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FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR CONSTRUCT GATR FACILITY

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force

PROPOSED ACTION: The United States Air Force (USAF) proposes to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility on Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), North Dakota. The Communication Squadron is preparing to install new GATR communication antennas and systems, for tactical aircraft control and commercial air traffic control. The antennas are used to provide quick deployment and high-bandwidth communications in remote, hard-to-reach areas. These systems allow operators in central locations to communicate with aircraft operating in the locale where the ground-to-air center is deployed. The system is designed for unattended operation.

Purpose and Need: The purpose of the proposed action is to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility at Grand Forks AFB. A ground to air transmitter and receiver facility is required for regional military/commercial communications between air traffic controller and pilots during the launching and recovering of aircraft. Combining the UHF/VHF transmitter and receiver sites into one consolidated facility minimizes the footprint on the airfield and reduces long term cost of maintaining separate facilities.

A modern, functionally designed, facility is needed for an efficient, effective operation of the newly acquired GATR equipment. The existing facilities 819, Receiver Site, and 820, Transmitter Site, are in disrepair and not sufficient to meet the demands of the GATR equipment. Neither site has sufficient HVAC nor adequate electrical systems or backup power to support the proposed action. Both sites have electrical/backup problems as currently installed. A site survey was conducted in 2004 to determine the feasibility of using one of the existing sites, 819 or 820, for the GATR site. One of the biggest obstacles to using 819 or 820 is keeping the communication hardware operational while renovating the surrounding facility.

The current antenna poles are condemned for climbing. The area floods after winter snow melts and is very swampy. Non-jurisdictional wetlands are abundant in the area. With the wet conditions of the area, the antenna slowly sinks and the input to the antenna corrodes, ultimately degrading and failing. However, the new facility would be best located in the vicinity of 819 or 820 to ease the communications transition, minimize downtime of the communication functions, and maximize the use of existing cable, communication and utility infrastructure. The proposed location avoids the wetlands in the area.

There was an alternative considered but eliminated from detailed study. In 2004 an original site survey at GFAFB for costing to consolidate the ATR Receiver (819) and Transmitter (820) to a single GATR site was accomplished by Tinker AFB. That survey recommended that the Transmitter site 820 be used as the consolidated site because it is in better overall condition, is a flatter site, and easier to get to. It is a smaller building at 1,200 SF; however, a supplemental storage area could provide the additional space needed. There is enough floor space to hold the additional equipment racks, if the racks are moved closer together, and a UPS placed on each
rack. The Receiver site 819 is a larger building at 1,500 SF; however it is of poorer condition. Both buildings need HVAC and electrical system upgrades. This survey to make Bldg 820 the consolidated site has since been discarded, due to the prohibitive costs to move cables twice.

The objectives for the proposed action is to construct a new facility to house the new state-of-the-art Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) equipment, with HVAC, mechanical and electrical and backup power support. The existing radio equipment racks (about 20 total) and radios (both UHF and VHF) will be consolidated from two into one facility. Both the transmitter and receiver UHF and VHF antennas will be consolidated onto new towers/poles. Current coaxial cable should be reusable. New antennas and associated cabling will be purchased with communication funds, due to the poor condition of the existing antenna from harsh weather conditions. The GATR project, common to the Air Force, will keep long term maintenance and facility costs down, while minimizing the footprint out on the airfield. The proposed location meets the criteria of the 7:1 imaginary surface of the potential future crosswind runway and will not require an airfield waiver.

The subsequent demolition of 819 and 820 will be addressed in a separate document. It will need to address storage tank, asbestos, and demolition issues.

Impacts from the Proposed Action would be concurrent with other actions occurring at Grand Forks AFB. There are several other construction and demolition projects occurring on Grand Forks AFB in the same time frame. These projects are addressed under separate NEPA documents. A related EIAP document is the Environmental Assessment (EA) and FONSI accomplished in #2002-116 to remove petroleum contaminated soil near 820. Multiple Transmitter (820) and Receiver (819) facility projects of the past have been categorically excluded, including an economic assessment to determine feasibility to repair versus construct a new facility; add 110V power in racks; emergency lights; lighting to illuminate AST; and denied request to add restroom and water.

Grand Forks AFB must decide whether to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility on this base.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

No Action Alternative 1: The no action alternative would be to leave the base as it is. Communications support equipment would be located in substandard facilities. As deterioration progresses, the Communication Squadron may lose communication support or contact to aircraft. Loss of UHF/VHF receiver/transmitter site capability prohibits the ATC controllers to communicate with both military and civilian aircraft. Aircraft would need to be diverted to another location. The radio receivers and transmitters are critical for controllers to communicate with pilots for safe air traffic control. A poor working environment adversely affects the mission at Grand Forks AFB.

Proposed Action 2: Construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility to house the GATR state-of-the-art communications equipment at a location estimated 650' north of facility 819 on the east side of road. The Communication Squadron proposes a 50x35' facility,
but the final size is contingent on the AMC funding limit. The project requires three new, 80' metal antennas mounted on new guyed metal poles, each 50' from the facility in three directions. Replace the antenna couplers. The communication equipment contractor/designer must conduct a site survey, recommend suitable solutions and provide appropriate foundations, including tower locations and antenna placements on towers. The contractor through coordination with CES would be required to obtain a FAA Aerospace Waiver prior to use of any construction equipment on the airfield. Estimates for equipment power requirements are total equipment power of 8,975 watts, and total equipment BTU of 30,644 BTU.

Alternative Action 3: Locate the GATR facility 750' north of facility 819 on the west side of the road. The area has many wetlands which must be avoided when designing the facility and the three adjacent 80 ft antenna towers. This location would place the facility and antenna another 100 feet farther from the potential crosswind runway.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Air Quality - Air Quality is considered good and the area is in attainment for all criteria pollutants.

Noise - The equipment used in construction will create additional noise. The increase in noise will be negligible and only occur during construction.

Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels - The increase in hazardous and solid wastes from construction will be temporary. Solid waste debris will be disposed of in an approved location, such as the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill. Inert construction debris will be disposed at an approved location, such as Berger Landfill.

Water Resources – Provided best management practices (BMPs) are followed, there will be minimal impacts on stormwater, ground water and water quality. The proposed action will have no impact on wastewater.

Biological Resources – BMPs and control measures, including storm drain covers and covering of stockpiles, will be implemented to ensure that impacts to biological resources be kept to a minimum. BMPs will be required to prevent the spread of noxious weeds, minimize soil erosion, and promote the establishment of native plant species.

Socioeconomic Resources - This action will have a minor positive effect on the local economy. Secondary retail purchases will make an additional contribution to the local communities. The implementation of the proposed action, therefore, will provide a short-term, beneficial impact to local retailers during the construction phase of the project.

Cultural Resources - The proposed action has little potential to impact cultural resources. In the unlikely event any such artifacts were discovered during the construction, the operator or contractor will be instructed to halt operations and immediately notify Grand Forks AFB civil engineers who will notify the State Historic Preservation Officer.
Land Use - The proposed operation will not have an impact on land use, since the areas will remain designated for the original use.

Transportation Systems – The proposed operation will have minor adverse impact to transportation systems on base due to vehicles traveling to and from the construction area.

Airspace/Airfield Operations - The proposed action will not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility.

Safety and Occupational Health – Participants on the installation must wear appropriate personnel protective equipment (PPE).

Environmental Management – The proposed action will not impact ERP Sites. BMPs will be implemented to prevent erosion.

Environmental Justice - EO 12898 requires federal agencies to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. There is no minority or low-income populations in the area of the proposed action or alternatives, and, thus, there will be no disproportionately high or adverse impact on such populations.

A copy of the EA is available at the Grand Forks AFB Public Affairs office. All interested agencies and persons are invited to submit written comments within thirty days from the public notice. The public notice appeared in the Grand Forks AFB Leader and the Grand Forks Herald.

No adverse environmental impact to any of the areas identified by the AF Form 813 is expected by the proposed action, Construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility.

CONCLUSION: Based on the Environmental Assessment performed to Construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility at Grand Forks AFB, no significant environmental impact is anticipated from the proposed action. Based upon this finding, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required for this action. This document and the supporting AF Form 813 fulfill the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA, and Air Force Instruction 32-7061, which implements the CEQ regulations.

WAYNE A. KOOP, R.E.M., GM-13
Environmental Management Flight Chief

Date: 12 MAY 06

Attachment:
Environmental Assessment
Agency: United States Air Force (USAF)

Action: The action proposes to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility at Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), North Dakota.

Contacts: 319 CES/CEVA
525 Tuskegee Airmen Boulevard
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205

Designation: Environmental Assessment (EA)

Abstract: This EA has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, and assesses the potential environmental impacts to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility, located on Grand Forks Air Force Base in Grand Forks County, North Dakota. Resource areas analyzed in the EA include Air Quality; Noise; Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels; Water Resources; Biological Resources; Socioeconomic Resources; Cultural Resources; Land Use; Transportation Systems; Airspace/Airfield Operations; Safety and Occupational Health; Environmental Management; and Environmental Justice.

In addition to the Proposed Action, the Alternative Action and the No Action Alternative were analyzed in the EA. The EA also addresses the potential cumulative effects of the associated activities along with other concurrent actions at Grand Forks AFB and the surrounding area.
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NDPDES  North Dakota Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NEPA  National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAP  National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NFPA  National Fire Protection Act
NHPA  National Historic Preservation Act
NOX  Nitrogen Oxides
NO2  Nitrogen Dioxide
NPDES  National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL  National Priorities List
NRHP  National Register of Historic Places
NWR  National Wildlife Refuge

O3  Ozone
OSHA  Occupational Safety and Health Act
OWS  Oil Water Separator

P2  Pollution Prevention
Pb  Lead
PCS  Petroleum-Contaminated Soil
PEM  Palustrine Emergent Wetland
PM10  Particulate Matter 10 Microns in Diameter
PM2.5  Particulate Matter 25 Microns in Diameter
POL  Petroleum Oil Lubricant
PPE  Personal Protective Equipment
ppm  Parts Per Million
PSD  Prevention of Significant Deterioration

QA/QC  Quality Assessment and Quality Control

RACM  Regulated Asbestos Containing Materials
RCRA  Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RCS  Report Control Symbol
RH  Relative Humidity
RI/FS  Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
RV  Recreational Vehicle

SAGE  Strategic Air Ground Equipment
SAIC  Science Applications International Corporation
SARA  Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SF  Square Feet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNG</td>
<td>Synthetic Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOₓ</td>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWMU</td>
<td>Solid Waste Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>Technical Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpy</td>
<td>Tons Per Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCA</td>
<td>Toxic Substance Control Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI</td>
<td>Thermal System Insulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV</td>
<td>Unmanned Aerial Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHF</td>
<td>Ultra High Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>Uninterruptible Power Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>United States Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UST</td>
<td>Underground Storage Tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Volatile Organic Compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHF</td>
<td>Very High Frequency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States Air Force (USAF) proposes to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility on Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), North Dakota. The Communication Squadron is preparing to install new GATR communication antennas and systems, for tactical aircraft control and commercial air traffic control. The antennas are used to provide quick deployment and high-bandwidth communications in remote, hard-to-reach areas. These systems allow operators in central locations to communicate with aircraft operating in the locale where the ground-to-air center is deployed. The system is designed for unattended operation.

Purpose and Need: The Communication Squadron is preparing to install new Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) communication antennas and systems, for tactical aircraft control and commercial air traffic control. Currently there are two separate Air Traffic Control (ATC) radio facilities (a transmitter and a receiver site, Buildings 820 and 819). Both these facilities are in disrepair, with the need to upgrade and renovate due to water leaks (roof, floor, and walls) and rodent infestation. The current locations of the transmitter and receiver sites are located in the middle of a very swampy area with flooding after the winter snow melt. Non-jurisdictional wetlands are abundant in the area. The electrical systems in both buildings are marginal for communication equipment, backup power, and HVAC capacity. Short circuits in the equipment trip the main breaker and engage the back up generator instead of tripping the breaker which feeds that equipment. Antenna towers (wooden poles) are in poor condition and are unsafe for climbing, which hinders maintenance on the already aging and weather beaten antennas. With the wet conditions of the area, the antenna slowly sinks and the input to the antenna corrodes, ultimately degrading and failing. Intermittent problems with radio communication between ATC and aircraft on the ground in certain locations of the runway and ramp are evident (due to the tree line located outside the fence line). The current site along the base exterior fence line is also an AT/FP concern.

A modern, functionally designed, facility is needed for an efficient, effective operation of the new equipment. There was an alternative considered but eliminated from detailed study. In 2004 an original site survey at GFAFB for costing to consolidate the ATR Receiver (819) and Transmitter (820) to a single GATR site was accomplished by Tinker AFB. The initial survey recommended that the Transmitter site 820 be used as the consolidated site because it is in better overall condition, is a flatter site, and easier to reach than 819. It is a smaller building at 1,200 SF; however, a supplemental storage area could provide the additional space needed. There is enough floor space to hold the additional equipment racks, if the racks are moved closer together, and a UPS placed on each rack. The Receiver site 819 is a larger building at 1,500 SF; however it is of poorer condition. Both buildings need HVAC and electrical system upgrades. The existing facilities 819, Receiver Site, and 820, Transmitter Site, are not sufficient to meet the demands of the GATR equipment. One of the biggest obstacles to using 819 or 820 is keeping the communication hardware operational while renovating the surrounding facility. This survey to make Bldg 820 the consolidated site has since been discarded, due to the prohibitive costs to move cables twice.
The proposed project would provide a new Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility to house the new Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) equipment, with appropriate HVAC, mechanical, electrical and backup power support. The new facility would be located in the vicinity of 819 or 820 to ease the communications transition, minimize downtime of the communication functions, and maximize the use of existing cable, communication and utility infrastructure. The existing radio equipment racks (about 20 total) and radios (both UHF and VHF) will be consolidated from two into one facility. Both the transmitter and receiver UHF and VHF antennas will be consolidated onto new towers/poles. Current coaxial cable should be reusable. New antennas and associated cabling will be purchased with communication funds, due to the poor condition of the existing antenna from harsh weather conditions.

The term “GATR” refers to taking the transmitter and receiver sites and consolidating into one “ground-to-air transmitter and receiver (GATR)” site. It’s a very common project throughout the Air Force. It keeps long term maintenance and facility costs down, while minimizing the footprint out on the airfield. The proposed location meets the criteria of the 7:1 imaginary surface of the current runway and potential future crosswind runway and will not require an airfield waiver.

The subsequent demolition of 819 and 820 will be addressed in a later document. It will need to address storage tank, asbestos, and demolition issues.

Grand Forks Air Force Base must decide whether to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility on Grand Forks AFB.

No Action Alternative 1: The no action alternative would be to leave the base as it is. Communications support equipment would be located in substandard facilities. As deterioration progresses, the Communication Squadron may lose communication support or contact to aircraft. Loss of UHF/VHF receiver/transmitter site capability prohibits the ATC controllers to communicate with both military and civilian aircraft. Aircraft would need to be diverted to another location. The radio receivers and transmitters are critical for controllers to communicate with pilots for safe air traffic control. A poor working environment adversely affects the mission at Grand Forks AFB.

Proposed Action 2: Construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility. See the AF 813 in Appendix D for a description of the proposal, and maps in Appendix E for the proposed location to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility. Construct a facility to house the GATR state-of-the-art communications equipment at a location estimated 650' north of 819 on the east side of road. The Communication Squadron proposes a 50x35' facility, but the final size is contingent on the AMC funding limit. Project shall include masonry construction (burnished black), concrete floor slab on grade with footings, standing seam metal roof, 12 foot high ceiling, underground electrical service, gravel access road, self-contained emergency generator, uninterrupted power supply (UPS), electric heat, air conditioning, facility penetration for communications, fire detection, and all required site improvements. No water, sewer, or fire suppression systems required. All work must be coordinated with the communication equipment contractor/designer. The electric will consist of commercial (12.47/7.2 KV grounded wye), primary/secondary pad mount transformer, and new...
generator with AST (self-contained unit with fuel storage). An overhead wireway (4"x4" minimum) should be provided for power runs to equipment racks. A minimum of two 4-inch conduits with inner duct should be provided from the nearest manhole to the facility demarc for fiber and copper cables. A minimum of six 4-inch ducts (two for each antenna tower) are required from antenna towers to a large junction box mounted on wall of facility (for antenna surge suppressor mounting). Junction box with six 4-inch ports through the wall into the facility, with ground bar connected directly to the earth-electrode subsystem for grounding of surge suppressors. Overhead ladder rack should be provided above the entire length of the facility from the antenna ports to the equipment racks for communications and cabling. The HVAC should consist of all electric heat, AC (direct expansion) maintained at 70F 20-80% RH non-condensing. Facility floor should be grounded in accordance with MIL-HDBK-419A, MIL-STD-188-124B, MIL-HDBK-1857, and MIL-HDBK-454A and provided with Equipotential Ground Plane. In the event a pre-engineered metal building is used for funding reasons, all metal parts would be bonded in accordance with MILSTD-188-124B, Section 5.2. All structural joints would connect IAW paragraph 5.2.6. and mating surfaces cleaned IAW paragraph 5.2.8. to ensure electrical continuity of the structure is maintained.

The project requires three new, 80’ metal antennas mounted on new guyed metal poles, each 50' from the facility in three directions. Replace the antenna couplers. The communication equipment contractor/designer must conduct a site survey, recommend suitable solutions and provide appropriate foundations. Tower locations and antenna placements on towers would be selected in accordance with guidelines contained in TO 31Z3-10-9. The contractor through coordination with CES would be required to obtain a FAA Aerospace Waiver prior to use of any construction equipment on the airfield. Estimates for equipment power requirements are total equipment power = 8975 watts, and total equipment BTU = 30,644 BTU; based on the use of 17 GRT-22 Transmitters x 140 watts = 2380 watts, 6 AM-6155 Amplifiers x 610 watts = 3660 watts, 16 GRR-24 Receivers x 50 watts = 800 watts, 9 GRT-21 Transmitters x 140 watts = 1260 watts, 11 GRR-23 Receivers x 50 watts = 550 watts, 1 G/A Patch Panel x 250 watts = 250 watts, and 1 Fiber Optic MUX x 75 watts = 75 watts. A facility UPS with capacity of 15 KVA sized for 20 minutes of reserve power is recommended. A distribution panel should be provided with minimum of 24 single pole 20A breakers to provide power for equipment racks. The back up generator should have an automatic transfer panel and be sized to power the UPS, lights, and HVAC for the facility, probably 25 KW. Purchase new generator--both the gensets at bldg 819 and 820 are over 15 years old and according to AMC policy are in the age window to be programmed for replacement by the time they are 20 years old. Also they are both only 15 KW generators and 240 volt single phase. Per new AMC AFI32-1063 in 2005, all gensets are to have a facility load of at least 75% of the generator rated load and if 3-phase power would be required, all automatic transfer switches installed are to be of the maintenance bypass/isolation type with a switched neutral (4-pole switch). The proposed location avoids the wetlands in the area.

Alternative Action 3: Locate the GATR facility 750’ north of facility 819 on the west side of the road. The area has many wetlands which must be avoided when designing the facility and the three adjacent 80 ft antenna towers. This location would place the facility and antenna another 100 feet farther from the potential crosswind runway.
Impacts by Resource Area

Air Quality - Air Quality is considered good and the area is in attainment for all criteria pollutants.

Noise - The equipment used in construction would create additional noise. The increase in noise would be negligible and only occur during construction.

Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels - The increase in hazardous and solid wastes from construction would be temporary. Solid waste debris would be disposed of in an approved location, such as the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill. Inert construction debris would be disposed at an approved location, such as Berger Landfill.

Water Resources - Provided best management practices (BMPs) are followed, there would be minimal impacts on stormwater, ground water and water quality. The proposed action would have no impact on wastewater.

Biological Resources – BMPs and control measures, including storm drain covers and covering of stockpiles, would be implemented to ensure that impacts to biological resources be kept to a minimum. BMPs would be required to prevent the spread of noxious weeds, minimize soil erosion, and promote the establishment of native plant species.

Socioeconomic Resources - This action would have a minor positive effect on the local economy. Secondary retail purchases would make an additional contribution to the local communities. The implementation of the proposed action, therefore, would provide a short-term, beneficial impact to local retailers during the construction phase of the project.

Cultural Resources - The proposed action has little potential to impact cultural resources. In the unlikely event any such artifacts were discovered during the construction, the operator or contractor would be instructed to halt operations and immediately notify Grand Forks AFB civil engineers who would notify the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Land Use - The proposed operation would not have an impact on land use, since the areas would remain designated for the original use.

Transportation Systems – The proposed operation would have minor adverse impact to transportation systems on base due to vehicles traveling to and from the construction area.

Airspace/Airfield Operations - The proposed action would not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility.

Safety and Occupational Health – Participants in the construction must wear appropriate personnel protective equipment (PPE).

Environmental Management – The proposed action would not impact ERP Sites. BMPs would be implemented to prevent erosion.
Environmental Justice - EO 12898 requires federal agencies to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. There is no minority or low-income populations in the area of the proposed action or alternatives, and, thus, there would be no disproportionately high or adverse impact on such populations.
1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PROPOSED ACTION

This Environmental Assessment (EA) examines the potential for impacts to the environment resulting from construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility on Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB). As required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, federal agencies must consider environmental consequences in their decision making process. The EA provides analysis of the potential environmental impacts from both the proposed action and its alternatives. The proposed action was described in an AF 813, enclosed in Appendix D. The environmental assessment is assigned RCS number 2006-152. The CES project number assigned is Construct Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) Communication Facility, JFSD200601.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Located in northeastern North Dakota (ND), Grand Forks AFB is the first core refueling wing in Air Mobility Command (AMC) and home to 51 KC-135R Stratotanker aircraft. The host organization at Grand Forks AFB is the 319th Air Refueling Wing (ARW). Its mission is to guarantee global reach, by extending range in the air, supplying people and cargo where and when they are needed and provides air refueling and airlift capability support to United States Air Force (USAF) operations anywhere in the world, at any time. Organizational structure of the 319th ARW consists primarily of an operations group, maintenance group, mission support group, and medical group.

The location of the proposed action and the alternative action would be at Grand Forks AFB, ND. Grand Forks AFB covers approximately 5,420 acres of government-owned land and is located in northeastern ND, about 14 miles west of Grand Forks, along United States (US) Highway 2. Grand Forks (population 49,321) is the third largest city in ND. Appendix A includes a Location Map. The city, and surrounding area, is a regional center for agriculture, education, and government. It is located approximately 160 miles south of Winnipeg, Manitoba, and 315 miles northwest of Minneapolis, Minnesota. The total base population, as of May 2005, is approximately 7,175. Of that, 2,842 are military, 3,953 are military dependents, and 380 civilians working on base (Grand Forks AFB, 2005).

The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 Report submitted by the President to Congress became final after November 8, 2005. This is an important milestone in the restructuring of DoD’s domestic base structure within the process established by Congress. The Department must begin this implementation process within 2 years from the date the President submitted to the Congress (September 15, 2005) and complete it within 6 years. The BRAC Commission’s final recommendation included realignment of the 319th Air Refueling Wing’s KC-135-R/T aircraft to Scott AFB, Seymour-Johnson AFB, MacDill AFB, Hickam AFB and McConnell AFB. It recommended modification of infrastructure at Grand Forks AFB to accommodate the emerging Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) mission. Twelve KC-135 aircraft will remain at Grand Forks AFB to facilitate an efficient and cost effective bed down of UAVs. The tankers will remain in place until the UAVs are operational at GFAFB, but not later than 31 Dec 2010, unless otherwise required for national emergencies. Grand Forks will remain an active Air Force installation with a new active duty/Air National Guard association unit created in anticipation of
emerging missions at Grand Forks. The 119th Fighter Wing at Hector International Airport Air National Guard Station at Fargo ND will be redesignated as a UAV wing, and facilities in Fargo will be expanded to accommodate the UAV ground control and intelligence analysis functions and expeditionary combat support elements. The Air Force will construct appropriate facilities on GFAFB to launch, recover, maintain and support the UAVs assigned to the 119th FW. One of the facilities proposed is the construction of a Crosswind Runway, angling northwest from the south end of the existing runway. The proposed location for the GATR facility would take into consideration the 7:1 imaginary surfaces of a potential crosswind runway. A map of this proposed runway and its relationship to the proposed GATR facility is located in Appendix E.

1.2 NEED FOR THE ACTION

The Communication Squadron is preparing to install new Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) communication antennas and systems, for tactical aircraft control and commercial air traffic control. The antennas are used to provide quick deployment and high-bandwidth communications in remote, hard-to-reach areas. These systems allow operators in central locations to communicate with aircraft operating in the locale where the ground-to-air center is deployed. The system is designed for unattended operation.

Currently there are two separate Air Traffic Control (ATC) radio facilities (a transmitter and a receiver site, Buildings 820 and 819). Both these facilities are in disrepair, with the need to upgrade and renovate due to water leaks (roof, floor, and walls) and rodent infestation. The current locations of the transmitter and receiver sites are located in the middle of a very swampy area with flooding after the winter snow melt. Non-jurisdictional wetlands are abundant in the area. The electrical systems in both buildings are marginal for communication equipment, backup power, and HVAC capacity. Short circuits in the equipment trip the main breaker and engage the back up generator instead of tripping the breaker which feeds equipment. Antenna towers (wooden poles) are in poor condition and are unsafe for climbing, which hinders maintenance on the already aging and weather beaten antennas. With the wet conditions of the area, the antenna slowly sinks and the input to the antenna corrodes, ultimately degrading and failing. Intermittent problems with radio communication between ATC and aircraft on the ground in certain locations of the runway and ramp are evident (due to the tree line located outside the fence line). The current site along the base exterior fence line is also an AT/FP concern.

A modern, functionally designed, facility is needed for an efficient, effective operation of the new equipment. The existing facilities 819, Receiver Site, and 820, Transmitter Site, are not sufficient to meet the demands of the GATR equipment. A site survey was conducted in 2004 to determine the possibility of using one of the existing sites, 819 or 820, for the GATR site. One of the biggest obstacles to using 819 or 820 is keeping the communication hardware operational while renovating the surrounding facility.

1.3 OBJECTIVES FOR THE ACTION

The proposed project would provide a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility to house the new Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) equipment, with appropriate
HVAC, mechanical, electrical and backup power support. The new facility would be located in
the vicinity of 819 or 820 to ease the communications transition, minimize downtime of the
communication functions, and maximize the use of existing cable, communication and utility
infrastructure. The existing radio equipment racks (about 20 total) and radios (both UHF and
VHF) will be consolidated from two into one facility. Both the transmitter and receiver UHF and
VHF antennas will be consolidated onto new towers/poles. Current coaxial cable should be
reusable. New antennas and associated cabling will be purchased with communication funds,
due to the poor condition of the existing antenna from harsh weather conditions.

The term “GATR” refers to taking the transmitter and receiver sites and consolidating into one
“ground-to-air transmitter and receiver (GATR)” site. It’s a very common project throughout the
Air Force. It keeps long term maintenance and facility costs down, while minimizing the
footprint out on the airfield. The proposed location meets the criteria of the 7:1 imaginary
surface of the current runway and potential future crosswind runway and will not require an
airfield waiver.

1.4 SCOPE OF EA

This EA identifies, describes, and evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with
construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility on Grand Forks AFB.
This analysis covers only this item. It does not include any previous construction or construction
of facilities, parking lots, associated water drainage structures, or other non-related construction
and construction activities.

The following must be considered under the NEPA, Section 102(E).

- Air Quality
- Noise
- Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels
- Water Resources
- Biological Resources
- Socioeconomic Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Land Use
- Transportation Systems
- Airspace/Airfield Operations
- Safety and Occupation Health
- Environmental Management
- Environmental Justice

1.5 DECISION(S) THAT MUST BE MADE

This EA evaluates the environmental consequences from construction of a Ground-to-Air
Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility on Grand Forks AFB. NEPA requires that
environmental impacts be considered prior to final decision on a proposed project. The
Environmental Management Flight Chief would determine if a Finding of No Significant Impact can be signed or if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared. Preparation of an environmental analysis must be accomplished prior to a final decision regarding the proposed project and must be available to inform decision makers of potential environmental impacts of selecting the proposed action or any of the alternatives.

1.6 APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND REQUIRED COORDINATION

These regulations require federal agencies to analyze potential environmental impacts of proposed actions and alternatives and to use these analyses in making decisions on a proposed action. All cumulative effects and irretrievable commitment of resources must also be assessed during this process. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations declares that an EA is required to accomplish the following objectives:

- Briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an EIS or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).
- Aid in an agency’s compliance with NEPA when an EIS is not necessary, and facilitate preparation of an EIS when necessary.

Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-7061 as promulgated in 32 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 989, specifies the procedural requirements for the implementation of NEPA and the preparation of an EA. Other environmental regulatory requirements relevant to the proposed action and alternatives are also in this EA. Regulatory requirements including, but not restricted to the following programs would be assessed:

- AF Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) (32 CFR 989)
- AFI 32-7020, Environmental Restoration Program
- AFI 32-7040, Air Quality Compliance
- AFI 32-7041, Water Quality Compliance
- AFI 32-7042, Solid and Hazardous Waste Compliance
- AFI 32-7063, Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Program
- AFI 32-7064, Integrated Natural Resource Management
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) [16 U.S.C. Sec 470a-11, et seq., as amended]
- Clean Air Act (CAA) [42 U.S.C. Sec 7401, et seq., as amended]
- Clean Water Act (CWA) [33 U.S.C. Sec 400, et seq.]
- CWA [33 U.S.C. Sec 1251, et seq., as amended]
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) [42 U.S.C. Sec. 9601, et seq.]
- Defense Environmental Restoration Program [10 U.S.C. Sec. 2701, et seq.]
- Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) of 1986 [42 U.S.C. Sec. 11001, et seq.]
- Endangered Species Act (ESA) [16 U.S.C. Sec 1531-1543, et seq.]
• Executive Order (EO) 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality as Amended by EO 11991
• EO 11988, Floodplain Management
• EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands
• EO 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs
• EO 12898, Environmental Justice
• EO 12989 Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-income Populations
• EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks
• NEPA of 1969 [42 U.S.C. Sec 4321, et seq.]
• National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 [16 U.S.C. Sec 470, et seq., as amended]
• Noise Control Act of 1972 [42 U.S.C. Sec. 4901, et seq., Public Law 92-574]
• ND Air Pollution Control Act (Title 23) and Regulations
• ND Air Quality Standards (Title 33)
• ND Hazardous Air Pollutants Emission Standards (Title 33)
• Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) of 1970 [29 U.S.C. Sec. 651, et seq.]
• Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) of 1976 [15 U.S.C. Sec. 2601, et seq.]

Grand Forks AFB has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for both waste water and storm water to cover base-wide industrial activities. Implementation of the proposed actions or alternative actions in the construction could possibly disturb one acre. The contractor performing the installation would then need to obtain a separate NPDES construction permit from the North Dakota Department of Health (NDDH). If less than an acre, the base permit would allow discharge of storm water runoff until the site is stabilized by the reestablishment of vegetation or other permanent cover.

Scoping for this EA included discussion of relevant issues with members of the environmental management and bioenvironmental flights. Scoping letters requesting comments on possible issues of concern are sent to agencies with pertinent resource responsibilities, as listed in Section 6.0. In accordance with 32 CFR 989, a copy of the final EA is submitted to the ND Division of Community Services.

Applicable regulatory requirements and required coordination before and during construction include a Work Clearance Request, Stormwater Protection Plan, Dust Control Plan, Spill Control Plan, and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to the CEV Water Program Manager; a Spill Control Plan and Waste Disposal Plan to the CEV Pollution Prevention Manager; and copies of all plans to the Contracting Officer.
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Based on the descriptions of the relevant environmental resources presented in Section 3 and the predictions and analyses presented in Section 4, this section presents a comparative summary matrix of the alternatives (the heart of the analysis), providing the decision maker and the public with a clear basis for choice among the alternatives.

This section has five parts:

- Selection Criteria for Alternatives
- Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study
- Detailed Descriptions of the Three Alternatives Considered
- Comparison of Environmental Effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives
- Identification of the Preferred Alternative

2.2 SELECTION CRITERIA FOR ALTERNATIVES

Selection criteria used to evaluate the Proposed and Alternative Actions include the following:

- A cost effective method to provide a facility to house the GATR equipment at GFAFB.
- A location to meet the criteria of the 7:1 imaginary surface of a potential crosswinds runway, a potential project for a future UAV mission.
- Minimum mission requirements include efficiency, effectiveness, legality, force protection and safety to meet AF requirements.
- Minimum environmental standards include OSHA, AFOSH, NFPA, AFI, CFR, EPA and North Dakota standards for noise, air, water, safety, HM/HW, vegetation, cultural, geology, soils, and socioeconomic.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED STUDY

There was an alternative considered but eliminated from detailed study. In 2004 an original site survey at GFAFB for costing to consolidate the ATR Receiver (819) and Transmitter (820) to a single GATR site was accomplished by Tinker AFB. The initial report recommended that the Transmitter site 820 be used as the consolidated site because it is in better overall condition, is a flatter site, and easier to get to. It is a smaller building at 1,200 SF; however, a supplemental storage area could provide the additional space needed. There is enough floor space to hold the additional equipment racks, if the racks are moved closer together, and a UPS placed on each rack. The Receiver site 819 is a larger building at 1,500 SF; however it is of poorer condition. Both buildings need HVAC and electrical system upgrades. This survey to make Bldg 820 the consolidated site has since been discarded, due to the prohibitive costs to move cables twice.

2.4 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES
This section describes the activities that would occur under three alternatives: the no action alternative, the proposed action, and an action alternative. These three alternatives provide the decision maker with a reasonable range of alternatives from which to choose.

2.4.1 Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative): Status Quo. The no action alternative would be to leave the base as it is. Communications support equipment would be located in substandard facilities. As deterioration progresses, the Communication Squadron may lose communication support or contact to aircraft. Loss of UHF/VHF receiver/transmitter site capability prohibits the ATC controllers to communicate with both military and civilian aircraft. Aircraft would need to be diverted to another location. The radio receivers and transmitters are critical for controllers to communicate with pilots for safe air traffic control. A poor working environment adversely affects the mission at Grand Forks AFB.

2.4.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action): Construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility. See the AF 813 in Appendix D for a description of the proposal, and maps in Appendix E for the proposed location to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility. Construct a facility to house the GATR state-of-the-art communications equipment at a location estimated 650' north of 819 on the east side of road. The Communication Squadron proposes a 50x35' facility, but the final size is contingent on the AMC funding limit. Project shall include masonry construction (burnished black), concrete floor slab on grade with footings, standing seam metal roof, 12 foot high ceiling, underground electrical service, gravel access road, self-contained emergency generator, uninterrupted power supply (UPS), electric heat, air conditioning, facility penetration for communications, fire detection, and all required site improvements. No water, sewer, or fire suppression systems required. All work must be coordinated with the communication equipment contractor/designer. The electric will consist of commercial (12.47/7.2 KV grounded wye), primary/secondary pad mount transformer, and new generator with AST (self-contained unit with fuel storage). An overhead wireway (4"x4"minimum) should be provided for power runs to equipment racks. A minimum of two 4-inch conduits with inner duct should be provided from the nearest manhole to the facility demarc for fiber and copper cables. A minimum of six 4-inch ducts (two for each antenna tower) are required from antenna towers to a large junction box mounted on wall of facility (for antenna surge suppressor mounting). Junction box with six 4-inch ports through the wall into the facility, with ground bar connected directly to the earth-electrode subsystem for grounding of surge suppressors. Overhead ladder rack should be provided above the entire length of the facility from the antenna ports to the equipment racks for communications and cabling. The HVAC should consist of all electric heat, AC (direct expansion) maintained at 70F 20-80% RH non-condensing. Facility floor should be grounded in accordance with MIL-HDBK-419A, MIL-STD-188-124B, MIL-HDBK-1857, and MIL-HDBK-454A and provided with Equipotential Ground Plane. In the event a pre-engineered metal building is used for funding reasons, all metal parts would be bonded in accordance with MILSTD-188-124B, Section 5.2. All structural joints would connect IAW paragraph 5.2.6. and mating surfaces cleaned IAW paragraph 5.2.8. to ensure electrical continuity of the structure is maintained.

The project requires three new, 80' metal antennas mounted on new guyed metal poles, each 50' from the facility in three directions. Replace the antenna couplers. The communication equipment contractor/designer must conduct a site survey, recommend suitable solutions and
provide appropriate foundations. Tower locations and antenna placements on towers would be selected in accordance with guidelines contained in TO 31Z3-10-9. The contractor through coordination with CES would be required to obtain a FAA Aerospace Waiver prior to use of any construction equipment on the airfield. Estimates for equipment power requirements are total equipment power = 8975 watts, and total equipment BTU = 30,644 BTU; based on the use of 17 GRT-22 Transmitters x 140 watts = 2380 watts, 6 AM-6155 Amplifiers x 610 watts = 3660 watts, 16 GRR-24 Receivers x 50 watts = 800 watts, 9 GRT-21 Transmitters x 140 watts = 1260 watts, 11 GRR-23 Receivers x 50 watts = 550 watts, 1 G/A Patch Panel x 250 watts = 250 watts, and 1 Fiber Optic MUX x 75 watts = 75 watts. A facility UPS with capacity of 15 KVA sized for 20 minutes of reserve power is recommended. A distribution panel should be provided with minimum of 24 single pole 20A breakers to provide power for equipment racks. The back up generator should have an automatic transfer panel and be sized to power the UPS, lights, and HVAC for the facility, probably 25 KW. Purchase new generator--both the gensets at bldg 819 and 820 are over 15 years old and according to AMC policy are in the age window to be programmed for replacement by the time they are 20 years old. Also they are both only 15 KW generators and 240 volt single phase. Per new AMC AFI32-1063 in 2005, all gensets are to have a facility load of at least 75% of the generator rated load and if 3-phase power would be required, all automatic transfer switches installed are to be of the maintenance bypass/isolation type with a switched neutral (4-pole switch). The proposed location avoids the wetlands in the area

2.4.3 Alternative 3: Locate GATR facility 750' north of facility 819 on the west side of the road. The area has many wetlands which must be avoided when designing the facility and the three adjacent 80 ft antenna towers. This location would place the facility and antenna another 100 feet farther from the potential crosswind runway. The proposed location narrowly avoids the wetlands in the area

2.5 DESCRIPTION OF PAST, PRESENT, AND REASONABLY FORESEEABLE FUTURE ACTIONS RELEVANT TO CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Impacts from the Proposed Action would be concurrent with other actions occurring at Grand Forks AFB. There are several other construction and demolition projects occurring on Grand Forks AFB in the same time frame. These projects are addressed under separate NEPA documents. A related EIAP document is the Environmental Assessment (EA) and FONSI accomplished in #2002-116 to remove petroleum contaminated soil near 820. Multiple Air Transmitter and Receiver (ATR) facility 819 and 820 projects of the past have been categorically excluded, including an economic assessment to determine feasibility to repair versus construct a new facility; add 110V power in racks; emergency lights; lighting to illuminate AST; and denied request to add restroom and water.

2.6 SUMMARY COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF ALL ALTERNATIVES

Potential impacts from implementing the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action, and Alternative are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

2.7 IDENTIFICATION OF PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
The preferred alternative is the proposed action to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.6.1: Summary of Environmental Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legend: ST = short-term; LT = long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious Weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened and Endangered Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Positive ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Beneficial ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace/Airfield Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Occupational Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation Restoration Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Adverse ST Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section succinctly describes the operational concerns and the environmental resources relevant to the decision that must be made concerning this proposed action. Environmental concerns and issues relevant to the decision to be made and the attributes of the potentially affected environment are studied in greater detail in this section. This descriptive section, combined with the definitions of the alternatives in Section 2, and their predicted effects in Section 4, establish the scientific baseline against which the decision-maker and the public can compare and evaluate the activities and effects of all the alternatives.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

Grand Forks AFB has a humid continental climate that is characterized by frequent and drastic weather changes. The summers are short and humid with frequent thunderstorms. Winters are long and severe with almost continuous snow cover. The spring and fall seasons are generally short transition periods. The average annual temperature is 40 °Farenheit (F) and the monthly mean temperature varies from 6 °F in January to 70 °F in July. Mean annual precipitation is 19.5 inches. Rainfall is generally well distributed throughout the year, with summer being the wettest season and winter the driest. An average of 34 thunderstorm days per year is recorded, with some of these storms being severe and accompanied by hail and tornadoes. Mean annual snowfall recorded is 40 inches with the mean monthly snowfall ranging from 1.6 inches in October to 8.0 inches in March. Relative humidity averages 58 percent annually, with highest humidity being recorded in the early morning. The average humidity at dawn is 76 percent. Mean cloud cover is 48 percent in the summer and 56 percent in the winter (USAF, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2-1: Climate Data for Grand Forks AFB, ND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AFCCC/DOO, October 1998
Wind speed averages 10 miles per hour (mph). A maximum wind speed of 74 mph has been recorded. Wind direction is generally from the northwest during the late fall, winter, and spring, and from the southeast during the summer.

Grand Forks County is included in the ND Air Quality Control Region. This region is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. In 1997, the ND Department of Health (NDDH) conducted an Air Quality Monitoring Survey that indicated that the quality of ambient air in ND is generally good as it is located in an attainment area (NDDH, 1998). Grand Forks AFB has the following air permits: T5-F78004 (permit to operate) issued by NDDH and a CAA Title V air emissions permit.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) established the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), which define the maximum allowable concentrations of pollutants that may be reached, but not exceeded within a given time period. The NAAQS regulates the following criteria pollutants: Ozone ($O_3$), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide ($NO_2$), sulfur dioxide ($SO_2$), lead (Pb), and particulate matter. The ND Ambient Air Quality Standards (NDAAQS) were set by the State of ND. These standards are more stringent and emissions for operations in ND must comply with the Federal or State standard that is the most restrictive. There is also a standard for hydrogen sulfide ($H_2S$) in ND.

Prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) regulations establishes $SO_2$, particulate matter 10 microns in diameter ($PM_{10}$), and $NO_2$ that can be emitted above a premeasured amount in each of three class areas. Grand Forks AFB is located in a PSD Class II area where moderate, well-controlled industrial growth could be permitted. Class I areas are pristine areas and include national parks and wilderness areas. Significant increases in emissions from stationary sources (100 tons per year (tpy) of CO, 40 tpy of nitrogen oxides ($NO_X$), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), or sulfur oxides ($SO_X$), or 15 tpy of $PM_{10}$) and the addition of major sources requires compliance with PSD regulations. There is also a 25 ton/year level for total particulate.

Air pollutants include $O_3$, CO, $NO_2$, $SO_2$, Pb, and particulate matter. Ground disturbing activities create $PM_{10}$ and particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). Combustion creates CO, $SO_2$, $PM_{10}$, and $PM_{2.5}$ particulate matter and the precursors (VOC and $NO_2$) to $O_3$. Only small amounts of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAP) are generated from internal combustion processes or earth-moving activities. The Grand Forks AFB Final Emissions Survey Report (USAF, 1996) reported that Grand Forks AFB only generated small levels HAPs, 10.3 tpy of combined HAPs and 2.2 tpy maximum of a single HAP (methyl ethyl ketone). Methyl Ethyl Ketone is associated with aircraft and vehicle maintenance and repair. Secondary sources include fuel storage and dispensing (USAF, 2001a).
Table 3.2-2
National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and ND Ambient Air Quality Standards (NDAAQS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>NAAQS $\mu g/m^3$ (ppm)$^a$</th>
<th>NDAAQS $\mu g/m^3$ (ppm)$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary$^b$</td>
<td>Secondary$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O$_3$</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>235 (0.12)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 hr$^e$</td>
<td>157 (0.08)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>40,000 (35)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 hr</td>
<td>10,000 (9)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO$_2$</td>
<td>AAM$^d$</td>
<td>100 (0.053)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_2$</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 hr</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1,300 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hr</td>
<td>365 (0.14)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>80 (0.03)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hr</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$$^e$</td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>1/4 year</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$S</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hr</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 mth</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instantaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ $\mu g/m^3$ – micrograms per cubic meter; ppm – parts per million

$^b$ National Primary Standards establish the level of air quality necessary to protect the public health from any known or anticipated adverse effects of pollutant, allowing a margin of safety to protect sensitive members of the population.

$^c$ National Secondary Standards establish the level of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare by preventing injury to agricultural crops and livestock, deterioration of materials and property, and adverse impacts on the environment.

$^d$ AAM – Annual Arithmetic Mean.

$^e$ The Ozone 8-hour standard and the PM 2.5 standards are included for information only. A 1999 federal court ruling blocked implementation of these standards, which USEPA proposed in 1997. USEPA has asked the US Supreme Court to reconsider that decision (USEPA, 2000).

PM$_{10}$ is particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter.

PM$_{2.5}$ is particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 microns in diameter.

Source: 40 CFR 50, ND Air Pollution Control Regulations – North Dakota Administrative Code (NDAC) 33-15

3.3 Noise

Noise generated on Grand Forks AFB consists mostly of aircraft, vehicular traffic and construction activity. Most noise is generated from aircraft during takeoff and landing and not from ground traffic. Noise levels are dependent upon type of aircraft, type of operations, and distance from the observer to the aircraft. Duration of the noise is dependent upon proximity of the aircraft, speed, and orientation with respect to the observer.
### Table 3.3-1
Typical Decibel Levels Encountered in the Environment and Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Maximum Exposure Limits</th>
<th>Source of Noise</th>
<th>Subjective Impression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Threshold of hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Still recording studio; Rustling leaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Quiet bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Soft whisper at 5 ft; Typical library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Quiet urban setting (nighttime); Normal level in home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Threshold of quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Large transformer at 200 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Private business office; Light traffic at 100 ft; Quiet urban setting (daytime)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Window air conditioner; Men’s clothing department in store</td>
<td>Desirable limit for outdoor residential area use (EPA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Conversation speech; Data processing center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Busy restaurant; Automobile at 100 ft</td>
<td>Acceptable limit for residential land use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vacuum cleaner in home; Freight train at 100 ft</td>
<td>Threshold of moderately loud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Freeway at 10 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Ringing alarm clock at 2 ft; Kitchen garbage disposal; Loud orchestral music in large room</td>
<td>Most residents annoyed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Printing press; Boiler room; Heavy truck at 50 ft</td>
<td>Threshold of hearing damage for prolonged exposure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>8 hr&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Heavy city traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>4 hr&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Freight train at 50 ft; Home lawn mower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2 hr&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pile driver at 50 ft; Heavy diesel equipment at 25 ft</td>
<td>Threshold of very loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1 hr&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Banging on steel plate; Air Hammer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.5 hr&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Rock music concert; Turbine condenser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.25 hr&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Jet plane overhead at 500 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>&lt; 0.25 hr&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Jet plane taking off at 200 ft</td>
<td>Threshold of pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>&lt; 0.25 hr&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Civil defense siren at 100 ft</td>
<td>Threshold of extremely loud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*dBA – decibals
*bft – feet
*c hr – hours
Source: US Army, 1978

### Table 3.3-2
Approximate Sound Levels (dBA) of Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Sound Levels (dBA) at Various Distances (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-end Loader</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because military installations attract development in proximity to their airfields, the potential exists for urban encroachment and incompatible development. The USAF utilizes a program known as AICUZ to help alleviate noise and accident potential problems due to unsuitable community development. AICUZ recommendations give surrounding communities alternatives to help prevent urban encroachment. Noise contours are developed from the Day-Night Average A-Weighted Sound Level (DNL) data which defines the noise created by flight operations and ground-based activities. The AICUZ also defines Accident Potential Zones (APZs), which are rectangular corridors extending from the ends of the runways. Recommended land use activities and densities in the APZs for residential, commercial, and industrial uses are provided in the base’s AICUZ study. Grand Forks AFB takes measures to minimize noise levels by evaluating aircraft operations. Blast deflectors are utilized in designated areas to deflect blast and minimize exposure to noise.

3.4 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AND STORED FUELS

3.4.1 Hazardous Waste, Hazardous Material, Recyclable Material

Hazardous wastes, as listed under the RCRA, are defined as any solid, liquid, contained gaseous, or combination of wastes that pose a substantive or potential hazard to human health or the environment. On-base hazardous waste generation involves three types of on-base sites: an accumulation point (90-day), satellite accumulation points, and spill cleanup equipment and materials storage (USAF, 2001c). Discharge and emergency response equipment is maintained in accessible areas throughout Grand Forks AFB. The Fire Department maintains adequate fire response and discharge control and containment equipment. Equipment stores are maintained in buildings 409 and 530. Petroleum contaminated soils generated from excavations throughout the base can be treated at the land treatment facility located on base. These solid wastes are tilled or turned several times a year to remediate the soils to acceptable levels.

Recyclable materials from industrial facilities are collected in the recycling facility, in building 671. Paper, cardboard, and wood are collected in separate storage bins. Glass, plastics and metal cans are commingled. Curbside containers are used in housing for recyclable materials. A contractor collects these materials and transports them off base for processing.

The Environmental Management Flight manages the hazardous material through a contract with Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC). Typical hazardous materials include reactive materials such as explosives, ignitables, toxics, and corrosives. Improper storage can impact human health and the safety of the environment.

Grand Forks AFB does apply insecticides and herbicides on Grand Forks AFB property improved zones. Personnel from the 319 CES Entomology Flight and the ground maintenance contractor perform the application. Applicators have personal certifications from the state of North Dakota. Mixing of herbicides by the current grounds keeping contractor is done at their off-base location, and transported on base for application. A selective use herbicide containing 2-4-D or a low rate glyphosate, such as Roundup, is likely to be utilized under the maintenance phase of the plan. 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D), is the most widely used herbicide in the world to kill unwanted broad-leaf plants. Roundup contains glyphosate, isopropylamine salt,
and is a popular, effective herbicide. No additional pesticide/herbicide accumulation other than residential applications on a case-by-case basis is expected. Aerial spraying for mosquitoes has occurred in the area with base-wide spraying. All weeds and grass in shrubs, plant beds and landscaped areas shall be removed and may be followed by chemical treatment if necessary. The use of chemicals in landscaped areas is done at the contractors risk as any damaged plants would be replaced at contractor’s expense. All herbicide usage on the installation is pre-approved and authorized under the Environmental Management Information System and the DoD Pesticide Standard Pesticide list. All applicators are certified in herbicide application.

3.4.2 Underground and Above Ground Storage Tanks

Since Grand Forks AFB is a military installation with a flying mission, there are several aboveground and underground fuel storage tanks (ASTs and USTs). Gasoline, diesel fuel, heating fuel, JP-8 aircraft fuel, and oil-water separator (OWS)-recovered oils are stored in thirty-nine (39) USTs. Twenty (20) regulated USTs include three (3) gasoline tanks, eight (8) diesel tanks, three (3) JP-8 tanks, and six (6) OWS product recovery tanks. Deferred USTs include five (5) JP-8 tanks. Five (5) USTs exempt from regulation include one (1) heating oil tank, three (3) emergency spill containment tanks, and one (1) hydraulic oil recovery tank. A map of UST locations is found in Appendix C.

Gasoline, diesel fuel, heating oil, JP-8, and used oil are stored in fifty-eight (58) ASTs. The majority of petroleum is JP-8 stored in six (6) tanks with a capacity of 3,990,000 gallons for the hydrant fuel system. Diesel fuel is stored in forty-five (45) tanks primarily for emergency generators. Other tanks include: heating oil stored in three (2) tanks; gasoline stored in two (2) tanks; and, used oil stored in three (3) tanks. All ASTs either have secondary containment or are programmed to have secondary containment installed. The six (6) hydrant fuel system tanks each are contained by a concrete dike system. A map of AST locations is found in Appendix C.

Runway deicing fluid (potassium acetate) is stored in two (2) 5000 gallon tanks while aircraft deicing fluid (propylene glycol) is stored in a 20,000 gallon tank (Type I) and a 4,000 gallon tank (Type IV). The Synthetic Natural Gas yard, including six tanks of propane, 60,000 gallons each, for a total of 360,000 gallons, is located north of the south gate. The propane is available for heating when the demand for natural gas is at peak.

3.4.3 Solid Waste Management

Hard fill, construction debris, and inert waste generated by Grand Forks AFB are disposed of at a permitted off-base landfill. All on-base household garbage and solid waste is collected by a contractor and transported to the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill, which opened in 1982. The majority of construction debris is disposed of at Berger Landfill (permit number IT-198) while municipal and asbestos waste is disposed of at the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill (SW-069).

GFAFB also operates a land treatment facility (IT-183) for the remediation of petroleum-contaminated soils (PCSs). PCSs are generated on-base through spills, are encountered while excavating for various subsurface repairs, or encountered while replacing or removing underground storage tanks and piping.
3.5 WATER RESOURCES

3.5.1 Ground Water

Chemical quality of ground water is dependent upon the amount and type of dissolved gases, minerals, and organic material leached by water from surrounding rocks as it flows from recharge to discharge areas. The water table depth varies throughout the base, from a typical 1-3 ft to 10 ft or more below the surface.

Even though the Dakota Aquifer has produced more water than any other aquifer in Grand Forks County, the water is very saline and generally unsatisfactory for domestic and most industrial uses. Its primary use is for livestock watering. It is sodium chloride type water with total dissolved solids concentrations of about 4,400 ppm. The water generally contains excessive chloride, iron, sulfate, total dissolved solids, and fluoride. The water from the Dakota is highly toxic to most domestic plants and small grain crops, and in places, the water is too highly mineralized for use as livestock water (Hansen and Kume, 1970).

Water from wells tapping the Emerado Aquifer near Grand Forks AFB is generally of poor quality due to upward leakage of water from underlying bedrock aquifers. It is sodium sulfate type water with excessive hardness, chloride, sulfate, and total dissolved solids. Water from the Lake Agassiz beach aquifers is usually of good chemical quality in Grand Forks County. The water is a calcium bicarbonate type that is relatively soft. The total dissolved content ranges from 308 to 1,490 ppm. Most water from beach aquifers is satisfactory for industrial, livestock, and agricultural uses (Hansen and Kume, 1970).

Grand Forks AFB draws 85 to 90 percent of its water for industrial, commercial and housing functions from the City of Grand Forks and 10 to 15 percent from Agassiz Water.

3.5.2 Surface Water

Natural surface water features located on or near Grand Forks AFB are the Turtle River and Kellys Slough National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). Drainage from surface water channels ultimately flows into the Red River.

The Turtle River, crossing the base boundary at the northwest corner, is very sinuous and generally flows in a northeasterly direction. It receives surface water runoff from the western portion of Grand Forks AFB and eventually empties into the Red River of the North that flows north to Lake Winnipeg, Canada. The Red River drainage basin is part of the Hudson Bay drainage system. At Manvel, ND, approximately 10 miles northeast of Grand Forks AFB, the mean discharge of the Turtle River is 50.3 feet cubed per second (ft³/s). Peak flows result from spring runoff in April and minimum flows (or no flow in some years) occur in January and February.

NDDH has designated the Turtle River to be a Class II stream, it may be intermittent, but, when flowing, the quality of the water, after treatment, meets the chemical, physical, and
bacteriological requirements of the NDDH for municipal use. The designation also states that it is of sufficient quality to permit use for irrigation, for propagation of life for resident fish species, and for boating, swimming, and other water recreation.

Kelly’s Slough NWR occupies a wide, marshy flood plain with a poorly defined stream channel, approximately two miles east and downstream of Grand Forks AFB. Kelly’s Slough NWR receives surface water runoff from the east half of the base and effluent from the base sewage lagoons located east of the base. Surface water flow of the slough is northeasterly into the Turtle River Drainage from surface water channels ultimately flowing into the Red River. Floodplains are limited to an area 250 ft on either side of Turtle River (about 46 acres on base). Appendix C contains a map depicting floodplains. Any development in or modifications to floodplains must be coordinated with the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The North Dakota State Water Commission requires that any structure in the floodplain have its lowest floor above the identified 100-year flood level.

Surface water runoff leaves Grand Forks AFB at four primary locations related to identifiable drainage areas on base. The four sites are identified as northeast, northwest, west, and southeast related to the base proper. These outfalls were approved by the NDDH as stated in the Grand Forks AFB ND Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NDPDES) Permit NDR02-0314 Stormwater Discharges from Industrial Activity. Of the four outfall locations, the west and northwest sites flow into the Turtle River, the northeast site flows to the north ditch and the southeast outfall flows into the south ditch. The latter two flow to Kelly’s Slough and then the Turtle River. All drainage from these surface water channels ultimately flows into the Red River. The Bioenvironmental Engineering Office samples the four outfall locations during months when de-icing activities occur on base.

3.5.3 Waste Water

Grand Forks AFB discharges its domestic and industrial wastewater to four stabilization lagoons located east of the main base. The four separate treatment cells consist of one primary treatment cell, two secondary treatment cells, and one tertiary treatment cell. Wastewater effluent is discharged under ND Permit ND0020621 into Kelly’s Slough. Wastewater discharges occur several times, lasting up to one week each, sometime between mid-April though November. Industrial wastewater at the base comprises less than ten percent of the total flow to the lagoons.

3.5.4 Water Quality

According to the National Water Quality Inventory Report (USEPA, 1995), ND reports the majority of rivers and streams have good water quality. Natural conditions, such as low flows, can contribute to violations of water quality standards. During low flow periods, the rivers are generally too saline for domestic use. Grand Forks AFB receives water from Grand Forks and Lake Agassiz Water. The city recovers its water from the Red River and the Red Lake River, while the water association provides water from aquifers. The water association recovers water from well systems within glacial drift aquifers (USAF, 1999). The 319th Civil Engineer Squadron tests the water received on base daily for fluorine and chlorine.
Bioenvironmental Flight collects monthly bacteriological samples to be analyzed at the ND State Laboratory.

3.5.5 Wetlands

About 246,900 acres in the county are drained wetland Type I (wet meadow) to Type V (open freshwater). Approximately 59,500 acres of wetland Type I to V are used for wetland habitat. Wetland Types IV and V include areas of inland saline marshes and open saline water. Kellys Slough NWR occupies a wide, marshy flood plain with a poorly defined stream channel, approximately two miles east and downstream of Grand Forks AFB. Kellys Slough NWR is the most important regional wetland area in the Grand Forks vicinity. EO 11990 requires zero loss of wetlands. Earlier surveys indicated Grand Forks AFB had 49 wetlands, covering 23.9 acres of wetlands, including 33 jurisdictional wetlands covering 12.2 acres. A wetland delineation conducted in 2004 indicated that the base has increased to 192 wetlands totaling 301 acres. Categorization includes 15 wetlands identified as jurisdictional comprising 145 acres on base; one Riverine wetland totaling 3 acres in Turtle River; one PEM/Lacustrine wetland totaling 47 acres; 190 Palustrine Wetlands totaling 251 acres, classified as 32 Scrub-shrub wetlands at 76 acres, 3 Forested Wetlands at approximately 1 acre, and 155 Emergent Wetlands at 174 acres. Vegetation is robust at GFAFB wetlands, and they are characterized as typical prairie potholes found within the northern plains ecoregion.

Wetlands on Grand Forks AFB occur frequently in drainage ways, low-lying depressions, and prairie potholes. Wetlands are highly concentrated in drainage ways leading from the wastewater treatment lagoons to Kellys Slough NWR. The majority of wetland areas occur in the northern and central portions of base, near the runway, while the remaining areas are near the eastern boundary and southeastern corner of base. Development in or near these areas must include coordination with the ND State Water Commission and the USACE. To help preserve wetlands, the North Dakota, Grand Forks County regional office of the Natural Resource Conservation Service recommends a 100-ft vegetated (grass) buffer with a perimeter filter strip.

3.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.6.1 Vegetation

Plants include a large variety of naturally occurring native plants. Hay land, wildlife management areas, waterfowl production areas, neighboring wildlife refuges, state parks, and conservation reserve program land have created excellent grassland and wetland habitats for wildlife in Grand Forks County. Pastures, meadows, and other non-cultivated areas create a prairie-land mosaic of grasses, legumes, and wild herbaceous plants. Included in the grasses and legumes vegetation species are tall wheat grass, brome grass, Kentucky bluegrass, sweet clover, and alfalfa. Herbaceous plants include little bluestem, goldenrod, green needle grass, western wheat grass, and bluegrama. Shrubs such as Juneberry, dogwood, hawthorn, buffaloberry, and snowberry also are found in the area. In wetland areas, predominant species include Typha sp., smartweed, wild millet, cord grass, bulrushes, sedges, and reeds. These habitats for upland wildlife and wetland wildlife attract a variety of species to the area and support many aquatic species.
Various researchers, most associated with the University of ND, have studied current native floras in the vicinity of the base. The Natural Heritage Inventory through field investigations has identified ten natural communities occurring in Grand Forks County (1994). Of these, two communities are found within base boundaries, River/Creek and Lowland Woodland. The River/Creek natural community refers to the Turtle River. This area is characterized by submergent and emergent aquatic plants, green algae, diatoms, diverse invertebrate animals such as sponges, flatworms, nematode worms, segmented worms, snails, clams, and immature and adult insects, fish, amphibians, turtles, and aquatic birds and mammals. Dominant trees in the Lowland Community include elm, cottonwood, and green ash. Dutch elm disease has killed many of the elms. European buckthorn (a highly invasive exotic species), chokecherry, and wood rose (Rosa woodsii) are common in the under story in this area. Wood nettle (Laportea canadensis), stinging nettle (Urtica dioica), beggars’ ticks (Bidens frondosa), and waterleaf (Hydrophyllum virginianum) are typical forbes.

A prairie restoration project in the “Prairie View Nature Preserve” has been developed to restore a part of the native tallgrass prairie that once was dominant in this region. Plants thriving in this preserve include western wheatgrass, slender wheatgrass, big bluestem, little bluestem, Indian grass, switchgrass, blue gramma, buffalo grass, and many native wildflower species. The Grand Forks AFB Natural Resources Manager and volunteers installed a butterfly garden in the Prairie View Nature Preserve in the fall of 2005, on National Public Lands Day. Volunteers helped plant the 1,300 square foot garden with about 50 different perennial varieties and shrubs.

Two hundred and fifty five taxa were identified in the ND Natural Heritage Inventory and the BS Bioserve biological inventory update for Grand Forks Air Force Base. Two rare orchid species are known to exist on Grand Forks AFB, the Large and Small Yellow Lady’s Slipper, identified during the 2004 inventory.

3.6.2 Wildlife

Grand Forks County is agrarian in nature, however it does have many wildlife management areas, waterfowl production areas, conservation reserve program land, and recreational areas providing excellent habitat for local wildlife within the county. Kellys Slough NWR is located a couple miles northeast of Grand Forks AFB. In addition to being a wetland, it is a stopover point for thousands of migratory birds, especially shorebirds. The Prairie Chicken Wildlife Management Area is located north of Mekinock and contains 1,160 acres of habitat for deer, sharp-tailed grouse, and game birds. Wildlife can also be found at the Turtle River State Park, the Bremer Nature Trail, and the Myra Arboretum.

The base supports a remarkable diversity of wildlife given its size and location within an agricultural matrix. The Turtle River riparian corridor, Prairie View Nature Preserve, grassland areas on the west side of the base, and the lagoons to the east of the base all provide important habitat for native plant and wildlife species and should be conserved as such within mission constraints. Many mammalian species are found on base such as the white tail deer, eastern cottontail, coyotes, beaver, raccoons, striped skunks, badgers, voles, gophers, shrews, mice, muskrat, squirrels, bats, and occasional moose and bear.
One hundred seventy bird species were identified in the 2004 biological survey, many of which include grassland bird species. Grassland bird populations are declining across North America due to huge losses of prime grassland habitat from conversion to agricultural, urban, and industrial development. No other avian group has experienced such dramatic losses as grassland birds. GFAFB is fortunate to support a large variety of grassland birds, many of which are listed on the Partners-in-Flight species of concern list, such as the grasshopper sparrow. Large blocks of grassland should be conserved to protect these grassland bird species if the mission constraints allow it.

3.6.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

According to the Biological Survey Update 2004 of GFAFB, 21 state-listed birds and 1 federally listed bird species, 2 state-listed plant species, 1 state-listed mammal species, and 1 state-listed amphibian have been identified at GFAFB. The base does have infrequent use by migratory threatened and endangered species, such as the bald eagle, but there are no critical or significant habitats for those species present. Several rare and state-listed species have been observed on base near Turtle River, the lagoons, and the grassland to the west of the airfield. The ESA does not require that Federal Agencies not jeopardize the existence of a threatened or endangered species nor destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat for threatened or endangered species.

3.7 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES

Grand Forks County is primarily an agricultural region and, as part of the Red River Valley, is one of the world’s most fertile. Cash crops include sugar beets, beans, corn, barley, and oats. The valley ranks first in the nation in the production of potatoes, spring wheat, sunflowers, and durum wheat. Grand Forks County’s population in 2000 was 66,109, a decrease of 6.5 percent from the 1990 population of 70,638 (ND State Data Center, No Date). Grand Forks County’s annual mean wage in Oct 2001 was $26,715 (Job Service of ND, 2001). Grand Forks AFB is one of the largest employers in Grand Forks County. As of May 2005, Grand Forks AFB had 2,842 active duty military members and 380 civilian employees. The total annual economic impact for Grand Forks AFB is $379,712,357.
3.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

According to the Grand Forks AFB Cultural Resources Management Plan, there are no archeological sites that are potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). A total of six archeological sites and six archeological find spots have been identified on the base. They include historic farmsteads and isolated historical artifacts. None meet the criteria of eligibility of the NRHP established in 36 CFR 60.4. There is no evidence for Native American burial grounds, or other culturally sensitive areas. Paleosols (soil that developed on a past landscape) remain a management concern requiring Section 106 compliance. Reconnaissance-level archival and archeological surveys of Grand Forks AFB conducted by the University of ND in 1989 indicated that there are no facilities (50 years or older) that possess historical significance. The base is currently consulting with the ND Historical Society on the future use of eight Cold War Era facilities. These are buildings 313, 606, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, and 714.

3.9 LAND USE

Land use in Grand Forks County consists primarily of cultivated crops with remaining land used for pasture and hay, urban development, recreation, and wildlife habitat. Principal crops are spring wheat, barley, sunflowers, potatoes, and sugar beets. Turtle River State Park, developed as a recreation area in Grand Forks County, is located about five miles west of the base. Several watershed protection dams are being developed for recreation activities including picnicking, swimming, and ball fields. Wildlife habitat is very limited in the county. Kellys Slough NWR (located about two miles east of the base) and the adjacent National Waterfowl Production Area are managed for wetland wildlife and migratory waterfowl, but they also include a significant acreage of open land wildlife habitat.

The main base encompasses 5,420 acres, of which the USAF owns 4,830 acres and another 590 acres are lands containing easements, permits, and licenses. Improved grounds, consisting of all covered area (under buildings and sidewalks), land surrounding base buildings, the 9-hole golf course, recreational ball fields, and the family housing area, encompass 1,120 acres. Semi-improved grounds, including the airfield, fence lines and ditch banks, skeet range, and riding stables account for 1,390 acres. The remaining 2,910 acres of the installation consist of unimproved grounds. These areas are comprised of woodlands, open space, and wetlands, including four lagoons (180.4 acres) used for the treatment of base wastewater. Agricultural out leased land (1,040 acres) is also classified as unimproved. Land use at the base is solely urban in nature, with residential development to the south and cropland, hayfields, and pastures to the north, west, and east of the base.

3.10 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

Seven thousand vehicles per day travel ND County Road B3 from Grand Forks AFB’s east gate to the US Highway 2 Interchange (Clayton, 2001). Two thousand vehicles per day use the off-ramp from US Highway 2 onto ND County Road B3 (Dunn, 2001). US Highway 2, east of the base interchange, handles 10,800 vehicles per day. (Kingsley and Kuntz, 2001). A four lane arterial road has a capacity of 6,000 vehicles per hour and a two lane, 3,000, based on the
average capacity of 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane. Roadways adjacent to Grand Forks AFB are quite capable of accommodating existing traffic flows (USAF, 2001a).

Grand Forks AFB has good traffic flow even during peak hours (6-8 am and 4-6 pm). There are two gates: the main gate located off of County Road B3, about one mile north of U.S. Highway 2 and the Secondary Gate located off of U.S. Highway 2, about 3/4 mile west of County Road B3. The main gate is connected to Steen Boulevard (Blvd), which is the main east-west road, and serves the passenger traffic; and the south gate is connected to Eielson Street (St), which is the main north-south road and serves the truck traffic.

3.11 AIRSPACE/AIRFIELD OPERATIONS

3.11.1 Aircraft Safety

Bird Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) is a major safety concern for military aircraft. Collision with birds may result in aircraft damage and aircrew injury, which may result in high repair costs or loss of the aircraft. A BASH hazard exists at Grand Forks AFB and its vicinity, due to resident and migratory birds. Daily and seasonal bird movements create various hazardous conditions. Although BASH problems are minimal, Kellys Slough NWR is a major stopover for migratory birds. Canadian Geese and other large waterfowl have been seen in the area (USAF, 2001b).

3.11.2 Airspace Compatibility

The primary objective of airspace management is to ensure the best possible use of available airspace to meet user needs and to segregate requirements that are incompatible with existing airspace or land uses. The Federal Aviation Administration has overall responsibility for managing the nation’s airspace and constantly reviews civil and military airspace needs to ensure all interests are compatibly served to the greatest extent possible. Airspace is regulated and managed through use of flight rules, designated aeronautical maps, and air traffic control procedures and separation criteria.

3.12 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Safety and occupational health issues include one-time and long-term exposure. Examples include asbestos/radiation/chemical exposure, explosives safety quantity-distance, and bird/wildlife aircraft hazard. Safety issues include injuries or deaths resulting from a one-time accident. Aircraft Safety includes information on birds/wildlife aircraft hazards and the BASH program. Health issues include long-term exposure to chemicals such as asbestos and lead-based paint. Safety and occupational health concerns could impact personnel working on the project and in the surrounding area.

The National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) of the CAA designates asbestos as HAP. OSHA provides worker protection for employees who work around or with asbestos containing material (ACM). Regulated ACM (RACM) includes thermal system
insulation (TSI), any surfacing material, and any friable asbestos material. Non-regulated Category I non-friable ACM includes floor tile and joint compound.

Lead exposure can result from paint chips or dust or inhalation of lead vapors from torch-cutting operations. This exposure can affect the human nervous system. Due to the size of children, exposure to lead based paint is especially dangerous to small children. OSHA considers all painted surfaces in which lead is detectable to have a potential for occupational health exposure.

3.13 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

3.13.1 Environmental Restoration Program

The Environmental Restoration Program (ERP) is the AF’s environmental restoration program based on the CERCLA. CERCLA provides for Federal agencies with the authority to inventory, investigate, and clean up uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites. There are seven ERP sites at Grand Forks AFB. These sites are identified as potentially impacted by past hazardous material or hazardous waste activities. They are the Fire Training Area/Old Sanitary Landfill Area, FT-02; New Sanitary Landfill Area, LF-03; Strategic Air Ground Equipment (SAGE) Building 306, ST-04; Explosive Ordnance Detonation Area, OT-05; Refueling Ramps and Pads, Base Tanks Area, ST-06; POL Off-Loading Area, ST-07; and Refueling Ramps and Pads, ST-08 (USAF, 1997b). Two sites are considered closed, OT-05 and ST-06. ST-08 has had a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) completed and the rest are in long-term monitoring. Grand Forks AFB is not on the National Priorities List (NPL)

3.13.2 GEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.13.2.1 Physiography and Topography

The topography of Grand Forks County ranges from broad, flat plains to gently rolling hills that were produced mainly by glacial activity. Local relief rarely exceeds 100 ft in one mile, and, in parts of the lake basin, less than five ft in one mile.

Grand Forks AFB is located within the Central Lowlands physiographic province. The topography of Grand Forks County, and the entire Red River Valley, is largely a result of the former existence of Glacial Lake Agassiz, which existed in this area during the melting of the last glacier, about 12,000 years ago (Stoner et al., 1993). The eastern four-fifths of Grand Forks County, including the base, lies in the Agassiz Lake Plain District, which extends westward to the Pembina escarpment in the western portion of the county. The escarpment separates the Agassiz Lake Plain District from the Drift Plain District to the west. Glacial Lake Agassiz occupied the valley in a series of recessive lake stages, most of which were sufficient duration to produce shoreline features inland from the edge of the lake. Prominent physiographic features of the Agassiz Lake Plain District are remnant lake plains, beaches, inter-beach areas, and delta plains. Strandline deposits, associated with fluctuating lake levels, are also present and are indicated by narrow ridges of sand and gravel that typically trend northwest-southwest in Grand Forks County.
Grand Forks AFB lies on a large lake plain in the eastern portion of Grand Forks County. The lake plain is characterized by somewhat poorly drained flats and swells, separated by poorly drained shallow swells and sloughs (Doolittle et al., 1981). The plain is generally level, with local relief being less that one foot. Land at the base is relatively flat; with elevations ranging from 880 to 920 ft mean sea level (MSL) and averaging about 890 ft MSL. The land slopes to the north at less than 12 ft per mile.

3.13.2.2 Soil Type Condition

Soils consist of the Gilby loam series that are characterized by deep, somewhat poorly drained, moderately to slowly permeable soils in areas between beach ridges. The loam can be found from 0 to 12 inches. From 12 to 26 inches, the soil is a mixture of loam, silt loam, and very fine sandy loam. From 26 to 60 inches, the soil is loam and clay loam.

3.13.3 Pesticide Management

Pesticides are handled at various facilities including Environmental Controls, Golf Course Maintenance, and Grounds Maintenance. Other organizations assist in the management of pesticides and monitoring or personnel working with pesticides. Primary uses are for weed and mosquito control. Herbicides, such as picloram, nonselective glyphosate and 2, 4-D are used to maintain areas on base. Military Public Health and Bioenvironmental Engineering provide information on the safe handling, storage, and use of pesticides. Military Public Health maintains records on all pesticide applicators. The Fire Department on-base provides emergency response in the event of a spill, fire, or similar type incident.

3.14 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Environmental justice addresses the minority and low-income characteristics of the area, in this case Grand Forks County. The county is more than 93 percent Caucasian, 2.3 percent Native American, 1.4 percent African-American, 1 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, less than 1 percent Other, and 1.6 percent “Two or more races”. In comparison, the US is 75.2 percent Caucasian, 12.3 African-American, 0.9 percent Native American or Native Alaskan, 3.6 percent Asian, 0.1 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 5.5 percent Other, and 2.4 percent “Two or more races”. Approximately 12.5 percent of the county’s population is below the poverty level in comparison to 13.3 percent of the state (US Bureau of the Census, 2002). There are few residences and no concentrations of low-income or minority populations around Grand Forks AFB.
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The effects of the proposed action and the alternatives on the affected environment are discussed in this section. The project involves construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility on Grand Forks AFB.

4.2 AIR QUALITY

4.2.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact air quality.

4.2.2 Alternatives 2 (Proposed Action)

Short term effects involve heavy construction equipment emissions (not a concern as they are mobile sources) and fugitive dust (mentioned on our Title V permit). Air Quality is considered good and the area is in attainment for all criteria pollutants. Fugitive emissions from construction activities are expected to be below the regulatory threshold and would be managed in accordance with NDAC 33-15-17-03. The total emission of criteria pollutants from the proposed action is below the de minimus thresholds and less than 10 percent of the Air Quality Region's planning inventory. This construction action is not "regionally significant" and does not require a conformity determination in accordance with 40 CFR 93.153(1), Air Programs. Best management practices (BMPs) to reduce fugitive emissions would be implemented to reduce the amount of these emissions.

4.2.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.3 NOISE

4.3.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact noise generation.

4.3.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

The short-term operation of heavy equipment in the construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility area would generate additional noise. These noise impacts would exist only during construction and would cease after completion. The increase in noise from activities would not be significant.

4.3.3 Alternative 3
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.4 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AND STORED FUELS

4.4.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact hazardous or solid waste generation.

4.4.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

All efforts to consider the use of Green Procurement Program (GPP) and other recycled materials for applicable construction materials to construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility shall be implemented. The increase in hazardous and solid wastes from construction would be temporary. A small amount of debris would be generated. Solid waste debris would be disposed of in an approved location, such as the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill, which is located within 12 miles of the proposed site. All measures would be taken to minimize the disturbance of any asbestos-containing material and prevent any asbestos fiber release episodes in all areas. Removal of any friable asbestos-containing material would be accomplished in accordance with section 33-15-13-02 of the North Dakota air pollution control rules. All solid waste materials would be managed and transported in accordance with the state’s solid and hazardous waste rules. Appropriate efforts to reduce, reuse and/or recycle waste materials are encouraged by the State of North Dakota. Inert waste should be segregated from non-inert waste, where possible, to reduce the cost of waste management.

In the event there is contact with surfaces covered with lead-based paint, the removal of lead-based paint would be properly handled to reduce or prevent exposing workers and building occupants to lead. The materials must be handled by properly trained individuals for removal and disposal.

Construction must not disturb OWSs, ASTs, USTs, UST piping, vapor probes, or groundwater monitoring wells. Maps of the UST and AST locations are included in Appendix C. There are no monitoring wells or vapor probes in the area. The self-contained AST for fuel storage proposed for the new facility must be double walled.

The subsequent demolition of 819 and 820 will be addressed in a later document. It will need to address storage tank, asbestos, and demolition issues.

4.4.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.5 WATER RESOURCES

4.5.1 Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)
The no action alternative would not impact groundwater, surface water, wastewater, water quality, or wetlands.

4.5.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Alternative)

4.5.2.1 Groundwater: Excavation would likely intercept the water table. If the excavated area fills with groundwater, water could be directly exposed to contaminants released from construction equipment. Provided best management practices are followed, there will be minimal impacts on ground water.

4.5.2.2 Surface Water: Surface water quality could be degraded in the short-term, during actual construction, and in the long term. Effects come from possible erosion contributing to turbidity of runoff and possible contamination from spills or leaks from construction equipment. Surface water could also be impacted if, due to storm water inflow to the excavation, the contractor would need to pump out the excavation. The contractor must utilize effective methods to control surface water runoff and minimize erosion. The long term effects come from the fact that additional impervious area is being added to a site where the drainage is already compromised and no additional consideration will be give to this drainage during this project. This could lead to overflowing ditches, increase in wetland area, and additional contaminants introduced to the water due to the increased flows. Proper stabilization and seeding the site immediately upon completion of the construction would provide beneficial vegetation, controlling erosion. Provided best management practices are utilized during construction, short term negative surface water impacts should be minimal. Long term negative impacts may occur with an overall decrease in water quality.

4.5.2.3 Wastewater: The proposed action would have no impact on wastewater.

4.5.2.4 Water Quality: Provided all containment needs are met and best management practices are used, the proposed action would have no impact to water quality.

4.5.2.5 Wetlands: The project is to occur directly adjacent to several wetland type areas so care must be taken to minimize impacts. Unavoidably, due to the additional surface runoff that is expected, some wetland areas will be minimally affected. Antenna installation activities should avoid any wetland areas. A USACE permit may be required for this. Activity in any wetlands cannot occur without a Clean Water Act section 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. No dumping, filling, dredging, or changing of the wetland hydrologic structure is permitted without a permit.

4.5.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.6.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)
The no action alternative would not impact wildlife, vegetation, or other biological resources.

4.6.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

4.6.2.1 Vegetation: BMPs and control measures, including covering of stockpiles and drain openings, would be implemented to ensure that impacts to biological resources be kept to a minimum. The amount of vegetation disturbed would be kept to the minimum required to complete the action. Disturbed areas should be re-established. There would be a short-term minimal loss of vegetation from construction activities.

4.6.2.2 Noxious Weeds: Public law 93-629 mandates control of noxious weeds. Limit possible weed seed transport from infested areas to non-infested sites. Avoid activities in or adjacent to heavily infested areas, or remove seed sources and propagules from site prior to conducting activities, or limit operations to non-seed producing seasons. Wash or otherwise remove all vegetation and soil from equipment before transporting to a new site. Mitigate activities which expose the soil by covering the area with weed seed free mulch and/or seed the area with native species. Covering the soil would reduce the germination of weed seeds, maintain soil moisture, and minimize erosion. If any fill material is used, it should be from a weed-free source.

4.6.2.3 Wildlife: Construction would have minimal impacts to wildlife. These areas provide foraging habitat for small mammals, such as mice and rabbits. The area is unimproved. Due to the abundance and mobility of these species and the profusion of similar areas in the general vicinity, any wildlife disturbed would be able to find similar habitat in the local area.

4.6.2.4 Threatened or Endangered Species: According to the Biological Surveys of 1994 and 2004, and bird surveys of 2001, 2004, and 2005, Grand Forks AFB has 56 bird species of concern: one federally threatened, 8 state-threatened and endangered, 29 state species of concern, 17 USFWS birds of conservation concern, and 22 DOD partners-in-flight species. In addition, referencing the 1994 and 2004 biological surveys, there are two state threatened plant species, one state species of concern for mammals, and one state species of concern for amphibians identified at GFAFB. The federally listed bird species (the Bald Eagle) has no critical habitat at GFAFB. Proposed activities should have no impact on these sensitive species, given all proposed actions are associated with buildings or areas that are located in a well traveled area.

4.6.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.7 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES

4.7.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact socioeconomics.

4.7.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)
Secondary retail purchases would make an additional contribution to the local communities. The implementation of the proposed action, therefore, would provide a short-term, minimal beneficial impact to local retailers during the construction phase of the project. There would be no long term impact to socioeconomic resources.

4.7.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.8.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact cultural resources.

4.8.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

The proposed action has little potential to impact cultural resources. In the unlikely event any such artifacts were discovered during the construction activities, the contractor would be instructed to halt construction and immediately notify Grand Forks AFB civil engineers who would notify the State Historic Preservation Officer. Buildings 819 and 820 are not among the buildings that are National Register eligible.

4.8.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.9 LAND USE

4.9.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact land use.

4.9.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

The proposed operation would not have an impact on the land use currently designated for the area.

4.9.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.10 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS
4.10.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact transportation.

4.10.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

The proposed action would have minimal adverse impact to transportation systems on base due to vehicles traveling to and from areas during construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility.

4.10.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.11 AIRSPACE/AIRFIELD OPERATIONS

4.11.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility.

4.11.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

The proposed action would not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility. The proposed location is beyond the 7:1 imaginary surface of the existing runway and a potential crosswind runway, and therefore no airfield waiver would be required.

4.11.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.12 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

4.12.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact safety and occupational health.

4.12.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

The proposed action would have no significant impact on safety and occupational health if the Architectural Compatibility Guidelines (ACG) are followed. Participants in construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility are required to wear appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE).

4.12.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.
4.13 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

4.13.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact ERP Sites or geological resources.

4.13.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

**ERP:** The proposed action would not impact ERP Sites.

**Geology:** The proposed action would not impact geological resources. Soils present in the proposed area include the Gilby series.

**Pesticides:** Pesticides would not be used during the construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility.

4.13.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.14 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

4.14.1 Alternative 1 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact environmental justice.

4.14.2 Alternative 2 (Proposed Action)

EO 12898 requires federal agencies to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. There are no minorities or low-income populations in the area of the proposed action or alternatives, and, thus, there would be no disproportionately high or adverse impact on such populations.

4.14.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.15 INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The short-term increases in air emissions and noise during construction and the impacts predicted for other resource areas, would not be significant when considered cumulatively with other ongoing and planned activities at Grand Forks AFB and nearby off-base areas. The cumulative impact of the Proposed Action or Alternative with other ongoing activities in the area would produce an increase in solid waste generation; however, the increase would be limited to
the timeframe of each project. The area landfills used for construction and construction debris do not have capacity concerns, and could readily handle the solid waste generated by the various projects.

4.16 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The proposed action and alternatives would involve the use of construction related vehicles, and their short-term impacts on noise, air quality, and traffic are unavoidable.

4.17 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

The proposed action and alternatives would involve the use of previously developed areas. No croplands, pastureland, wooded areas, or wetlands would be modified or affected as a result of implementing the Proposed Action and, consequently, productivity of the area would not be degraded.

4.18 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Under the proposed action, fuels, manpower, economic resources, and other recovery materials related to the construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility would be irreversibly lost.
5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Steve Braun  
USTs and Special Programs  
319 CES/CEVC  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Everett “Gene” Crouse  
Chief, Airfield Management  
319 OSS/OSAA  
695 Steen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Diane Strom  
NEPA/EIAP Program  
319 CES/CEVA  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Mark Hanson, Attorney  
Chief, General Law  
319 ARW/JA  
460 Steen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Gary Johnson  
Ground Safety Manager  
319 ARW/SEG  
679 4th Avenue (Ave)  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Chris Klaus  
Water Programs Manager  
319 CES/CEVC  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Heidi Nelson  
Community Planner  
319 CES/CECP  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Larry Olderbak  
Environmental Restoration Manager  
319 CES/CEVR  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Gary Raknerud  
Chief, Pollution Prevention  
319 CES/CEVP  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Kristen Rundquist  
Natural Resources/Air Program Manager  
319 CES/CEVC  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Jeffrey L McClellan, 2d Lt, USAF, BSC  
Bioenvironmental Engineer  
Bioenvironmental Engineering Flight  
319 ADS/SGGB  
1599 J St  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Linda Fuglestad  
Hazardous Material Program Manager  
319 CES/CEVP  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205
6.0 LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS CONSULTED AND/OR PROVIDED COPIES

Dr. Terry Dwelle
State Health Officer
North Dakota Department of Health
600 East Boulevard Ave
Bismarck, ND 58505-0200

Mr. Merlan E. Paaverud
State Historic Preservation Officer
State Historical Society of North Dakota
612 East Boulevard Ave
Bismarck ND  58505-0200

Mr. Terry Steinwand
Commissioner
North Dakota Game and Fish
100 North Bismarck Expressway
Bismarck, ND 58501

Mr. Larry Knudtson, Planning
North Dakota State Water Commission
900 E Boulevard Ave, Dept 770
Bismarck ND  58505-0850

Mr. Jeffrey Towner
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
3425 Miriam Avenue
Bismarck ND  58501
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CULTURAL RESOURCE PROBABILITY MAP
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APPENDIX C
ENVIRONMENTAL SITE MAP
UST and AST LOCATION MAP
Grand Forks AFB Environmental Sites (SW)
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- Underground Waste Storage
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- WATER
REQUEST FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

INSTRUCTIONS: Section I to be completed by Proponent; Sections II and III to be completed by Environmental Planning Function. Continue on separate sheets as necessary. Reference appropriate item number(s).

SECTION I - PROPOSENT INFORMATION

| 1. TO (Environmental Planning Function) | 319 CES/CEVA |
| 2. FROM (Proponent organization and functional address symbol) | MSgt Neil McComsey, 319 CS/SCXS |
| 2a. TELEPHONE NO. | 701-747-5327 |

3. TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION
Construct Ground-to-Air Transmit & Receive (GATR) Facility, JFSD200601

4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION (Identify decision to be made and need date)
A modern, functionally designed, facility is needed for an efficient, effective operation. The current facilities 819 and 820 are in disrepair and not sufficient to meet the demands of the GATR equipment, with inadequate HVAC and electrical systems.

5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA) (Provide sufficient details for evaluation of the total action)
Repair existing or construct a facility to house the new state-of-the-art Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) equipment, with HVAC, mechanical and electrical support in the vicinity of 819 and 820.

6. PROPONENT APPROVAL (Name and Grade)
Roger Hegland, GS-12, Chief Plans Flight
319 CS/SCX, (701) 747-5318

SECTION II - PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY.

| 7. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE/LAND USE (Noise, accident potential, encroachment, etc.) |
| 8. AIR QUALITY (Emissions, attainment status, state implementation plan, etc.) |
| 9. WATER RESOURCES (Quality, quantity, source, etc.) |
| 10. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH (Asbestos/radiation/chemical exposure, explosives safety quantity-distance, bird/wildlife aircraft hazard, etc.) |
| 11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE (Use/storage/generation, solid waste, etc.) |
| 12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Wetlands/floodplains, threatened or endangered species, etc.) |
| 13. CULTURAL RESOURCES (Native American burial sites, archaeological, historical, etc.) |
| 14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (Topography, minerals, geothermal, Installation Restoration Program, seismicity, etc.) |
| 15. SOCIOECONOMIC (Employment/population projections, school and local fiscal impacts, etc.) |
| 16. OTHER (Potential impacts not addressed above.) |

SECTION III - ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS DETERMINATION

17. PROPOSED ACTION QUALIFIES FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CATEX) ☒; OR PROPOSED ACTION DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR A CATEX; FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED.

18. REMARKS
This action is not "regionally significant" and does not require a conformity determination in accordance with 40 CFR 93.153(1). The total emission of criteria pollutants from the proposed action are below the de minimus thresholds and less than 10 percent of the Air Quality Region's planning inventory.
4.0 Purpose and Need for Action: Construct Ground-to-Air Transmit & Receive (GATR) Facility, JFSD200601

4.1 Purpose of the Action (mission objectives-who proposes to do what, where, when): Construct a facility to house the new Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) equipment, with HVAC, mechanical and electrical support. Locate in vicinity of 819 or 820 to ease transition, minimize downtime, and maximize use of existing communication & utility infrastructure.

4.2 Need for the Action (why this action is desired or required-why here, why now): A modern, functionally designed, facility is needed for an efficient, effective operation. The current facilities 819 and 820 are not sufficient to meet the demands of the GATR equipment. Neither site has sufficient HVAC or adequate electrical systems. Current antenna poles are condemned for climbing. Area floods after winter snow melts and is very swampy.

4.3 Objectives for the Action (what goal do you wish to accomplish): Provide appropriate facility to house GATR equipment and related systems. Meet minimum mission requirements: effectiveness, timeliness, cost effective, legality, safety, efficiency, force protection.

4.4 Related EISs/EAs and other documents (similar projects in the past): 02 EA to remove petroleum contaminated soil near 820; Catex for economic assessment to determine feasibility to repair vs build; add 110V power; emergency lights; AST lighting.

4.5 Decision that must be made: Construct Ground-to-Air Transmit & Receive (GATR) Facility, JFSD200601.

4.6 Applicable Regulatory Requirements and Required Coordination-- required permits, licenses, entitlements: Submit a Work Clearance Request, Stormwater Protection Plan, Dust Control Plan, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to the CEV Water Program Manager; Spill Control Plan and Waste Disposal Plan to CEV Pollution Prevention Manager, and Contracting Officer.

5.1 Description of the Proposed Action (in brief, introduction): Construct GATR Facility, JFSD200601.

5.2 Selection criteria for Alternatives: location to meet 7:1 imaginary surface of potential crosswinds runway.

5.2.1 Minimum mission requirements: effectiveness, timeliness, cost effective, legality, safety, efficiency, force protection.

5.2.2 Minimum environmental standards: noise, air, water, safety, HW, vegetation, cultural, geology, soils, socioeconomic.

5.3 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study: In 2004 an original site survey at GFAFB for costing to consolidate the ATR Receiver and Transmitter to a single GATR site was accomplished by Tinker AFB. This survey to make Bldg 820 the consolidated site has since been discarded, due to the prohibitive costs to move cables twice.

5.4.1 No-action alternative: Communications support equipment will be located in substandard facilities. As deterioration progresses, CS may lose communication support to aircraft. Poor working environment adversely affects the mission at GFAFB.

5.4.2 Proposed Action: Construct facility to house GATR state-of-the-art communications equipment at location est 650' north of 819 on the east side of road. Propose 50x35' facility, but final size contingent on AMC funding limit. If a pre-engineered metal building is used, all metal parts would be bonded in accordance with MILSTD-188-124B, Section 5.2. All structural joints would connect IAW para 5.2.6. and mating surfaces cleaned IAW para 5.2.8. to ensure electrical continuity of the structure is maintained. Requires three new, 80' metal antennas mounted on new guyed metal poles, 50' from the facility. Replace antenna couplers. Communication equipment contractor/designer must conduct site survey, recommend suitable solutions & provide appropriate foundations. Tower locations & antenna placements on towers will be selected in accordance with guidelines contained in TO 31Z3-10-9. Contractor through coordination with CES will be required to obtain FAA Aerospace Waiver prior to use of any construction equipment on the airfield. Estimates for equipment power requirements are Total equipment power = 8975 watts, and Total equipment BTU = 30,644 BTU; based on the use of 17 GRT-22 Transmitters x 140 watts = 2380 watts, 6 AM-615 Amplifiers x 610 watts = 3660 watts, 16 GRR-24 Receivers x 50 watts = 800 watts, 9 GRT-21 Transmitters x 140 watts = 1260 watts, 11 GRR-23 Receivers x 50 watts = 550 watts, 1 G/A Patch Panel x 250 watts = 250 watts, and 1 Fiber Optic MUX x 75 watts = 75 watts. A facility UPS with capacity of 15 KVA sized for 20 minutes of reserve power is recommended. A distribution panel should be provided with minimum of 24 single pole 20A breakers to provide power for equipment racks. An overhead wireway (4x4 minimum) should be provided for power runs to equipment racks. The back up generator should have an automatic transfer panel, and be sized to power the UPS, lights, and HVAC for the facility, probably 25 KW. Facility floor should be grounded in accordance with MILSTD-188-124B and provided with Equipotential Ground Plane installed according to drawings. A minimum of two 4-inch conduits with inner duct should be provided from the nearest manhole to the facility demarc for fiber and copper cables. A minimum of six 4-inch ducts (two for each antenna tower) should be provided from antenna towers to a large junction box mounted on wall of facility (for antenna surge suppressor mounting). Junction box should be provided with six 4-inch ports through the wall into the facility. Junction box should also be provided with a ground bar connected directly to the earth-electrode subsystem for grounding of surge suppressors. Overhead cable ladder should be provided within the facility from the antenna ports to the equipment racks. Purchase new generator--both the gensets at bldg 819 & 820 are over 15 years old and according to AMC policy are in the age window to be programmed for replacement by the time they are 20 years old. Also they are both only 15 KW generators and 240 volt single phase. Per new AMC AF132-1063 in 2005 all gensets are to have a facility load of at least 75% of the generator rated load and if 3-phase power will be required, all automatic transfer switches installed are to be of the maintenance bypass/isolation type with a switched neutral (4-pole switch).

5.4.3 Another Reasonable Action Alternative: Locate facility 750' north of 819 on W side of road. Area has many wetlands.

5.5 Description of Past and Reasonably foreseeable Future Actions Relevant to Cumulative Impacts: Several other construction & demolition projects occur on GFAFB in the same time frame. These projects are addressed under separate NEPA documents.

5.6 Recommendation of preferred alternative: Construct Ground-to-Air Transmit & Receive (GATR) Facility, JFSD200601.
APPENDIX E
GATR SITE AND LOCATION MAP
GRAND FORKS AFB, NORTH DAKOTA

CONSTRUCT GATR COMM FACILITY

LOCATION PLAN

Proposed Site

Bldg 820, Transmitter

Bldg 819, Receiver
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. COMPONENT</th>
<th>AF (AMC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. DATE</td>
<td>13 Mar 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION</td>
<td>GRAND FORKS AFB, NORTH DAKOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>CONSTRUCT GATR COMM FACILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PROJECT NUMBER</td>
<td>JFSD200601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE PLAN**

- Proposed GATR Facility
- Antennas located 50' from GATR Facility

Site Plan:

- **Existing Fence**
- **Alert Road**
- **Proposed GATR Facility**
- **Antennas located 50' from GATR Facility**
Based on our cable locations this would be the optimal site for us. The only issue is NONE of the footprint or antennas can disturb the blue area.

1 – proposed location, due to higher ground & more room for antenna to avoid wetlands.
2 – alternative location; farthest from future crosswind runway 7:1 imaginary surface.
3 – poor alternative; many wetlands surround.
4- Comm’s choice due to proximity to bldg 819 & existing cable locations; would need airfield waiver.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. COMPONENT</th>
<th>AF (AMC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. DATE</td>
<td>28 Oct 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION</td>
<td>GRAND FORKS AFB, NORTH DAKOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>BRAC-CONSTRUCT CROSSWIND RUNWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PROJECT NUMBER</td>
<td>JFSD200607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE PLAN**

- **SITE**
- **Runway**: 8000' x 150'
- **Clear Zone**: 8000' x 150'
- **Primary Surface**:
- **Base Boundary**
APPENDIX F
PUBLIC NOTICE AND INTERAGENCY RESPONSE
Grand Forks Air Force Base has proposed the construction of a ground to air transmitter and receiver facility. An environmental assessment has been conducted and a finding of no significant impact has been determined for this action. Anyone wishing to view the support documents to this action should contact the 319th Air Refueling Wing Public Affairs Office within the next 30 days at 747-3901 or 747-9408.

Publication Fee $10.00

---

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, ss.
COUNTY OF GRAND FORKS

My name is [Name], representative of the GRAND FORKS HERALD, INC., publisher of the Grand Forks Herald, Morning Edition, a daily newspaper of general circulation, printed and published in the City of Grand Forks, in said County and State, and has been during the time hereinafter mentioned, and that the advertisement of

a printed copy of which is hereto annexed, was printed and published in every copy of the following issues of said newspaper, for a period of time (s) to wit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr.</th>
<th>3-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td>3-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and that the full amount of the fee for the publication of the annexed notice inures solely to the benefit of the publishers of said newspaper; that no agreement or understanding for a division thereof has been made with any other person and that no part thereof has been agreed to be paid to any person whomsoever and the amount of said fee is $10.00

That said newspaper was, at the time of the aforesaid publication, the duly elected and qualified Official Newspaper within said County, and qualified in accordance with the law of the State of North Dakota to do legal printing in said County and State.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30 day of Mar. A.D. 2006

[Signature]
Notary Public, Grand Forks, ND

---

Publication Fee $10.00
Public Notices

NOTICE OF SALE

The property described in the Final Judgment and Decree of Foreclosure is located in Grand Forks County, North Dakota, and is more particularly delineated by metes and bounds as follows:

- The northeast quarter (NE 1/4) of the southwest quarter (SE 1/4) of Section 31, Township 113 North, Range 49 West of the 1st Principal Meridian.

Said property will be sold pursuant to the Judgment and Decree of Foreclosure, upon the failure of the owners or parties in interest to pay the amount of $52,086.26, plus interest, costs, and expenses of such sale applicable thereto.

The highest bidder for cash at public auction at the time and place listed below shall be the purchaser of said property.

- The auction will be held at 10:00 a.m. on April 27, 2006, at the Grand Forks County Courthouse, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

- The successful bidder is required to pay the full amount of the bid immediately after the sale and to convey title to the property to the person paying the highest bid.

- Instructions for bidders are available at the Grand Forks County Courthouse or by calling 701-746-7360.

- Bidders must provide a valid form of identification and a security deposit in the amount of $10,000.

- The sale is subject to judicial approval and may be adjourned or canceled at any time.

- The sale is being conducted in accordance with the laws of the State of North Dakota.

- The sale is open to the public, and all persons claiming an interest in the property are invited to attend.

- The sale is being conducted by the Grand Forks County Sheriff and the Grand Forks County Treasurer.

- Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Grand Forks County Treasurer at 701-746-7360.

- The sale is subject to the laws of the State of North Dakota, and the purchase of the property is subject to all applicable state and federal laws.

Public Notices

NOTICE OF PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the above-mentioned action is to quell title to certain real estate located in the County of Grand Forks, State of North Dakota, described as follows:

- Lots Five (5) and Six (6), in Block Forty-nine (49), of the Grand Forks Cemetery Addition.

The premises to be sold pursuant to said Judgment and Decree are situated in the County of Grand Forks, State of North Dakota.

- The premises are described as follows:
  - Lots Five (5) and Six (6), in Block Forty-nine (49), of the Grand Forks Cemetery Addition.

- The premises are subject to all applicable state and federal laws.

- The premises are being sold subject to the approval of the court.

- The proceeds of the sale will be used to pay the judgment debt and costs.

- The successful bidder is required to pay the full amount of the bid immediately after the sale.

- The sale is subject to judicial approval and may be adjourned or canceled at any time.

- The sale is being conducted in accordance with the laws of the State of North Dakota.

- The sale is open to the public, and all persons claiming an interest in the property are invited to attend.

- The sale is being conducted by the Grand Forks County Sheriff and the Grand Forks County Treasurer.

- Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Grand Forks County Treasurer at 701-746-7360.

- The sale is subject to the laws of the State of North Dakota, and the purchase of the property is subject to all applicable state and federal laws.

Public Notices

NOTICE OF REAL ESTATE TRANSACTION

The property described in the Final Judgment and Decree of Foreclosure is located in Grand Forks County, North Dakota, and is more particularly delineated by metes and bounds as follows:

- The northeast quarter (NE 1/4) of the southwest quarter (SE 1/4) of Section 31, Township 113 North, Range 49 West of the 1st Principal Meridian.

Said property will be sold pursuant to the Judgment and Decree of Foreclosure, upon the failure of the owners or parties in interest to pay the amount of $52,086.26, plus interest, costs, and expenses of such sale applicable thereto.

The highest bidder for cash at public auction at the time and place listed below shall be the purchaser of said property.

- The auction will be held at 10:00 a.m. on April 27, 2006, at the Grand Forks County Courthouse, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

- The successful bidder is required to pay the full amount of the bid immediately after the sale and to convey title to the property to the person paying the highest bid.

- Instructions for bidders are available at the Grand Forks County Courthouse or by calling 701-746-7360.

- Bidders must provide a valid form of identification and a security deposit in the amount of $10,000.

- The sale is subject to judicial approval and may be adjourned or canceled at any time.

- The sale is being conducted in accordance with the laws of the State of North Dakota.

- The sale is open to the public, and all persons claiming an interest in the property are invited to attend.

- The sale is being conducted by the Grand Forks County Sheriff and the Grand Forks County Treasurer.

- Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Grand Forks County Treasurer at 701-746-7360.

- The sale is subject to the laws of the State of North Dakota, and the purchase of the property is subject to all applicable state and federal laws.

Public Notices

NOTICE OF REAL ESTATE TRANSACTION

The property described in the Final Judgment and Decree of Foreclosure is located in Grand Forks County, North Dakota, and is more particularly delineated by metes and bounds as follows:

- The northeast quarter (NE 1/4) of the southwest quarter (SE 1/4) of Section 31, Township 113 North, Range 49 West of the 1st Principal Meridian.

Said property will be sold pursuant to the Judgment and Decree of Foreclosure, upon the failure of the owners or parties in interest to pay the amount of $52,086.26, plus interest, costs, and expenses of such sale applicable thereto.

The highest bidder for cash at public auction at the time and place listed below shall be the purchaser of said property.

- The auction will be held at 10:00 a.m. on April 27, 2006, at the Grand Forks County Courthouse, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

- The successful bidder is required to pay the full amount of the bid immediately after the sale and to convey title to the property to the person paying the highest bid.

- Instructions for bidders are available at the Grand Forks County Courthouse or by calling 701-746-7360.

- Bidders must provide a valid form of identification and a security deposit in the amount of $10,000.

- The sale is subject to judicial approval and may be adjourned or canceled at any time.

- The sale is being conducted in accordance with the laws of the State of North Dakota.

- The sale is open to the public, and all persons claiming an interest in the property are invited to attend.

- The sale is being conducted by the Grand Forks County Sheriff and the Grand Forks County Treasurer.

- Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Grand Forks County Treasurer at 701-746-7360.

- The sale is subject to the laws of the State of North Dakota, and the purchase of the property is subject to all applicable state and federal laws.
Elementary. This program is open to all base and surrounding community families with children who are 3 or 4-years-old by Aug. 31.

Four-year-old children from income-qualifying families or with special needs are accepted first, and 3-year-old children are accepted as slots are available.

Copies of parent’s verification of income (leave and earnings statement) and children’s birth certificate, shot records and social security number are needed. In addition, tours of Head Start will also be available.

For more information, call Carol Showers at 787-5028.

Virtual employment for military spouses

The Staff Centrix program is designed to teach military spouses to launch and grow their own virtual assistant businesses, and embark on rewarding, challenging and portable careers.

The program is made up of a series of several workshops scheduled for April 20, 24, and 27. The application deadline is April 5. Participants are selected based on the information they provide in their applications.

Candidates for the program should have a minimum of two years of administrative support experience, Internet access, a good working knowledge of basic software, a computer with the Windows 95 (or newer) operating system, and a strong desire for employment.

For more information to participate in this free training program, please submit the online application at http://www.msvas.com/application_grandforks.html or contact Cheryl Anderson at 747-6436.

AMXS spouses meeting

There will be a 319th Aircraft Maintenance Squadron spouses meeting Monday at 6 p.m. in the Sunflower Chapel basement.

The theme is "bring your scrapbook to share with others." This will be a time to share and learn about other squadron spouses’ scrapbooking techniques.

Childcare will be provided.

For more information, call Mandy Roberts at 594-8334.

Kickoff festivities

All members of the base community are invited to an event kicking off “Month of the Young Child,” Saturday at 8:45 a.m. in the Community Activity Center. Rebecca Shelton (who recently won the state American Legion oratorical contest) will read a proclamation kicking off the month, which will be signed by Col. Bill Bender, 319th Air Refueling Wing commander. The event will also include a balloon drop and remarks by motivational speaker Tracey Ballas. For more information, please contact Kelly Painter at 747-4506.

Environmental notice

Grand Forks Air Force Base has proposed the construction of a ground to air transmitter and receiver facility. An environmental assessment has been conducted and a finding of no significant impact has been determined for this action.

Anyone wishing to view the support documents to this action should contact the 319th Air Refueling Wing Public Affairs Office within the next 30 days at 747-5017 or 747-5608.

Too Many Bills? Turn to Us.

Choose wisely, Choose CCCS of The Village.

- 114-year-old agency
- Get your bills under control
- Consolidate your payments

Call Consumer Credit Counseling Service of The Village Family Service Center.
April 21, 2006

Ms. Diane M. Strom
Environmental Impact Analysis Program
319 CES/CEVA, Room 128
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205-6434

ND SHPO 97-0527Y: GATR construction Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota

Dear Ms. Strom;

We reviewed ND SHPO 97-0527Y: GATR construction Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, and concur with a “No Historic Properties Affected” determination, provided the project is of the nature specified and takes place in the legal description outlined and mapped in the draft report. Any borrow fill, must come from an approved source, that is a source surveyed by an archaeologist and found to contain no significant cultural resources.

We concur that sites 32GF124 and 32GF125 are not eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

If you have any questions please contact Susan Quinnell, at (701) 328-3576 or squinnell@state.nd.us

Sincerely,

Merlan E. Paaverud, Jr.
State Historic Preservation Officer (North Dakota)
May 2, 2006

Ms. Diane Strom
Environmental Impact Analysis Program
319 CES/CEVA, Room 128
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd.
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

Re: Draft Environmental Assessment for Constructing a Ground-to-Air Transmitter & Receiver Facility at Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks County

Dear Ms. Strom:

This department has reviewed the information concerning the above-referenced project submitted under date of April 20, 2006, with respect to possible environmental impacts.

This department believes that environmental impacts from the proposed construction will be minor and can be controlled by proper construction methods. With respect to construction, we have the following comments:

1. All necessary measures must be taken to minimize fugitive dust emissions created during construction activities. Any complaints that may arise are to be dealt with in an efficient and effective manner.

2. Care is to be taken during construction activity near any water of the state to minimize adverse effects on a water body. This includes minimal disturbance of stream beds and banks to prevent excess siltation, and the replacement and revegetation of any disturbed area as soon as possible after work has been completed. Caution must also be taken to prevent spills of oil and grease that may reach the receiving water from equipment maintenance, and/or the handling of fuels on the site. Guidelines for minimizing degradation to waterways during construction are attached.

3. Projects disturbing one or more acres are required to have a permit to discharge storm water runoff until the site is stabilized by the reestablishment of vegetation or other permanent cover. Further information on the storm water permit may be obtained from the Department’s website or by calling the Division of Water Quality (701-328-5210). Also, cities may impose additional requirements and/or specific best management practices for construction affecting their storm drainage system. Check with the local officials to be sure any local storm water management considerations are addressed.
4. Noise from construction activities may have adverse effects on persons who live near the construction area. Noise levels can be minimized by ensuring that construction equipment is equipped with a recommended muffler in good working order. Noise effects can also be minimized by ensuring that construction activities are not conducted during early morning or late evening hours.

The department owns no land in or adjacent to the proposed improvements, nor does it have any projects scheduled in the area. In addition, we believe the proposed activities are consistent with the State Implementation Plan for the Control of Air Pollution for the State of North Dakota.

These comments are based on the information provided about the project in the above-referenced submittal. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers may require a water quality certification from this department for the project if the project is subject to their Section 404 permitting process. Any additional information which may be required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the process will be considered by this department in our determination regarding the issuance of such a certification.

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

L. David Glatt, P.E., Chief
Environmental Health Section

LDG: cc
Attach.
Construction and Environmental Disturbance Requirements

These represent the minimum requirements of the North Dakota Department of Health. They ensure that minimal environmental degradation occurs as a result of construction or related work which has the potential to affect the waters of the State of North Dakota. All projects will be designed and implemented to restrict the losses or disturbances of soil, vegetative cover, and pollutants (chemical or biological) from a site.

Soils

Prevent the erosion of exposed soil surfaces and trapping sediments being transported. Examples include, but are not restricted to, sediment dams or berms, diversion dikes, hay bales as erosion checks, riprap, mesh or burlap blankets to hold soil during construction, and immediately establishing vegetative cover on disturbed areas after construction is completed. Fragile and sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, delicate flora, or land resources will be protected against compaction, vegetation loss, and unnecessary damage.

Surface Waters

All construction which directly or indirectly impacts aquatic systems will be managed to minimize impacts. All attempts will be made to prevent the contamination of water at construction sites from fuel spillage, lubricants, and chemicals, by following safe storage and handling procedures. Stream bank and stream bed disturbances will be controlled to minimize and/or prevent silt movement, nutrient upsurges, plant dislocation, and any physical, chemical, or biological disruption. The use of pesticides or herbicides in or near these systems is forbidden without approval from this Department.

Fill Material

Any fill material placed below the high water mark must be free of top soils, decomposable materials, and persistent synthetic organic compounds (in toxic concentrations). This includes, but is not limited to, asphalt, tires, treated lumber, and construction debris. The Department may require testing of fill materials. All temporary fills must be removed. Debris and solid wastes will be removed from the site and the impacted areas restored as nearly as possible to the original condition.
April 21, 2006

Diane M. Strom  
Dept. of the Air Force  
319 CES/CEVA, Room 128  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd.  
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

"Letter of Clearance" In Conformance with the North Dakota Federal Program Review System - State Application Identifier No.: ND060420-0160

Dear Ms. Strom:

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment - Construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver Facility

The above referenced assessment has been reviewed through the North Dakota Federal Program Review Process. As a result of the review, clearance is given to the project only with respect to this consultation process.

If the proposed project changes in duration, scope, description, budget, location or area of impact, from the project description submitted for review, then it is necessary to submit a copy of the completed application to this office for further review.

We also request the opportunity for complete review of applications for renewal or continuation grants within one year after the date of this letter.

Please use the above SAI number for reference to the above project with this office. Your continued cooperation in the review process is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

James R. Boyd  
Manager of Governmental Services  
Division of Community Services

Rec 24 Apr 06
Diane,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft FONSI and EA for the construction of a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) facility at Grand Forks Air Force Base. The proposed project will have minimal impacts to fish and wildlife resources and will not affect threatened and endangered species therefore the US Fish and Wildlife Service does not object to the construction of the preferred alternative as proposed.

Terry Ellsworth
North Dakota Ecological Services Field Office
3425 Miriam Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58501

Office (701) 355-8505
Fax (701) 355-8513
Terry_Ellsworth@fws.gov

We are soliciting your views and comments on the proposed project. Any information or comments relating to environmental or other matters that you might provide will be used in identifying constraints that should be considered during the development of the proposed action.
Please forward any comments of information within twenty days. Thank you for your assistance. Any questions or concerns can be addressed to Diane Strom, Environmental Impact Analysis Program, 525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd, Grand Forks AFB ND 58205-6434.

Sincerely,
Diane M. Strom
Environmental Impact Analysis Program
319 CES/CEVA, Room 128
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205-6434
Phone (701) 747-6394; DSN 362-6394
FAX (701) 747-6155; DSN 362-6155
Diane.Strom@grandforks.af.mil
(See attached file: EA FONSI draft.pdf)
From: Schumacher, John D. [jdschumacher@nd.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 5:35 PM
To: Strom Diane Civ 319 CES/CEVA
Subject: RE: EA to Construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver Facility at Grand Forks AFB

The North Dakota Game and Fish Department has reviewed this project for wildlife concerns. We do not believe it will have any significant adverse effects on wildlife or wildlife habitat, including endangered species, based on the information provided.

Sincerely,
John Schumacher
Resource Biologist
PH: 701-328-6321
jdschumacher@nd.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Strom Diane Civ 319 CES/CEVA [mailto:Diane.Strom@grandforks.af.mil]
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2006 1:25 PM
To: Boyd, James R.; Knudtson, Larry J.; Schumacher, John D.; Quinnell, Susan L.; Terry_Ellsworth@fws.gov; Glatt, Dave D.
Cc: Leier, Joleen M.; Steinwand, Terry R.; Dyke, Steve R.; jeffrey_towner@fws.gov; Marie_Nelson@fws.gov; Paaverud, Merl E.; Dwelle, Terry L.
Subject: EA to Construct a Ground-to-Air Transmitter and Receiver Facility at Grand Forks AFB

We are soliciting your views and comments on the proposed project. Any information or comments relating to environmental or other matters that you might provide will be used in identifying constraints that should be considered during the development of the proposed action.

Please forward any comments of information within twenty days. Thank you for your assistance. Any questions or concerns can be addressed to Diane Strom, Environmental Impact Analysis Program, 525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd, Grand Forks AFB ND 58205-6434.

Sincerely,

Diane M. Strom

Environmental Impact Analysis Program

319 CES/CEVA, Room 128

525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd

Grand Forks AFB ND 58205-6434

Phone (701) 747-6394; DSN 362-6394
MEMORANDUM FOR 319 CES/CEVA

FROM: 319 ARW/JA

SUBJECT: Legal Review – Construction of a Ground to Air Transmitter and Receiver (GATR) Facility. (EA/FONSI)

1. Based upon my review the proposed Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) complies with 32 CFR part 989 and is legally sufficient.

2. 32 CFR §. 989.14 states an EA must discuss the need for the proposed action, reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, the affected environment, the environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives (including the "no action" alternative), and a listing of agencies and persons consulted during preparation. The EA meets these requirements and follows the alternatives analysis guidance outlined in Sec. 989.8.

3. 32 CFR §. 989.14(g) states when the action selected is located in wetlands or floodplains, it must discuss why no other practicable alternative exists to avoid impacts. See AFI 32-7064, Integrated Natural Resources Management. The proposed alternative has no impact on wetlands.

4. Public notification was accomplished on March 28, 30 and 31, 2006. No public comments were received. Agency comments are included at the end of the EA. None appear to raise extraordinary environmental issues.

5. If you have any questions about these comments, please contact the undersigned at 7-3606.

MARK W. HANSON, GS-12, DAF
Chief, General Law