FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR
MAIN GATE-SEPARATED POV PARKING LOT

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force

PROPOSED ACTION: Under this alternative, Grand Forks AFB would construct a POV parking lot near the main gate, but separated from the main gate facilities, entry control points, and inspection areas. The POV parking lot is required for vehicles not allowed on base for a variety of reasons. The parking lot must be a separate site from the main gate, to solve an extremely dangerous parking situation and avoid AT/FP risks from unknown and uninspected vehicles being allowed adjacent to the main gate facilities and security forces personnel. A twenty-car parking lot to provide off-base parking, with lights and curbing, will be near the entrance of Sunflake Housing, east of Sunflake Circle, off Freedom Drive. The location will encourage parkers to cross County Road B-3 at the designated crosswalk.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Under the alternative actions, Grand Forks AFB would construct a POV parking lot near the main gate, but separated from the main gate facilities, entry control points, and inspection areas. Three locations east of the main gate were considered. One location was east of Sunflake Housing, on the southern corner. One location was east of Sunflake Housing, on the northern corner. One location was west of Sunflake Housing, east of the drainage ditch, at the corner of County B-3 and the main gate corner entrance.

Under the no action alternative, there will be no POV lot available to provide safe parking for vehicles not allowed on base, and no safe separation to protect the main gate facilities and security personnel from AT/FP risks. The existing POV parking lot at the south gate will be dismantled with the improvements done at the south gate in summer 2004. This would create a situation where individuals unauthorized to drive on base would be parking in a variety of spots off-base, which could create a haphazard and unsafe parking plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES:
Air Quality - 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. Best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented to reduce the amount of these emissions.

Noise - Short-term operation of heavy equipment in the construction area would generate additional noise. The increase in noise from construction activities would be negligible.

Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels - The increase in hazardous and solid wastes from construction related activities would be minimal and temporary. Construction debris would be disposed of in approved location, such as the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill.
Environmental Assessment: Construct POV Parking Lot Main Gate-Separated at Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota

This Final EA has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, and assesses the potential environmental impacts of constructing a Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot, located 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 Actions and the No Action Alternative were analyzed in the EA. The EA also addresses the potential cumulative effects of the associated construction activities along with other concurrent actions at Grand Forks AFB and the surrounding area.
Water Resources – Provided BMPs are followed, there would be minimal impacts on ground water, surface water, wetlands, and water quality. The proposed action would have no impact on waste water.

Biological Resources – BMPs and control measures, including silt fences 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 contractors and 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 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.

Land Use – The proposed action would not impact land use.

Transportation Systems – The proposed action would have minimal adverse impact to transportation systems on base due to vehicles traveling to and from the construction site.

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

Safety and Occupational Health – The proposed impact would not impact safety and occupational health.

Environmental Management – The proposed action would not impact IRP Sites. BMPs would be implemented to prevent erosion. No pesticides would be used as part of this project.

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 are 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.

No adverse environmental impact to any of the areas identified by the AF Form 813 is expected by the proposed action, Construct Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot.

CONCLUSION: Based on the Environmental Assessment performed for Construct Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot, 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: 21 Sep 04
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Lead</td>
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<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
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<td>USAF</td>
<td>United States Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Volatile Organic Compound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States Air Force (USAF) proposes to construct a Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot on Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), North Dakota.

Purpose and Need: The purpose for this project is to provide a POV parking lot near the main gate, but separated from the main gate facilities, entry control points, and inspection areas. The POV parking lot is required for vehicles not allowed on base for a variety of reasons. The parking lot must be a separate site from the main gate, to solve an extremely dangerous parking situation and avoid AT/FP risks from unknown and uninspected vehicles being allowed adjacent to the main gate facilities and security forces personnel. A twenty-car parking lot is needed to provide off-base parking with lights and curbing, within the funding requirements of AMC. The existing POV parking lot at the south gate will be dismantled with the improvements done at the south gate in summer 2004.

Proposed Action: Under the proposed action, CE will construct a POV parking lot near the main gate, but separated from the main gate facilities, entry control points, and inspection areas. The POV parking lot is required for vehicles not allowed on base for a variety of reasons. Design of the new main gate facilities and AT/FP decisions have relocated this parking lot from the vicinity of the main gate to a separate site across the road from the main gate. This solves an extremely dangerous parking situation and avoids AT/FP risks from unknown and uninspected vehicles being allowed adjacent to the main gate facilities and security forces personnel. HQ AMC staff has determined that because of the revised siting and change from repair to construction, this parking lot cannot be built under the existing main gate design/build contract. The preferred action is near the entrance of Sunflake Housing, east of Sunflake Circle, off Freedom Drive (see Option B drawing). The location will encourage parkers to cross County Road B-3 at the designated crosswalk. With nice fencing and landscape treatment, it will separate the housing units nearby, and still give 50 feet of backyard to each housing unit. This twenty-car parking lot will provide off-base parking with lights and curbing, within the funding requirements. The existing POV parking lot at the south gate will be dismantled with the improvements done at the south gate in summer 2004.

Alternate Location Alternative Two: Under the alternative action, Alternative Two is shown as a red dot Site A on the site plan. This alternative is less desirable because it will be a lengthy walk for the persons parking, and would encourage them to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk, creating a safety hazard. This would require much of the same work included in the proposed action.

Alternate Location Alternative Three: Alternative Three is shown as a blue dot Site B on the site plan. This alternative is less desirable because it will be a lengthy walk for the persons parking, and would encourage them to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk, creating a safety hazard. This would require much of the same work included in the proposed action.
Alternate Location Alternative Four: Alternative Four is shown as Option A. This alternative is less desirable because of the higher costs involved to re-route drainage due to the existing ditch. Further environmental analysis is needed if this alternative is chosen, due to the potential for fuel, antifreeze or battery acid leakage into the ditch. This would require much of the same work included in the proposed action, plus drainage, additional culverts and fill.

No Action Alternative Five: Under the no action alternative, there will be no POV lot available to provide safe parking for vehicles not allowed on base, and no safe separation to protect the main gate facilities and security personnel from AT/FP risks. The existing POV parking lot at the south gate will be dismantled with the improvements done at the south gate in summer 2004. This would create a situation where individuals unauthorized to drive on base would be parking in a variety of spots off-base, which could create a haphazard and unsafe parking plan.

Impacts by Resource Area

Air Quality - Air Quality is considered good and the area is in attainment for all criteria pollutants. No significant impacts to air quality would result because of parking lot construction activities.

Noise - The people constructing the parking lot would create additional noise. The increase in noise would be negligible and only occur when the lot was being built.

Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels - The increase in hazardous and solid wastes from construction related activities would be minimal and temporary. Construction debris would be disposed of in approved location, such as the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill.

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

Biological Resources – BMPs and control measures, including silt fences 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 contractors and 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 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.
Land Use - The proposed construction would not have an impact on land use.

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

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

Safety and Occupational Health – The Grand Forks AFB Safety Office has indicated they have no safety concerns.

Environmental Management – The proposed action would not impact IRP Sites. BMPs would be implemented to prevent erosion. No pesticides would be used as part of this project.

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 are 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 Main Gate-Separated POV parking lot 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.

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 48 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 actions) 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 2003, is approximately 6,934. Of that, 2,849 are military, 3,747 are military dependents, and 338 civilians working on base (Grand Forks AFB, 2003).

1.2 NEED FOR THE ACTION

The purpose for this project is to provide a POV parking lot near the main gate, but separated from the main gate facilities, entry control points, and inspection areas. The POV parking lot is required for vehicles not allowed on base for a variety of reasons, such as personnel who have lost their driving and parking privileges on-base, yet require a place to park their car while they walk on-base for duty. The parking lot must be a separate site from the main gate, to solve an extremely dangerous parking situation and avoid AT/FP risks from unknown and uninspected vehicles being allowed adjacent to the main gate facilities and security forces personnel. A twenty-car parking lot is needed to provide off-base parking, with lights and curbing, within the funding requirements of AMC, which meets the needs of the Grand Forks AFB population. The existing POV parking lot at the south gate will be dismantled with the improvements done at the south gate in summer 2004.
1.3 OBJECTIVES FOR THE ACTION

The purpose of the proposed action is to construct a Main Gate-Separated POV parking lot.

1.4 SCOPE OF EA

This EA identifies, describes, and evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with constructing a Main Gate-Separated POV parking lot on Grand Forks AFB. This analysis covers only those items listed above. It does not include any previous construction of facilities, parking lots, associated water drainage structures, or other non-related 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 constructing a Main Gate-Separated POV parking lot on Grand Forks AFB. NEPA requires that environmental impacts be considered prior to final decision on a proposed project. The Environmental Management Flight Chief will determine if a Finding of 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 will 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
• 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 to cover base-wide industrial activities. Construction of the proposed action or an alternative action would disturb less than one acre, thus not requiring a contractor to obtain a separate NPDES from the North Dakota Department of Health (NDDH). The 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 were sent to agencies with pertinent resource responsibilities. In accordance with AFI 32-7061, a copy is submitted to the ND Division of Community Services.
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 Five 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:

- All weather access to a parking lot, authorized for individuals who have lost their driving privileges on-base, and yet require a place to park their car while they walk onto base.
- A location within walking distance of the Grand Forks AFB main gate.
- A location sufficient distance from the Grand Forks AFB main gate to solve an extremely dangerous parking situation and avoid AT/FP risks from unknown and uninspected vehicles being allowed adjacent to the main gate facilities and security forces personnel.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED STUDY

No alternatives were eliminated from detailed study.

2.4 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

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

2.4.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action): Construct Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot

Under the proposed action, CE will construct a POV parking lot near the main gate, but separated from the main gate facilities, entry control points, and inspection areas. The POV parking lot is required for vehicles not allowed on base for a variety of reasons. Design of the new main gate facilities and AT/FP decisions have relocated this parking lot from the vicinity of the main gate to a separate site across the road from the main gate. This solves an extremely dangerous parking situation and avoids AT/FP risks from unknown and uninspected vehicles being allowed adjacent
to the main gate facilities and security forces personnel. HQ AMC staff has determined that because of the revised siting and change from repair to construction, this parking lot cannot be built under the existing main gate design/build contract. The preferred action is near the entrance of Sunflake Housing, east of Sunflake Circle, off Freedom Drive (see Option B drawing). The location will encourage parkers to cross County Road B-3 at the designated crosswalk. With nice fencing and landscape treatment, it will separate the housing units nearby, and still give 50 feet of backyard to each housing unit. This twenty-car parking lot will provide off-base parking with lights and curbing, within the funding requirements. The existing POV parking lot at the south gate will be dismantled with the improvements done at the south gate. Runoff and drainage will be addressed during design of the project. Excess spoil material (black dirt) will be transported to an on-base material stockpile ("Pea Patch").

2.4.2 Alternative 2: Alternate Location

Under the alternative action, a Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot location is shown as a red dot Site A on the site plan, east/southeast of housing in the Sunflake housing area. This alternative is less desirable because it will be a lengthy walk for the persons parking, and would encourage them to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk. This would require much of the same work included in the proposed location.

2.4.3 Alternative 3: Alternate Location

Under the alternative action, a Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot location is shown as a blue dot Site B on the site plan, east/northeast of housing in the Sunflake housing area. This alternative is less desirable because it will be a lengthy walk for the persons parking, and would encourage them to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk. This would require much of the same work included in the proposed location.

2.4.4 Alternative 4: Alternate Location

Alternative Three is shown as Option A, in the southwest corner of Sunflake Housing, along the east side of County Road B-3. This alternative is less desirable because of the higher costs involved to re-route drainage, and add culverts, due to the existing ditch. It would require 90 feet clearance for road easement of County Road B-3. It would encourage pedestrians to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk. Further environmental analysis is needed if this alternative is chosen, due to the potential for fuel, antifreeze or battery acid leakage into the ditch.

2.4.5 Alternative 5 (No Action Alternative): Status Quo

Under the no action alternative, there will be no POV lot available to provide safe parking for vehicles not allowed on base, and no safe separation to protect the main gate facilities and security personnel from AT/FP risks.
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.

2.6 SUMMARY COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF ALL ALTERNATIVES

Potential impacts from implementing the Proposed Action, Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, and the No Action Alternative are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.6.1: Summary of Environmental Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legend</strong>: ST = short-term; LT = long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastes, Hazardous Materials, and Stored Fuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noxious Weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened and Endangered Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace/Airfield Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Occupational Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation Restoration Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 IDENTIFICATION OF PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The preferred action is the Proposed Action: Construct a Main Gate-Separated POV parking lot near the entrance of Sunflake Housing, east of Sunflake Circle, off Freedom Drive.
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 Fahrenheit (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>Month</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</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 ($\text{O}_3$), carbon monoxide ($\text{CO}$), nitrogen dioxide ($\text{NO}_2$), sulfur dioxide ($\text{SO}_2$), 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 ($\text{H}_2\text{S}$) in ND.

Prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) regulations establishes $\text{SO}_2$, particulate matter 10 microns in diameter ($\text{PM}_{10}$), and $\text{NO}_2$ 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 ($\text{NO}_x$), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), or sulfur oxides ($\text{SO}_x$), or 15 tpy of $\text{PM}_{10}$) 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 $\text{O}_3$, $\text{CO}$, $\text{NO}_2$, $\text{SO}_2$, Pb, and particulate matter. Ground disturbing activities create $\text{PM}_{10}$ and particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter ($\text{PM}_{2.5}$). Combustion creates CO, $\text{SO}_2$, $\text{PM}_{10}$, and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ particulate matter and the precursors (VOC and $\text{NO}_2$) to $\text{O}_3$. 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><strong>Primary</strong>(^b)</td>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong>(^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>None</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})</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>( \frac{1}{2} ) 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>Quiet bedroom</td>
<td>Threshold of quiet</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>Quiet urban setting (nighttime); Normal level in home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Quiet urban setting (daytime)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Window air conditioner; Men's clothing department in store</td>
<td>Desirable limit for outdoor residential area use (EPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Conversation speech; Data processing center</td>
<td>Busy restaurant; Automobile at 100 ft</td>
<td>Acceptable level for residential land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vacuum cleaner in home; Freight train at 100 ft</td>
<td>Freeway at 10 ft</td>
<td>Threshold of moderately loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></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>Printing press; Boiler room; Heavy truck at 50 ft</td>
<td>Most residents annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Heavy city traffic</td>
<td>8 hr^c</td>
<td>Threshold of hearing damage for prolonged exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Freight train at 50 ft; Home lawn mower</td>
<td>4 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pile driver at 50 ft; Heavy diesel equipment at 25 ft</td>
<td>2 hr</td>
<td>Threshold of very loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Banging on steel plate; Air Hammer</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Rock music concert; Turbine condenser</td>
<td>0.5 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Jet plane overhead at 500 ft</td>
<td>0.25 hr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Jet plane taking off at 200 ft</td>
<td>&lt; 0.25 hr</td>
<td>Threshold of pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Civil defense siren at 100 ft</td>
<td>&lt; 0.25 hr</td>
<td>Threshold of extremely loud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*dBA – decibals
^ft – feet
^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

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 523 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.

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 County Landfill, which opened in 1982.

Recyclable materials from industrial facilities are collected in the recycling facility, in building 424. Paper, glass, plastics, cardboard, and wood are collected in separate storage bins. Curbside containers are used in housing for recyclable materials. A contractor collects these materials and transports them off base.

The Environmental Management Flight manages the hazardous material through a contract with Mactec Pacific Environmental Services. 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.

Since Grand Forks AFB is a military installation with a flying mission, there are several aboveground and underground fuel storage tanks. None of the alternatives would impact fuel storage tanks.
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 poor quality 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 (ft$^3$/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).

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 discharge occurs for about one week, sometime between mid-April though October. Industrial wastewater at the base comprises less than ten percent of the total flow to the treatment 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 Engineering Squadron tests the water received on base daily for fluorine and chlorine. The 319th
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. Grand Forks AFB has 49 wetlands, covering 23.9 acres of wetlands (see Appendix C), including 33 jurisdictional wetlands covering 12.2 acres. Wetlands on Grand Forks AFB occur frequently in drainage ways, low-lying depressions, and 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.

3.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.6.1 Vegetation

Plants include a large variety of naturally occurring native plants. Because of the agrarian nature of Grand Forks County, cropland is the predominant element for wildlife habitat. Pastures, meadows, and other non-cultivated areas are overgrown with grasses, legumes, and wild herbaceous plants. Included in the grasses and legumes vegetation species are tall wheat grass, brome grass, sweet clover, and alfalfa. Herbaceous plants include little bluestem, goldenrod, green needle grass, western wheat grass, and bluegrama. Shrubs such as Juneberry, dogwood, hawthorn, and snowberry also are found in the area. In wetland areas, predominant species include 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. Prior to 1993 field investigations, ten natural communities occurring in Grand Forks County were identified in the ND Natural Heritage Inventory (1994). Of these, only one community, Lowland Woodland, is represented within the base boundaries. Dominant trees in this community are 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.
One hundred and forty two total taxa, representing less than a third of the known Grand Forks County plant taxa, were identified in the ND Natural Heritage Inventory. No rare plants species are known to exist on Grand Forks AFB.

3.6.2 Wildlife

Grand Forks County is primarily cropland although there are wildlife areas located 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 migratory birds. 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.

There is minimal habitat for wildlife on Grand Forks AFB due to extensive development. White tail deer, eastern cottontail, and ring-neck pheasant can be found on base. The proposed project area only provides low-quality foraging habitat for small animals.

3.6.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

According to the 1994 ND Natural Heritage Inventory, “There are no known federally threatened or endangered species populations on or adjacent to Grand Forks AFB.” The base does have infrequent use by migratory threatened and endangered species, such as the bald eagle and peregrine falcon, but there are no critical or significant habitats for those species present. The inventory also indicated that red-breasted nuthatch and moose are two special concern species. They have been observed on base near Turtle River. The inventory also indicated that there is no habitat on or near Grand Forks AFB to sustain a moose population. Red-breasted nuthatches prefer woodland habitats dominated by conifers. These birds are transients and pose no particular concern. The ESA does 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 worlds 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 2003, Grand Forks AFB had 3, 165 active duty military members and 338 civilian employees. The total annual economic impact for Grand Forks AFB is $325,647, 980.
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. 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, 703-707, 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.

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 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 the south gate is connected to Eielson Street (St), which is the main north-south road.

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 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 INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM

The Installation Restoration Program (IRP) 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 IRP 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 Round-up, are used to maintain areas adjacent to roadways. 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 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 97.6 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 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 Main Gate-Separated POV parking lot on Grand Forks AFB.

4.2 AIR QUALITY

4.2.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)

No long-term effects; however 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. Best management practices (BMPs) to reduce fugitive emissions would be implemented to reduce the amount of these emissions.

4.2.2 Alternative 2

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

4.2.3 Alternative 3

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

4.2.4 Alternative 4

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

4.2.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact air quality.

4.3 NOISE

4.3.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)

The short-term operation of heavy equipment in the construction area would generate additional noise. These noise impacts would exist only during construction and would cease after completion. The increase in noise from construction activities would be negligible.
4.3.2 Alternative 2
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

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

4.3.4 Alternative 4
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.3.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)
The no action alternative would not impact noise generation.

4.4 WASTES, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AND STORED FUELS

4.4.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)
The increase in hazardous and solid wastes from construction related activities would be minimal and temporary. Construction debris would be disposed of in approved location, such as the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill, which is located within 12 miles of the construction site. 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.

4.4.2 Alternative 2
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

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

4.4.4 Alternative 4
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.4.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)
The no action alternative would not impact hazardous or solid waste generation.
4.5 WATER RESOURCES

4.5.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)

Groundwater: Actual construction of facilities should not involve deep excavation. This will mean minimal impact on groundwater during construction. Paving the actual lot and compaction of soils may reduce infiltration; however the area is already considered developed so impacts will most likely be minimal. Provided best management practices are followed, there will be minimal impacts on ground water.

Surface Water: Surface water quality could be degraded, both in the short-term, during actual construction, and over the long-term due to reduced storm water quality caused by the increase of paved area. The short-term effects come from possible erosion contributing to turbidity of runoff and possible contamination from spills or leaks from construction equipment. The contractor must utilize effective methods to control surface water runoff and minimize erosion. Proper stabilization and seeding the site immediately upon completion of the construction would provide beneficial vegetation, controlling erosion. Secondary containment needs must be studied, and implemented if needed, to prevent future contamination of surface water and the environment in general. Long-term surface water degradation could occur simply from the fact that additional area is paved, reducing the ability of local environment to absorb water and increasing both the volume and velocity of storm water runoff. Also since we are providing more spaces, there will be more cars at the facility, and the amounts of the various drips and leaks from those vehicles will also increase, potentially degrading surface water quality. The design of the paved area must consider these long-term effects and, as required by Federal Law, include mitigating features and BMP's such as allowing the stormwater to run through grassed areas prior to discharge. Provided best management practices are utilized during design and construction, negative surface water impacts should be minimal.

Water Quality: Provided containment needs are met and best management practices are used, the proposed action would have minimal impact to water quality.

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

Wetlands: The proposed action would have no direct impact on wetlands provided BMP’s are utilized during design and construction. If they are not utilized, then the project quite probably will have a minimal negative impact on wetlands. This would be due to the increased volume, flow rates, and decreased water quality of the sites storm water discharges.

4.1.1 Alternative 2

Groundwater: Actual construction of facilities should not involve deep excavation. This will mean minimal impact on groundwater during construction. Paving the actual lot and compaction of soils may reduce infiltration; however the area is already considered developed so impacts will most likely be minimal. Provided best management practices are followed, there will be minimal impacts on ground water.

Surface Water: Surface water quality could be degraded, both in the short-term, during actual construction, and over the long-term due to reduced storm water quality caused by the increase of...
paved area. The short-term effects come from possible erosion contributing to turbidity of runoff and possible contamination from spills or leaks from construction equipment. The contractor must utilize effective methods to control surface water runoff and minimize erosion. Proper stabilization and seeding the site immediately upon completion of the construction would provide beneficial vegetation, controlling erosion. Secondary containment needs must be studied, and implemented if needed, to prevent future contamination of surface water and the environment in general. Long-term surface water degradation could occur simply from the fact that additional area is paved, reducing the ability of local environment to absorb water and increasing both the volume and velocity of storm water runoff. Also since we are providing more spaces, there will be more cars at the facility, and the amounts of the various drips and leaks form those vehicles will also increase, potentially degrading surface water quality. The design of the paved area must consider these long-term effects and, as required by Federal Law, include mitigating features and BMP’s such as allowing the stormwater run through grassed areas prior to discharge. Provided best management practices are utilized during design and construction, negative surface water impacts should be minimal.

**Water Quality:** Provided containment needs are met and best management practices are used, the proposed action would have minimal impact to water quality.

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

**Wetlands:** The proposed action would have no direct impact on wetlands provided BMP’s are utilized during design and construction. If they are not utilized, then the project quite probably will have a minimal negative impact on wetlands. This would be due to the increased volume, flow rates, and decreased water quality of the sites storm water discharges.

4.1.2 Alternative 3

**Groundwater:** Actual construction of facilities should not involve deep excavation. This will mean minimal impact on groundwater during construction. Paving the actual lot and compaction of soils may reduce infiltration; however the area is already considered developed so impacts will most likely be minimal. Provided best management practices are followed, there will be minimal impacts on ground water.

**Surface Water:** Surface water quality could be degraded, both in the short-term, during actual construction, and over the long-term due to reduced storm water quality caused by the increase of paved area. The short-term effects come from possible erosion contributing to turbidity of runoff and possible contamination from spills or leaks from construction equipment. The contractor must utilize effective methods to control surface water runoff and minimize erosion. Proper stabilization and seeding the site immediately upon completion of the construction would provide beneficial vegetation, controlling erosion. Secondary containment needs must be studied, and implemented if needed, to prevent future contamination of surface water and the environment in general. Long-term surface water degradation could occur simply from the fact that additional area is paved, reducing the ability of local environment to absorb water and increasing both the volume and velocity of storm water runoff. Also since we are providing more spaces, there will be more cars at the facility, and the amounts of the various drips and leaks form those vehicles will also increase, potentially degrading surface water quality. The design of the paved area must consider these long-term effects and, as required by Federal Law, include mitigating features and
BMP’s such as allowing the storm water run through grassed areas prior to discharge. Provided best management practices are utilized during design and construction, negative surface water impacts should be minimal.

**Water Quality:** Provided containment needs are met and best management practices are used, the proposed action would have minimal impact to water quality.

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

**Wetlands:** The proposed action would have no direct impact on wetlands provided BMP’s are utilized during design and construction. If they are not utilized, then the project quite probably will have a minimal negative impact on wetlands. This would be due to the increased volume, flow rates, and decreased water quality of the site’s storm water discharges.

### 4.1.3 Alternative 4

**Groundwater:** Actual construction of facilities should not involve deep excavation. This will mean minimal impact on groundwater during construction. Paving the actual lot and compaction of soils may reduce infiltration; however the area is already considered developed so impacts will most likely be minimal. Provided best management practices are followed, there will be minimal impacts on groundwater.

**Surface Water:** Surface water quality could be degraded, both in the short-term, during actual construction, and over the long-term due to reduced storm water quality caused by the increase of paved area. The short-term effects come from possible erosion contributing to turbidity of runoff and possible contamination from spills or leaks from construction equipment. The contractor must utilize effective methods to control surface water runoff and minimize erosion. Proper stabilization and seeding the site immediately upon completion of the construction would provide beneficial vegetation, controlling erosion. Secondary containment needs must be studied, and implemented if needed, to prevent future contamination of surface water and the environment in general. Long-term surface water degradation could occur simply from the fact that additional area is paved, reducing the ability of local environment to absorb water and increasing both the volume and velocity of storm water runoff. Also since we are providing more spaces, there will be more cars at the facility, and the amounts of the various drips and leaks form those vehicles will also increase, potentially degrading surface water quality. The design of the paved area must consider these long-term effects and, as required by Federal Law, include mitigating features and BMP’s such as allowing the stormwater run through grassed areas prior to discharge. Provided best management practices are utilized during design and construction, negative surface water impacts should be minimal.

**Water Quality:** Provided containment needs are met and best management practices are used, the proposed action would have minimal impact to water quality.

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

**Wetlands:** The proposed action would have no direct impact on wetlands provided BMP’s are utilized during design and construction. If they are not utilized then the project quite probably will have a minimal negative impact on wetlands. This would be due to the increased volume, flow rates, and decreased water quality of the site’s storm water discharges.
Alternative 5 (No Action)

The no action alternative would have no additional impact on water resources.

4.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.6.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)

Vegetation: BMPs and control measures, including silt fences and covering of stockpiles, 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.

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. Activities which expose the soil shall be mitigated by covering the area with weed seed free mulch and/or seed the area with native species. Covering the soil will 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.

Wildlife: Construction would have insignificant impacts to wildlife. These areas provide foraging habitat for small mammals, such as mice and rabbits. The area is improved and frequently maintained by the grounds maintenance contractor. Due to the abundance and mobility of these species and the profusion of natural habitats in the general vicinity, any wildlife disturbed would be able to find similar habitat in the local area.

Threatened or Endangered Species: According to the 1994 ND Natural Heritage Inventory (1994), “There are no known federally threatened or endangered species populations on or adjacent to Grand Forks AFB.” A threatened species, the bald eagle, has been observed using GFAFB sewage lagoons in Oct/Nov of 2003. However, the construction area does not include optimal habitat for the bald eagle or any other transient federal-or state-listed species that may occur in Grand Forks County.

4.6.2 Alternative 2

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

4.6.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.
4.6.4 Alternative 4
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.6.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)
The no action alternative would not impact biological resources.

4.7 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES

4.7.1 Alternative 1 (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.

4.7.2 Alternative 2
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

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

4.7.4 Alternative 4
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.7.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)
The no action alternative would not impact socioeconomics.

4.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.8.1 Alternative 1 (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.

4.8.2 Alternative 2
Alternative 2 impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.
4.8.3 Alternative 3
Alternative 3 impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.8.4 Alternative 4
Alternative 4 impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.8.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)
The no action alternative would not impact cultural resources.

4.9 LAND USE

4.9.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)
The proposed construction would not have an impact on land use.

4.9.2 Alternative 2
Alternative 2 would not have an impact on land use.

4.9.3 Alternative 3
Alternative 3 would not have an impact on land use.

4.9.4 Alternative 4
Alternative 4 would not have an impact on land use.

4.9.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)
The no action alternative would not have an impact on land use.

4.10 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

4.10.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)
The proposed action would have minimal adverse impact to transportation systems on base due to vehicles traveling to and from Main Gate-Separated POV parking lot.

4.10.2 Alternative 2
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

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

4.10.4 Alternative 4
Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action.

4.10.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)
The action would not impact transportation.

4.11 AIRSPACE/AIRFIELD OPERATIONS

4.11.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)
The proposed action would not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility.

4.11.2 Alternative 2
The action would not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility.

4.11.3 Alternative 3
The action would not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility.

4.11.4 Alternative 4
The action would not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility.

4.11.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)
The no action alternative would not impact aircraft safety or airspace compatibility.

4.12 SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

4.12.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)
The proposed action would have no impact on safety and occupational health.

Alternative 2
Alternative 2 would have no impact on safety and occupational health.
Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would have no impact on safety and occupational health.

Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would have no impact on safety and occupational health.

4.12.2 Alternative 5 (No Action)

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

4.13 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

4.13.1.1 Alternative 1 (Proposed Action)

IRP: The proposed action would not impact IRP Sites.

Geology: The proposed action would not impact geological resources.

Pesticides: No pesticides would be used as part of this project.

4.13.1.2 Alternative 2

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action. Soils present in the proposed area include the Gilby series.

4.13.1.3 Alternative 3

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action. Soils present in the proposed area include the Gilby series.

4.13.1.4 Alternative 4

Impacts would be similar to those generated under the proposed action. Soils present in the proposed area include the Gilby series.

4.13.1.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact IRP Sites or geological resources. No pesticides would be used as part of this project.

4.14 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
4.14.1 Alternative 1 (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 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.

4.14.2 Alternative 2

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

4.14.3 Alternative 3

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

4.14.4 Alternative 4

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

4.14.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)

The no action alternative would not impact environmental justice.

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 construction in the area would produce and increase in solid waste generation; however, the increase would be limited to the timeframe of each construction project. The area landfill used for construction and demolition debris does not have capacity concerns and could readily handle the solid waste generated by the various projects.

4.16 UNAVIODABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The use of construction-related vehicles and their short-term impacts on noise, air quality, and traffic is unavoidable.

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

The proposed action and alternative 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 or Alternatives 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, fill and other construction materials related to construction of a Main Gate-Separated POV parking lot would be irreversibly lost.
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Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Gary Raknerud  
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Diane Strom  
NEPA/EIAP Program  
319 CES/CEVA  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
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Natural Resources/Air Program Manager  
319 CES/CEVC  
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Contract Attorney  
319 ARW/JA  
460 Steen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

Bradley J. Schulte, Capt, USAF, BSC  
Bioenvironmental Engineering Flight Commander  
319AMDS/SGGB  
1599 J St  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205

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

Heidi Nelson  
Community Planner  
319 CES/CECP  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd  
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205
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Mr. Terry Dwelle  
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North Dakota Department of Health  
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State Historical Society of North Dakota  
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APPENDIX C
ENVIRONMENTAL SITE MAP
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 - PROPONENT INFORMATION

1. TO (Environmental Planning Function)  319 CES/CEVA
2. FROM (Proponent organization and functional address symbol)  319 CES/CD
2a. TELEPHONE NO.  701-747-4761

3. TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION
MAIN GATE-SEPARATED POV PARKING LOT

4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION (identify decision to be made and need date)
This parking lot is required for personnel who have lost their driving privileges on-base, yet require a place to park their car while they walk on-base for duty. The site must be distanced to prevent unknown and uninspected (cont.p.2)

5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA) (Provide sufficient details for evaluation of the total action.)
Add a parking lot to hold vehicles from offbase residents and/or military members with revoked driving privileges. Continued on page 2.

6. PROPONENT APPROVAL (Name and Grade)
MARY C. GILTNTER, GM-13
Deputy Base Civil Engineer
6b. DATE  7-20-94

SECTION II - PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY. (Check appropriate box and describe potential environmental effects including cumulative effects.) (+ = positive effect; 0 = no effect; - = adverse effect; U = unknown effect)

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.

19. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FUNCTION CERTIFICATION
(Name and Grade)
WAYNE A.. KOOP, R.E.M., GM-13
Environmental Management Flight Chief
19a. SIGNATURE  20 JUL 04
19b. DATE

AF FORM 813, 19990901 (IMT-V1)
THIS FORM CONSOLIDATES AF FormS 813 AND 814.
vehicles from being adjacent to the main gate and security forces personnel and presenting a security risk.

Construct a POV parking lot near the main gate, but separated from the main gate facilities, entry control points, and inspection areas. The POV parking lot is required for vehicles not allowed on base for a variety of reasons. Design of the new main gate facilities and AT/FP decisions have relocated this parking lot from the vicinity of the main gate to a separate site across the road from the main gate. This solves an extremely dangerous parking situation and avoids AT/FP risks from unknown and uninspected vehicles being allowed adjacent to the main gate facilities and security forces personnel. HQ AMC staff has determined that because of the revised siting and change from repair to construction, this parking lot cannot be built under the existing main gate design/build contract. The preferred action is near the entrance of Sunflake Housing, east of Sunflake Circle, off Freedom Drive (see Option B drawing). The location will encourage parkers to cross County Road B-3 at the designated crosswalk. With nice fencing and landscape treatment, it will separate the housing units nearby, and still give 50 feet of backyard to each housing unit. This twenty-car parking lot will provide off-base parking with lights and curbing, within the funding requirements. The existing POV parking lot at the south gate will be dismantled with the improvements done at the south gate.

ALTERNATIVE TWO
Alternative Two is shown as a red dot Site A on the site plan. This alternative is less desirable because it will be a lengthy walk for the persons parking, and would encourage them to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk.

ALTERNATIVE THREE
Alternative Three is shown as a blue dot Site B on the site plan. This alternative is less desirable because it will be a lengthy walk for the persons parking, and would encourage them to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk.

ALTERNATIVE FOUR
Alternative Four is shown as Option A. This alternative is less desirable because of the higher costs involved to re-route drainage due to the existing ditch. Further environmental analysis is needed if this alternative is chosen, due to the potential for fuel, antifreeze or battery acid leakage into the ditch.

ALTERNATIVE FIVE (NO ACTION)
If not constructed, there will be no POV lot available to provide safe parking for vehicles not allowed on base, and no safe separation to protect the main gate facilities and security personnel from AT/FP risks.
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION
GRAND FORKS AFB, NORTH DAKOTA

4. PROJECT TITLE
Long-term Parking Lot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 2-Site</th>
<th>Alternative 3-Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (red dot)</td>
<td>B (blue dot)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITE PLAN

Existing Pedestrian Crossing to Base Proper

Future Walkway

SITE A

SITE B

Sunflake Housing

Map Created by GIB Services, 319th CES

UTILITY BOARD APPROVAL

DATE

COMPUTER GENERATED FORM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. COMPONENT</th>
<th>AF (AMC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. DATE</td>
<td>18 Mar 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ALLMATION AND LOCATION</td>
<td>GRAND FORKS AFB, NORTH DAKOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>LONG-TERM PARKING LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALTERNATIVE 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PROJECT NUMBER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCATION PLAN**

- SITE
- County Road B
- Steen Blvd
EIAP Checklist

Title: Main Gate-Separated PoV Parking Lot

RCS# 04-280

Date Received:

6-24-04 No health concerns.

6-24-04 Comments barred.

6-25-04 Cleared to proceed.

6-23-04 Concur.

7-20-04 Signed

6-24-04 Comments

6-24-04 Comments

6-24-04 Comments

6-24-04 Comments

6-24-04 Comments

6-24-04 Comments

6-23-04 No comments

6-23-04 No comments

6-23-04 No comments

6-23-04 No comments

6-22-04 No comments

6-22-04 No comments

6-22-04 No comments

7-22-04 8-6-04

7-22-04 8-6-04

7-22-04 8-4-04

9-29-04 9-27-04

Expiry:

Coordination w/Public Affairs

Reg. 7-20-04, App. 7-29-04

Base Leader

GF Herald

8-6-04

8-3-04

CEV To 16 Sep 04

Legal To 15 Sep 04

ARW/CV

9-21-04

9-16-04

NA

Rhetoric

ND Game and Fish

State Historical Society of ND

NDDCS

9-29-04

9-27-04

NA

NA

NA

NA

Copy

Send copy to Proponent of signed 813. Mary Giltnar

FONSI – one single sided Copy for Wayne & EPC.

+ EA to Gary Williamson for project folder.

+ 813 + EA to Real Property if they initiated 813.

one copy of FONSI to Division of Community Services.

22 Sep 04

22 Sep 04

Filing

Update EIAP Master Log – change color from yellow to green or red.

Update data (My Network Places/public on Jfsd2cs20101/Records Mgmt/45-othe other Records Mgmt Ops T37-1917-000-04-319 MSG/02-CES/25-CEV/01-CEVA/66-TU32-01R03.00/C-EIAP Log)

Update Master Log on H:\env_eng on ‘F:\fsfd41009’/CEVA/EIAP Logs/Old Logs/EIAP Log Master)

Update FY Log on H drive. ‘F:\fsfd41009’/CEVA/EIAP Logs/Old Logs/EIAP Log current FY)

Move File folder from H drive to official record:

H:\EIAP 04 completed

(My Network Places/public on Jfsd2cs20101/Records ....T032-01R03.00/B-General Assessments)

Originals to Tracy for scanning and filing.

ALLS-PM update 12 Sep 04.
MEMORANDUM FOR 319 CES/CEVA

FROM: 319 ARW/JA

SUBJECT: Maingate-Separated POV Parking Lot EA/FONSI

1. I reviewed the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the above-referenced project. The proposed EA and FONSI are both legally sufficient and comply with the requirements of 32 CFR Part 989. I recommend that Mr. Koop approve the FONSI.

2. The EA contains the need for the proposal, alternatives to the proposal, environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and a listing of agencies and persons consulted for EA preparation. The EA and FONSI were made available for public comment in the Grand Forks Herald. From a legal perspective the projects does not have a significant environmental impact. Therefore, the EA is legally sufficient and a FONSI is appropriate.

3. If you have any questions about these comments, please contact me at 7-3606.

MARK W. HANSON, GS-12, DAF
Chief, General Law
Proposed action is legally sufficient.

-----Original Message-----

From: Strom Diane M Civ 319 CES/CEVA
Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2004 4:00 PM
To: Hanson Mark Civ 319 ARW/JA
Subject: Legal Review of FONSI

Request a legal review of the final FONSI and EA for the Main-Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot, in preparation for Mr. Koop to sign the FONSI.

Notice was published on 3 and 5 Aug 04 in Grand Forks Herald and 6 Aug 04 in The Leader. No comments were received.

Copies of NDDH, NDGF, SHPO responses are included.

Diane M. Strom, 319 CES/CEVA
NEPA/EIAP Program
Environmental Impact Analysis Process
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd
Grand Forks AFB ND 58205-6434
Phone (701) 747-6394
Fax (701) 747-6155
E-mail: diane.strom@grandforks.af.mil
Call for parking info
701-786-3913

Public Notification

Grand Forks Air Force Base has proposed the construction of a parking lot near the main gate, but separated from it. An environmental assessment has been conducted and a finding of no significant impact has been determined for this action. Anyone who would like 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.

Affidavit of Publication

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA } SS.
COUNTY OF GRAND FORKS } 2155

That } is a 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 underground fuel tank recovery & construction parking lot 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>Issue</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 2</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 5</td>
<td>2004</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 $2,501.40: 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 23rd day of Aug., A.D. 2007

ELAINE FAWCETT
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Notary Public, Grand Forks, ND
JACQUELINE BIGAR HOROSCOPE

Happy birthday.
Risking both emotionally and financially could backfire this week. You are not nearly as sure-footed as you may have thought. You are likely to flounder and misstep, and this is more likely than usual.

VIRGO (Aug. 23-Sept. 22) You might not appreciate someone's opinions and leadership, but you have little choice. Let 2023 you find ways to commit to your new way. Your impact will be evident. Tonight: On the phone.

SAGITTARIUS (Nov. 22-Dec. 21) You might find yourself in a situation you find difficult to manage, especially in the work place. Tonight: Put on your dancing shoes.

SCORPIO (Oct. 23-Nov. 21) Your creativity is being put to the test, but so does your courage. You know when enough is enough. Tonight: Put on your dancing shoes.

CAPRICORN (Dec. 22-Jan. 19) You might be more important than what is said. You choose to say yes to a deal that is actually more important than you. Tonight: Put your best foot forward.

AQUARIUS (Jan. 20-Feb. 18) Things are moving along. Be sure to share. More projects and tasks. Tonight: Put on your dancing shoes.


Herald will help you find a cash buyer for something you have been storing in your home.

H International tractor, loader, snow plow bucket, $1300. 8N Ford, 5th wheel mowers, $2500, 215-889-0200.

ROOFING & Repairs, interior/exterior painting, commercial, residential, mobile home, 773-4352.

ABC SEAMLESS steel gutters. Lifetime warranty. Call 746-7246.

We pay CASH for your contract for debris, 1st & 2nd mortgages, annuities, mobile homes, contracts. MCE, 773-3193.

Grand Forks & Area Efficiency apartments.

A beautiful 3 bedroom, 2 bath, white chest & white walls. 894-6267. $75,000, call 701-894-6267.

4plexes, $145,000. Call 701-780-9152.

4plex downtown. $400,000. 4th St. Call 701-780-9152.

4plex historic district, $1100/mo. Call 701-845-9152.

4plex, $145,000. Call 701-780-9152.

4plex, $1100/mo. Call 701-780-9152.

4plexes, $145,000. Call 701-780-9152.

56 Tillable acres in GF County - NW corner Section 21, 7-19-18. $27,000. Call 701-786-3913.

56 Tillable acres in GF County - NW corner Section 21, 7-19-18. $27,000. Call 701-786-3913.

Air Force Base, Grand Forks, ND. 746-6500. Call 701-780-9152.

Business Finance
450 Business Finance

EXCELLENT rental/office space available. 4400 sq. ft. downtown. (former Jewel Box). $139 sq. ft. Call 701-780-5050. Available now thru 772-2296.

EXCELLENT rental/office space available. 4400 sq. ft. downtown. (former Jewel Box). $139 sq. ft. Call 701-780-5050. Available now thru 772-2296.

EXCELLENT rental/office space available. 4400 sq. ft. downtown. (former Jewel Box). $139 sq. ft. Call 701-780-5050. Available now thru 772-2296.

EXCELLENT rental/office space available. 4400 sq. ft. downtown. (former Jewel Box). $139 sq. ft. Call 701-780-5050. Available now thru 772-2296.

EXCELLENT rental/office space available. 4400 sq. ft. downtown. (former Jewel Box). $139 sq. ft. Call 701-780-5050. Available now thru 772-2296.

EXCELLENT rental/office space available. 4400 sq. ft. downtown. (former Jewel Box). $139 sq. ft. Call 701-780-5050. Available now thru 772-2296.

EXCELLENT rental/office space available. 4400 sq. ft. downtown. (former Jewel Box). $139 sq. ft. Call 701-780-5050. Available now thru 772-2296.

EXCELLENT rental/office space available. 4400 sq. ft. downtown. (former Jewel Box). $139 sq. ft. Call 701-780-5050. Available now thru 772-2296.
MPF closure

The Military Personnel Flight customer service section closes from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. Aug. 23 for computer system upgrades. They won't have the capability to issue identification cards, accomplish Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System updates or give out Rapids Reports. For details call 747-4902.

Public notice

Grand Forks Air Force Base has proposed the construction of a parking lot near the main gate, but separated from it. An environmental assessment has been conducted and a “finding of no significant impact” has been determined for this action.

Anyone who would like 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.

Promotion study list available

RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, Texas (AFPN) — Promotion-eligible enlisted Airmen can now find which materials to study for the 2005 testing cycles.

The most current Weighted Airman Promotion System catalogue, which lists the materials used by test writers to develop the 2005 promotion tests, is now available on the Air Force Personnel Center Web site at http://www.afpc.randolph.af.mil/testing. The catalogue lists study references for those testing for staff through chief master sergeant.

Career development course study material, when required, is automatically shipped to promotion-eligible Airmen by the Air Force Institute for Advanced Distributed Learning staff. Enlisted Airmen should check the catalogue every year to ensure they have the current references. The catalogue often includes non-CDC publications, said officials.

Test administration dates for the 2005 chief master sergeant cycle are Sept. 7 to 10. The dates for senior master sergeant testing are Dec. 6 to 17, while testing for technical sergeant and master sergeant place Feb. 15 to March 31. Senior airmen will test for staff sergeant May 1 to 31. (Courtesy of AFPC News Service)

AF general denies appeal

LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE, Va. (AFPN) — A U.S. Air Force general has denied the appeal of an Illinois Air National Guard F-16 Fighting Falcon pilot regarding the punishment he received for his role in a 2002 friendly fire incident in Afghanistan.


Major Schmidt was found guilty of derelictions of duty, received a reprimand and will forfeit $5,672 pay for dropping a 500-pound, laser-guided bomb from his F-16 fighter jet, killing four Canadian soldiers and wounding eight more in the incident.

Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice entitles punished servicemembers to one appeal to “the next superior authority,” so General Hornburg’s decision brings nonjudicial punishment proceedings on this issue to a close.

Forces hit militants near Pakistan border

WASHINGTON — Afghan troops supported by coalition ground forces and warplanes fought an all-day pitched battle with militants near the Pakistani border Aug. 2.

The fighting began during the early morning in Khost province, according to a Coalition Press Information Center release. It eventually involved nearly 100 enemy troops in two major engagements that spanned the day.

A B-1B Lancer bomber, A-10 Thunderbolt aircraft, and AH-1 Cobra and UH-1 helicopters, plus American infantry, were employed to provide air and ground support to Afghan forces battling the militants, according to the release.

At the end of the day’s fighting, one Afghan soldier had been killed and three others wounded. Officials noted one militant was killed and another was wounded, while another enemy was captured.

Officials believe the enemy carried additional wounded and dead off the battlefield.

In other news from Afghanistan, the Afghan government reportedly will deploy 11 battalions and two companies of Afghan National Army troops around the country to bolster security for the Oct. 9 national elections.

Also, more than 12,000 former members of disbanded militia have turned in their weapons as part of an Afghan government program, officials said. More than 10,000 of the former militia members have been enrolled in retraining programs to ease their return to civilian life.

VA establishes laser eye surgery policies

WASHINGTON — The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) has announced a new policy providing a single, uniform standard of care throughout the Department for performing laser eye surgery procedures.

“Our Department has no higher priority than to ensure veterans receive the highest possible quality health care at all of our facilities,” said Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony J. Principi, “This new policy will provide an additional level of safety for our patients who come to us for eye care.”

VA’s new policy states that all therapeutic laser eye surgeries at VA facilities will be performed under the supervision of an ophthalmologist in a manner consistent with Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations standards.

Only optometrists who are fully trained and appropriately licensed will be granted clinical privileges by the department to perform therapeutic laser eye surgery under the supervision of an ophthalmologist.

Presently, Oklahoma is the only state that licenses optometrists to perform laser surgery. VA will continue to evaluate and consider state and national standards of practice as it sets its own standard of care.

VA currently operates 158 hospitals, 132 nursing homes, 42 residential rehabilitation treatment programs, and 854 outpatient clinics. The new policy will take effect immediately at all facilities with the capability to perform laser-eye surgeries.
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MPF closure

The Military Personnel Flight customer service section closes from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. Aug. 23 for computer system upgrades. They won’t have the capability to issue identification cards, accomplish Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System updates or give out Rapids Reports. For details call 747-4902.

Public notice

Grand Forks Air Force Base has proposed the construction of a parking lot near the main gate, but separated from it. An environmental assessment has been conducted and a “finding of no significant impact” has been determined for this action.

Anyone who would like 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.

Promotion study list available

RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, Texas (AFPN) — Promotion-eligible enlisted Airmen can now find which materials to study for the 2005 testing cycle. The most current Weighted Airman Promotion System catalogue, which includes the materials used by test writers to develop the 2005 promotion tests, is now available on the Air Force Personnel Center Web site at http://www.afpc.randolph.af.mil/testing. The catalogue includes study references for those testing staff through chief master sergeant.

Career development course study material, when required, is automatically shipped to promotion-eligible Airmen through the Air Force Institute for Advanced Distributed Learning staff. Enlisted Airmen should check the catalogue every year to ensure they have the current study references. The catalogue often includes non-CDC publications, said officials.

The institute staff will begin shipping the course study material in September for people testing for staff, technical and master sergeant. If career development study material is not received by November, Airmen should contact their unit promotion testing monitor to initiate follow-up actions, said officials.

Test administration dates for the chief master sergeant cycle are Sept. 10. The dates for senior master sergeant testing are Dec. 6 to 17, while testing for...
Quarterly award winners

Congratulations to the 319th Air Refueling Wing Quarterly award winners for Second Quarter, April to June 2004.

Company Grade Officer
1st Lt. Edward Bunce,
319th Operations Support Squadron
Noncommissioned Officer
Master Sgt. Lyle Spring,
319th Maintenance Operations Squadron
Noncommissioned Officer
Tech Sgt. Shawni Hedberg,
319th Medical Support Squadron
Airman
Bradley Radziere,
319th Aircraft Maintenance Squadron
Senior Airman Tim Farr,
319th Aircraft Maintenance Squadron
Cat. 1 -- Civilian Program Specialist
John H. Welch,
319th Medical Support Squadron
Cat. 2 -- Civilian Program Manager
Kristen A. Rangerup,
319th Civil Engineering Squadron
Cat. 3 -- Senior Civilian Program Manager
Glenn T. W. Garton,
319th Services Squadron

ALS graduates

Congratulations to the Airman Leadership School graduates of Class 04F.
Senior Airman Crystal R. Greenwood John L. Levitow Award
Senior Airman Shaun J. Weimer Distinguished Graduate and Academic Award
Staff Sgt. Nathaniel L. Espeian Academic Award
Senior Airman Warren O. Richards Leadership Award
Senior Airman Joseph M. Austin
Senior Airman Christopher M. Breaux
Senior Airman Eduardo E. De Souza
Senior Airman Joseph R. Ganzzenniller
Senior Airman Steven G. Hillard
Senior Airman Matthew V. Johnson
Senior Airman Mathias P. Junger
Senior Airman Ryan C. Love
Senior Airman Jeremy T. Martinez
Senior Airman Jarrod N. Ortiz
Senior Airman Jeneane M. Owens
Senior Airman Jerenoll L. Renoll
Senior Airman Jonathan Schmehel
Senior Airman Nicholas Smith
Senior Airman Steven H. Vaudt
Senior Airman Shelby W. Williams

QUARTERLY ASSIGNMENT LISTING AVAILABLE
RANDOLPH AIR FORCE BASE, Texas (AFPN) -- The Enlisted Air Force Personnel Center is now available.

EQUAL advertises upcoming assignment requirements, by Air Force specialty and rank. Airmen should review, prioritize and update their assignment preferences based on the listing, officials said.

People can view the lists on the AFPC home page at https://afas.afpc.randolph.af.mil/amsweb/master.cfm or at local MPFs. Airmen on temporary duty during the advertising period can contact the nearest personnel office for assistance.

MPF closure

The Military Personnel Flight customer service section closes from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. Aug. 23 for computer system upgrades. They won't have the capability to issue identification cards, accomplish Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System updates or give out Rapids Reports. For details call 747-4902.

Public notice

Grand Forks Air Force Base has proposed the construction of a parking lot near the main gate, but separated from it.

An environmental assessment has been conducted and a “finding of no significant impact” has been determined for this action.

Anyone who would like to view the support documents to this action should contact the 319th Air Refueling Wing Public Affairs Office within the next 23 days at 747-5017.

Aug 13, 2004
September 1, 2004

Ms. Diane Strom
319 CES/CEVA
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd.
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

Re: Environmental Assessment for
Constructing a Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot
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 July 22, 2004, 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. Projects disturbing more than one acre are required to have an NDPDES permit to discharge storm water runoff until the site is stabilized by the reestablishment of vegetation or other permanent cover. For more information on the construction storm water discharge permit, visit the Department’s website or contact the Division of Water Quality at (701) 328-5210.

3. 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.
If you have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

L. David Glatt, Chief
Environmental Health Section

LDG:cc
September 1, 2004

Ms. Diane Strom
319 CES/CEVA
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd.
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

Re: Environmental Assessment for
    Constructing a Main Gate-Separated PQV Parking Lot
    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 July 22, 2004, 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. Projects disturbing more than one acre are required to have an NDPDES permit to discharge storm water runoff until the site is stabilized by the reestablishment of vegetation or other permanent cover. For more information on the construction storm water discharge permit, visit the Department's website or contact the Division of Water Quality at (701) 328-5210.

3. 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.
Ms. Diane Strom

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

Sincerely,

L. David Glatt, Chief
Environmental Health Section

LDG:cc
TO: Diane Strom, 319 CES/CEVA
Fax #: 701-747-6155
Phone: 701-747-6394

FROM: David Glatt, ND Dept. of Health
Fax #: (701) 328-5200
Phone: (701) 328-5150

DATE: 9/2/04
Number of pages following: 2
Remarks:
Sorry for the delay. The original will be mailed today.
RE: Environmental Assessment for Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota.

Dear Mr. Hildebrand:

The U.S. Air Force is preparing an environmental assessment (EA) on constructing a POV parking lot on Grand Forks AFB. Attached is a copy of the EA. Please review the document and identify any additional resources within your agency's responsibility that may be impacted by the action. Comments should be sent within 15 days of receipt of this letter to:

Ms. Diane Strom, 319 CES/CEVA
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd.
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

Your assistance in providing information is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please call Ms. Strom at 701-747-6394.

Sincerely,

WAYNE A. KOOP
Environmental Management Flight Chief

Attachment:
Environmental Assessment
August 4, 2004

Diane Strom, 319 CES/CEVA
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

ND SHPO Ref.: 97-0527am, Draft EA, POV Parking Lot, Grand Forks AFB, ND.

Dear Ms. Strom:

We have reviewed: Environmental Assessment: Construct POV Parking Lot, Main Gate-Separated, At Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota (Draft Version, 12 July 04).

We have no comments on the draft Environmental Assessment.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project. Please include the ND SHPO Reference number listed above in any further correspondence for this specific project. If you have any questions please contact Duane Klinner at (701) 328-3576.

Sincerely,

Merlan E. Paaverud, Jr.
State Historic Preservation Officer
(North Dakota)
September 23, 2004

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

"Letter of Clearance" In Conformance with the North Dakota Federal Program Review System - State Application Identifier No.: ND040923-0476

Dear Ms. Strom:

SUBJECT: FONSI - Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot

The above referenced FONSI 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

www.ndcommerce.com
1. Paragraph 4(a) indicates parking lot is required for Revoked/Barred Personnel …. Recommend future references in the EA indicate Parking lot is for personnel who have lost their driving privileges on base. The word “barred” is probably inaccurate. Barred people typically aren’t allowed on GFAFB including the Sunflake housing area. I am also unaware of anyone who has had parking privileges revoked.

2. I think we should list as possible alternative - parking at the south gate. If for security reasons this is not possible we can eliminate from consideration.

3. I don’t believe we have a serious environmental issue but we should consider whether the increased traffic flow and pollution will result from an influx of people into this area. 20 cars is probably not an influx to the degree that it effects quality of the human environment.

4. One alternative proposed a parking lot near a storm water ditch. Construction result in sediments entering the storm water. In addition, the cars who park in the parking lot may fuel/antifreeze/battery acid that may flow into the ditch.

MARK W. HANSON, GS-12 DAF
Chief, General Law
319th Air Refueling Wing
Grand Forks AFB North Dakota
Tel: DSN 362-3618; 701-747-3618
Fax: DSN 362-4766; 701-747-4766

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic transmission may contain attorney work-product or information protected under the attorney-client privilege, both of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release outside of DoD channels without prior authorization from the sender.

-----Original Message-----
From: Strom Diane M Civ 319 CES/CEVA
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2004 12:57 PM
To: Zhorela Steve M Civ 319 CES/CECP; Braun Stephen M Civ 319 CES/CEVC; Chicosky Stephen C MSgt 319 AMXS; Coleman Matthew F Capt 319 ARW/SEF; Crouse Everett E Civ 319 OSS/OSAA; Franklin David W TSgt 319 ARW/SEG; Hanson Mark Civ 319 ARW/JA; Johnson Gary L Civ 319 ARW/SEG; Klaus Christopher Civ 319 CES/CEVC; Minter Jeremy 2dLt 319 AMDS/SGGB; Nelson Heidi R Civ 319 CES/CECP; Olderbak Larry Civ 319 CES/CEVP; Raknerud Gary D Civ 319 CES/CEVP; Rundquist Kristen A Civ 319 CES/CEVC; Schulte Brad J Capt 319 ADS/SGGB; Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP
Cc: Koop Wayne A Civ 319 CES/CEV; McCullough David Civ 319 CES/CEVC
Subject: RCS 04-280 Coordination AF 813

Please review the attached AF Form 813 for the construction of a Main Gate-Separated POV Parking Lot, and provide any environmental impacts or a negative response. This project will require the completion of an environmental assessment, so please cover impacts from each of the four alternatives in detail, by 30 Jun 04.

Thanks,
Diane Strom, 319 CES/CEVA
NEPA/EIAP Program
747-6394

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 - PROPOINENT INFORMATION

1. TO (Environmental Planning Function) 319 CES/CEVA
   2. FROM (Proponent organization and functional address symbol) 319 CES/CD
   2a. TELEPHONE NO. 701-747-4761

3. TITLE OF PROPOSED ACTION
   MAIN GATE-SEPARATED POV PARKING LOT

4. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION (Identify decision to be made and need date)
   This parking lot is required for Revoked/Barred personnel, who have lost their driving and parking privileges on-base, yet require a place to park their car while they walk on-base for duty. The site must be distanced to prevent unknown and un inspected (cont.p.2)

5. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES (DOPAA) (Provide sufficient details for evaluation of the total action.)
   Add a parking lot to hold vehicles from offbase residents and/or military members with Revoked/Barred driving privileges. Continued on page 2.

6. PROPONENT APPROVAL (Name and Grade) MARY C. GILTNER, GM-13 Deputy Base Civil Engineer
   6a. SIGNATURE
   6b. DATE

SECTION II - PRELIMINARY ENVIROMENTAL SURVEY. (Check appropriate box and describe potential environmental effects including cumulative effects.) (+ = positive effect; 0 = no effect; - = adverse effect; U = unknown effect)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. AIR INSTALLATION COMPATIBLE USE ZONE/LAND USE (Noise, accident potential, encroachment, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AIR QUALITY (Emissions, attainment status, state implementation plan, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WATER RESOURCES (Quality, quantity, source, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH (Asbestos/radiation/chemical exposure, explosives safety quantity-distance, bird/wildlife aircraft hazard, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE (Use/storage/generation, solid waste, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (Wetlands/floodplains, threatened or endangered species, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CULTURAL RESOURCES (Native American burial sites, archaeological, historical, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (Topography, minerals, geothermal, Installation Restoration Program, seismicity, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SOCIOECONOMIC (Employment/population projections, school and local fiscal impacts, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. OTHER (Potential impacts not addressed above.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

19. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING FUNCTION CERTIFICATION (Name and Grade) 19a. SIGNATURE
   19b. DATE

AF FORM 813, 19990901 (IMT-V1) THIS FORM CONSOLIDATES AF FORMS 813 AND 814. PREVIOUS EDITIONS OF BOTH FORMS ARE OBSOLETE.
vehicles from being adjacent to the main gate and security forces personnel and presenting a security risk.

Construct a POV parking lot near the main gate, but separated from the main gate facilities, entry control points, and inspection areas. The POV parking lot is required for vehicles not allowed on base for a variety of reasons. Design of the new main gate facilities and AT/FP decisions have relocated this parking lot from the vicinity of the main gate to a separate site across the road from the main gate. This solves an extremely dangerous parking situation and avoids AT/FP risks from unknown and uninspected vehicles being allowed adjacent to the main gate facilities and security forces personnel. HQ AMC staff has determined that because of the revised siting and change from repair to construction, this parking lot can not be built under the existing main gate design/build contract. The preferred action is near the entrance of Sunflake Housing, east of Sunflake Circle, off Freedom Drive (see Option B drawing). The location will encourage parkers to cross County Road B-3 at the designated crosswalk. With nice fencing and landscape treatment, it will separate the housing units nearby, and still give 50 feet of backyard to each housing unit. This twenty-car parking lot will provide off-base parking with lights and curbing, within the funding requirements.

ALTERNATIVE ONE
Alternative One is shown as a red dot Site A on the site plan. This alternative is less desirable because it will be a lengthy walk for the persons parking, and would encourage them to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk.

ALTERNATIVE TWO
Alternative Two is shown as a blue dot Site B on the site plan. This alternative is less desirable because it will be a lengthy walk for the persons parking, and would encourage them to cross County Road B-3 at a site other than the designated crosswalk.

ALTERNATIVE THREE
Alternative Three is shown as Option A. This alternative is less desirable because of the higher costs involved to re-route drainage due to the existing ditch.

ALTERNATIVE FOUR (NO ACTION)
If not constructed, there will be no POV lot available to provide safe parking for vehicles not allowed on base, and no safe separation to protect the main gate facilities and security personnel from AT/FP risks.
Strom Diane M Civ 319 CES/CEVA

From: Rundquist Kristen A Civ 319 CES/CEVC
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2004 4:14 PM
To: Strom Diane M Civ 319 CES/CEVA
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD2004456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Importance: High

Diane -

I gave you a map of this area yesterday. Are you feeling comfortable with it?

Kristen

-----Original Message-----
From: Koop Wayne A Civ 319 CES/CEV
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2004 2:34 PM
To: Strom Diane M Civ 319 CES/CEVA
Cc: Rundquist Kristen A Civ 319 CES/CEVC
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD2004456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)
Importance: High

We'll need to do the EIAP evaluation right away for this new sight! Thanx.

Wayne A. Koop DSN 362-4590
CES Environmental Manager

-----Original Message-----
From: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2004 12:16 PM
To: Zhorela Steve M Civ 319 CES/CECP; Nelson Heidi R Civ 319 CES/CECP; Koop Wayne A Civ 319 CES/CEV; Painter Brad S Civ 319 CES/CECE
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD2004456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Here's the go-ahead from Ken and the BCE to pursue out-of-cycle FB approval and funds request for the alternative siting for this POV lot. Wayne, this should help the EIAP issues for this requirement, see the third slide in the attachment below.

//SIGNED//
GARY C. WILLIAMSON, DAFC
Facility Programmer

-----Original Message-----
From: Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2004 11:59
To: Zhorela Steve M Civ 319 CES/CECP
Cc: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD2004456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Do the out-of-cycle siting and request funds from AMC?

//signed//
KEN JOHNSON, GM-13, DAFC
Engineering Flight Chief

-----Original Message-----
From: Fogarty Patrick F LtCol 319 CES/CC
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2004 11:26 AM
To: Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC
Cc: Giltner Mary C Civ 319 CES/CD
Subject: RE: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Yes, we need to press forward to get the money this year...
PFF

---Original Message-----
From: Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2004 11:09 AM
To: Fogarty Patrick F LtCol 319 CES/CC
Cc: Giltner Mary C Civ 319 CES/CD
Subject: RE: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Steve has a cost estimate from PACES of $70K for a 20 slot lot located just east of Sunflake Circle off Freedom Drive. We need a good site survey to make sure the cost is high enough to cover any fill needed. Do you want us to go to the FWG/FB for siting approval and request funds from AMC?

//signed//
KEN JOHNSON, GM-13, DAFC
Engineering Flight Chief

---Original Message-----
From: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP
Sent: Monday, 21 June 2004 08:27
To: Zhorela Steve M Civ 319 CES/CECP; Nelson Heidi R Civ 319 CES/CECP
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Lot's of emails on this issue. I tried to collect them in the following email chain, pretty much by date. Where do we go from here? There are probably at least two options, as follows?

Option 1. Stay with current FB-approved siting. AMC won't fund it this FY, so at next FWG/FB it should be prioritized for future year programs?

Option 2. Evaluate another siting such as the attachment below. This would require new FWG/FB approval. If it's decided to pursue this option, then an out-of-cycle FWG/FB action should be started and detailed cost estimates obtained with the pavements IDIQ and SABER line items?

//SIGNED//
GARY C. WILLIAMSON, DAFC
Facility Programmer

---Original Message-----
From: Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC
Sent: Monday, 21 June 2004 10:32
To: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Gary,

I'm trying not to bother Steve until the B2C is done. Can you provide an answer for this? I don't know how they can say a $50K parking lot. How much parking lot with lights and curb can we do for $50K?

//signed//
KEN JOHNSON, GM-13, DAFC
Engineering Flight Chief

---Original Message-----
From: Fogarty Patrick F LtCol 319 CES/CC  
Sent: Friday, 18 June 2004 21:16  
To: Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC  
Cc: Zhorela Steve M Civ 319 CES/CECP; Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP; Giltner Mary C Civ 319 CES/CD  
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)  

Ken--  

Latest on the parking lot programming?  

PFF  

-----Original Message-----  
From: Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC  
Sent: Friday, 18 June 2004 12:03  
To: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP  
Cc: Zhorela Steve M Civ 319 CES/CECP  
Subject: RE: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)  

Yes. we need to request the funds.  

//signed//  
KEN JOHNSON, GM-13, DAFC  
Engineering Flight Chief  

-----Original Message-----  
From: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP  
Sent: Thursday, 17 June 2004 15:23  
To: Zhorela Steve M Civ 319 CES/CECP; Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC  
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)  

The alternative siting hasn't been priced out yet, but should be a lot cheaper? The spot closer to B3, even with reduced number of spots would probably still be costly because of the fill and storm drainage systems required? Should we get an actual estimate on the alternative siting?  

//SIGNED//  
GARY C. WILLIAMSON, DAFC  
Facility Programmer  

-----Original Message-----  
From: Nelson Heidi R Civ 319 CES/CECP  
Sent: Thursday, 17 June 2004 15:00  
To: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP  
Subject: RE: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)  

Long_term.pdf (237 KB).  

Gary,
The first slide contains our two preferred locations which got shot down, and the second page is an alternate concept that I came up with around the same time since I was not for the ditch siting. There is over 50' of space left for each of the backyards. If you have a nice fence and landscaping treatment behind the houses, I thought this site would have worked real well, but it was never really given a chance. I know Lt Col Fogarty was concerned about the people using the crosswalk onto the base, so this site would still work well from that angle.

Heidi

-----Original Message-----
From: Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC
Sent: Friday, 18 June 2004 10:03
To: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Gary,

I'm sending this to you to prevent sidetracking Steve from the B2C. Can you pin down the details and show me a map and a preliminary cost.

//signed//
KEN JOHNSON, GM-13, DAFC
Engineering Flight Chief

-----Original Message-----
From: Johnson Ken W  Civ 319 CES/CEC
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2004 11:54 AM
To: Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP; Fogarty Patrick F LtCol 319 CES/CC
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Do you know what he is talking about? Are we going to do a simple gravel lot with no curbs and no lighting?
KEN JOHNSON, GM-13, DAFC
Engineering Flight Chief

-----Original Message-----
From: Peppers Rick D GS-13 AMC/A75D
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2004 11:49 AM
To: Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC; Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP
Cc: Balzano John M Maj AMC/A75D; Bittick Judith D LtCol AMC/A75D
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Ken,

I got a note from Col Brittenham stating that you guys were going to try and reduce scope on this funds request so we can help you out. This was much higher in cost than when originally brought to our attention. Do you know status of down-scope effort???

v/r

Rick Peppers
HQ AMC/A75D
DSN: 779-0840

-----Original Message-----
From: Balzano John M Maj AMC/A75D
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2004 8:12 AM
To: Fogarty Patrick F LtCol 319 CES/CC
Cc: Bittick Judith D LtCol AMC/A75D; Rivers Efrem L Maj AMC/A75R; Peppers Rick D GS-13 AMC/A75D; Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CECP; Giltner Mary C Civ 319 CES/CD; Trueblood Danny M GS-12 AMC/A78A
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Lt Col Fogarty,

Lt Col Bittick is on leave until 1 June and I'm filling in. This requirement has gotten much bigger than we anticipated. We expected it to be in the range of $50K based on the amount broken out for it when it was part of the gate project. This is the figure we've been providing to Col Brittenham and Gen Eulberg. We will likely not be able to support a requirement six times larger. Our reserves of O&M funds are very limited and Gen Eulberg has been focusing primarily on critical infrastructure requirements. I don't believe we will be able to fund this project as it stands this fiscal year.

v/r

John

JOHN M. BALZANO, Maj. USAF
Facility Program Manager
HQ AMC/A75D
DSN 779-0749 Comm (618) 229-0749
Fax DSN 779-0255

-----Original Message-----
From: Fogarty Patrick F LtCol 319 CES/CC
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2004 9:05 PM
To: Bittick Judith D LtCol AMC/A75D
Cc: Giltner Mary C Civ 319 CES/CD; Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CECP; Trueblood Danny M GS-12 AMC/A78A; Peppers Rick D GS-13 AMC/A75D; Rivers Efrem L Maj AMC/A75R; Krewson Gary A GS-13 AMC/A7CP
Subject: FW: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

Judy--
This is the project we discussed a few weeks ago that had to be separated from the AMC gate project since we had to change the siting...which changed the programming from repair to construction. We’re looking for AMC’s support to support it to keep the entire project in line and on target.

Thanks!
PFF

-----Original Message-----
From: Knutson Jeffrey Civ 319 CES/CERF
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2004 8:39AM
To: AMC/A78-FUNDS
Cc: Fogarty Patrick F LtCol 319 CES/CC; Giltner Mary C Civ 319 CES/CD; Johnson Ken W Civ 319 CES/CEC; Painter Brad S Civ 319 CES/CECE; Mann Duane F Civ 319 CONS/LGCB; Danielson Naomi B Civ 319 CES/CER; Adams Frances B Civ 319 CPTS/FM; Williamson Gary C Civ 319 CES/CECP; Kraupa Kay E GS-11 AMC/A78A; Peppers Rick D GS-13 AMC/A75D
Subject: Grand Forks, O&M, JFSD200456A/B FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING (ROF)

1. Request for a Reservation of Funds
   A. Program: FY04 O&M
   B. PEC/EEIC: 41976/529
   C. Project Number: JFSD200456A/B
   D. Project Title: FP-CONS MAIN GATE SEPARATED POV LOT/LIGHTING
   E. CWE: $300.0K ($250.0K + $50.0K)
   F. Number of Days Required to Award These Funds: 30 Days
   G. Acquisition Method: IDC/SABER
   H. Reason for request: Construction funds are requested to construct a POV parking lot separated from the main gate, with associated lighting. The existing parking lot is located at the commercial gate and its use as a POV parking lot will go away with the construction of the gate projects. Due to Anti-Terrorism / Force-Protection directives, the parking should be separated from the entry gate facilities and personnel. This initiative is not included in the gate projects, and requires separate funding.

2. POC: Mr. Brad Painter DSN 362-4946

319 CES/CERF
Grand Forks AFB, ND
EA for 04-280 is enclosed for your review, prior to sending to PA for 30 day public notice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>File</th>
<th>Note and Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>For Clearance</td>
<td>Per Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Requested</td>
<td>For Correction</td>
<td>Prepare Reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate</td>
<td>For Your Information</td>
<td>See Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Investigate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Justify</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMARKS**

FONSI for 04-280 is enclosed for your signature. No comments were received during 30 day public notice. Legally sufficient letter enclosed.

**FROM:** (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)

_Diane Strom, 319 CES/CEVA, NEPA / EIAP_

Room No 128. - Bldg. 410
Phone No. 747-6394

---

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions.
Mr. Merlen E. Paaverud  
State Historic Preservation Officer  
State Historical Society of North Dakota  
612 East Boulevard Avenue  
Bismarck ND 58505-0200

RE: Environmental Assessment for Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota.

Dear Mr. Paaverud:

The U.S. Air Force is preparing an environmental assessment (EA) on constructing a POV parking lot on Grand Forks AFB. Attached is a copy of the EA. Please review the document and identify any additional resources within your agency's responsibility that may be impacted by the action. Comments should be sent within 15 days of receipt of this letter to:

Ms. Diane Strom, 319 CES/CEVA  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd.  
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

Your assistance in providing information is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please call Ms. Strom at 701-747-6394.

Sincerely,

WAYNE A. KOOP  
Environmental Management Flight Chief

Attachment:  
Environmental Assessment
Mr. Dean Hildebrand, Commissioner  
North Dakota Game and Fish  
100 North Bismarck Expressway  
Bismarck, ND 58501

RE: Environmental Assessment for Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota.

Dear Mr. Hildebrand:

The U.S. Air Force is preparing an environmental assessment (EA) on constructing a POV parking lot on Grand Forks AFB. Attached is a copy of the EA. Please review the document and identify any additional resources within your agency's responsibility that may be impacted by the action. Comments should be sent within 15 days of receipt of this letter to:

Ms. Diane Strom, 319 CES/CEVA  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd.  
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

Your assistance in providing information is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please call Ms. Strom at 701-747-6394.

Sincerely,

WAYNE A. KOOP  
Environmental Management Flight Chief

Attachment:  
Environmental Assessment
Mr. Terry Dwelle  
State Health Officer  
North Dakota Department of Health  
600 East Boulevard Avenue  
Bismarck, ND 58505-0200  

RE: Environmental Assessment for Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota.

Dear Mr. Dwelle:

The U.S. Air Force is preparing an environmental assessment (EA) on constructing a POV parking lot on Grand Forks AFB. Attached is a copy of the EA. Please review the document and identify any additional resources within your agency’s responsibility that may be impacted by the action. Comments should be sent within 15 days of receipt of this letter to:

Ms. Diane Strom, 319 CES/CEVA  
525 Tuskegee Airmen Blvd.  
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205-6434

Your assistance in providing information is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please call Ms. Strom at 701-747-6394.

Sincerely,

WAYNE A. KOOP  
Environmental Management Flight Chief

Attachment:  
Environmental Assessment