dioxide (i.e., CO_2e).

In North Dakota, the USEPA regulates GHG primarily through a permitting program known as the GHG Tailoring Rule. This rule applies to GHG emissions from larger stationary sources. In addition, the USEPA promulgated a rule requiring specific sources to report their GHG emissions if they emit 25,000 metric tons or more of CO₂e per year ($40 \text{ CFR } \S 98.2(a)(2)$). These requirements only apply to stationary sources of emissions.

Per the CEQ interim guidance released January of 2023, "Agencies should exercise judgment when considering whether to apply this guidance to the extent practicable to an ongoing NEPA process," (88 FR 1196). The Air Force guidance on applying and conducting a Social Cost of GHG Analysis is under development. The Air Force guidance will be released shortly and will provide specifics on applying Social Cost of GHG Analyses and ensure standardization across the Air Force. Therefore, no Social Cost of GHG Analysis will be conducted for EAs and EISs that are currently ongoing.

3.6.2 Existing Conditions

3.6.2.1 Regional Climate

Grand Forks AFB is in the northeastern part of North Dakota and its climate is representative of that of the Northern Great Plains. Its regional climate is characterized by cold winters and warm to hot summers and

experiences wide extremes in temperatures. The warmest month in the region is July, with average high and low temperatures of 81 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) and 56°F, respectively. January is the coldest month, with an average high temperature of 17°F and average low temperature of -3°F. The wettest month by average precipitation is July, with an average of 3.48 inches of rain. The driest month is February, with an average of 0.52 inch of precipitation. December and January are the months with the highest average snowfall of 11 inches (US Climate Data, 2019).

3.6.2.2 Air Quality Status and Existing Emissions

Grand Forks AFB is in Grand Forks County, which is in attainment/unclassifiable for all criteria pollutants (USEPA, 2023a). As a result, the General Conformity Rule does not apply to the Proposed Action and no conformity analysis is required. The NDDEQ owns and operates a network of eight ambient air quality monitoring sites located across the state. NDDEQ air quality monitoring data show that the air quality in the region, including Grand Forks County, is generally good and there were no exceedances of either the federal or state ambient air quality standards in calendar year 2021 for ozone, nitrogen oxides, or particulate matter (NDDEQ, 2022).

3.6.2.3 Climate Change Considerations

Ongoing global climate change has the potential to increase average temperatures and cause more frequent rainstorms in the Great Plains region of the US, including North Dakota (USEPA, 2016). These variations in regional climate patterns could result in changes to flooding frequency, vegetation types, and vegetation growth rates.

3.6.3 Environmental Consequences

3.6.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Because the North Dakota AQCR is in an attainment or unclassifiable area for all NAAQS (<u>40 CFR</u> <u>§81.335</u>); the General Conformity Rule does not apply to the Proposed Action.

When the ROI is in attainment for all NAAQS, the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) value is used as a threshold for all criteria pollutants other than lead. Due to the toxicity of lead, the use of the PSD threshold as an indicator of potential air quality impact insignificance is not protective of human health or the environment. Therefore, the *de minimis* value is used instead. Based on guidance in Chapter 4 of the Air Force's Air Quality EIAP Guide, Volume II, *Advanced Assessments*, proposed project emissions are compared against the insignificance indicator of 250 tons per year (25 tons per year for lead). Insignificance indicators were used in the analysis to provide an indication of the significance of potential impacts to air quality based on current ambient air quality relative to the NAAQS. These indicators do not define a significant impact; however, they do provide a threshold to identify actions that are insignificant. Any action with net emissions below the insignificance indicators for all criteria pollutant is considered so insignificant that the action would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of one or more NAAQSs.

3.6.3.2 Methodology

The Air Conformity Applicability Model (ACAM), (version 5.0.17b), developed by the Air Force Civil Engineering Center, was used to estimate air emissions associated with fugitive dust from earthdisturbance activities and operation of heavy-duty construction equipment and vehicles under the Proposed Action (see **Section 2.1**). The ACAM was run assuming that all construction would occur within a 12-month period. By doing so, emissions are estimated for the Proposed Action activities using the most conservative timeline scenario. If emissions estimated using the conservative approach do not exceed any of the significant thresholds or indicators, it can be safely assumed that there would be no exceedances in air emissions calculated using any other alternative scenario timelines.

The ACAM summary report and assumptions of the data used in the ACAM to estimate emissions are included in **Appendix D**.

3.6.3.3 Proposed Action

Emissions from the Proposed Action would primarily result from project activities associated with the following key actions: reconstruction of ground topography, regrading airfield's West Ditch for drainage improvement, drainage system redesign, perimeter fence replacement. Emissions would also occur from construction related vehicles off-site, including the hauling of fill material. **Table 3-4** compares the annual estimated emissions from implementation of the Proposed Action with the insignificance indicator for each criteria pollutant. The highest annual emission rate from construction activities would be for PM₁₀ (93.782 tons per year), which would be below the insignificance indicator value. Impacts from earthwork projects, such as grading and trenching, would be primarily localized, with emissions occurring only during construction. Less-than-significant effects on air quality would be anticipated from implementing the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would result in short-term, moderate, adverse impacts to air quality within the ROI.

No new stationary sources of air emissions would be anticipated as part of the Proposed Action. The addition of any new stationary sources in the future would need to comply with air quality permitting and operating requirements that apply to Grand Forks AFB.

Activity	Emissions (tons per year)							
Activity	CO	NOx	PM 10	PM _{2.5}	SOx	VOC	Lead	NH₃
Reconstructing ground topography	1.859	1.911	65.071	0.071	0.006	0.343	0.000	0.0007
Regrading airfield West Ditch	0.298	0.237	4.187	0.009	0.001	0.042	0.000	0.0001
Redesigning the drainage system	1.196	1.064	22.711	0.038	0.004	0.202	0.000	0.0004
Replacing fencing	0.653	0.629	1.813	0.023	0.002	0.116	0.000	0.000
Proposed Action Total ^{a,b}	4.006	3.841	93.782	0.14	0.013	0.703	0.000	0.001
Insignificance Indicator ^c (tpy)	250	250	250	250	250	250	25	250
Exceedance (Yes/No)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

 Table 3-4.

 Annual Emissions under the Proposed Action Compared with Insignificance Indicator

ACAM = Air Conformity Applicability Model; CO = carbon monoxide; NAAQS = National Ambient Air Quality Standards; NH₃ = ammonia; NO_x = nitrogen oxides; PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide; tpy = tons per year; VOC – volatile organic compound; Notes:

a ACAM output results.

b Implementation for all construction projects is assumed to occur during one calendar year (2024).

c Insignificance indicator values are for attainment area criteria pollutants. The Installation is in an attainment/unclassified area for all criteria pollutants of federal NAAQS.

The North Dakota Administrative Code specifies non-permitting requirements, such as control of fugitive dust (Chapter 33-15-17) and prohibitions for open burning (Chapter 33-15-04). Grand Forks AFB and its contractors would comply with applicable regulations and take reasonable measures for mitigating dust that may become airborne during grading, excavating, and land-clearing activities.

Total CO₂e emissions from the Proposed Action would be approximately 1,264.1 tons from construction activities (**Table 3-5**). North Dakota's 2020 GHG emissions is reported to be approximately 54.3 million metric tons of CO₂e from all sectors (US Energy Information Administration, 2020), which translates to approximately 59.85 million tons of CO₂e (1 metric ton = 1.10231 tons). As such, the Proposed Action would account for about 0.002 percent of North Dakota's 2020 total GHG emissions, as reported.

The Proposed Action would contribute a small fraction of the state's GHG emissions and would not be expected to result in a significant impact on climate change in the region. Emissions from combustion sources would produce increases in GHG emissions, contributing to the regional GHG inventory, albeit minimal.

Proposed Projects	Estimated GHG Emissions (US tons of CO ₂ e)				
Reconstructing Ground Topography	607.3				
Regrading Airfield West Ditch	74.6				
Redesign of the Drainage System	371.4				
Fence Replacement	210.8				
Proposed Action Total	1264.1				

Table 3-5.Estimated GHG Emissions from Proposed Projects

 CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent; GHG = greenhouse gas

There would be no significant impacts to air quality from the Proposed Action; therefore, no mitigation would be required. Best Management Practices (BMPs) that apply to Grand Forks AFB for construction and demolition would include dust suppression techniques, such as water spraying, which would result in lower emissions than those estimated in this section (see **Table 3-4**).

3.6.3.4 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the Proposed Action would result in a short-term temporary increase in constructionrelated emissions. Should reconstruction activities at Grand Forks AFB occur at the same time as other construction, demolition, or renovation projects, temporary cumulative effects to air quality as a result of increased particulate matter and dust in the air could occur. However, implementation of the Proposed Action would be required to implement BMPs to reduce fugitive dust and combustion emissions during construction activities to acceptable levels. Annual construction emissions associated with the Proposed Action are not expected to exceed *de minimis* thresholds during any year of cumulative project implementation.

Of the projects listed in **Table 3-1**, none would be anticipated to result in significant operational air quality impacts. Air quality impacts associated with these projects would occur as a result of construction and would be temporary in nature. Because no operational impacts to air quality would occur, the Proposed Action and projects listed in **Table 3-1** would not contribute significantly to any potential cumulative impacts to air quality. When considered in conjunction with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB, no significant cumulative effects to air quality would be anticipated with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.6.3.5 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would not generate any new construction emissions and would not change emissions from current emissions levels in the ROI. As a result, no impacts would occur to regional air quality under the No Action Alternative.

3.7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.7.1 Definition of the Resource

Biological resources include native or invasive plants and animals; sensitive and protected floral and faunal species; and the associated habitats, such as wetlands, forests, grasslands, cliffs, and caves in which they exist. Habitat can be defined as the resources and conditions in an area that support a defined suite of organisms. The following is a description of the primary federal statutes that form the regulatory framework for the evaluation of biological resources.

The ROI for biological resources is Grand Forks AFB.
3.7.1.1 Endangered Species Act

The ESA established protection for threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. Sensitive and protected biological resources include plant and animal species listed as threatened, endangered, or special status by USFWS. The ESA also allows the designation of geographic areas as critical habitat for threatened or endangered species. Under the ESA, an "endangered species" is defined as any species in danger of extinction throughout all, or a large portion, of its range. A "threatened species" is defined as any species likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future. USFWS maintains a list of candidate species under evaluation for possible listing as threatened or endangered under the ESA. Although candidate species receive no statutory protection under the ESA, USFWS has attempted to advise government agencies, industry, and the public that these species are at risk and may warrant protection in the future under the ESA.

3.7.1.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The MBTA makes it unlawful for anyone to take migratory birds or their parts, nests, or eggs unless permitted to do so by regulations. Per the MBTA, "take" is defined as "pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect" (50 CFR § 10.12). Birds protected under the MBTA include nearly all species in the US except for non-native/human-introduced species and some game birds.

EO 13186, *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, requires all federal agencies undertaking activities that may negatively impact migratory birds to follow a prescribed set of actions to further implement MBTA. EO 13186 directs federal agencies to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with USFWS that promotes the conservation of migratory birds. The DoD has signed a MOU with the USFWS to promote the conservation of migratory birds while sustaining the use of military managed lands and airspace for testing, training, and operations. (DoD 2014). Under the terms of the MOU, operational safety takes precedence over conservation in airfield environments.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314, 116 Stat. 2458) provided the Secretary of the Interior the authority to prescribe regulations to exempt the Armed Forces from the incidental take of migratory birds during authorized military readiness activities. Congress defined military readiness activities as all training and operations of the US Armed Forces that relate to combat and the adequate and realistic testing of military equipment, vehicles, weapons, and sensors for proper operation and suitability for combat use. Further, in October of 2012, the Authorization of Take Incidental to Military Readiness Activities was published in the *Federal Register* (50 CFR § 21.15), authorizing incidental take during military readiness such activities may result in significant adverse effects on a population of a migratory bird species.

In December 2017, the US Department of the Interior issued M-Opinion 37050, *The Migratory Bird Treaty Act Does Not Prohibit Incidental Take*, which concluded that the take of migratory birds from an activity is not prohibited by the MBTA when the purpose of that activity is not the take of a migratory birds, eggs, or nests. On 11 August 2020, the US District Court, Southern District of New York, vacated M-37050. Thus, incidental take of migratory birds is again prohibited. The interpretation of the MBTA remains in flux, and additional court proceedings are expected.

3.7.1.3 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

The *Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940* (<u>16 USC §§ 668–668d</u>) (BGEPA) prohibits actions to "take, possess, sell, purchase, barter, offer to sell, purchase or barter, transport, export or import, at any time or any manner, any bald eagle [or any golden eagle], alive or dead, or any part, nest, or egg thereof." Further, the BGEPA defines "take" as:

[P]ursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, molest or disturb.

The BGEPA defines "disturb" as:

[T]o agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, injury to an eagle, a decrease in productivity

by substantially interfering with the eagle's normal breeding, feeding or sheltering behavior, or nest abandonment by substantially interfering with the eagle's normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior.

The BGEPA also prohibits activities around an active or inactive nest site that could result in disturbance to returning eagles.

3.7.1.4 Invasive and Noxious Weed Species

Invasive species are non-native species whose introduction causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm, or harm to human, animal, or plant health. EO 13751, *Safeguarding the Nation from the Impacts of Invasive Species*, requires federal agencies to identify actions that may affect invasive species; use relevant programs to prevent introductions of invasive species; detect, respond, and control such species; monitor invasive species populations; and provide for restoration of native species. Invasive species damage native habitat and impede management by outcompeting native species.

Noxious weeds in North Dakota are any plant propagated by either seed or vegetative parts and determined to be injurious to public health, crops, livestock, land, or other property by the state, county, or municipal authority (North Dakota Century Code § 4.1-47-02, <u>Control of Noxious Weeds</u>).

3.7.2 Existing Conditions

3.7.2.1 Ecoregion Description

Based on the US Forest Service's use of Bailey's Ecoregions, the ROI for the Proposed Action, is located within the Humid Temperate Domain (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). The Humid Temperate Domain, is influenced by both tropical and polar air masses. Within the Humid Temperate Domain, there are six divisions; Grand Forks AFB is located within the Prairie Division. Climates in the Prairie Division are subhumid and typically receive between 20 to 40 inches of rain per year. Grand Forks AFB is located entirely within the Lake Agassiz Plain Level III Ecoregion. Ecoregions are used to describe areas of similar type, quality, and quantity of environmental resources (USEPA, 2020). Ecoregions are assigned hierarchical levels to delineate regions spatially based on different levels of planning and reporting needs. Level III ecoregion descriptions provide a regional perspective and are specifically oriented for environmental monitoring, assessment and reporting, and decision-making (Commission for Environmental Cooperation, 1997). The vegetation and wildlife common within the ecoregion on Grand Forks AFB are described below.

Regional Environment

Several natural areas maintained by the State or Federal Government are located within 5–10 miles of Grand Forks AFB, totaling approximately 10,000 acres of grasslands with interspersed wetland and wetland complexes in this area to preserve and protect native and restored prairies. The largest area is the Kellys Slough National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) Greater Complex of more than 6,800 acres located approximately 2 miles east of the Base. This area serves as a major stopover point for migratory waterfowl and shorebirds, providing breeding habitat for several bird species.

The University of North Dakota owns a parcel of land adjacent to the western portion of the Base in Mekinock Township. This parcel runs northwestward from the Installation. Turtle River State Park, which is approximately 6 miles west of Grand Forks AFB on the Turtle River, contains approximately 784 acres of diverse habitat including upland hardwoods, wetlands, and prairie remnants.

3.7.2.2 Vegetation

Of the Base's 5,745 acres of land, much of it was historically agricultural land before construction of Grand Forks AFB in the mid-1950s. During that time, much of the Base was planted in a standard grass mix of smooth bromegrass (*Bromus inermis*), red fescue (*Festuca rubra*), and Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*). Since then, some areas have been improved with native prairie species such as western wheat grass (*Pascopyrum smithii*), little bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*), big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*),

switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum*), sideoats gramma (*Bouteloua curtipendula*), and Indian grass (*Sorghastrum nutans*). However, there are no known natural prairie remnants on Installation property.

Native vegetation is uniquely adapted to growing conditions in this ecotype; introduced and turf-type grasses will not thrive in the combination of hydric soils, salinity, and temperature extremes at Grand Forks AFB. Ponding and open-water areas reduce root depth and vegetation often drowns, causing open, bare areas. These bare soil areas can be seen across Grand Forks AFB with visible white crusts indicating their saline nature.

The majority of the project area is cool-season grassland. Within the project area, unimproved vegetation receives various grounds maintenance management actions such as occasional mowing, woody vegetation removal, and/or prescribed burning actions to provide operational maintenance.

Wetlands cover approximately 93 acres in the project area (see **Section 3.8.2.2**). Most of the wetlands occur on the north end of the project area with a smaller area occurring along the west side. Wetlands are mostly dominated by herbaceous species including rushes (*Juncus* spp.), cattails (*Typhus* spp.), spike-rushes (*Eleocharis* spp.), chainmaker's bulrush (*Scirpus americanus*), hairy-fruit sedge (*Carex trichocarpa*), and prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*) (Grand Forks AFB, 2013a).

Woodland areas on the west sides of the airfield have been identified as a wildlife attractant due to tall trees (**Figure 3-2**). These locations were attractive to raptors to perch as they hunt on the airfield. Many other birds such as crows, blackbirds, sparrows, and songbirds would use this location for perching and loafing.

The Turtle River and associated riparian corridor that extends from Turtle River State Park past Grand Forks AFB is an important link connecting natural ecosystems in the region. The river and riparian area runs through the northwestern corner of the Base, within the project area. The river and its wooded banks serve as both habitat and as a corridor for native wildlife and plants (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b).

3.7.2.3 Wildlife

A diversity of wildlife species is found on the Base nestled in a landscape of mixed-prairie, wetlands, and agricultural fields. Wildlife species observed range from small mammals, such as mice, to larger ungulates, such as white-tailed deer. Migratory birds are common, including waterfowl, neo-tropical migrants, and grassland birds. Mammals observed on Base are primarily small mammals common to grassland habitats, including the plains pocket gopher (*Geomys bursarius*), the Richardson's ground squirrel (*Spermophilus richardsonii*), the thirteen-lined ground squirrel (*Spermophilus tridecemlineatus*), the white-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus townsendii*), eastern cottontail rabbit (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), and the striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*). The wetland areas also provide habitat for shrews, voles, muskrats, weasels, and foxes. All of these species are common to eastern North Dakota (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b).

The Turtle River, which runs through the northwestern corner of the Base, holds at least 14 species of fish (Grand Forks AFB, 2020). Four amphibian species and four reptile species have been identified on Base using available wetland and Turtle River riparian habitats. The identified amphibians include the American toad (*Bufo americanus*), Canadian toad (*Bufo hemiphrys*), northern leopard frog (*Rana pipiens*), and wood frog (*Rana sylvatica*). The reptiles found were the common garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis*), plains garter snake (*Thamnophis radix*), painted turtle (*Chrysemys picta*), and the common snapping turtle (*Chelydra serpentina*). There are 238 bird species known to occur on Grand Forks AFB. The Turtle River area provides habitat for a variety of woodland bird species. Grasslands are recognized as one of the most threatened ecosystems; the Installation's grasslands and wetlands provide habitat for various grassland birds (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b).





3.7.2.4 Threatened, Endangered, and Other Protected Species

Threatened and Endangered Species

Eight federally endangered, threatened, candidate, and critical habitat species are listed by the USFWS as known to occur in Grand Forks County, including the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*), whooping crane (*Grus americana*), northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), Dakota skipper (*Hesperia dacotae*), Poweshiek skipperling (*Oarisma poweshiek*), rusty patched bumble bee (*Bombus affinis*), and Sprague's pipit (*Anthus spragueii*) (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). Through its Information for Planning and Consultation website, the USFWS, on 14 June 2023, identified the following species as potentially affected by activities at Grand Forks AFB: the northern long-eared bat and the monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*), a candidate species.

Surveys for endangered, threatened, candidate, and other protected species and their habitats have been performed within the Installation boundaries. No federally listed threatened or endangered species have been observed on Grand Forks AFB, nor does critical habitat exist within Grand Forks AFB (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). The Installation manages threatened and endangered species proactively to prevent potential listings as well as conserve species that are legally protected or of concern at the state or federal level. Whenever practicable within the constraints of the military mission, Grand Forks AFB will avoid/minimize impacts to the species and manage their habitats found on Base.

The northern long-eared bat has been sighted in North Dakota; however, there is no documentation of northern long-eared bats hibernating in the state. North Dakota is on the very western edge of their range. These bats are endangered primarily because of the white-nose syndrome fungus that is spreading rapidly throughout their range (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b).

The monarch butterfly is a candidate species being considered for protection under the ESA and occurs on Grand Forks AFB. Monarch butterflies feed on nectar from many flower species but breed only where there are milkweeds (*Asclepias* spp.). Monarchs are annual immigrants to North Dakota, arriving as early as mid-May. On Grand Forks AFB, monarch butterflies have been recorded nectaring at such sources as wild bergamot (*Monarda fistulosa*), hoary vervain (*Verbena stricta*), common milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*), narrow-leaved coneflower (*Echinacea angustifolia*), and thistles (*Cirsium*) (Grand Forks AFB, 2014a).

Migratory Birds

Avian surveys have documented over 238 species of birds on Grand Forks AFB with 105 breeding species recorded, many of which are protected under the federal MBTA. Migratory bird species frequent the Base due to the available wetland and grassland habitat and are most likely to occur in the undeveloped areas of the Base. Migratory birds are common, including waterfowl, neo-tropical migrants, and grassland birds. Prairie pothole marshes, like those found on Grand Forks AFB and throughout the region, serve as breeding habitat for many waterfowl species and stopover sites for resting and feeding for all types of birds.

Sixty-two migratory birds classified as species of conservation priority (SCP) by the NDGFD occur on Grand Forks AFB in areas outside of the main cantonment area, including open grasslands, wetlands, and woodlands (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). These include the bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*), black-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus erythropthalmus*), Le Conte's sparrow (*Ammodramus leconteii*), lark bunting (*Calamospiza melanocorys*), American bittern (*Botaurus lentiginosus*), dickcissel (*Spiza americana*), black tern (*Chlidonias niger*), red-headed woodpecker (*Melanerpes erythrocephalus*), chestnut-collared longspur (*Calcarius ornatus*), grasshopper sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*), and Nelson's sparrow (*Ammodramus nelsoni*).

Kellys Slough NWR, approximately 2 miles from the Installation, serves as a migration stopover and staging area for shorebirds and waterfowl (e.g., ducks, geese, and swans) in the area. The closest bald eagle nest to Grand Forks AFB is on the west side of Kellys Slough NWR. A bald eagle was observed on the Installation in 2009 during the winter bird survey in the vicinity of the Turtle River riparian area, and golden eagles have been observed migrating through the Installation during the spring. The Base currently holds a permit to harass bald eagles for aviation safety concerns (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b).

Grand Forks Species of High Priority for Base Conservation

Numerous state SCP have been documented on the Installation. The list of SCPs prioritized by the Base for conservation includes species protected by the ESA, MBTA, and/or the BGEPA, and species that may have no or limited regulatory protection (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b) (**Table 3-6**). SCPs not protected under regulations but prioritized by the Base include the Canadian toad (*Bufo hemiophrys*), mapleleaf mussel (*Quadrula quadrula*), creek heelsplitter (*Lasmigona compressa*) regal fritillary (*Speyeria idalia*), Dutchman's breeches (*Dicentra cucullaria*), lesser yellow lady's slipper (*Cypripedium parviflorum var. parviflorum*), and white lady's slipper (*Cypripedium candidum*) (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). A description of these species can be found in the Grand Forks AFB *Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan* (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). The Canadian toad potentially occurs in wetland areas in the project area. The two mussel species occur in the Turtle River, outside the project area. The lesser yellow lady's slipper and the white lady's slipper orchids have been found growing in intermixing patches on Base, just west of the airfield within the project area and also in the southeastern portions of the Base (see **Figure 3-2**). The NDGFD lists both of these plants as imperiled/rare or uncommon (NDGFD, 2023).

3.7.2.5 Invasive and Noxious Weed Species

Surveys for invasive species and noxious weeds were conducted in 2003, 2008/2009, and 2013. Three invasive plant species are known to occur on Grand Forks AFB: field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvenis*), bull thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), and perennial sowthistle (*Sonchus arvenis*) (Grand Forks AFB, 2013b). Six State-listed noxious weeds have been found on Base: absinth wormwood (*Artemisia absinthium*), Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula*), musk thistle (*Carduus nutans*), spotted knapweed (*Centaurea maculosa*), and kochia (*Kochia scoparia*). Generally, Canada thistle and leafy spurge, along with the invasive species perennial sowthistle, are frequently found throughout the Installation. Weed removal is required under Air Force Manual 91-203, *Air Force Occupational Safety, Fire, and Health Standards* (2022), In addition, North Dakota Weed Law requires landowners to control and prevent the spread of noxious weeds from their properties. The Grand Forks County Weed Control Board is responsible for administering the Noxious Weed Control Program in Grand Forks County (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b; North Dakota Department of Agriculture, 2013).

3.7.3 Environmental Consequences

3.7.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria for potential impacts on biological resources are based on the following:

- importance (i.e., legal, commercial, recreational, ecological, or scientific) of the resource;
- proportion of the resource that would be affected relative to its occurrence in the region;
- sensitivity of the resource to the proposed activities; and
- duration of potential ecological impact.

Adverse impacts on biological resources would occur if the Proposed Action negatively affects species or habitats of high concern over relatively large areas or if estimated disturbances cause reductions in population size or distribution of a species of high concern.

As a requirement under the ESA, federal agencies must provide documentation that ensures that the agency's proposed actions would not adversely affect the existence of any threatened or endangered species. The ESA requires that all federal agencies avoid "taking" federally threatened or endangered species (which includes jeopardizing threatened or endangered species habitat).

Table 3-6.
Species of High Priority for Base Conservation

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status (NDGFD SCP Level) ^a	Habitat	
Amphibians					
Canadian toad	Bufo hymiophyrs	-	1	Shallow wetlands, streams and roadside ditches. Winters in burrows below frost line	
Invertebrates					
Monarch butterfly	Danaus plexippus	-	1	Fields, roadside areas, open areas, wet areas, or urban gardens; milkweed and flowering plants are needed for monarch habitat	
Regal fritillary	Speyeria idalia	-	1	Wet meadows and tallgrass prairie	
Dakota skipper	Hesperia dacotae	Т		Mixed and tallgrass prairie	
Poweshiek skipperling	Oarisma poweshiek	E		Remnants of native prairie	
Rusty patch bumble bee	Bombus affinis	Т		Grasslands and tallgrass prairies	
Mussels			I		
Mapleleaf	Quadrula quadrula	-	3	Large permanent streams. Located in the Turtle River (CE Park)	
Creek heelsplitter	Lasmigona compressa	-	1	Large permanent streams. Located in the Turtle River (CE Park)	
Plants					
Dutchman's breeches	Dicentra cucullaria	-	S1	Early spring bloomer, part shade, woodlands	
Lesser yellow lady's slipper	Cypripedium parviflorum	-	S2/S3	Fields and open Areas, wet areas	
White lady's slipper	Cypripedium candidum	-	S2/S3	Fields and open Areas, wet areas	
Birds					
Bobolink	Dolichonyx oryzivorus	MBTA, BCC	2	Variety of grasslands including tall grass prairie, hay-land, and retired cropland	
Black-billed cuckoo	Coccyzus erythropthalmus	MBTA, BCC	1	Groves of trees, forest edges, and thickets, frequently associated with water	
Le Conte's sparrow	Ammodramus Ieconteii	MBTA, BCC	2	Fens, lowland tracts of tall grass prairie and wet meadows	
Lark bunting	Calamospiza melanocorys	MBTA, BCC	1	Plains, prairies, meadows and sagebrush	
American bittern	Botaurus Ientiginosus	MBTA, BCC	1	Bogs, marshes, and wet meadows	
Dickcissel	Spiza americana	MBTA, BCC	2	Alfalfa, sweet clover, and other brushy grasslands, irruptive species – 2007 on Base	
Black tern	Chlidonias niger	MBTA, BCC	1	Shallow freshwater marshes with emergent vegetation, including prairie slough, lake margins and occasionally river or island edges	
Red-headed woodpecker	Melanerpes erythrocephalus	MBTA, BCC	1	Open forests with clear understories, tree- rows in agricultural areas	
Chestnut- collared longspur	Calcarius ornatus	MBTA, BCC	1	Mixed-grass and short grass uplands. Open prairie and cropland	
Grasshopper sparrow	Ammodramus savannarum	MBTA, BCC	1	Open grasslands and prairies with patches of bare ground	
Nelson's sparrow	Ammodramus nelsoni	MBTA, BCC	1	Freshwater prairie marshes and meadows	

Source: Grand Forks AFB, 2020b; NDGFD, 2023 BCC = Birds of Conservation Concern; MBTA = Migratory Bird Treaty Act. NDGFD = North Dakota Game and Fish Department; SCP = Species of Conservation Priority; T&E = threatened and endangered

Notes:

Plant rankings are obtained from the North Dakota Natural Heritage Program and are as follows: S1 = State-listed critically imperiled; S2 = State-listed imperiled; S3 = State-listed rare or uncommon; а

3.7.3.2 Proposed Action

<u>Vegetation</u>

Vegetation in the project area would be converted to a drier monoculture of grass including approximately 93 acres of wetlands, existing areas with native prairie grasses, and 8 acres of woodland. The areas designated for project activities under the Proposed Action total 1,291 acres. Much of this area is identified as cool-season grassland that is dominated by introduced grasses including Kentucky bluegrass and smooth bromegrass. As part of the Proposed Action, the Base would cultivate airfield vegetation unattractive to wildlife such as a mown monoculture of grass without vertical habitat structure and minimal standing water. Vegetation height would be maintained between 7 and 14 inches. As a result, any grasslands within the project area would be regraded and replaced. Seed selection for the project area would include species adapted to the local area, deemed unattractive for wildlife, able to assist with infiltration rates to aid the removal of standing water, and that can thrive in the local ecotype (and soil types) withstanding repeated mowing to successfully meet DAFI compliance.

Grass species might not grow in bare, saline locations in the areas that are self-improved. The regrading and installation of drainage tile would replace the existing wetland vegetation in the project area with an herbaceous species that is adapted to drier conditions and periodic mowing. This would reduce the attractiveness of the area near the airfield to a wide variety birds adapted to wetlands and a diverse mixture of upland and wetland vegetation. Approximately 8 acres of woodland areas on the west side of the airfield that have been identified as a wildlife attractant would be removed under the Proposed Action (see **Figure 3-2**). The Proposed Action would have permanent, moderate, adverse impacts to vegetation within the ROI.

Two State-listed S2/S3-imperiled/vulnerable species of concern, the lesser yellow lady's slipper and the white lady's slipper orchids, occur within the project area. Under the Proposed Action, approximately 50 acres of lesser yellow lady's slipper and white lady's slipper orchids would likely be uprooted and removed during reconstruction activities in the project area. The Proposed Action would have permanent, moderate adverse impacts on lesser yellow lady's slipper and the white lady's slipper orchids within the ROI.

The Proposed Action would occur adjacent to the rare and significant ecological communities of the Turtle River and the associated lowland woodland community. Plant species of priority within the Turtle River lowland woodlands/riparian forest include the Dutchman's breeches, which is State-listed as S1-critically imperiled. Impacts to this community and this species could occur from runoff from the project area toward Turtle River or if construction boundaries crossed into the area of the Turtle River lowland woodlands/riparian forest.

Overall, the Proposed Action would be anticipated to have permanent, moderate, adverse impacts to vegetation within the ROI.

<u>Wildlife</u>

The conversion of the vegetation within the project area to a drier monoculture of grass would reduce the diversity of wildlife species that currently exists in the mixture of grassland, wetlands, and woodland areas. The Proposed Action would eliminate existing grassland habitat and would regrade and replace existing grasslands and wetlands with airfield vegetation unattractive to wildlife, such as a monoculture of an herbaceous species adapted to drier conditions and tolerant to periodic mowing.

Under the Proposed Action, wildlife would be adversely affected by reducing the quality of available habitat and could relocate to find more attractive habitat on Base or in adjacent landscapes to Grand Forks AFB. The woodland area that would be cleared is adjacent to larger woodland areas along the Turtle River, which may provide suitable habitat for displaced species. The number of common mammals and bird species inhabiting the existing grasslands could be reduced. Many bird species and larger mobile mammal species would likely relocate to other areas of similar habitat in the vicinity of Grand Forks AFB, such as the University of North Dakota Oakville Prairie Field Station, which contains 900 acres of upland and lowland prairie and is located approximately 4 miles southeast. Birds that are obligate wetland species would be displaced from the project area to other similar habitats in the region such as the five waterfowl production areas and the Kelly's Slough National Wildlife Refuge that are 3 to 8 miles east of the project area. The Proposed Action also would include replacement of the Installation's west perimeter fence (22,240 feet of fence line). Fence posts would be driven into the ground 8 feet deep and 10 feet apart, requiring no digging or trenching. The proposed fence would not be specifically designed to keep out wildlife; rather, it would function as a security fence. Impacts on wildlife from the construction of the perimeter fence would be negligible.

Overall, the Proposed Action would be anticipated to result in permanent, minor, adverse impacts to wildlife, which would relocate to other suitable habitat regionally.

Threatened, Endangered, and Other Protected Species

No federally listed threatened or endangered species have been observed on Grand Forks AFB, nor does critical habitat exist within Grand Forks AFB. The Air Force has determined the Proposed Action would have "no effect" on federally threatened or endangered species.

The quality of habitat available to migratory birds, including the state SCP, would be reduced by removal of wetland habitat and the replacement of existing grassland with a monocultural herbaceous species less attractive to birds. The number of migratory birds, including the bobolink, black-billed cuckoo, Le Conte's sparrow, lark bunting, American bittern, dickcissel, black tern, red-headed woodpecker, chestnut-collared longspur, grasshopper sparrow, and Nelson's sparrow, would be reduced within the project area. To the extent available, migratory birds may use similar habitat in the surrounding region.

The SCP lesser yellow lady's slipper and the white lady's slipper orchids within the project area would be removed and replaced with vegetation unattractive to wildlife under the Proposed Action. Additionally, the SCP in the Turtle River area, including Dutchman's breeches, the Canadian toad, and two mussels (maple leaf and creek heelsplitter), could be impacted by the adjacent construction through water quality issues caused by runoff from the grading and construction. BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize sedimentation and erosion with the potential to impact water quality. Common, indirect impacts of wetland removal would include an influx of surface water and sediments or changes in local drainage patterns (see **Section 3.8.3.2**). Increases in soil erosion and sedimentation could impact the Turtle River and the species found there.

Invasive and Noxious Weed Species

Soil disturbance during project activities would create potential sites for establishment of invasive and noxious weed species. However, the Proposed Action would cultivate airfield vegetation unattractive to wildlife and maintain vegetation height between 7 and 14 inches. The planting and maintenance of that vegetation could aid in preventing the establishment of invasive species and noxious weeds by eliminating existing invasive species within the project area. BMPs, such as checking construction sites for presence of invasive plants and noxious weeds, would also be employed. The use of off-Base fill material could increase the risk of invasive plants and noxious weeds. If invasive plants and noxious weeds are present, steps could be taken to lessen the probability of spreading seeds throughout the Installation, such as mechanical or chemical treatment of the plants, avoiding areas of invasive plants and noxious weeds, and thoroughly cleaning and inspection of equipment and work clothing before moving off Base. With implementation of the BMPs such as those in the Grand Forks AFB *Noxious and Invasive Weed Survey and Control Plan* (Grand Forks AFB, 2013b), impacts from invasive plants and noxious weeds would not be expected.

3.7.3.3 Cumulative Effects

Impacts to biological resources would be expected to wetlands, migratory birds, and other SCPs. Much of the surrounding land that was historically grasslands and wetlands has previously been converted to agricultural land. Regionally, Kellys Slough NWR (**Table 3.1**) provides habitat for migratory waterfowl and shorebirds. Refuge staff manage the NWR water levels to meet those needs, providing wetlands with a variety of water levels and open mudflats. In addition to the 6,800 acres of NWR lands and waters, there are several USFWS-owned waterfowl production areas and a State-owned wildlife management area adjacent to and nearby the NWR that provide additional grassland and wetland habitat. A reduction in wetland and grassland habitat at Grand Forks AFB could cause birds that are obligate wetland species to

be displaced from the project area to other similar habitats in the region, like those found at Kellys Slough NWR. Also, development within GrandSKY Business Park may result in filling of wetlands within the GrandSKY property. However, the amount of wetlands potentially impacted by construction has not yet been determined.

When considered in conjunction with past loss of wetland and grassland habitat and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB, the Proposed Action would have moderate, adverse cumulative effects to biological resources. However, improvements to grassland and mitigations that may be implemented under a Section 404 permit for conversion of wetlands would reduce the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action.

3.7.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no reconstruction and replacement activities would occur. There would be no changes to biological resources beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.

3.8 WATER RESOURCES

3.8.1 Definition of the Resource

Water resources include surface water, groundwater, stormwater, wetlands, and floodplains. The *Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948*, as amended by CWA, was enacted to protect water resources vulnerable to contamination and quality degradation. The CWA provides the authority to establish water quality standards, control discharges into surface and subsurface waters (including groundwater), develop waste treatment management plans and practices, and issue permits for discharges. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit under Section 402 of the CWA is required for discharges into navigable waters. The USEPA oversees the state's issuance of NPDES permits at federal facilities as well as water quality regulations (CWA, Section 401) for both surface- and groundwater.

The ROI for water resources is Grand Forks AFB and areas downstream that are entirely within the Lower Red Drainage Basin, and the Turtle Watershed.

3.8.1.1 Surface Water and Stormwater

The USACE and USEPA define surface waters as Waters of the US (WOTUS), which are primarily lakes, rivers, estuaries, coastal waters, and wetlands. WOTUS, or jurisdictional waters, including surface water resources as defined in 33 CFR § 328.3, are regulated under Sections 401 and 404 of the CWA and Section 10 of the *Rivers and Harbors Act*. Man-made features not directly associated with a natural drainage, such as upland stock ponds and irrigation canals, are generally not considered jurisdictional waters.

3.8.1.2 Stormwater

Stormwater is surface runoff generated from precipitation and has the potential to introduce sediments and other pollutants into surface waters. Stormwater is regulated under the CWA Section 402 NPDES program. Impervious surfaces such as buildings, roads, parking lots, and even some natural soils increase surface runoff. Stormwater management systems are designed to contain runoff on site during construction and to maintain predevelopment stormwater flow characteristics following development through either the application of infiltration or retention practices. Section 438 of the EISA (Public Law 110-140) establishes stormwater design requirements for development and redevelopment projects. Under these requirements, federal facility projects larger than 5,000 ft² must maintain or restore, to the maximum extent feasible, the predevelopment hydrologic conditions of the property with respect to the water temperature, rate, volume, and duration of flow.

3.8.1.3 Groundwater

Groundwater is water that exists in the saturated zone beneath the earth's surface in pore spaces and fractures and includes aquifers. Groundwater is recharged through water on the ground's surface seeping

downward through small holes and openings (e.g., precipitation and surface water bodies) and via the upward movement of water in lower aquifers through porous soil and rock. Groundwater is an essential resource that can be used for drinking, irrigation, and/or industrial processes, and can be described in terms of depth from the surface, aquifer or well capacity, water quality, recharge rate, and surrounding geologic formations. Groundwater quality and quantity are regulated under several different programs, including the *Safe Drinking Water Act* (Public Law 93-523; 42 USC 300f–300j), which helps protect aquifers that are critical to water supply.

3.8.1.4 Wetlands

The USACE (<u>33 CFR § 328.3</u>) and the USEPA (<u>40 CFR § 230.3(o)</u>) define wetlands as "areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions." Wetlands are a subset of WOTUS, and those deemed "jurisdictional" are regulated under Section 404 of the CWA. When a federal agency's proposed action requires a Section 404 wetlands permit, states are provided authority to enforce surface-water-quality standards under Section 401 of the CWA by review of the proposed action and permit application. The natural-function benefits of wetlands include flood control, groundwater recharge, maintenance of biodiversity, wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, and maintenance of water quality.

3.8.1.5 Floodplains

Floodplains are areas of low-level ground along rivers, stream channels, or coastal waters that provide a broad area to fill with, and temporarily store, floodwater. In their natural vegetated state, floodplains slow the rate at which the incoming overland flow reaches the main water body. Floodplains are subject to periodic or infrequent inundation due to rain or melting snow. The risk of flooding is influenced by local topography, the frequency of precipitation events, and the size and characteristics of the watershed that contains the floodplain.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) evaluates and maps flood potential, which defines the 100-year (regulatory) floodplain. The 100-year floodplain is the area that has a 1-percent annual chance of inundation by floodwater. FEMA uses letter designations for flood zone classification. Zone A designates 100-year floodplains where flood depths (base flood elevations) have not been calculated and further studies are needed. Zone AE floodplains include calculated base flood elevations, which are the minimum elevation standards for buildings in a floodplain. Zone X indicates areas outside of the FEMA 100-year regulatory floodplain that have a low risk of flooding hazards (FEMA, 2020). Federal, state, and local regulations often limit floodplain development to passive uses, such as recreational and preservation activities, to reduce the risks to property and human health and safety.

EO 11988, *Floodplain Management*, provides guidelines that agencies should follow as part of their decision-making process on projects that have potential impacts to, or within, the floodplain. This EO requires that federal agencies avoid, to the extent possible, the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative. As its title implies, EO 13690, *Establishing a Flood Risk Management Standard and Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input*, provided a means for stakeholder involvement; however, this EO was later revoked by Section 6 of EO 13807, *Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure*. EO 13807 did not revoke or otherwise alter EO 11988.

3.8.2 Existing Conditions

3.8.2.1 Surface Water

Grand Forks AFB is located within the approximately 40,200-square-mile Red River Basin, which spans parts of eastern North Dakota, northwestern Minnesota, and northeastern South Dakota in the US and southern Manitoba in Canada. Within the Red River Basin, Grand Forks AFB is located in the Turtle

Watershed, which is approximately 683 square miles³ (North Dakota Department of Health [NDDH] 2018a, 2018b).

No surface water is located within the proposed project area. The Turtle River, which flows through the northwest corner of the Installation (outside of the project area), is a perennial stream tributary to the Red River (**Figure 3-3**). It is the only primary surface water present on Grand Forks AFB and is listed by the NDDH as fully supporting, but threatened, with respect to fish and other aquatic biota beneficial uses due to elevated cadmium and selenium (NDDH, 2019). The Turtle River cannot be used as drinking water without further treatment, but can be used for irrigation, water recreation, and propagation of resident fish species (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). Kellys Slough, an intermittent stream tributary to Turtle River that flows through the Kellys Slough NWR, is located approximately 2 miles east of the Base. The NDDH has not assigned beneficial uses or established water quality criteria for Kellys Slough.

3.8.2.2 Wetlands

There are approximately 412 acres of wetlands on Grand Forks AFB. A wetlands survey and delineation of the project area was conducted in 2021 and a full report of the findings was completed in February of 2022. A total of 1,291 acres was surveyed and 92.81 acres of wetlands were identified. Approximately 98 percent, or 91.07 acres of the area surveyed, are classified as palustrine emergent wetlands, and 2 percent, or 1.74 acres are classified as palustrine scrub-shrub (Grand Forks AFB, 2022). Palustrine emergent wetlands are characterized by erect, rooted, herbaceous hydrophytes (i.e., aquatic plants), excluding mosses and lichens. Palustrine scrub-shrub wetlands include wetland areas dominated by woody vegetation less than 20 feet tall. The majority of wetlands at Grand Forks AFB also are prairie potholes, a type of wetland that forms in shallow depressions in the land. Prairie potholes generally receive the majority of their water from snowmelt runoff in the spring with secondary sources emanating from warm season precipitation.

A total of 48.8 acres of wetlands appear to have a connection to WOTUS. The remaining 43.93 acres of wetlands identified in the project area appeared to be surrounded by upland with no discernable overland connection to other WOTUS.

As described in the 2022 survey report, 92.81 acres of wetlands were identified within the project area (Grand Forks AFB, 2022). For this delineation, the project area was divided into four major areas: Flight Line North (FLN), Flight Line South (FLS), Flight Line East (FLE), and Flight Line West (FLW) (**Tables 3-7–3-10** and **Figures 3-4–3-9**).

Approximately 41 percent of the wetlands delineated within the project area were located in FLN. The area that comprises FLN has a high prevalence of wetlands, in part because this area is underlain by a predominantly hydric soil, Ojata silty clay loam (I176A) (see **Section 3.9** of this EA). Additionally, it is one of the lower-lying portions of the project area, with a gentle slope from the west to the northeast. A total of 22 wetlands (38.06 acres) were mapped in FLN (**Table 3-7** and **Figure 3-4**). Nine of these wetlands were alongside or within ditches. One such wetland, FLN-06j, is in the Northwest Ditch, which runs along 22nd Avenue NE and connects with the Turtle River, a WOTUS, through a culvert system.

Approximately 11 percent of the wetlands delineated within the project area were located in FLS. The FLS area is underlain by Lankin loam, which is a predominantly non-hydric soil, and is characterized by mixed grasslands to the south and southeast of the runway. The survey identified 10 wetlands in this area totaling 10.19 acres, all of which are classified as palustrine emergent wetlands (**Table 3-8** and **Figure 3-5**). No wetlands in FLS have discernable aboveground connections to any WOTUS.

Approximately 14 percent of the wetlands delineated within the project area were located in FLE. The FLE area is the most developed of the survey areas and includes buildings, maintenance docks, plane storage hangars, and large areas of concrete. The survey identified 20 wetlands totaling 12.62 acres within FLE, all of which are classified as palustrine emergent wetlands (**Table 3-9** and **Figures 3-6** and **3-7**). No wetlands within FLE have discernable aboveground connections to any WOTUS.

³ See the North Dakota Hydrologic Units Interactive map, <u>https://www.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=1af4ba1cfe6249a29d43cb5426ecbfe7</u>





Wetland ID	Туре	Wetland Type	Area (acres)
FLN-01	Freshwater Emergent; pond	PEM	0.83
FLN-06b	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	19.81
FLN-06h	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	1.79
FLN-06j	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	2.51
FLN-08	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	3.19
FLN-09	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	3.77
FLN-12	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	1.29
FLN-13	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	1.46
FLN-14	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.73
FLN-15	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.24
FLN-17	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	1.04
FLN-18	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.39
FLN-19	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.24
FLN-20	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.17
FLN-21	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.06
FLN-22	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.14
FLN-23	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PSS	0.09
FLN-24a	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.04
FLN-24b	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.01
FLN-24c	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.11
FLN-24d	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.06
FLN-24e	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.10
	38.06		

Table 3-7. Wetlands – Flight Line North

Source: Grand Forks AFB, 2022

FLN = Flight Line North; PEM = palustrine emergent; PSS = palustrine shrub-scrub

Table 3-8. Wetlands - Flight Line South

Wetland ID	Туре	Wetland Type	Area (acres)		
FLS-16	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.74		
FLS-17	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	Freshwater Emergent; ditch PEM			
FLS-18	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.07		
FLS-25	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	4.05		
FLS-31a	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.12		
FLS-31c	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.05		
FLS-31d	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.05		
FLS-31h	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.29		
FLS-45	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	1.89		
FLS-51	Freshwater Emergent	1.76			
	10.19				

Source: Grand Forks AFB, 2022 FLS = Flight Line South; PEM = palustrine emergent; PSS = palustrine shrub-scrub

Wetland ID	Туре	Wetland Type	Area (acres)
FLE-01	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.46
FLE-05	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	2.07
FLE-07i	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.21
FLE-11	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.23
FLE-12	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.85
FLE-14	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.42
FLE-16	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.45
FLE-19	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	3.64
FLE-20	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.43
FLE-25	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.03
FLE-27	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.01
FLE-28	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.07
FLE-31	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.01
FLE-32	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.52
FLE-33	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.12
FLE-34	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.42
FLE-35	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	2.03
FLE-36	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.32
FLE-37	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.16
FLE-38	FLE-38 Freshwater Emergent PEM		0.17
	12.62		

Table 3-9. Wetlands – Flight Line East

Source: Grand Forks AFB, 2022 FLE = Flight Line East; PEM = palustrine emergent; PSS = palustrine shrub-scrub

Wetland ID	Туре		
FLW-01a	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	12.04
FLW-01b	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	1.59
FLW-01c	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	2.25
FLW-01d	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	1.67
FLW-01e	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.04
FLW-02	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	2.19
FLW-03	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.36
FLW-05	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.51
FLW-06	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.36
FLW-07	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	3.91
FLW-08	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.56
FLW-09	Freshwater Scrub-Shrub	PSS	0.94
FLW-10	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	1.52
FLW-47	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.03
FLW-65	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.05
FLW-72	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.49
FLW-73	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	1.05
FLW-74	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.05
FLW-75	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.03
FLW-76a	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.47
FLW-76b	Freshwater Emergent; ditch	PEM	0.07
FLW-76c	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.06
FLW-77	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.60
FLW-78	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.10
FLW-79	Freshwater Emergent	PEM	0.10
FLW-80a	Freshwater Scrub-Shrub; ditch PSS		0.29
FLW-80b	Freshwater Scrub-Shrub; ditch	PSS	0.06
FLW-80c	Freshwater Scrub-Shrub; ditch PSS		0.06
FLW-80d	Freshwater Scrub-Shrub; ditch PSS		0.30
FLW-81 Freshwater Emergent PEM		PEM	0.20
TOTAL			31.94

Table 3-10. Wetlands – Flight Line West

Source: Grand Forks AFB, 2022

FLW = Flight Line West; PEM = palustrine emergent; PSS = palustrine shrub-scrub











FIGURE 3-6 Wetlands Identified in the FLE Lower Area

Wetlands



Flight Line Area Division

0 0.1 Miles

Imagery: ESRI, 2021 Coordinate System: WGS 1984 UTM Zone 14N





FIGURE 3-7 Wetlands Identified in the FLE Upper Area



Flight Line Area Division

0

Installation Boundary



0.1 Miles

Proposed Project Area Wetlands

Base

Imagery: ESRI, 2021 Coordinate System: WGS 1984 UTM Zone 14N



FIGURE 3-8 Wetlands Identified in the FLW Lower Area

- Drainage Ditch
- Fence Line
- Flight Line Area Division

٥



0.1 Miles

Imagery: ESRI, 2021 Coordinate System: WGS 1984 UTM Zone 14N

Grand Force Base Air Force Base



FIGURE 3-9 Wetlands Identified in the FLW Upper Area

0.1 Miles

Drainage Ditch
 Fence Line
 Flight Line Area Division
 Installation Boundary

0

N

- Proposed Project Area Wetlands
 - 100-Year Floodplain

Imagery: ESRI, 2021 Coordinate System: WGS 1984 UTM Zone 14N



Approximately 34 percent of the wetlands delineated within the project area were located in FLW. The FLW area consists mostly of undeveloped land that is maintained in mixed grassland. A total of 30 separate wetlands covering 31.94 acres were identified in FLW, of which 25 are classified as palustrine emergent wetlands and 5 are classified as palustrine scrub-shrub (**Table 3-10** and **Figures 3-8** and **3-9**). Sixteen of these wetlands were alongside or within ditches; wetlands FLW-01a through FLW-01e make up a large ditch system that drains water from areas west of the runway into the Turtle River (the West Ditch), totaling 17.59 acres. This ditch system exits the Base through a culvert under 27th Street.

3.8.2.3 Stormwater

The majority of the project area has been graded such that drainage ditches collect surface water and flow from south to north, then west toward the Turtle River. The far northern portion of the project area drains to the northeast, and the southern portion drains to the east. Stormwater drainage at Grand Forks AFB is managed through a network of underground pipes and catch basins that direct runoff to four drainage ditches located in the southeastern, northeastern, northwestern, and western areas of the Base. Flow in these ditches is discharged to either Turtle River or Kellys Slough via nine outfalls that are operated under a NPDES Industrial Stormwater General Permit (NDR05-000). The project area borders the West Ditch and Northwest Ditch, which run along the Installation boundary (Grand Forks AFB, 2017).

The Northwest Ditch collects drainage from the sanitary landfill areas (both closed and capped), the Base small arms range, the northernmost end of the airfield, and part of the parallel taxiway area. The West Ditch collects drainage from much of the airfield runway and taxiway areas (including associated pavement underdrain systems), the now closed Explosive Ordnance Detonation Area, and the western perimeter of the Base. The West Ditch drains to Turtle River via a drainage channel along 21st Avenue (with a corresponding easement).

Both the West and Northwest ditches have the potential to contain the following significant materials (based on the definition of General Storm Water Permit, Part VI): propylene glycol (deicer), fuels (jet fuel, diesel, motor vehicle gasoline), oils and lubricants, used oils, and hazardous chemicals under CERCLA Section 101(14) (<u>40 CFR Part 302</u>) (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b).

3.8.2.4 Groundwater

The uppermost aquifer at Grand Forks AFB is the Emerado Aquifer, located 50 to 75 feet below ground surface. High levels of salt and dissolved solids have degraded the water quality of this aquifer. The Grand Forks AFB gets its drinking water mainly from the Red River and Red Lake River through the City of Grand Forks; therefore, potable water for Grand AFB is obtained through the City of Grand Forks from surface water resources including the Red River and Red Lake River (Grand Forks AFB, 2018a). A perched aquifer exists on portions of the Base approximately 3–8 feet below ground level. The water in the West Ditch is generally considered to be at water table level.

3.8.2.5 Floodplains

There is a 100-year floodplain associated with Turtle River that crosses the northwestern corner of Grand Forks AFB and extends along the northwestern panhandle of the Installation boundary, incorporating approximately 224 acres of the proposed project area (**Figure 3-3**). This floodplain is classified as Zone A, and as detailed analyses are not performed for Zone A floodplains, no base flood elevation has been established in this area. There is also a 100-year floodplain along the southeastern boundary of the sewage treatment lagoons associated with Kellys Slough (**Figure 3-3**) (FEMA, 2022).

3.8.3 Environmental Consequences

3.8.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria for potential impacts on water resources are based on water availability, quality, and use; existence of floodplains; and associated regulations. Potential adverse impacts to water resources would occur if the Proposed Action or Alternatives:

- reduce water availability or supply to existing users,
- overdraft groundwater basins,
- exceed safe annual yield of water supply sources,
- adversely affect water quality,
- endanger public health by creating or worsening health hazard conditions, or
- violate established laws or regulations adopted to protect sensitive water resources.

3.8.3.2 Proposed Action

Surface Waters

There are no surface waters located within the proposed project area. However, the Turtle River is located adjacent to the project area with parts of the project area draining to it through the Northwest Ditch and the West Ditch. While drainage maintenance and other improvements could be beneficial to regional surface waters, minor, adverse impacts to Turtle River would be expected due to runoff from construction activities and the filling of wetlands. These impacts are discussed further in the wetlands and stormwater sections below.

<u>Wetlands</u>

Under the Proposed Action, approximately 93 acres of wetlands would be filled and leveled to resolve standing water and reduce attractive habitat in the airfield and vicinity, resulting in a permanent adverse impact to affected wetlands. Wetland removal would decrease habitat, landscape diversity, and connectivity among aquatic resources. Common indirect impacts of wetland removal include influx of surface water and sediments or changes in local drainage patterns. Increases in soil erosion and sedimentation would have the potential to alter the quality and characteristics of wetlands and surface waters associated with the Turtle River and are further discussed below under *Stormwater*.

The 2022 wetlands delineation report identified 92.81 acres of wetlands occurring within the project area; however, a jurisdictional determination by USACE, Omaha District, has yet to be completed to assess whether any wetlands within the proposed project area are classified as jurisdictional and are protected under the CWA. The determination, which is included as **Appendix E**, would affect which regulations and permits would apply to the Proposed Action and what management techniques would be utilized. The Proposed Action would require Grand Forks AFB to obtain an individual Section 404 permit and a Section 401 permit under the CWA.

DoD facilities are to preserve the natural beneficial values of wetlands in carrying out activities in accordance with EO 11990, *Protection of Wetlands* and DoDI 4715.03, *Natural Resources Conservation Program.* Grand Forks AFB would ensure no net loss of size, function, and value of wetlands, and would preserve the natural and beneficial values of wetlands in carrying out activities in accordance with EO 11990. To document planning conducted to avoid and minimize potential adverse impacts of the Proposed Action on wetland resources, the Air Force prepared a FONPA.

The terms of a Section 404 permit require compensatory mitigation for any unavoidable permanent adverse impacts to wetlands, including those that would occur under the Proposed Action. Compensatory mitigation refers to restoration, creation, enhancement, and preservation of wetlands to compensate for permitted wetland losses. A Wetlands Mitigation Plan (**Appendix C**) was prepared for the Proposed Action and identified two mitigation banks in Grand Forks County that could be used for in-lieu fee program credits; these mitigation banks include the Mekinock Site, a private commercial mitigation bank, and the Thompson Site, which is administered by Ducks Unlimited, a private nonprofit organization. Grand Forks AFB would submit a more detailed compensatory mitigation plan following the completion of project design along with the Section 404 permit application as required (Grand Forks AFB, 2013a). Grand Forks AFB would take all necessary actions to remain in compliance with the CWA, and USACE and State of North Dakota wetland regulations. Because Grand Forks AFB would purchase adequate wetland mitigation credits to offset the unavoidable wetland impacts and strictly adhere to all applicable permit conditions and BMPs, the overall impacts of the Proposed Action on wetlands would be insignificant.

During project activities, Grand Forks AFB would require contractors to adhere to all applicable permits and management plans, including Section 404 and 401 permits under the CWA. Appropriate BMPs would also be adhered to, including source control measures to prevent pollutants from leaving certain areas, reduce/eliminate the introduction of pollutants, protect sensitive areas, and prevent precipitation and pollutants from interacting. BMPs are implemented for all ground-disturbing activities greater than one acre to prevent soil erosion and protect surface waters (Grand Forks AFB, 2013a). All Section 404 permits also have associated BMPs that would be followed to minimize the risk of soil erosion or sediment discharges (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). Minimization measures, including construction controls and natural resources controls, are outlined in the Wetlands Mitigation Plan (**Appendix C**). These measures, including development of a project-specific stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), would help to minimize effects to surrounding waters and wetlands that are not part of the Proposed Action, such as the Turtle River. Further analysis of avoidance and minimization efforts would be conducted prior to submitting the necessary permit applications for direct wetland impacts.

Stormwater

The Proposed Action includes regrading the airfield's West Ditch (up to 14,000 linear feet) and conducting perimeter drainage maintenance. During construction, the Proposed Action would increase the risk of soil being eroded and transported to nearby water bodies during stormwater events. Impacts to surface waters from sedimentation and erosion would be minimized through the implementation of appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs which would prevent sediment, debris, and other pollutants from entering the Turtle River directly via the stormwater conveyance system. As part of that system, the drainage channel along 21st Avenue could be adversely impacted from erosion and sedimentation as well. Road crossings of the Turtle River adjacent to the Base (21st Avenue and 27th Street) could be impacted from an increase in runoff, directly increasing the flow of Turtle River.

BMPs utilized could include the installation of silt fences to reduce erosion from stormwater runoff, and structural controls such as dikes to prevent accidental spills from reaching the environment. Grand Forks AFB also maintains a spill prevention control and countermeasures (SPCC) plan, which contains specific procedures for preparing for and responding to inadvertent discharges of oil or releases of hazardous substances at the Base, and any relevant guidance from this plan would be followed (Grand Forks AFB, 2019). Additional measures include sediment discharge prevention techniques outlined in the Grand Forks AFB Construction General Permit guidance, USEPA's Stormwater Management for Construction Activities, 832-R-92-005, the project-specific SWPPP, and any applicable BMPs associated with Section 404 permits.

Although the Northwest Ditch does not pose a stormwater contamination threat under normal working conditions, ground-disturbing activities related to the Proposed Action could potentially increase this threat. Stormwater discharge on Grand Forks AFB would continue to be monitored as usual throughout the duration of the Proposed Action for various materials, including oil and grease and other chemicals, in accordance with the Base's NPDES permit. With implementation of applicable BMPs and techniques, as well as adherence to all applicable permits and regulations, impacts to stormwater from the Proposed Action would be short term and negligible.

Several activities under the Proposed Action, such as grading the West Ditch to remove standing water, conducting perimeter drainage maintenance, and installing drain tile would have long-term, minor, beneficial impacts on stormwater by improving the drainage environment near the airfield. As discussed above, common indirect impacts of wetland removal include influx of surface water and sediments or changes in local drainage patterns. Increases in soil erosion and sedimentation could impact the Turtle River.

Groundwater

Ground disturbance associated with the Proposed Action would primarily occur at the surface level and would not reach the groundwater supply. Grand Forks AFB would adhere to the direction supplied by UFC 3-210-10 to comply with EISA Section 438, which provides guidance for the management of stormwater for federal projects. Compliance with this guidance would ensure post-project hydrology mirrors pre-project hydrology on the project area to the maximum extent technically feasible with respect to temperature, rate, volume, and duration of flow. Additionally, the re-seeding of the airfield as a part of the Proposed Action

would have long-term beneficial impacts on groundwater conditions by increasing filtration of runoff (Shaw & Schmidt, 2003). No monitoring wells would be impacted by the Proposed Action. Adverse impacts to groundwater from the Proposed Action would be short term and negligible.

Floodplains

Under the Proposed Action, activity for replacement of the perimeter fence would take place in several areas within the Turtle River 100-year floodplain. Although no digging or trenching would be required to install fence posts, there would be potential for erosion and sedimentation to occur at the base of each post where it was driven into the ground. This would be managed with the implementation of erosion and sedimentation BMPs and adherence to applicable management plans, regulations, and permits. Adverse impacts to the floodplain due to the perimeter fence replacement would be short term and negligible.

The process of regrading the West Ditch would include soil compaction, which would stabilize the soil and reduce its vulnerability to future erosion and sedimentation in the floodplain. The Proposed Action would alter the natural function and hydrology of the floodplain by filling wetlands and altering the existing drainage features. It would be anticipated that storm and floodwater conveyance would occur at a faster rate under implementation of the Proposed Action, as repairing the West Ditch and the addition of drainage tiles would increase water flow during flood events.

To document planning conducted to avoid and minimize potential adverse impacts of the Proposed Action on floodplain resources, the Air Force prepared a FONPA.

3.8.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

Under the Proposed Action, impacts to surface waters, wetlands, stormwater, and floodplains would be anticipated. Much of the surrounding land that was historically grasslands and wetlands has previously been converted to agricultural land. As listed in Table 3-1, potential GrandSKY business park construction would be expected to impact wetlands, though no specific construction details are available at this time. Those construction activities would require GrandSKY and Grand Forks AFB to obtain an individual Section 404 permit and a Section 401 permit under the CWA. Regionally, Kellys Slough NWR provides habitat for migratory waterfowl and shorebirds. Refuge staff manage the NWR water levels to meet those needs, providing wetlands with a variety of water levels and open mudflats. In addition to the 6,800 acres of NWR lands and waters, there are several USFWS-owned waterfowl protection areas and a State-owned wildlife management area adjacent to and nearby the NWR that provide additional grassland and wetland habitat. These protected areas could offer habitat for displaced species.

The Air Force would adhere to all terms required under Section 404/401 permits for the Proposed Action and would mitigate unavoidable impacts to wetlands where required under the CWA. When considered in conjunction with past loss of wetland and grassland habitat and any unknown present or future loss of similar habitat in the region, the Proposed Action would have mode rate cumulative effects to water resources following the implementation of BMPs and mitigation efforts.

3.8.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. There would be no changes to water resources beyond baseline. For instance, there would be no change to the natural function and hydrology of the floodplain since no wetlands would be filled. No existing drainage features would be altered. However, the No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.

3.9 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

3.9.1 Definition of the Resource

Geological resources include geology, topography, and soils. Geology refers to the structure and configuration of surface and subsurface features. Characteristics of geology include geomorphology, subsurface rock types, and structural elements. Topography refers to the shape, height, and position of the

land surface. Soil refers to the unconsolidated materials overlying bedrock or other parent material. Soils are defined by their composition, slope, and physical characteristics. Attributes of soil, such as elasticity, load-bearing capacity, shrink-swell potential, and erodibility, determine its suitability to support a particular land use.

Prime farmland, as defined by the USDA in the *Farmland Protection Policy Act* (<u>7 USC §§ 4201–4209</u>) (FPPA), is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops, and is available for these uses.

The ROI for geological resources is the proposed project area.

3.9.2 Existing Conditions

3.9.2.1 Geology

Grand Forks AFB is in Grand Forks County, North Dakota, near the eastern edge of the Williston Structural Basin. The layers of bedrock that lay below the County slope gently to the west toward the Basin's center. Surficial deposits at Grand Forks AFB consist of late Wisconsin glacial drift and are approximately 225 feet thick beneath the Base. The Installation sits within the Agassiz Lake Plain, a flat expanse of land that used to be the bed of Glacial Lake Agassiz, which existed in the area during the melting of the last glacier approximately 12,000 years ago. Glacial deposits beneath the plain consist of up to 95 feet of clay and siltrich lake deposits, with glacial till containing isolated deposits of sand and gravel. Underneath the glacial deposits are sandstones, siltstones, and shales of the Lower Cretaceous Fall River and Lakota Formations, which are unconformably underlain by limestones and dolomites of the Ordovician Red River Formation.

3.9.2.2 Topography

The topography of Grand Forks County was formed largely due to Glacial Lake Agassiz. The Agassiz Lake Plain is characterized by somewhat poorly drained flats and swells separated by shallow, poorly drained portions of land, and areas with deep mud. This physiographic region extends westward to the Pembina escarpment in the western portion of the county, which separates the Agassiz Lake Plain District from the Drift Plain District to the west. Prominent physiographic features of the Agassiz Lake Plain District are remnant lake plains, beaches, inter-beach areas, and delta plains that were formed at the mouths of rivers. The elevation of this district ranges from about 1,160 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) along the Pembina escarpment to about 800 feet AMSL in the northeast corner of the county. Base topography is relatively flat, with elevations ranging from 880 to 920 feet AMSL, and averages about 890 feet AMSL. Grand Forks AFB land slopes to the northeast at less than 12 feet per mile, and local variations in elevation are typically less than 1 foot (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b).

3.9.2.3 Soils

There are 29 different types of soil found on the Base and only 16 types within the ROI (**Table 3-11** and **Figure 3-10**). These soils may limit management options, as most of the soil associations, or major soil components, are listed as partially hydric, that is, they formed in conditions in which they were fully saturated with water (such as flooding) and may have a higher water holding capacity. All of Grand Forks AFB is composed of either the Bearden-Antler association or the Ojata association, both of which are considered saline soils, in that they contain excessive levels of dissolvable salts. All soil groups on Base, except for the Glyndon-Gardens group, are generally unsuitable for building site development. The Antler-Gilby-Svea and Bearden-Antler groups are suited to vegetative growth, although salinity, wetness, soil blowing, and boulders and stones may restrict cultivation. The LaDelle-Cashel soil type is well suited for cultivated crops and supporting native hardwoods, the Ojata association is well suited for pasture or wildlife habitat, and the Wyndmere-Tiffany-Arveson soils are typically used for cultivated crops (USDA, 2023).

The main soil in the ROI is I400A, or Gilby loam, which makes up approximately 36.2 percent of the ROI, followed by I477A, or Antler silty clay loam, moderately saline, which makes up approximately 20.4 percent of the ROI (**Table 3-11**). Both soil types are classified as "somewhat poorly drained." Other main soils present within the ROI include I213B or Embden fine sandy loam (classified as "moderately well-drained") and I201A or Glyndon silt loam (classified as "somewhat poorly drained").

In addition, most of the soils contain moderate to high salinity. Sodium chloride is the dominant salt in the saline soils of eastern Grand Forks County. Compaction and rutting are increased when soils have high moisture content. Compaction leads to reduced infiltration and ponding of water. Ponding and open-water areas reduce root depth and vegetation often drowns, causing open, bare areas. These bare soil areas can be seen across Grand Forks AFB with visible white crusts indicating their saline nature.

Map Unit Symbol	Nameª	Slope (%)	Drainage Rating	Acres on Grand Forks AFB	Percent of ROI
I147B	Velva sandy loam, moist, occasionally flooded ^b	0–6	Well-drained	36.4	0.1
I150B	Zell, fine-silty-LaDelle silt loams	2–6	Well-drained	11.7	0.6
I155A	Grimstad fine sandy loam	0–2	Somewhat poorly drained	115.3	1.9
I156A	Antler silt loam	0–2	Somewhat poorly drained	36.9	1.9
I164B	Zell-Gardena silt loams, 2 to 6 percent slopes	2–6	Well-drained	15.0	0.1
I176A	Ojata silty clay loam	0–1	Poorly drained	106.1	5.5
I199A	Antler-Mustinka silt loams	0–2	Somewhat poorly drained	224.8	0.7
I201A	Glyndon silt loam	0–2	Somewhat poorly drained	1,072.6	11.1
I202A	Gardena silt loam	0–2	Moderately well-drained	32.1	0.7
I213B	Embden fine sandy loam	2–6	Moderately well-drained	239.9	9
1400A	Gilby loam	0–2	Somewhat poorly drained	1,220.0	36.2
I413A	Lankin loam	0–2	Moderately well-drained	198.3	9.2
1422D	Sioux loam	2–15	Excessively drained	9.2	0.5
1477A	Antler silty clay loam, moderately saline ^b	0–2	Somewhat poorly drained	805.2	20.4
I594A	LaDelle silt loam, occasionally flooded ^b	0–2	Moderately well-drained	28.1	0.9
l601A	Bearden silty clay loam, moderately saline ^b	0–2	Somewhat poorly drained	21.9	1

 Table 3-11.

 Soil Types Associated with Project Area at Grand Forks AFB

Source: USDA Web Soil Survey

N/A = not applicable; ROI = Region of Influence Notes:

a Hydrologic class listed is that of the minor soil type that makes up the majority of that soil association.

b Soils with multiple hydrologic classes listed indicates that two types of minor soils within an association together make up the majority of that association found on Base.

3.9.2.4 Prime Farmland

The land at Grand Forks AFB is under military use and is not developable for agricultural purposes. In accordance with Section 1540(c)(1) of the FPPA, "Farmland" does not include land already in or committed to urban development, and these areas would not be subject to the FPPA. Therefore, prime farmland is not carried forward for analysis.





3.9.3 Environmental Consequences

3.9.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria for potential impacts on geological resources are based on the following:

- substantial alteration of unique or valued geologic or topographic conditions;
- substantial soil erosion, sedimentation, and/or loss of natural function (e.g., compaction); and
- development on soils with characteristics that do not support the intended land use.

3.9.3.2 Proposed Action

<u>Geology</u>

The underlying geology of the area occupied by Grand Forks AFB would not change under the Proposed Action. No direct or indirect impacts to geology would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

Topography

The Proposed Action would involve ground topography reconstruction, including filling, clearing, grubbing, regrading (via heavy-equipment operation), landscaping, cultivating, and re-seeding no less than 150 acres of the project area. Existing wetlands would be filled in, resulting in a leveling of the topography within the proposed project area. While reconstruction activities would alter the current topography within the project area, it is not anticipated that these activities would amount to large-scale alteration of current topography. Topography reconstruction activities would be limited to those necessary to maintain efficient drainage. Therefore, the Proposed Action would result in long-term, minor impacts to topography.

<u>Soils</u>

Ground-disturbing activities under the Proposed Action would disturb soils in the project area, primarily Gilby loam, Antler silty clay loam, Embden fine sandy loam, and Glyndon silt loam (see **Figure 3-9**). Slopes within the areas proposed for construction range from 0 to 6 percent, with drainage classes from "somewhat poorly drained" to "moderately well-drained." All soils within the proposed project area, with the exception of Embden fine sandy loam, belong to Hydrologic Group C, meaning they have a medium runoff potential. Embden fine sandy loam belongs to Hydrologic Group A and has low runoff potential. The installation of drainage tiles, topography reconstruction, and regrading of the West Ditch would improve drainage conditions and lower the risk of runoff from those Group C soils as well as other Group C and D soils found in the proposed project area. As discussed in **Section 3.8.3**, common indirect impacts of wetland removal include influx of surface water and sediments or changes in local drainage patterns. Increases in soil erosion and sedimentation resulting from implementation of the Proposed Action could impact the Turtle River.

Standing water occurs in the project area due to compacted clay, hydric, saline soils. Most of the standing water in the field/grassland is due to the clay compacted soils from mowing in the semi-improved areas. Regular mowing could lead to increased compaction, causing infiltration issues by increasing surface evaporation and salinity levels.

Fill material could be used to fill wetlands and other low-lying areas. The source for off-Base fill material is not known at this time. There is the potential for invasive plants and noxious weeds to be present in off-Base fill material (see **Section 3.7.3.2**).

Grand Forks AFB requires BMPs to be used during ground-disturbing activities to prevent soil erosion. BMPs used during project implementation could include, but would not be limited to, the prompt installation of sod and silt fences, post-construction soil stabilization measures, and any BMPs associated with required permits related to erosion and sedimentation prevention. With appropriate BMPs in place and adherence to all applicable permits, regulations, and management plans, impacts to soils would be short term and negligible.

3.9.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action, in addition to the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, would have negligible cumulative effects to soils during project activities, which would occur in previously disturbed areas. Of the projects listed in **Table 3-1**, none would be located within the ROI of this Proposed Action. BMPs and compliance with permits would minimize the cumulative effect on soils. Additional future construction in the project area is unlikely due to proximity to the runways. Therefore, when considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB, no significant cumulative effects to geological resources would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.9.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the proposed project area would be undertaken. There would be no changes to geological resources beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.

3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.10.1 Definition of the Resource

Cultural resources are any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object considered important to a culture or community for scientific, traditional, religious, or other purposes. These resources are protected and identified under several federal laws and EOs including the *Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974* (54 USC § 312501–312508), the *American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978* (42 USC § 1996), the *Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979*, as amended (16 USC §§ 470aa–470mm), the *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990* (25 USC §§ 3001–3013), and the NHPA. The NHPA requires federal agencies to consider effects of federal undertakings on historic properties prior to deciding or taking an action and integrate historic preservation values into their decision-making process. Federal agencies fulfill this requirement by completing the NHPA Section 106 consultation process, as set forth in 36 CFR Part 800. NHPA Section 106 also requires agencies to consult with federally recognized American Indian tribes with a vested interest in the undertaking. NHPA Section 106 requires all federal agencies to seek to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties (36 CFR § 800.1(a)).

Cultural resources include the following subcategories:

- Archaeological (i.e., prehistoric or historic sites where human activity has left physical evidence of that activity, but no structures remain standing);
- Architectural (i.e., buildings, structures, groups of structures, or designed landscapes that are of historic or aesthetic significance); and
- Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) (resources of traditional, religious, or cultural significance to American Indian tribes).

Significant cultural resources are those listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or determined to be eligible for listing. To be eligible for the NRHP, properties must be 50 years old and have national, state, or local significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture. They must possess sufficient integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association to convey their historical significance and meet at least one of four criteria for evaluation:

- 1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history (Criterion A);
- 2. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past (Criterion B);

- 3. Embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values, or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (Criterion C); and/or
- 4. Have yielded or be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history (Criterion D).

Properties that are less than 50 years old can be considered eligible for the NRHP under criteria consideration G if they possess exceptional historical importance. Those properties must also retain historic integrity and meet at least one of the four NRHP criteria (Criteria A, B, C, or D). The term "historic property" refers to National Historic Landmarks, NRHP-listed, and NRHP-eligible cultural resources.

The ROI for cultural resources is Grand Forks AFB.

3.10.2 Existing Conditions

3.10.2.1 Archaeological Properties

Previous archaeological investigations have been conducted at Grand Forks AFB in areas between the airfield and Base boundaries, along the southern Base boundary, and within the southeastern corner of the Base. The remainder of acreage at the Base has been previously disturbed from construction grading for the existing facilities.

A 235-acre area on Grand Forks AFB was surveyed in 1989 for archaeological resources in areas west of the airfield. Two sites and three isolated finds were identified and all were evaluated as not eligible for listing on the NRHP (Artz, 1989). In 1995 and 1996, approximately 1,595 acres were surveyed on Grand Forks AFB as part of a Class III Intensive Cultural Resources Inventory in areas between the airfield and Base boundaries and within the southeast corner of the Base. Four sites and three isolated finds were identified, and all were evaluated as not eligible for listing on the NRHP (Crane et al., 1996; Science Applications International Corporation [SAIC], 2011; Grand Forks AFB, 2012).

A cultural resources survey of 1,293 acres in the project area was conducted in 2022. During the survey, eight archaeological resources that were previously identified were reconfirmed. In addition, the 2022 survey identified two cultural properties in the project area that had not previously been identified. All 10 sites were recommended ineligible for listing on the NRHP due to lack of integrity or significance (Grand Forks AFB, 2023). In a letter dated 15 December 2023 (**Appendix A**), the State Historical Society of North Dakota concurred with Grand Forks AFB's determination of "No Historic Properties Affected."

3.10.2.2 Traditional Cultural Properties

Grand Forks AFB has no known TCPs and there is no evidence of any Native American burial grounds or sacred areas on Grand Forks AFB that would be subject to the provisions of the *American Indian Religious Freedom Act*, *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act*, or NHPA (Grand Forks AFB, 2016).

In accordance with DoDI 4710.02, *Interactions with Federally Recognized Tribes*, and DAFI 90-2002, *Air Force Interaction with Federally Recognized Tribes*, consultation with Tribal Historic Preservation Officers and tribal leaders of the 29 federally recognized Native American tribes with interest in the region was undertaken as part of the EIAP (and the 2022 cultural survey described in **Section 10.2.1**) to identify TCPs that could be affected by the Proposed Action. The 2022 cultural resources survey, which included tribal participation, did not identify any cultural resources or TCPs. The survey team was assisted and accompanied in the field by Traditional Cultural Specialists from the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, and the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. No TCPs were identified in the project area as part of this endeavor (Grand Forks AFB, 2023).

3.10.2.3 Architectural Properties

No eligible NRHP-listed buildings are located within the proposed project area. A reconnaissance inventory of Cold War-era resources and related material culture was conducted in 1995 at eight selected bases throughout the US. A total of 242 facilities on or supported by Grand Forks AFB were inventoried and evaluated, of which one (Building 714) located on Grand Forks AFB was identified as potentially eligible for

listing on the NRHP. This building was later demolished in 2013. Additional surveys conducted in 2011 and 2015 did not identify any other structures eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP (SAIC, 2011; HDR, 2016). No historic buildings remain on the Base (Grand Forks AFB, 2016). One historic facility, known as "Cold War Heritage Plaza," serves as mitigation for the demolition of Building 306. This facility is an outdoor interpretative boardwalk with 20 storyboards describing the history of Grand Forks AFB during the Cold War (Grand Forks AFB, 2016). This facility is located outside of the proposed project area.

3.10.3 Environmental Consequences

3.10.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Adverse impacts on cultural resources would occur if the Proposed Action or Alternatives results in the following:

- physically altering, damaging, or destroying all or part of a resource;
- altering characteristics of the surrounding environment that contribute to the resource's significance;
- introducing visual or audible elements that are out of character with the property or alter its setting;
- neglecting the resource to the extent that it deteriorates or is destroyed; or
- the sale, transfer, or lease of the property out of agency ownership (or control) without adequate enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure preservation of the property's historic significance.

For the purposes of this EA, an impact is considered significant if it alters the integrity of a NRHP-listed, eligible, or potentially eligible resource or potentially impacts TCPs.

3.10.3.2 Proposed Action

Archaeological Properties

No impacts to archaeological properties would be anticipated to occur under the Proposed Action. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of an archaeological resource during demolition or construction, ground-disturbing activities would be suspended, and a cultural resources meeting called to determine if an Unanticipated Discovery Plan would be developed and implemented.

As part of the 2022 survey, two cultural properties were newly identified in the proposed project area. There are also eight archaeological resources in the project area that were previously identified and reconfirmed during the 2022 survey. All properties, including the two new cultural properties, have been recommended as ineligible for NRHP (Grand Forks AFB, 2022). Under the Proposed Action, no NRHP-eligible sites would be impacted; therefore, no effects to archaeological properties would be anticipated to occur. In a letter dated 15 December 2023 (**Appendix A**), the State Historical Society of North Dakota concurred with Grand Forks AFB's determination of "No Historic Properties Affected."

Traditional Cultural Properties

No TCPs, sacred sites, human remains, associated grave goods, unassociated grave goods, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony have been identified or recovered on Grand Forks AFB. No impacts to TCPs would be anticipated to occur under the Proposed Action.

Architectural Properties

No eligible NRHP-listed buildings are located within the proposed project area. Under the Proposed Action, no effects to architectural properties would be anticipated to occur.

3.10.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

No cultural resources would be impacted by the Proposed Action. Of the projects listed in **Table 3-1**, none would be located within the ROI of this Proposed Action. Future construction in the proposed project area

unrelated to the Proposed Action would be unlikely due to the proximity to the runway. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB, no significant cumulative impacts to cultural resource would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.10.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. The No Action Alternative would result in no change to cultural resources on the Installation. Taking no action would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.

3.11 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTES, TOXIC SUBSTANCES, AND CONTAMINATED SITES

3.11.1 Definition of the Resource

CERCLA (<u>42 USC § 9601</u> et seq.), as amended by the *Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act* (SARA) and TSCA (<u>15 USC § 2601</u> et seq., as implemented by <u>40 CFR Part 761</u>), defines hazardous materials (HAZMAT) as any substance with physical properties of ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity that might cause an increase in mortality, serious irreversible illness, and incapacitating reversible illness, or that might pose a substantial threat to human health or the environment. The OSHA is responsible for the enforcement and implementation of federal laws and regulations pertaining to worker health and safety under <u>29 CFR Part 1910</u>. OSHA also includes the regulation of HAZMAT in the workplace and ensures appropriate training in their handling.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended under RCRA (<u>42 USC § 6901</u> et seq.) and further amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, defines hazardous wastes as any solid, liquid, contained gaseous, or semi-solid waste, or any combination of wastes, that pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment. In general, both HAZMAT and hazardous wastes include substances that, because of their quantity, concentration, physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, might present substantial danger to public health and welfare or the environment when released or otherwise improperly managed.

Air Force Policy Directive 32-70, *Environmental Considerations in Air Force Programs and Activities*, establishes the policy that the Air Force is committed to performing the following actions:

- cleaning up environmental damage resulting from its past activities,
- meeting all environmental standards applicable to its present operations,
- planning its future activities to minimize environmental impacts,
- responsibly managing the irreplaceable natural and cultural resources it holds in public trust, and
- eliminating pollution from its activities wherever possible.

DAFMAN 32-1067, *Water and Fuel Systems*, identifies compliance requirements for underground storage tanks (USTs) and aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), and associated piping, that store petroleum products and hazardous substances. Evaluation of HAZMAT and hazardous wastes focuses on USTs and ASTs as well as the storage, transport, and use of pesticides, fuels, oils, and lubricants. Evaluation might also extend to generation, storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous wastes when such activity occurs at or near the project site of a Proposed Action. In addition to being a threat to humans, the improper release of HAZMAT and hazardous wastes can threaten the health and wellbeing of wildlife species, botanical habitats, soil systems, and water resources. In the event of HAZMAT and hazardous wastes release, the extent of contamination will vary based on the type of soil, topography, weather conditions, and water resources that occur in the vicinity of the event.

DAFMAN 32-7002, *Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention*, establishes procedures and standards that govern management of HAZMAT throughout the Air Force. This manual applies to all Air

Force personnel who authorize, procure, issue, use, or dispose of HAZMAT, and to those who manage, monitor, or track any associated activities.

Through the Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) initiated in 1980, a subcomponent of the Defense ERP that became law under SARA (formerly the Installation Restoration Program), each DoD installation is required to identify, investigate, and clean up hazardous waste disposal or release sites. Remedial activities for ERP sites follow the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments under the RCRA Corrective Action Program. The ERP provides a uniform, thorough methodology to evaluate past disposal sites, control the migration of contaminants, minimize potential hazards to human health and the environment, and clean up contamination through a series of stages until it is decided that no further remedial action is warranted.

Description of ERP activities provides a useful gauge of the condition of soils, water resources, and other resources that might be affected by contaminants. It also aids in the identification of properties and their usefulness for given purposes (e.g., activities dependent on groundwater usage might be foreclosed where a groundwater contaminant plume remains to complete remediation).

Toxic substances might pose a risk to human health but are not regulated as contaminants under the hazardous waste statutes. Included in this category are asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, radon, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). A proposed activity may affect and be affected by the presence of special hazards or controls over them. Information on special hazards describing their locations, quantities, and condition assists in determining the significance of such activity.

The ROI for HAZMAT and hazardous wastes is Grand Forks AFB. The Proposed Action would not involve building construction, demolition, or renovation activities; therefore, asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, radon, and PCBs are not discussed further.

3.11.2 Existing Conditions

3.11.2.1 Hazardous Materials and Wastes

The State of North Dakota implements RCRA and regulates hazardous waste under the National Defense Advisory Commission Chapter 33-24, *Hazardous Waste Management*, which adopted federal hazardous waste regulations with few additions. Additionally, the *Grand Forks AFB Hazardous Waste Management Plan* outlines the responsibility and provides instruction for appropriate waste handling and management to ensure conformance with the regulations, policies, and guidance for any hazardous wastes generated, treated, stored, or responded to (in terms of releases) on the Base (Grand Forks AFB, 2020a). Grand Forks AFB's SPCC Plan contains specific procedures for preparing for and responding to inadvertent discharges of oil or releases of hazardous substances at the Base (Grand Forks AFB, 2019).

Grand Forks AFB is classified as a small-quantity hazardous waste generator, in that the Base produces greater than 100 kilograms (220 pounds) but less than 1,000 kilograms (2,200 pounds) of hazardous waste in a calendar month (Grand Forks AFB, 2020a; USEPA, 2022a). The largest volume of hazardous waste on the Base is generated by aircraft and jet engine maintenance and overhaul activities. Additional activities that generating hazardous wastes include a dental laboratory; the Auto Skills Development Center; paint removal and application; degreasing; metal etching and carbon removal of engines; and abrasive blasting. These activities require the use of hazardous metals and large volumes of solvents and generate dust and liquid waste. Other hazardous wastes include petroleum products and waste, hydraulic fluid, antifreeze, and mercury-containing light bulbs and ballasts.

Grand Forks AFB does not have a permitted hazardous waste storage facility, and waste is stored on Base in containers at a satellite accumulation point (SAP). SAPs are areas where hazardous waste is initially accumulated at or near the point of generation that is under the control of the SAP manager. Hazardous wastes accumulated at an SAP are not subject to accumulation time limits; however, they are subject to volume limits (Grand Forks AFB, 2020a). After accumulation at the SAP, all hazardous wastes generated at Grand Forks AFB are transferred to the central accumulation site where they are transferred off Base by Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services to a treatment, storage, and disposal facility. Small-quantity generators like Grand Forks AFB may store waste for up to 270 days if the waste must be shipped 200

miles or more to the nearest treatment, storage, and disposal facility. Grand Forks AFB is more than 200 miles from the nearest treatment, storage, and disposal facility and can therefore store hazardous wastes for up to 270 days without a permit (Grand Forks AFB, 2020a).

3.11.2.2 Fuel Storage

Fuel storage containers at Grand Forks AFB that are subject to SPCC Plan requirements include ASTs, USTs, emergency generators with external and/or internal tanks, oil/water separators, mobile tanks, drums, and oil-filled operating equipment. Grand Forks AFB currently has 40 ASTs and 11 USTs (Grand Forks AFB, 2019). Thirteen ASTs are located in the proposed project area.

The majority of the petroleum handled at Grand Forks AFB is jet fuel (JP-8) used for military aircraft. JP-8 is stored in field-erected bulk storage ASTs at two facilities: the contractor-operated Bulk Fuel Storage Area (Pumphouse 501) located on the south side of the Base between Eilson Street and Building 516 (currently vacant), and the Hydrant Fuels Area (Pumphouse 658) located approximately 115 ft north of Unmanned Aircraft Systems Squadron Operations (Building 542).

3.11.2.3 Environmental Restoration Program and Other Potentially Contaminated Sites

The Secretary of Defense established the ERP in 1981 to investigate and remediate hazardous waste sites at DoD facilities. The Air Force subsequently established its ERP to locate and investigate hazardous waste sites on its installations, termed ERP sites. Fully restored and remediated ERP sites present few constraints to future on-Base development; however, land use controls⁴ may be required. Grand Forks AFB has five ERP sites and one Area of Concern⁵ (**Table 3-12** and **Figure 3-11**).

Site Number	Name	Status
FT002	Fire Training Area/Old Sanitary Landfill Area	Closed, long-term monitoring
LF003	New Sanitary Landfill Area	Closed, long-term monitoring
ST007	Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants Off-Loading Area	Long-term monitoring
ST008	Refueling Ramps and Pads	Natural attenuation with no long-term monitoring
TU503	Fuel storage USTs next to Building 501	Long-term monitoring
TU504	Jet Engine Test Cell at Building 539 (Area of Concern)	Long-term monitoring

Table 3-12.Environmental Restoration Program Sites

ERP Site FT002 has been capped and is considered closed; the site is undergoing shallow and deep groundwater monitoring, surface water monitoring, and cap maintenance. LF003 also is considered closed and is undergoing shallow groundwater monitoring. ST007 also is undergoing shallow groundwater monitoring. Per an agreement with NDDH, ST008, does not require further monitoring at this time and the remedy is solely natural attenuation. TU503 is being treated with monitored natural attenuation⁶ and is

⁴ Land use controls may consist of non-engineered instruments, such as administrative and legal controls or engineered and physical barriers (e.g., fences and security guards). Land use controls help to minimize the potential for exposure to contamination and/or protect the integrity of a response action and are typically designed to work by limiting land and/or resource use or by providing information that helps modify or guide human behavior at a site (USEPA, 2022b).

⁵ An Area of Concern is any area of a facility where a release of hazardous waste to the environment has occurred, is suspected to have occurred, or may occur, regardless of the frequency or duration of the release (Law Insider, 2023).

⁶ Refers to the reliance on natural attenuation (lessening in amount, force, magnitude, or value) processes (within the context of a carefully controlled and monitored site cleanup approach) to achieve site-specific remediation objectives within a timeframe that is reasonable compared to that offered by other, more active methods (USEPA, 1999).




undergoing groundwater monitoring. TU504 also is being treated with monitored natural attenuation in conjunction with phytoremediation⁷ and is undergoing groundwater monitoring (Grand Forks AFB, 2020c). None of the ERP sites is located in the proposed project area.

The former grenade range GR752 and the current grenade range sites are located within the proposed project area. The former grenade range was closed in 1995 and subsequently regraded and reseeded with native species. No additional cleanup activity is required for the site (Grand Forks AFB, 2014b).

3.11.2.4 Perfluoroalkyl Substances and Aqueous Film Forming Foam

PFAS is a group of synthetic fluorinated chemicals employed in a wide variety of residential, commercial, and industrial uses and can be found in everyday items such as nonstick cookware, stain-resistant fabric and carpet, certain types of food packaging, and firefighting foam (Air Force Civil Engineer Center [AFCEC], 2022). Scientific studies have shown that exposure to some PFAS in the environment may be linked to harmful health effects in humans and animals. In recent years, the USEPA has been taking steps to address PFAS and protect communities across the US. In 2016, the USEPA announced advisory levels for two types of PFAS in drinking water, perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA). In August 2022, the USEPA issued a proposal to designate two of the most widely used PFAS as hazardous substances under CERCLA (USEPA, 2023b).In March 2023, the USEPA proposed to establish legally enforceable levels for six PFAS known to occur in drinking water.

Aqueous film forming foam (AFFF), which the Air Force began to use in the 1970s to extinguish petroleumbased fires, contains both PFOS and PFOA. In August of 2016, the Air Force began phasing out PFOSbased AFFF and other AFFF products and introduced newer, more environmentally friendly formulas. In August 2017, the Air Force finished the phase-out and completed the new foam delivery. All Air Force investigation and mitigation work relating to PFOS and PFOA is performed in accordance with CERCLA, applicable state laws, and the USEPA's lifetime drinking water health advisory of 70 parts per trillion (AFCEC, 2023). Up until at least May 2017, Grand Forks AFB operated several AFFF suppression systems as a component of the Base's overall fire protection system. These systems were installed in Hangars 601, 603, 605, and 649 (Grand Forks AFB, 2017).

 Table 3-13 provides information on nine identified AFFF-contaminated sites.

3.11.2.5 Pesticides

The application of all pesticides at Grand Forks AFB, including herbicides, fungicides, insecticides, and rodenticides, is authorized by Grand Forks AFB's Integrated Pest Management Program, which contains policies, standards, and requirements meant to establish and maintain safe, effective, and environmentally sound integrated pest management procedures (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). The Base also operates under a North Dakota Pesticide Discharge General Permit, which authorizes discharge to surface waters of the state from handling, use, or application of pesticides for activities conducted in accordance with state laws and regulations; the *Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act*; and proper pesticide labeling procedures (Grand Forks AFB, 2018c). Additionally, pesticide usage outside the Base boundary is subject to federal regulation under TSCA.

3.11.3 Environmental Consequences

3.11.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

Impacts on hazardous materials management would be considered adverse if the federal action results in noncompliance with applicable federal and state regulations or increases the amounts generated or procured beyond current Grand Forks AFB waste management procedures and capacities. Impacts on the ERP would be considered adverse if the Proposed Action disturbs (or creates) contaminated sites resulting in negative effects on human health or the environment.

⁷ The treatment of pollutants or waste (as in contaminated soil or groundwater) by the use of green plants that remove, degrade, or stabilize the undesirable substances (such as toxic metals).

Table 3-13.			
Aqueous	Film Forming	Foam Areas	

AFFF Area Number	AFFF Area Name	Associated Existing ERP Site	Area Selection Rationale
1	Former Fire Training Area 1	FT002	There is a high probability that large quantities of AFFF were used during fire training exercises. The two unlined burn pits were used from the late 1950s until the mid-1980s.
2	Current Fire Training Area	None	AFFF was used during equipment testing. The AFFF pond accidentally overflowed and drained to the adjacent ditches in 2010. Approximately 30–50 gallons of AFFF were used during each training event.
3	Hangar 601	None	The hangar has an AFFF fire suppression system. AFFF has been observed on the adjacent concrete pavement. Less than 20 gallons of AFFF mixture may have migrated into the nearby grassy areas.
4	Hangar 605	None	The hangar has an AFFF fire suppression system. Small amounts of AFFF have been observed on the paved ramp adjacent to the hangar.
5	Hangar 649	None	The hangar has an AFFF fire suppression system. No known AFFF releases have occurred inside the hangar. A buried AFFF concentrate supply line at the northwest corner of the hangar developed a leak and released an unknown volume of AFFF concentrate outside the hangar.
6	1980 B-52 Fire	None	Unknown one-time volume of AFFF was used to extinguish a B–52 fire. AFFF likely migrated to nearby grass-covered areas.
7	1983 B-52 Fire	None	An unknown volume of AFFF was used to extinguish a B-52 fire. AFFF likely migrated to nearby grass-covered areas.
8	Sewage Lagoons	None	Sewage lagoons, potentially containing AFFF, discharge several times a year through NPDES Outfalls 001A and 001B into surface drainage features.
9	Outfall West	None	Potentially AFFF-contaminated stormwater from the B-52 fires and the current fire training area may have been released through Outfall West into the Turtle River.

Source: Aerostar, 2019

AFFF = aqueous film forming foam; ERP = Environmental Restoration Program; NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

3.11.3.2 Proposed Action

Hazardous Materials and Wastes

The use of certain HAZMAT would be required during activities associated with the Proposed Action, such as petroleum fuel products used in equipment and machinery necessary for topography reconstruction. Construction contractors would be responsible for monitoring exposure to HAZMAT. Adherence to the Grand Forks AFB *Hazardous Waste Management Plan* would minimize impacts from the handling and disposal of hazardous substances and ensure compliance with state and federal hazardous materials regulations (Grand Forks AFB, 2020a). Potential impacts from the accidental release of such products would be minimized by following response procedures specified in Grand Forks AFB's SPCC Plan (Grand Forks AFB, 2019). Short-term, negligible impacts could occur due to the use of HAZMAT during activities associated with the Proposed Action.

Fuel Storage

Activities associated with the Proposed Action would not require the use of existing fuel storage facilities on Grand Forks AFB or the addition of new fuel storage facilities; therefore, no impacts to fuel storage would be anticipated to occur under the Proposed Action.

Environmental Restoration Program Sites

Although several ERP sites intersect with or are located alongside the proposed project area, all activities associated with the Proposed Action would take place west of the ERP sites and would not result in disturbance to those locations (see **Figure 3-9**). Therefore, no impacts to ERP sites would be anticipated to occur under the Proposed Action.

PFAS/AFFF

PFAS may be present in soil and/or groundwater throughout the project area, including ERP Site FT002, a former fire training area, due to the use of AFFFs. No ground disturbance or impacts to Site FT002 would be anticipated to occur under the Proposed Action.

As stated in **Table 3-13**, potentially AFFF-contaminated stormwater may have been released through the Outfall West into the Turtle River. Whenever possible, disturbance of the identified AFFF sites would be avoided to reduce potential impacts. However, the extent of AFFF contamination is not known at this time.

Pesticides

Implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in a change to the application of pesticides, fungicides, insecticides, and rodenticides at Grand Forks AFB. Herbicides would be used to assist in the replacement of existing grasslands with airfield vegetation unattractive to wildlife. With the establishment of new vegetation as part of the Proposed Action, broadleaf herbicides would continue to be used to manage weeds. Impacts to natural resources from herbicide applications include potential impacts to non-target species, runoff from application sites, and unintentional releases to the environment by spills and application errors of chemicals. All pesticide-related activities would continue to be monitored under Grand Forks AFB's Integrated Pest Management Plan. Pesticide usage would increase in the short term but would return to normal levels in the long term under the Proposed Action.

3.11.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action would result in negligible impacts related to HAZMAT and hazardous wastes; any additional facility construction in the future (unrelated to this Proposed Action) would need to be evaluated for impacts to HAZMAT and hazardous wastes. Of the projects listed in **Table 3-1**, only the GrandSKY project would be located within the ROI of this Proposed Action but no cumulative impacts would be expected since GrandSKY is located on separate leased land. Continued use of broadleaf herbicides would have minor impacts to vegetation. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB, no significant cumulative impacts to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.11.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no action to the project area would be undertaken. There would be no changes to HAZMAT and hazardous wastes management beyond baseline conditions. The No Action Alternative would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.

3.12 INFRASTRUCTURE, INCLUDING TRANSPORTATION AND UTILITIES

3.12.1 Definition of the Resource

Infrastructure consists of the systems and structures that enable a population in a specified area to function. Infrastructure is wholly man-made, with a high correlation between the type and extent of infrastructure and the degree to which an area is characterized as developed. Infrastructure components include transportation and utility systems, solid waste management, and stormwater infrastructure. The availability of infrastructure and its capacity to support more users, including future development of an area, are generally regarded as essential to continued economic growth.

Transportation is defined as the system of roadways, highways, and transit services that provide ingress/egress from or to a particular location, as well as access to regional goods and services. Utilities include electrical, natural gas, potable water, sanitary sewage/wastewater, stormwater conveyance, and communications systems. Solid waste management primarily relates to landfill capacity for disposal of nonhazardous solid waste (e.g., construction waste) generated in an area or by a population. Stormwater infrastructure includes the man-made conveyance systems that function in tandem with natural drainages to collect and control the rate of surface runoff during and after a precipitation event. In urbanized areas, stormwater that is not discharged to a waterbody is conveyed to sanitary sewers, systems that collect, move, and treat liquid waste prior to its discharge back into the environment.

The ROI for infrastructure, transportation, and utilities is Grand Forks AFB and the external infrastructure components and services relied upon to operate the Base.

3.12.2 Existing Conditions

3.12.2.1 Transportation

The transportation system at Grand Forks AFB comprises more than 420 acres of paved roadways, driveways, and parking lots, of which almost half is paved roadways (Grand Forks AFB, 2017). Traffic volume peaks entering the Base from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. and exiting from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The gates average approximately 34,000 scans per week (Grand Forks AFB, 2017).

The primary roadways on the Base are Eielson Street, J Street, and Steen Boulevard. Steen Boulevard provides east-to-west access to the Base from its main entrance at 25th Street NE; Eielson Street provides north-to-south access from US Highway 2, and J Street provides a north-to-west corridor for the east side of the Base.

3.12.2.2 Communications

The communications system on the Base consists of fiber-optic cables between buildings and twisted-pair copper cable for in-building conductivity. Manhole and conduit systems provide communications support to the Base through buried communication infrastructure. Service and infrastructure are available to support a range of communication requirements such as voice, data, video, wireless, land mobile radio, aircraft, and security systems (Grand Forks AFB, 2017). Operations of the High Frequency Global Communications System are overseen by the Communications Squadron, which provides command and control to the President, Cabinet Members, DoD agencies, and other US Government aircraft and ships around the world.

3.12.2.3 Electricity and Natural Gas

Electricity at Grand Forks AFB is provided by Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., with an annual capacity of 138 kilovolts (kV) and a high daily demand of 55.2 kV. Currently, the Base is using approximately 40 percent of the electrical capacity (Grand Forks AFB, 2017). The majority of the electrical system on Base consists of underground lines, and emergency backup generators support mission facilities, utility services, and contingency situations by supplying emergency electrical power to critical facilities on the Base (Grand Forks AFB, 2006).

Xcel Energy, a local distributing company, supplies natural gas to Grand Forks AFB. The Base is served by a 12-inch main pipeline that delivers natural gas to the metering station (Building 163) near the main gate, where an 8-inch main distributes natural gas from the main metering station to the rest of the Base. Heating facilities on Base largely use natural gas, and natural gas capacity is available for future Base expansion (Grand Forks AFB, 2006).

3.12.2.4 Potable Water Supply

Potable water at Grand Forks AFB is received from the City of Grand Forks, which draws from the Red River and Red Lake River. There are two water mains that serve the Base: a 14-inch main from the City of Grand Forks, and an 8-inch main from the East Central Regional Water District. Four elevated storage tanks provide a capacity of 1.9 million gallons of water for the Base (Grand Forks AFB, 2018a). The water distribution system is maintained by Base Utilities Inc., and recent water quality monitoring performed in compliance with state and federal requirements indicates no violations or exceedances of drinking water quality standards (Bioenvironmental Engineering, 2019).

3.12.2.5 Sewage

The sewage system at Grand Forks AFB is designed to feed sewage treatment lagoons via a system of gravity and force mains using two primary lift stations. One lift station, Facility 1336, is located in the north central portion of the Base and primarily serves the family housing area, an elementary school, and northern section of the flightline. The other lift station, Facility 801, is located in the south-central portion of the Installation and serves a portion of the housing area, an elementary school, and administrative and community facilities associated with the proposed projects. The sewage treatment lagoons are operated by the Base and located less than one mile east of the main cantonment area on Base property. The treatment lagoons consist of four treatment cells: one primary, two secondary, and one tertiary cell. Treated wastewater is discharged from the lagoons under State of North Dakota Wastewater Discharge Permit ND0020621 and flows into the south drainage ditch, which empties into Kellys Slough NWR (Grand Forks AFB, 2020b). Wastewater discharge into Kellys Slough has not been necessary in recent years due to the reduced population on the Base and rehabilitation projects occurring at the lagoons.

3.12.2.6 Solid Waste Management

DAFMAN 32-7002, *Environmental Compliance and Pollution Prevention*, is implemented under an Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan (Grand Forks AFB. 2020d). The 319 RW Civil Engineer Squadron (CES), Installation Management Flight, Environmental Element (319 CES/CEIE) has overall responsibility for implementing the solid waste management program and is the lead organization for monitoring compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

Grand Forks AFB does not generate waste that meets the definition of industrial solid waste, nor does it have an active on-site landfill. Municipal waste is disposed of through a contract with the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill (Permit No. 0347). Located approximately 12 miles from the Base, the landfill receives municipal solid waste that is collected and transported under contract by Waste Management (Grand Forks AFB. 2020d). Waste Management is responsible for providing weight tickets for all disposed waste and this information is managed and maintained by the 319 CES/CEIE.

3.12.3 Environmental Consequences

3.12.3.1 Evaluation Criteria

The Air Force defines a significant effect on or from infrastructure, transportation, and utilities within the ROI as one or more of the following:

- measurable change or service reduction within the regional transportation network;
- prolonged or repeated interruption of public transportation services regionally;
- prolonged or repeated service disruptions to utility end users; and
- substantial increase in utility demand relative to existing and planned regional uses.

3.12.3.2 Proposed Action

Transportation

Since no new personnel are included as part of the Proposed Action, long-term vehicular traffic would not increase. Increased truck traffic and construction workers commuting to the Installation during periods of construction would be expected to cause temporary increases in demand and increased congestion on local roads. At project sites, temporary lane closures would be expected during construction activities. However, construction-related traffic would most likely occur on the western side of the Base, away from daily traffic in the cantonment. The transportation system is in good condition and meets current and future mission needs. In order to haul approximately 3700 cubic yards of fill to the Base, roughly 185 heavy truck trips would occur off-site over the course of the project; the proposed source of the fill material is currently unknown. When compared to daily traffic arriving and departing from Grand Forks AFB, this increase would be negligible. Overall, the Proposed Action would not impact the transportation systems on and off the Installation.

Communications

The Proposed Action would not impact the communications systems on the Installation. No impacts to the communications system would be expected.

Electricity and Natural Gas

The Proposed Action would not impact the electricity and natural gas systems on the Installation. No impacts to the electricity and natural gas systems would be expected.

Potable Water Supply

The Proposed Action would not impact the potable water supply on the Installation. No impacts to the potable water supply would be expected.

<u>Sewage</u>

The Proposed Action would not impact the sewage system on the Installation. No impacts to the sewage system would be expected.

Solid Waste Management

The Proposed Action would not impact the solid waste management systems on the Installation. No impacts to the solid waste management systems would be expected.

3.12.3.3 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the Proposed Action at Grand Forks AFB would not result in or contribute to any operational changes to the airfield, transportation network, or any other related infrastructure on the Base. Any construction-related impacts to traffic would be short term and temporary. Based on the location and timeline of projects listed in Table 3-1, construction activities associated with the Proposed Action would not combine with impacts at Grand Forks AFB to create a cumulative impact. Construction related traffic on the west side of the base could overlap with construction traffic for the GrandSKY development. However, any cumulative traffic impacts would be infrequent and intermittent at that location. When considered in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions at Grand Forks AFB, no significant cumulative impacts to infrastructure including transportation and utilities would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the Proposed Action.

3.12.3.4 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no projects under the Proposed Action would occur. The No Action Alternative would result in no change to the infrastructure and utilities systems on the Installation. Taking no action would leave the Installation out of compliance with DAFI 91-202 and DAFI 91-212 regarding airfield vegetation.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 4 LIST OF PREPARERS

The following individuals assisted in the preparation of this Final EA:

Danielle Cemprola

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC NEPA Program Manager M.B.A., Business Administration M.S., Community Development B.S., Geography Years of Experience: 16 Contribution: Program Management and Quality Control

Ronald Green, PhD

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC Project Manager/Senior Scientist Ph.D., Zoology M.S., Wildlife Biology B.S., Wildlife Biology Years of Experience: 33 Contribution: Biological Resources

Kevin Groppe, PE

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC Project Manager M.S., Environmental Engineering B.S., Chemical Engineering Years of Experience: 25 Contribution: Project Management, Safety, Noise

Michael Nied

Environmental Engineer B.S., Biological Systems Engineering–Natural Resources Years of Experience: 11 Contribution: Biological Resources

Violet Perry

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC Environmental Planner M.S., Urban Planning AICP Candidate B.S., Outdoor Adventure Leadership Years of Experience: 1 Contribution: GIS, Water Resources

Joanne Stover

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC B.S., Business Administration Years of Experience: 30 Contribution: Technical Editor/Document Production

Karin Volpe

Environmental Assessment Services, LLC Environmental Planner B.A., Urban Planning Minors: Disaster Risk Reduction Years of Experience: 3 Contribution: Waste Management, Infrastructure

Christa Stumpf

Versar, Inc. Program Manager, NEPA Planner M.S., Forest Resource and Land Use Planning B.S., Wildland Management Years of Experience: 24 Contribution: Air Quality

4.1 GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTORS

The following individuals contributed to this EA:

Contributor	Organization/Affiliation
Grace Keesling	AFCEC/CIET
Sarah Amthor	AFIMSC Det 8/CEO
Maj Enisa Dervisevic	AFLOA/JAOE-ELFSC
Lance Landon	319 CES/CENP
Jeff Fuqua	319 CES/CENP
Don Phillips	319 CES/CENM
Yia Liberman	319 CES/CENPD
Andrew Swenson	319 RW/SEG
Kristen Rundquist	ACC 319 CES/CEIEC
Robert E. Greene	319 CES/CENPL

CHAPTER 5 REFERENCES

- Aerostar. 2019. Final Site Inspection Report of Aqueous Film Forming Foam Areas at Grand Forks Air Force Base Grand Forks County, North Dakota. May.
- Air Force Civil Engineer Center (AFCEC). 2022. Fact Sheet: Department of the Air Force Response to PFAS. US Air Force. <u>https://www.afcec.af.mil/Portals/17/documents/Environment/Emerging%20contaminants/PFAS%2</u> <u>0Fact%20Sheet%20Draft%20220504_1.pdf?ver=IR3SR3Pzh9iwJLx-S0fC2A%3d%3d</u> (accessed 2 May 2023).
- AFCEC. 2023. "Air Force Response to PFAS". <u>https://www.afcec.af.mil/WhatWeDo/Environment/Perfluorinated-Compounds/</u> (accessed 2 May 2023).
- Artz, J.A. 1989. The Past in Mekinock Township: Cultural Resources of the Proposed Peacekeeper Rail Garrison Program, Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks County, North Dakota.

Bioenvironmental Engineering. 2019. Grand Forks Air Force Base Drinking Water Quality Report 2019.

- Berglund, B. and T. Lindvall, (Eds.). 1995. "Community noise." *Archives of the Center for Sensory Research*, 2(1), 1-195. <u>https://www.nonoise.org/library/whonoise/whonoise.htm</u> (accessed 24 April 2023).
- Commission for Environmental Cooperation. 1997. *Ecological Regions of North America Toward a Common Perspective*. <u>http://www.cec.org/files/documents/publications/1701-ecological-regions-north-america-toward-common-perspective-en.pdf</u> (accessed 19 September 2023).
- Crane, B.D., C. Shields, V. Robertson, and J. Abell. 1996. *Grand Forks Air Force Base Cultural Resources Survey*.
- Department of the Air Force. 2017. *Final Supplemental EA for the Relocation of the North Dakota Air Branch to Grand Forks Air Force* Base.
- Department of Defense (DoD). 2014. Memorandum of Understanding Between the U.S. Department of Defense and the U.S. Fish And Wildlife Service to Promote the conservation of Migratory Birds.
- Department of Transportation. 2006. *Construction Noise Handbook*. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/
- Federal Aviation Administration and US Department of Agriculture. 2021. *Wildlife Strikes to Civil Aircraft in the United States 1990–2019*. February.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2020. "FEMA Flood Maps and Zones Explained." <u>https://www.fema.gov/blog/fema-flood-maps-and-zones-explained</u> (accessed 24 February 2023).
- FEMA. 2022. "FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer." <u>https://hazards-</u> <u>fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9c</u> <u>d&extent=-97.41978223846563,47.97462557101016,-97.37824018524189,47.9889886186338</u> (accessed 5 August 2022).

Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB). 2006. General Plan: Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. April.

Grand Forks AFB. 2012. *Final Environmental Assessment Addressing Riparian Restoration and Stabilization at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota*. US Air Force. September.

Grand Forks AFB. 2013a. Final Wetlands Management Plan. US Air Force.

Grand Forks AFB. 2013b. Noxious and Invasive Weed Survey and Inventory and Weed Control and Management Plan. October 2013.

Grand Forks AFB. 2014a. Butterfly and Moth Survey, Report, and Management Plan. January.

Grand Forks AFB. 2014b. Final Comprehensive Site Evaluation Phase I/II Report. October.

Grand Forks AFB. 2016. Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. US Air Force. April.

Grand Forks AFB. 2017. *Installation Development Plan.* Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. US Air Force.

- Grand Forks AFB. 2018a. Asbestos Management Plan for Grand Forks Air Force Base. US Air Force.
- Grand Forks AFB. 2018b. Environmental Assessment for Multiple Projects at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. February.
- Grand Forks AFB. 2018c. Pesticide Discharge General Permit NDG870000. US Air Force.
- Grand Forks AFB. 2019. Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan. Department of the Air Force Air Mobility Command 319th Air Base Wing Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. April.
- Grand Forks AFB. 2020a. Hazardous Waste Management Plan. Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. US Air Force.
- Grand Forks AFB. 2020b. Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. US Air Force.

Grand Forks AFB. 2020c. JFSD_FY20CTC_SHARD.doc received 11 November 2020.

Grand Forks AFB. 2021. Climate Change Assessment for Integrated Management Resource Plans.

- Grand Forks AFB. 2022. Wetland Delineation for Airfield BASH Mitigation. February.
- HDR. 2016. Grand Forks Air Force Base Class III Intensive Architectural Resources Inventory. March.
- Law Insider. 2023. "Areas of Concern Definition." <u>https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/areas-of-concern</u> (accessed 1 May 2023).
- North Dakota Game and Fish. 2023. "Species of Conservation Priority." <u>https://gf.nd.gov/wildlife/scp</u> (accessed May 2023).
- North Dakota Department of Health (NDDH). 2018a. *Major Drainage Basins of North Dakota*. Division of Water Quality. <u>https://deq.nd.gov/publications/wq/3_wm/WBD/WBD_Basins.pdf</u> (accessed 26 July 2022).
- NDDH. 2018b. *Major Drainage Subbasins and Codes of North Dakota*. Division of Water Quality. <u>https://deq.nd.gov/publications/wq/3_wm/WBD/WBD_SUBBasinsWithCodes.pdf</u> (accessed 26 July 2022).
- NDDH. 2019. North Dakota 2018 Integrated Section 305(b) Water Quality Assessment Report and 10 Section 303(d) List of Waters Needing Total Maximum Daily Loads.

- North Dakota Department of Agriculture. 2013. "Pesticide Enforcement Program." Noxious and Invasive Weed Survey and Inventory and Weed Control and Management Plan. October.
- Science Applications International Corporation. 2011. *Final Cultural Resource Survey of Historic Places Evaluation of Historic Buildings, Structures and Sites as Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks County, North Dakota.*
- Shaw, D. and R. Schmidt. 2003. *Plants for Stormwater Design*. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. St. Paul, Minnesota.
- US Census Bureau, 2020. "Emerado City Census Profile." https://data.census.gov/profile/Emerado_city,_North_Dakota?g=160XX00US3824060
- US Department of Agriculture. 2023. "Soil Map Grand Forks County, North Dakota (Grand Forks AFB)." Natural Resources Conservation Service. <u>https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/</u>
- US Climate Data. 2019. *Climate Data for Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota*. <u>https://www.usclimatedata.com/climate/grand-forks-afb/north-dakota/united-states/usnd0147</u> (accessed 2 December 2020).
- US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1999. OSWER Directive 9200.4-17P: Use of Monitored Natural Attenuation at Superfund, RCRA Corrective Action, and Underground Storage Tank Sites. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. <u>https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2014-02/documents/d9200.4-17.pdf</u> (accessed 27 April 2023).
- USEPA. 2016. *What Climate Change Means for North Dakota*, EPA 430-F-16-036. August 2016. <u>https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-09/documents/climate-change-nd.pdf</u> (accessed 5 May 2023).
- USEPA. 2020. "Level III & IV Ecoregions of the Continental United States." United States Environmental Protection Agency. <u>https://www.epa.gov/eco-research/level-iii-and-iv-ecoregions-continental-united-states (</u>accessed 15 December 2020).
- USEPA. 2022. "Categories of Hazardous Waste Generators". <u>https://www.epa.gov/hwgenerators/categories-hazardous-waste-generators</u> (accessed 6 September 2022).
- USEPA. 2022b. "Land Use Controls (LUCs)." <u>https://www.epa.gov/fedfac/land-use-controls-lucs</u> (accessed May 2, 2023).
- USEPA. 2023a. "Current Nonattainment Counties for All Criteria Pollutants." <u>https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/ancl.html</u> (accessed 25 June 2023).
- USEPA. 2023b. "Key Actions to Address PFAS". <u>https://www.epa.gov/pfas/key-epa-actions-address-pfas#:~:text=On%20August%2026%2C%202022%2C%20EPA,for%20cleaning%20up%20their%20contamination</u> (accessed 1 May 2023).

This page intentionally left blank