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<td>AFPD</td>
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<td>LBP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>Air Mobility Command</td>
<td>NDDDH</td>
<td>North Dakota Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
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<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bgs</td>
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<td>NFA</td>
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</tr>
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<td>P.L.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFSP</td>
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<td>SHPO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>USACE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>Defense Logistics Agency</td>
<td>USAF</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBS</td>
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<td>USFWS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIAP</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Analysis Process</td>
<td>UST</td>
<td>underground storage tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
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<td>WPA</td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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1. Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

This Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA) has been prepared to support the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) and describes a proposal by Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB) to dispose of the Defense Fuels Supply Point (DFSP) facility, two segments of pipeline, and associated infrastructure. This section presents background information on the DFSP facility, pipelines, and its associated infrastructure; the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action; the location and mission of Grand Forks AFB; and a summary of key environmental compliance requirements.

1.1 Background

The 319th Civil Engineer Squadron, Asset Management Flight (319th CES/CEA) at Grand Forks AFB proposes to complete the U.S. Air Force (USAF) Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) to determine the potential environmental impacts from disposal of the DFSP facility, DFSP pipelines, and associated infrastructure.

Grand Forks AFB is a USAF installation under the Air Mobility Command (AMC). The 319th Air Base Wing (319 ABW), which serves as the host wing, provides base operational support to wing personnel, three tenant units, and nine Geographically Separated Units. Grand Forks AFB trains, deploys, and redeployes more than 1,200 airmen in support of the Air Expeditionary Force and combatant commander requirements. Grand Forks AFB provides facilities and equipment support for the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), and the 69th Reconnaissance Group. Grand Forks AFB also provides logistical, medical, civil engineer, contracting, communications, security and force support, and facilities and equipment valued at $2.2 billion; and executes a budget of $48 million. Tenants on Grand Forks AFB include the Air Force Audit Agency, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and the DHS. The installation is in Grand Forks County, near the North Dakota-Minnesota state boundary, north of and adjacent to the City of Emerado and is 15 miles west of the City of Grand Forks (see Figure 1-1).

The DFSP facility is approximately 13 miles from Grand Forks AFB, east of Interstate- (I) 29 and north of U.S. Highway 2 (US 2). DFSP-Grand Forks encompasses 11.25 acres on the north side of 27th Avenue North at the intersection of North 42nd Street, Grand Forks County, North Dakota. The facility was constructed in 1958 and 1959 and contains four aboveground petroleum storage tanks, three accessory tanks, several small aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and underground storage tanks (USTs), three bottom-loading truck racks, a 20-railroad-car loading facility (use discontinued in 1990), various additional equipment, and eight buildings containing support services. Figure 1-1 shows the location of the DFSP Facility (on the far right) and the associated pipeline segments. Figure 1-2 shows a close-up aerial view of the DFSP facility, with buildings, storage tanks, and other features identified.

The DFSP’s most recent mission was to receive, store, and distribute Defense Logistics Agency-owned JP-8 (aviation fuel) to Department of Defense (DOD) facilities. Table 1-1 provides information on the ASTs and USTs at the facility. The facility originally handled JP-4 and propeller plane fuel, but they were phased out with JP-8.

There are eight buildings at the DFSP facility: a driver’s shelter, an administration office, an emergency generator building, storage shed, generator storage and maintenance building with a fire pump room, fuel pump/manifold building, foam storage facility, and fuel sample facility (anti-static additive building). The DFSP includes fuel-loading areas for trucks and railroad cars (with multiple rail spurs), and four main bulk fuel storage tanks with concrete-lined containment pools. The emergency generator building houses two diesel-powered generators. The pumphouse room in the fuel pump/manifold building has multiple aboveground and underground pipelines and houses three diesel-powered generators.
Figure 1-1. Proposed Action’s Region of Influence and Key Local Features
Figure 1-2. Overhead View of DFSP Facility
Table 1-1. ASTs and USTs at DFSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tank No./ Type</th>
<th>Maximum Capacity (gallons)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year Installed</th>
<th>Product Stored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (AST)</td>
<td>2,310,000</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>JP-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (AST)</td>
<td>3,360,000</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>JP-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (AST)</td>
<td>3,360,000</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>JP-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (AST)</td>
<td>2,310,000</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>JP-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (AST)</td>
<td>30,240</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>JP-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (AST)</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Deicing agent FSII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (AST)</td>
<td>17,101</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Reclaimed fuel from truck rack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (AST)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Fire Pump Room</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>JP-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (AST)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pump/ Manifold Building</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>JP-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (UST)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Foam Building</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3% protein-based foam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (UST)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Foam Building</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3% protein-based foam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (UST)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Behind Generator Building</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (UST)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Cell 4</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Tank bottom water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (UST)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sample Shed</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Anti-static additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (UST)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sample Shed</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Anti-static additive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (UST)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Cell 4</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Tank bottom water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (UST)</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>South of Sample Shed</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Reclaimed fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (UST)</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>South of Admin. Bldg</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Reclaimed fuel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GFAFB 2003

There are two oil/water separators (OWSs) south of the pumphouse building; the second OWS was added to handle additional discharge. The separators have a storage capacity of 1,500 and 1,000 gallons and a throughput rate of 250 and 100 gallons per minute, respectively.

The smaller OWS is operational but the larger one is not currently functional because of the need for a new valve. The new valve has been acquired but has not yet been installed (LePier 2011). Both OWSs have been cleaned to remove petroleum substances. In addition, discharge tested in 2010 contained pure water and did not require any OWS cleaning.

All tanks that formerly contained hazardous materials have been drained and cleaned to meet federal, state, and local standards. Based on the findings of an Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS), it is possible that the buildings contain lead-based paint (LBP) (GFAFB 2003). Testing in 2003 has confirmed the transformers present at the DFSP do not contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), but it is possible some fluorescent light ballasts contain PCBs. No asbestos survey has been completed, but asbestos-containing material (ACM) was known to have been present on the facility based on documented removal of some ACM. Therefore, it is assumed ACM could still be present on the facility.
A security fence surrounds the depot with access available only through a gate off of 27th Avenue North. The terminal stored bulk petroleum for Grand Forks AFB and other Air Force and Air National Guard units (DESC 2009). The USAF purchased the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) DFSP facility in 1979 and private contractors operated it until the fuel terminal closed on 1 November 2007. The DLA was issued a USAF permit to operate the industrial facility. When the facility closed, the DLA requested the USAF terminate the permit. The DLA has a long-term permit on the DFSP property and associated infrastructure owned by the USAF. This permit is expiring and the USAF and DLA have no further need for the property or the associated infrastructure.

The DFSP pipeline consists of two segments: a 14.25-mile segment from Grand Forks AFB to the DFSP (GFAFB 2009) and a 0.87-mile segment from the DFSP to a pipeline terminal at the Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. facility approximately 1 mile south of the DFSP (GFAFB 2003). See Figure 1-1 for an overview of the location of the DFSP, Grand Forks AFB, Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. bulk storage facility, interconnecting pipelines, and sensitive resources in the vicinity of the Proposed Action. The pipeline is below ground except for where the pipeline starts at the DFSP, near the bulk fuel storage tanks at Grand Forks AFB, and Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. The pipeline is made of carbon steel, with a polyethylene butyl adhesive coating except for where a plastic resin coating is used in the locations where the pipeline was replaced to fix leaks.

The 14.25-mile pipeline and associated infrastructure including two low-point drains (one on each side of Kellys Slough), 28 cathodic test points, 5 cathodic rectifiers, and associated electrical boxes and lines extend from Grand Forks AFB to the DFSP approximately 1 mile north of US 2 along 19th Avenue Northeast and 27th Avenue North. The DFSP pipeline runs along a relatively straight line from Grand Forks AFB and enters south of the DFSP facility. The pipeline as originally installed has a diameter of 9 inches and is buried approximately 40 inches below ground surface (bgs). When repairs were done to correct leaks, the replacement pipe was 10 inches in diameter with adapters installed where connections were made to the original 9-inch-diameter pipeline (GFAFB 2003). See Figure 1-1 for the location where the 9-inch pipe was replaced with 10-inch pipe. The pipeline crosses under and through Grand Forks AFB, private farmlands, coulees, wetlands, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS] waterfowl production areas (WPAs), the Grand Forks International Airport (IAP), I-29, and several industrial areas. Kellys Slough USFWS National Wildlife Refuge [NWR] is just north of some portions of the DFSP pipeline. In addition, a segment of the pipeline is located along the northern edge of the Grand Forks Municipal Landfill, which is currently being capped and closed. Appendix A includes photographs of features of the DFSP facility, the pipeline, and associated infrastructure.

An 8-inch, underground, welded pipeline runs north from the Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. facility along the Burlington, Northern, and Santa Fe Railway (currently known as the BNSF Railway) railway grade and under 27th Avenue North to the DFSP. The 0.87-mile pipeline is buried approximately 40 inches below ground level and the pipeline passes near the western edge of the CENEX Harvest States Cooperative (an agricultural transport company), directly south of the DFSP facility and through agricultural land to the Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. facility. There are 8 cathodic protection test stations (sacrificial anodes) along this approximately 0.87-mile-long stretch of underground pipeline (GFAFB 2003).

Although past releases of fuels to groundwater have been documented at the DFSP, groundwater sampling has indicated that the contamination levels are below North Dakota Department of Health (NDDH) criteria levels. The NDDH issued a no further action (NFA) determination on 26 September 2003 concerning hydrocarbon contamination at the site. The most recent sampling of groundwater monitoring wells at the DFSP indicated all samples are below industrial use action levels (DLA 2010). In addition to releases at the DFSP, there have been three leaks in the pipeline between DFSP and Grand Forks AFB. The leaks occurred in April 1982 (approximately 100 gallons of JP-4), October 1988
(approximately 100 gallons of JP-4), and April 1992 (approximately 100 gallons of JP-4). The leaking pipe was replaced, contaminated soil excavated, and a determination of NFA was issued by NDDH. See Figure 1-1 for the locations of these past leaks.

An initial EBS for the termination of the permit between the DLA and the USAF for the DFSP facility and pipeline was conducted and finalized in September 2003 (GFAFB 2003). In summer 2009, an EBS addendum was completed for transferring the fuel depot property from DLA back to the USAF (GFAFB 2009). This addendum was updated in August 2010 to include groundwater sampling results from June 2010. This addendum concluded that no environmental changes have occurred since the initial EBS was prepared in 2003 (DLA 2010). Grand Forks AFB recently approved the EBS addendum on 31 August 2011.

Closure/mothballing activities included draining and water-washing the storage tanks; draining the OWSs; draining the generator and diesel engines; cleaning, draining, and pressurizing the pipeline (with inert nitrogen gas); removing batteries; and removing chemicals from the DFSP buildings. DLA has managed the DFSP facility and pipelines in accordance with a Operations and Maintenance Manual (DLA 1995), including pipeline abandonment and facility deactivation. Signage has been placed indicating that the storage tanks have been permanently closed in accordance with Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 112.2. Other than basic maintenance and environmental duties, no activities have taken place at the facility since 1 November 2007. Funding from DLA is continuing to be used for maintenance and management at the site.

As designed, stormwater moving from the site went through an OWS and was pumped off site. The pump is no longer operational and storm-water migrates off site with no sampling performed or required. The fuel depot facility has a wastewater permit for discharge of the storm water through the OWSs. The separators were regularly maintained during operation of the facility (cleaned out and inspected yearly), and are still being used to discharge water from containment areas through a lift station to a ditch on the south side of 27th Avenue North. The facility used to have an air emissions permit, but it was not renewed because no fuel is currently stored at the facility.

1.2 Purpose of and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to dispose of the DFSP, two segments of pipeline, and all associated infrastructure. The need for the Proposed Action is to reduce the costs to the USAF and DLA for maintenance and management of the system. This would remove the responsibility of the USAF to maintain and manage the DFSP facility, pipelines, associated infrastructure, and land, which are real property that is no longer needed by the USAF to support the 319 ABW mission.

1.3 Summary of Key Environmental Compliance Requirements

1.3.1 National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] Section 4321–4347) is a federal statute requiring the identification and analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with proposed actions before those actions are taken. The intent of NEPA is to help decisionmakers make well-informed decisions based on an understanding of the potential environmental consequences and take actions to protect, restore, or enhance the environment. NEPA established the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) that was charged with the development of implementing regulations and ensuring federal agency compliance with NEPA. The CEQ regulations mandate that all federal agencies use a prescribed structured approach to environmental impact analysis. This approach also requires federal agencies to use an interdisciplinary and systematic approach in their
decisionmaking process. This process evaluates potential environmental consequences associated with a proposed action and considers alternative courses of action.

The process for implementing NEPA is codified in Title 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508, *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act*. The CEQ was established under NEPA to implement and oversee federal policy in this process. The CEQ regulations specify that an EA be prepared to briefly provide evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)/Finding of No Practicable Alternative (FONPA), where a FONPA is appropriate (see Section 1.4.2), or whether the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is necessary. The EA can aid in an agency’s compliance with NEPA when an EIS is unnecessary and facilitate preparation of an EIS when one is required.


1.3.2 Integration of Other Environmental Statutes and Regulations

To comply with NEPA, the planning and decisionmaking process for actions proposed by federal agencies involves a study of other relevant environmental statutes and regulations. The NEPA process, however, does not replace procedural or substantive requirements of other environmental statutes and regulations. It addresses them collectively in the form of an EA or EIS, which enables the decisionmaker to have a comprehensive view of key environmental issues and requirements associated with the Proposed Action. According to CEQ regulations, the requirements of NEPA must be integrated “with other planning and environmental review procedures required by law or by agency so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively.”

1.3.3 The Scope of the Analysis

The EA will examine potential effects of the Proposed Action and alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, on 13 resource areas: air quality, noise, hazardous materials and waste, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, land use, socioeconomic resources, environmental justice, transportation, safety and occupational health, geological resources, and utilities and infrastructure. These resources were identified as being potentially affected by the Proposed Action and include applicable elements of the natural and human environments required by specific laws, regulations, Executive Orders (EOs), or policies.

1.3.4 Interagency and Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning (IICEP), Native American Tribal Consultation, and Public Involvement

**IICEP.** NEPA requirements help ensure that environmental information is made available to the public during the decisionmaking process and prior to actions being taken. The premise of NEPA is that the quality of federal decisions will be enhanced if proponents provide information to the public and involve the public in the planning process. The Intergovernmental Coordination Act and EO 12372, *Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs*, require federal agencies to cooperate with and consider state and local views in implementing a federal proposal. Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-7060, *Interagency and Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning*, requires the USAF to implement the IICEP process, which is used for the purpose of agency coordination and implements scoping requirements.
Through the IICEP process, Grand Forks AFB notifies relevant federal, state, and local agencies of the Proposed Action and alternatives and provides them sufficient time to make known their environmental concerns specific to the action. The IICEP process also provides Grand Forks AFB with the opportunity to cooperate with and consider state and local views in implementing the federal proposal. IICEP material related to this action will be included in Appendix B, and will be expanded throughout the EIAP process.

**Native American Tribal Consultation.** EO 13175, *Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments* (6 November 2000) directs federal agencies to coordinate and consult with Native American tribal governments whose interests might be directly and substantially affected by activities on federally administered lands. Consultation under EO 13175 is distinct from project-specific consultation with a tribe under NEPA or Section 106 of the NHPA, and has as a goal of building a dialogue and constructive, government-to-government relationship between a federal agency and a given tribal government. To comply with the various legal mandates, federally recognized tribes that are affiliated historically within the Grand Forks AFB geographic region are invited to consult on all proposed undertakings that have a potential to affect properties of cultural, historical, or religious significance to the tribes. Because many tribes were displaced from their original homelands, tribes with cultural roots in an area might not currently reside in the region where the undertaking is to occur. Effective consultation requires identification of tribes based on ethnographic and historical data and not simply a tribe’s current proximity to a project area. The tribal consultation process is distinct from NEPA coordination or the IICEP processes and requires separate notification of all relevant tribes by Grand Forks AFB. The timelines for tribal consultation are also distinct from those of intergovernmental consultations. The Grand Forks AFB Government representative point-of-contact for Native American tribes is the Installation Commander. The Grand Forks AFB Government point-of-contact for consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) is the Cultural Resources Manager.

To initiate early project-specific consultation regarding the Proposed Action under NEPA and Section 106 of the NHPA and in furtherance of its broader consultation responsibilities to the tribes, Grand Forks AFB sent a letter requesting consultation to each affiliated tribe. The letter describes the Proposed Action and asks the tribe to identify any concerns that it may have. Consultation regarding specific proposed projects must begin very early in the process. Grand Forks AFB continues its broader consultation government-to-government relationships with affiliated federally recognized tribes on an on-going basis. A list of all Native American tribal governments consulted regarding this action is included in Appendix B.

**Public Involvement.** Concurrent with the completion of the Draft EA, a Notice of Availability (NOA) will be published in the *Grand Forks Herald* and the Draft EA will be made available to the public for a 30-day review period. The NOA will be issued to solicit comments on the Proposed Action and involve the local community in the decisionmaking process. Public and agency comments on the Draft EA will be considered prior to a decision being made as to whether or not to sign a FONSI/FONPA.
2. Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives

This section describes the six alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, which have been evaluated to implement the USAF’s proposal to dispose of the DFSP facility, two segments of pipeline, and associated infrastructure. This section also describes the decision to be made and identifies the Preferred Alternative.

2.1 Alternative 1 – Disposal of the Intact DFSP Facility, Short Segment of Pipeline, and Long Segment of Pipeline

Under Alternative 1, the 319 ABW proposes disposal of the intact DFSP facility, pipelines, and associated infrastructure through the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) by transferring or selling the DFSP facility and associated infrastructure, and both segments of pipeline, to another entity. The two segments of pipeline include a 14.25-mile segment between Grand Forks AFB and the DFSP facility and a 0.87-mile segment between the DFSP facility and the Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. facility.

Disposing of the land and associated infrastructure associated with the DFSP facility and pipeline requires the USAF to oversee DLA maintenance of the property in a stabilized state that does not pose or create a hazard to health and safety in compliance with existing federal, state, and local environmental laws. The DFSP facility and pipelines are in compliance with NDDH, USEPA, and other requirements. Documentation supporting the transfer would include asbestos survey data and other environmental sampling and reporting information. The USAF would then dispose of the property associated with the DFSP facility and pipelines by transfer or sale through GSA. All easements would be reassigned to the new owner of the facility through GSA.

Pipeline marker signs associated with underground segments of the pipeline and aboveground facilities would be left in place. If the new owner decided to remove the pipeline, the land would need to be restored to its original conditions after pipeline removal is completed.

2.2 Alternative 2 - Disposal of the DFSP Facility, Short Segment of Pipeline, and Long Segment of Pipeline

Under Alternative 2, the 319 ABW proposes to dispose of the DFSP facility and associated infrastructure through the GSA by transferring or selling the DFSP facility and associated infrastructure, and both segments of pipeline, to another entity. However, both pipeline segments’ associated infrastructure would be demolished. The two segments of pipeline include a 14.25-mile segment between Grand Forks AFB and the DFSP facility and a 0.87-mile segment between the DFSP facility and the Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P. facility. The estimated timeframe for the demolition process would be several months (typically mid-April to early November), and could potentially occur within one construction season depending on the start date of the process.

Disposing of the land and associated infrastructure associated with the DFSP facility and pipeline requires the USAF to restore the property to a stabilized state that does not pose or create a hazard to health and safety in compliance with existing federal, state, and local environmental laws. The DFSP facility and pipelines are in compliance with NDDH, USEPA, and other requirements. Prior to disposition, the USAF would conduct an asbestos survey and all friable asbestos would be encapsulated or removed from the facilities. The USAF would then dispose of the property associated with the DFSP facility and pipelines by transfer or sale to GSA. All easements would be either reassigned (if associated with a segment of the pipeline that would be reused) or terminated.
Easements are currently active with a variety of entities including BNSF Railway; private owners; and Blooming, Falconer, and Rye townships. The easement agreement with BNSF Railway currently requires either the U.S. Government (the USACE is the U.S. Government signatory authority) to remove the pipeline and restore the land for continued railroad use upon termination of the easement, or the railroad would remove the pipeline and bill the U.S. Government. The easements with BNSF Railway would need to be reassigned to preclude the requirement to remove the pipeline beneath the BNSF Railway railroad grade. The other easements do not require removal of the pipeline upon termination of the easement. However, if the pipeline were removed, the land would need to be restored to its original conditions after pipeline removal is completed.

Demolition of all surface infrastructure along the pipelines would include low-point drains, cathodic test points, cathodic rectifiers, and associated electrical boxes and lines. If demolition would expose soils contaminated above North Dakota state action levels, removal or remediation would be required and performed. Pipeline marker signs associated with underground segments of the pipeline to be abandoned would be left in place. Pipeline marker signs associated with aboveground facilities to be demolished would be removed (GFAFB 2010). The metal and possibly other materials recovered from the demolished infrastructure that can be recycled would be recycled, and non-recyclable material would be disposed in local construction debris landfills. Hazardous components would be recovered and disposed of in accordance with U.S. and North Dakota requirements.

Removal of low-point drains and other infrastructure along the pipelines would disturb vegetation and likely result in impacts on wetlands and other waters of the United States. Wetland impacts would need to be addressed in compliance with EO 11990 and Clean Water Act requirements (including Section 404 permitting). Demolition of the infrastructure would involve ground disturbance by construction equipment such as backhoes, bulldozers, graders, and dump trucks. The disturbances would occur only in the area of infrastructure, with surface disturbance on the order of up to several feet in localized areas. After disturbance, the area would be regraded and revegetated with appropriate vegetation (which in most cases would be vegetation native to this region). In the areas of wetland disturbance, restoration with native wetland vegetation would be performed.

2.3 Alternative 3: Disposal of the DFSP Facility and Remaining Short Segment of Pipeline and Abandon the Long Segment of Pipeline

Alternative 3 would be identical to Alternative 2 with the exception that the 14.25-mile-long segment of pipeline would be abandoned. The USAF would demolish the eight cathodic protection test stations (sacrificial anodes) along the short pipeline. If demolition would expose soils contaminated above North Dakota state action levels, removal or remediation would be required and performed. All easements would be either reassigned (if associated with a segment of the pipeline that would be reused) or terminated. The estimated timeframe for the demolition process would be several months (typically mid-April to early November), and could potentially occur within one construction season depending on the start date of the process.

Easements are currently active with a variety of entities including BNSF Railway; private owners; and Blooming, Falconer, and Rye townships. The easement agreement with BNSF Railway currently requires either the U.S. Government (the USACE is the U.S. Government signatory authority) to remove the pipeline and restore the land for continued railroad use upon termination of the easement, or the railroad would remove the pipeline and bill the U.S. Government. The easements with BNSF Railway would need to be reassigned to preclude the requirement to remove the pipeline beneath the BNSF Railway railroad grade. The other easements do not require removal of the pipeline upon termination of the
easement. However, if the pipeline were removed, the land would need to be restored to its original conditions after pipeline removal has been completed.

Federal regulations for reporting of abandonment of pipelines apply for crossing of navigable waterways (49 CFR 195), but there are no waterways of that classification located along the existing DLA pipelines. There are no known North Dakota or local requirements for abandonment of fuel pipelines. Abandonment would be done in accordance with DLA’s Operation and Maintenance Manual and best management practices. In addition, the USAF would cap the 14.25-mile-long pipeline at strategic locations such as under roadways or the airport and fill the pipeline with concrete, bentonite, or other inert material to lessen the potential of the pipeline from becoming exposed from yearly frost. The underground segments of the pipeline would be abandoned in place. Pipeline marker signs associated with underground segments of the pipeline to be abandoned would be left in place. Pipeline marker signs associated with aboveground facilities to be demolished would be removed (GFAFB 2010).

Construction equipment required and construction processes performed would be similar to those described for Alternative 2. Additionally, concrete trucks and tankers would likely be used to facilitate abandonment of the 14.25-mile-long pipeline by capping and filling the pipeline with inert material.

2.4 Alternative 4: Disposal of the Demolished DFSP Facility, Reuse Short Segment of Pipeline, and Abandon the Long Segment of Pipeline

Alternative 4 differs from Alternative 2 in that the DFSP facility would be demolished, and the 0.87-mile-long segment of pipeline would not be abandoned and would be available for reuse. However, the USAF would demolish the eight cathodic protection test stations (sacrificial anodes) along the short pipeline. The easements with BNSF Railway would need to be reassigned to preclude the requirement to remove the pipeline beneath the BNSF Railway railroad grade.

Demolishing the DFSP facility’s associated infrastructure would include the USAF demolishing all DFSP facility buildings, tanks, containment areas, structures, infrastructure (including the OWSs), and pavements. Disposing of the land associated with the DFSP facility and pipeline requires the USAF to restore the property to a stabilized state that does not pose or create a hazard to health and safety in compliance with existing federal, state, and local environmental laws. ASTs, buildings and their foundations, and various infrastructure would be removed. Subsurface piping and USTs would be closed in place in accordance with NDHD requirements. If demolition would expose soils contaminated above North Dakota state action levels, removal or remediation would be required and performed. Disposal of the demolished DFSP facility and restored land would occur by transfer or sale to GSA. The estimated timeframe for the demolition process would be several months (typically mid-April to early November), and could potentially occur within one construction season depending on the start date of the process.

Abandonment of the 14.25-mile-long pipeline and reassignment or termination of easements would be done in the same manner as explained for Alternative 2. Construction equipment required and construction processes performed would be similar to those described for the demolition activities along the pipeline as described for Alternative 2. In addition, more specialized construction equipment (such as cranes, shear attachment for crane, flatbed trucks, and excavators) would be required for demolition of the facilities at the DFSP. Large quantities of metal and other remnants of the facilities would be recovered for recycling.
2.5 Alternative 5: Disposal of the Demolished DFSP Facility and Abandon the Short and Long Segments of Pipeline

Alternative 5 includes demolition of all DFSP facility associated infrastructure, abandoning the 14.25-mile and 0.87-mile DFSP pipeline segments in place, and demolishing associated pipeline infrastructure. The USAF would demolish all DFSP facility buildings, tanks, containment areas, structures, infrastructure, and pavements. Disposing of the land associated with the DFSP facility and pipeline requires the USAF to restore the property to a stabilized state that does not pose or create a hazard to health and safety in compliance with existing federal, state, and local environmental laws. ASTs, buildings and their foundations, and various infrastructure would be removed. Subsurface piping and USTs would be closed in place in accordance with NDDH requirements. If demolition would expose soils contaminated above North Dakota state action levels, soil removal or remediation would be required and performed. The estimated timeframe for the demolition process would be several months (typically mid-April to early November), and could potentially occur within one construction season depending on the start date of the process.

Abandonment of the 14.25-mile-long and 0.87-mile-long pipelines and termination of easements would be done in the same manner as explained for the 14.25-mile-long pipeline under Alternative 3. Construction equipment required and construction processes performed would be similar to those described for the demolition and abandonment activities as described for Alternative 4, with some additional land disturbance associated with abandonment of the 0.87-mile pipeline.

Disposal of the demolished DFSP facility and restored land would occur by transfer or sale to GSA.

2.6 Alternative 6 - No Action Alternative

CEQ regulations require consideration of the No Action Alternative for all proposed actions. The No Action Alternative serves as a baseline against which the impacts of the Proposed Action and other potential alternatives can be compared and consequently it would be carried forward for further evaluation in the EA.

Under the No Action Alternative, the USAF would not dispose of the DFSP facility, two segments of pipeline, and associated infrastructure, which would result in the continuation of the existing condition. The permit between DLA and the USAF would be canceled, and the USAF would accept the DFSP from DLA. The USAF would be required to maintain and manage the DFSP facility, associated infrastructure, and pipeline, which would include maintaining pressure in the pipeline with nitrogen, paying landowners for easements, and paying for and maintaining regulatory permits. This would result in substantial costs to the USAF for facilities and infrastructure that would no longer be in use. In addition, DFSP facilities and associated infrastructure would continue to deteriorate over time.

2.7 Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Further Analysis

An alternative that was considered but eliminated from further detailed analysis involved demolishing the entire DFSP facility and associated infrastructure and both segments of the pipeline, along with the infrastructure associated with the facility and pipelines (including removal of the pipelines at all locations except beneath critical infrastructure such as the Interstate system and Grand Forks IAP runways and taxiways). After demolition was completed, the property associated with the DFSP would be disposed of by transfer or sale to GSA, and the easements would be terminated. However, due to the anticipated environmental impacts on farmland, wetlands, streams, and wildlife habitats; 19th Avenue Northeast and
27th Avenue North; Grand Forks IAP land; and other resources, this alternative is not considered environmentally desirable. Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from further detailed analysis.

Another alternative considered but eliminated from further analysis was to convert the existing DFSP facility, pipelines, and infrastructure into a biofuels plant using an enhanced use lease (EUL). However, results of a feasibility study concluded that a biofuels EUL would not be financially viable under current economic conditions. Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from further detailed analysis.

2.8 Decision to be Made and Identification of the Preferred Alternative

The EA will support decisionmaking as to whether or not further environmental analysis must be accomplished in the form of an EIS. Implementation of Alternative 1 is the Preferred Alternative. The EA will also provide information to help decide which alternative to select.
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Representative Photos of the DFSP, Pipelines, and Infrastructure
Appendix A

Representative Photos of DFSP, Pipelines, and Infrastructure

DFSP Pipelines Aboveground at GFAFB

Administrative Building at DFSP

Aboveground Storage Tanks and Generator Building at DFSP

Cathodic Rectifier Above DFSP Pipeline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low-Point Drain Along DFSP Pipeline by Kelly Slough</th>
<th>Fuel Loading Area at DFSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manifold and Generator Buildings at DFSP</td>
<td>Piping Inside Manifold Building at DFSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Abandoned Railroad Spur at DFSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Generator Inside Manifold Building at DFSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>DFSP Pipeline Aboveground on Magellan Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>DFSP Pipeline Inside Magellan Manifold Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsurface DFSP Pipeline Paralleling Gravel Road with Pipeline Marker in Distance</td>
<td>DFSP Pipeline Beneath Flood Control Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFSP Pipeline Adjacent to Grand Forks International Airport</td>
<td>DFSP Pipeline Along N. 42nd Street Near DFSP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

INTERAGENCY AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING (IICEP), NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBAL CONSULTATION, AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT CORRESPONDENCE
Interagency and Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning Distribution List

The Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives (DOPAA), prepared to support the preparation of the Environmental Assessment, was made available to the following agencies listed below for a 30-day review period to solicit their comments on the Proposed Action.

USEPA Region 8
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, CO 80202-1129

Mr. Jeff Towner
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
North Dakota Field Office
3425 Miriam Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58501-7926

U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Migratory Bird Office
P.O. Box 25486 DFC
Denver, CO 80225

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
2397 DeMers Avenue
Grand Forks, ND 58201

Bismarck Regulatoy Office
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
1513 South 12th Street
Bismarck, ND 58504

Dr. Terry Dwelle, State Health Officer
North Dakota Department of Health
600 East Boulevard Avenue
Department 301
Bismarck, ND 58505-0200

Department of Energy
Western Area Power Administration
ND Maintenance Office
P.O. Box 1173
Bismarck, ND 58202-1173

Division of Community Services
ND Department of Commerce
1600 East Century Avenue, Suite 2
P.O. Box 2057
Bismarck, ND 58202-2057

North Dakota State Water Commission
900 East Boulevard Avenue, Dept 770
Bismarck, ND 58505-0850

Mr. Terry Steinwand, Commissioner
North Dakota Game and Fish
100 North Bismarck Expressway
Bismarck, ND 58505-5095

Mr. Merlan E. Paaverud
State Historic Preservation Officer
State Historical Society of North Dakota
612 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58505-0830

Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Indian Affairs Commission
600 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58505-0300

Mr. Steve Crandall, Park Manager
Turtle River State Park
3084 Park Avenue
Arvillo, ND 58214

Grand Forks County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Box 6372
Grand Forks, ND 58206-6372

Ms. Amanda Hillman, Watershed Coordinator
Grand Forks County Soil Conservation District
4775 Technology Circle STE 1C
Grand Forks, ND 58203

Polk County Board of Commissioners
612 North Broadway, Suite 215
Crookston, MN 56716

City of Grand Forks
P.O. Box 6372
Grand Forks, ND 58206-5200
Grand Forks Municipal Solid Waste Landfill
724 North 47th Street
Grand Forks, ND 58203

Mr. Will Moore
Defense Logistics Agency
400 Eielson Street, Building 408
Grand Forks AFB, ND 58205

North Dakota Department of Transportation
608 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58505-0700

Mr. Larry LePier
LePier Oil Company
320 East 1st Street, Highway 2
Fosston, MN 56542

UND Aerospace Administration
Grand Forks International Airport
Airport Drive
Grand Forks, ND 58203

Mr. Mark Haugen
Magellan Midstream Partners, L.P.
3930 Gateway Drive
Grand Forks, ND 58201

Mr. Patrick Dame, Executive Director
Grand Forks Regional Airport Authority
2787 Airport Drive
Grand Forks, ND 58203

Mr. Mark R. Fisher
District Wildlife Biologist - DLWMD
PO Box 908
221 2nd St. NW STE 2
Devils Lake, ND 58301

Mr. Stephen Deatherage, DLA Project Manager
8725 John J. Kingman Suite 2828
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

Mr. Todd Feland, Public Works Director
Grand Forks Municipal Solid Waste Landfill
724 North 47th Street
Grand Forks, ND 58203
The DOPAA, prepared to support the preparation of the Environmental Assessment, was made available to the following Native American tribes listed as follows to solicit their comments on the Proposed Action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Lake Tribe</td>
<td>Myra Pearson, Chairwoman</td>
<td>P.O. Box 359, Fort Totten, ND 58335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Rock Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>Charles W. Murphy, Chairman</td>
<td>P.O. Box D, Fort Yates, ND 58538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Affiliated Tribes</td>
<td>Tex G. Hall, Chairman</td>
<td>P.O. Box D, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>Merle St. Claire, Chairman</td>
<td>404 Frontage Road, New Town, ND 58763-9402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>Kevin Keckler, Sr., Chairman</td>
<td>4180 Highway 281, Belcourt, ND 58316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow Creek Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>Duane Big Eagle</td>
<td>590 Frontage Road, New Town, ND 58763-9402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>Anthony Reider, President</td>
<td>5720 6th Street NW, Suite E, Cass Lake, MN 56633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Brule Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>Michael Jandreau, Chairman</td>
<td>57548-0187, Lower Brule, SD 57548-0187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oglala Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>John Yellow Bird Steele, President</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2070, Pine Ridge, SD 57770-2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebud Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>Rodney Bordeaux, Chairman</td>
<td>P.O. Box 430, Rosebud, SD 57570-0430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate</td>
<td>Robert Shepherd, Chairman</td>
<td>P.O. Box 509, Agency Village, SD 57262-0509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebud Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>Robert Cournoyer, Chairman</td>
<td>P.O. Box 248, Marty, SD 57361-0248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Chippewa Tribe</td>
<td>Kevin Leecy, Chairman</td>
<td>3444 Lakeshore Drive, Nett Lake, MN 55772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Chippewa Tribe</td>
<td>Karen R. Diver, Chairwoman</td>
<td>1720 Big Lake Road, Cloquet, MN 55720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Chippewa Tribe</td>
<td>Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe</td>
<td>115 6th Street NW, Suite E, Cass Lake, MN 56633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Chippewa Tribe</td>
<td>Arthur LaRose, Chairman</td>
<td>6401 Lakeshore Drive, Nett Lake, MN 55772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Chippewa Tribe</td>
<td>Erma Vizenor, Chairwoman</td>
<td>1050 4th Street NW, Suite E, Cass Lake, MN 56633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B-3
Minnesota Chippewa Tribe
Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe
Marge A. Anderson, Chief Executive
43408 Oodena
Onamia, MN 56359

Minnesota Chippewa Tribe
Grand Portage Band
P.O. Box 428
Grand Portage, MN 55605

Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians
Floyd “Buck” Jourdain, Chairman
P.O. Box 550
Red Lake, MN 56671

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community
Stanley R. Crooks, Chairman
2330 Sioux Trail NW
Prior Lake, MN 55372

Upper Sioux Indian Community
Kevin Jensvold, Chairman
P.O. Box 147
Granite Falls, MN 56241

Lower Sioux Indian Community
Gabe Prescott, President
P.O. Box 308
Morton, MN 56270

Prairie Island Indian Community
Victoria Winfrey, President
5636 Sturgeon Lake Road
Welch, MN 55088