

DOCUMENT

I 1.

98:

AN 4 X

PROPERTY OF
Agricultural Engineering Dept.
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY



3 0109 00091 6893

Final Environmental Statement
ANG Coal
Gasification Company
(ANGCGC)
North Dakota Project
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program



51

H

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
INT FES 78-1

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

ANG COAL
GASIFICATION COMPANY
(ANGCGC)


NORTH DAKOTA PROJECT.

PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM

PREPARED BY
UPPER MISSOURI REGION
U. S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION .
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NORTH DAKOTA
STATE UNIVERSITY
APR 28 2003
LIBRARIES

Jan. 20, 1978


R. Keith Hodgson
Commissioner

N. D. S. U. LIBRARY
FARGO, N. D.

TD
195
G3
U55
1978

SUMMARY

() Draft (X) Final Environmental Statement

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Missouri Region

1. Type of action: (X) Administrative () Legislative

2. Brief description of action:

The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to make available to ANG Coal Gasification Company (ANGCGC) 17,000 acre-feet of water annually for coal gasification needs from Garrison Reservoir through a 40-year water service contract. The gasification complex, to be located in southwestern (Mercer County) North Dakota, would produce 250 million cubic feet per day of synthetic natural gas for use in the Michigan and Wisconsin market areas. The water intake, coal and ash handling, and plant access systems would be shared with an adjacent 880 MW coal-fired powerplant proposed by Basin Electric Power Cooperative.

3. Summary of environmental impact and adverse environmental effects:

Starting in 1988, the combined ANCGC and Basin Electric projects would emit 14,665 pounds of sulfur dioxide, 6,143 pounds of nitrogen oxides, and 693 pounds of particulates each hour. These emissions would adversely affect existing ambient air quality and visibility. Surface waters would be temporarily degraded from mining and construction of a 365-mile product gas pipeline which would traverse 86 water areas. Ground water quantity and quality could be altered by aquifer disturbance and leachates from ash and other solid wastes buried in the mined area. The gasification plant and associated facilities would occupy about 600 acres of land; mining activity would disturb about 12,500 acres over the 25-year life of the plant. Land disturbance would temporarily destroy wildlife habitat and agricultural land and even with successful reclamation the wildlife habitat would be permanently altered. The proposed ANCGC and Basin Electric projects would cause a peak influx of about 6,200 persons during construction and about 4,800 persons during operations into a presently rural area. This population influx would cause significant effects on existing social systems and infra-structures.

4. Alternatives considered;

Alternatives considered include: No project; alternate sources of natural gas; alternate locations; alternate processes and process units; alternate use of resources; and alternate sources of energy.

5. Statements are being distributed to the following:

List of agencies from whom comments have been requested is attached.

6. Date of draft statement made available to CEQ and the public:

Draft Statement: March 17, 1977

Final Statement: *January 20, 1978*

LIST OF ENTITIES FROM WHOM COMMENTS HAVE BEEN REQUESTED
OR RECEIVED WITH RESPONDENTS INDICATED BY "*"

A. Statements distributed by the Commissioner of Reclamation for
review and comment:

Department of the Interior:

Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
*Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
*Director, National Park Service
Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs
*Director, Geological Survey
*Director, Bureau of Mines
*Director, Bureau of Land Management

Department of Agriculture

*Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Secretary, Department of Defense

*Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

*Secretary, Department of State

Secretary, Department of Transportation

Regional Director, Department of Housing and Urban Development,
Denver, Colorado

*Regional Director, Environmental Protection Agency, Denver,
Colorado

*Chairman, Federal Power Commission

*Administrator, Energy Research and Development Administration

Administrator, Federal Energy Administration

B. Statements distributed by the Regional Director for information
only:

Department of the Interior:

Field Representative, Missouri Basin Region, Denver, Colorado
Missouri River Basin Planning Officer, Omaha, Nebraska
*Area Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Aberdeen,
South Dakota
State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Billings, Montana
Chief, Intermountain Field Operation Center, Bureau of
Mines, Denver, Colorado
Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver,
Colorado

SUMMARY

() Draft (X) Final Environmental Statement

Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Upper Missouri Region

1. Type of action: (X) Administrative () Legislative

2. Brief description of action:

The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to make available to ANG Coal Gasification Company (ANGCGC) 17,000 acre-feet of water annually for coal gasification needs from Garrison Reservoir through a 40-year water service contract. The gasification complex, to be located in southwestern (Mercer County) North Dakota, would produce 250 million cubic feet per day of synthetic natural gas for use in the Michigan and Wisconsin market areas. The water intake, coal and ash handling, and plant access systems would be shared with an adjacent 880 MW coal-fired powerplant proposed by Basin Electric Power Cooperative.

3. Summary of environmental impact and adverse environmental effects:

Starting in 1988, the combined ANCGC and Basin Electric projects would emit 14,665 pounds of sulfur dioxide, 6,143 pounds of nitrogen oxides, and 693 pounds of particulates each hour. These emissions would adversely affect existing ambient air quality and visibility. Surface waters would be temporarily degraded from mining and construction of a 365-mile product gas pipeline which would traverse 86 water areas. Ground water quantity and quality could be altered by aquifer disturbance and leachates from ash and other solid wastes buried in the mined area. The gasification plant and associated facilities would occupy about 600 acres of land; mining activity would disturb about 12,500 acres over the 25-year life of the plant. Land disturbance would temporarily destroy wildlife habitat and agricultural land and even with successful reclamation the wildlife habitat would be permanently altered. The proposed ANCGC and Basin Electric projects would cause a peak influx of about 6,200 persons during construction and about 4,800 persons during operations into a presently rural area. This population influx would cause significant effects on existing social systems and infra-structures.

4. Alternatives considered;

Alternatives considered include: No project; alternate sources of natural gas; alternate locations; alternate processes and process units; alternate use of resources; and alternate sources of energy.

5. Statements are being distributed to the following:

List of agencies from whom comments have been requested is attached.

6. Date of draft statement made available to CEQ and the public:

Draft Statement: March 17, 1977

Final Statement: *January 20, 1978*

LIST OF ENTITIES FROM WHOM COMMENTS HAVE BEEN REQUESTED
OR RECEIVED WITH RESPONDENTS INDICATED BY "*"

A. Statements distributed by the Commissioner of Reclamation for
review and comment:

Department of the Interior:

- Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- *Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
- *Director, National Park Service
- Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs
- *Director, Geological Survey
- *Director, Bureau of Mines
- *Director, Bureau of Land Management

Department of Agriculture

*Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Secretary, Department of Defense

*Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

*Secretary, Department of State

Secretary, Department of Transportation

Regional Director, Department of Housing and Urban Development,
Denver, Colorado

*Regional Director, Environmental Protection Agency, Denver,
Colorado

*Chairman, Federal Power Commission

*Administrator, Energy Research and Development Administration

Administrator, Federal Energy Administration

B. Statements distributed by the Regional Director for information
only:

Department of the Interior:

- Field Representative, Missouri Basin Region, Denver, Colorado
- Missouri River Basin Planning Officer, Omaha, Nebraska
- *Area Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Aberdeen,
South Dakota
- State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Billings, Montana
- Chief, Intermountain Field Operation Center, Bureau of
Mines, Denver, Colorado
- Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver,
Colorado

Department of the Interior (continued):

- *Area Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bismarck, North Dakota
- Regional Hydrologist, Water Resources Division, Geological Survey Denver, Colorado
- Regional Director, National Park Service, Denver, Colorado
- North Central Reservoir Investigations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pierre, South Dakota

Department of Agriculture:

- Farmers Home Administration, Bismarck, North Dakota
- State Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Bismarck, North Dakota
- *Rural Electrification Administration, Washington, D.C.
- *Forest Service, Missoula, Montana

Department of the Army:

- *District Engineer, U.S. Army Engineer District, Corps of Engineers, Omaha, Nebraska

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

- Regional Director, U.S. Public Health Service, Denver, Colorado

Department of Transportation:

- Division Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, Bismarck, North Dakota

Federal Power Commission:

- Regional Engineer, Federal Power Commission, Chicago, Illinois

Energy Research and Development Administration:

- Manager, Field Office, Chicago, Illinois

Chairman, Missouri River Basin Commission, Omaha, Nebraska

C. Statements distributed by the Regional Director inviting comments:

State of North Dakota:

- Governor of North Dakota, Bismarck
- *North Dakota State Planning Agency, Bismarck^{1/} (For distribution to State agencies.)
- Superintendent, State Historical Society, Bismarck
- *North Dakota Game and Fish Department, Bismarck
- *State Attorney General, Bismarck
- *North Dakota Regional EIS, Bismarck
- *North Dakota Geological Survey, Grand Forks
- *North Dakota Park Service, Mandan
- *State Health Department, Bismarck
- *North Dakota Highway Department, Bismarck
- *Regional Environmental Assessment Program, Bismarck

1/ State Clearinghouse

County Commissioners:

Mercer County
Oliver County
Dunn County

City Governments:

Bismarck	Center
Beulah	Dodge
Hazen	Halliday
Golden Valley	Riverdale
Stanton	Killdeer

State of Minnesota:

Governor of Minnesota, St. Paul^{1/}
State Planning Agency, St. Paul^{1/}
*Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul

Others:

Three Affiliated Tribes Business Council, New Town, North Dakota
Regional Governor, Izaak Walton League, Minot, North Dakota
Environmental Defense Fund, East Setauket, New York
Director, Midwest Region, Nature Conservancy, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Central Environmental Council, NDSU, Fargo, North Dakota
*North Dakota Natural Science Society, Jamestown, North Dakota
Institute of Ecological Studies, UND, Grand Forks, North Dakota
North Dakota Wildlife Federation, Bismarck, North Dakota
Northern Environmental Council, Duluth, Minnesota
North Dakota Chapter, The Wildlife Society, Jamestown, North Dakota
Field Representative, National Audubon Society, Jamestown,
North Dakota
Field Representative, Wildlife Management Institute, Firth,
Nebraska
United Plainsmen, Bismarck, North Dakota
Lewis and Clark Environmental Association, Bismarck, North Dakota
North Dakota Section, Sierra Club, Minot, North Dakota
North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown, North Dakota
*Otter Tail Power Company, Fergus Falls, Minnesota
*American Natural Gas Service Company, Detroit, Michigan
*Iowa Confederation of Environmental Organizations, Ames, Iowa
*Mercer County Landowners, Beulah, North Dakota

^{1/} State Clearinghouse

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Description of Proposed Project	1-1
1.1 Brief Description of Proposed Project and of Companies Involved	1-1
1.2 Purpose and Need	1-3
1.2.1 Domestic Energy Supply and Demand	1-3
1.2.2 Need for Project	1-6
1.3 Permits, Approvals, and Certifications Required . .	1-9
1.4 Relationship to Other Projects	1-11
1.4.1 Industrial	1-11
1.4.2 Governmental	1-13
1.5 Detailed Project Description	1-15
1.5.1 Location	1-15
1.5.2 Land Requirements	1-15
1.5.3 Coal Mining	1-18
1.5.3.1 General	1-18
1.5.3.2 Mining Operations and Reclamation . .	1-23
1.5.4 Coal Gasification Plant	1-27
1.5.4.1 General	1-27
1.5.4.2 Coal Preparation, Storage, and Handling	1-29
1.5.4.3 Storage Reclaim System	1-33
1.5.4.4 Screening System	1-33
1.5.4.5 Gasifier Feed System	1-34
1.5.4.6 Gasification Units	1-34
1.5.4.7 Utilities	1-42
1.5.5 Pollution Control and Abatement	1-46
1.5.5.1 General	1-46
1.5.5.2 Wastewater Treatment	1-46
1.5.5.3 Gaseous Effluent System	1-48
1.5.5.4 Cooling Facilities	1-53
1.5.5.5 Solid Wastes	1-57
1.5.5.6 Byproducts	1-58

	<u>Page No.</u>
1.5.6 Associated Systems	1-59
1.5.6.1 Product Gas Pipeline	1-59
1.5.6.2 Water Intake and Pipeline	1-64
1.5.6.3 Railroad Spur	1-67
1.5.7 Maintenance Procedures	1-67
2. Description of Existing Environment	2-1
2.1 Physical Environment	2-1
2.1.1 Climate	2-1
2.1.2 Air	2-3
2.1.2.1 Meteorology	2-3
2.1.2.2 Quality	2-6
2.1.2.3 Noise	2-11
2.1.2.4 Odor	2-14
2.1.3 Water	2-14
2.1.3.1 Hydrology	2-14
2.1.3.2 Quality	2-39
2.1.4 Physiography	2-46
2.1.4.1 Regional Physiography	2-46
2.1.4.2 Geology	2-48
2.1.4.3 Soils	2-51
2.1.4.4 Geological Hazards	2-53
2.1.4.5 Land Use	2-56
2.2 Biological Environment	2-57
2.2.1 General	2-57
2.2.2 Terrestrial Plant Communities	2-58
2.2.2.1 Agricultural	2-58
2.2.2.2 Prairie	2-61
2.2.2.3 Wetland	2-64
2.2.2.4 Woodlands	2-66

	<u>Page No.</u>
2.2.3 Terrestrial Fauna	2-67
2.2.3.1 Birds	2-67
2.2.3.2 Mammals	2-71
2.2.3.3 Amphibians and Reptiles	2-74
2.2.4 Aquatic Ecosystems	2-74
2.2.4.1 Renner Bay (Lake Sakakawea)	2-74
2.2.4.2 Knife River Basin	2-76
2.2.4.3 Product Pipeline Route	2-77
2.2.5 Unique Biological Resources	2-79
2.2.5.1 Unique Ecosystems	2-79
2.2.5.2 Endangered Species	2-79
2.3 Socioeconomic Environment	2-80
2.3.1 Demography	2-80
2.3.2 Economy	2-80
2.3.3 Community Services	2-88
2.4 Sociocultural Environment	2-93
2.4.1 Indian Culture	2-93
2.4.2 Non-Indian Culture	2-96
2.4.3 Historic and Archaeological Features	2-96
2.5 Future Environment Without the Proposed Project	2-100
3. Environmental Impacts of Proposed Action	3-1
3.1 Impacts on the Physical Environment	3-1
3.1.1 Air	3-1
3.1.1.1 Climate	3-1
3.1.1.2 Air Quality	3-1
3.1.1.3 Cumulative Impact on Air Quality - ANGCGC and Basin Electric	3-9
3.1.1.4 Odor	3-17
3.1.1.5 Noise	3-18

	<u>Page No.</u>
3.1.2 Water	3-22
3.1.2.1 Surface Water	3-22
3.1.2.2 Ground Water	3-25
3.1.3 Physiography	3-30
3.2 Impacts on the Biological Environment	3-33
3.2.1 Terrestrial Flora	3-33
3.2.1.1 Plantsite	3-33
3.2.1.2 Surface Mining	3-34
3.2.1.3 Water Intake and Pipeline	3-38
3.2.1.4 Railroad Spur	3-38
3.2.1.5 Product Pipeline	3-39
3.2.1.6 Analysis of Impacts to Terrestrial Flora	3-41
3.2.2 Terrestrial Fauna	3-43
3.2.2.1 Plantsite	3-43
3.2.2.2 Surface Mining	3-43
3.2.2.3 Water Intake and Pipeline	3-44
3.2.2.4 Railroad Spur	3-45
3.2.2.5 Product Pipeline	3-45
3.2.2.6 Analysis of Impacts to Terrestrial Fauna	3-46
3.2.3 Analysis of Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems . .	3-48
3.3 Cumulative Impacts on the Socioeconomic Environment - ANGCGC and Basin Electric	3-50
3.3.1 Economic Factors	3-51
3.3.1.1 Anticipated Worker Requirements . . .	3-51
3.3.1.2 Population Impacts	3-56
3.3.1.3 Income and General Economic Conditions	3-58
3.3.1.4 Summary and Analysis of Economic Impacts	3-62

	<u>Page No.</u>
3.3.2 Impacts on the Socioeconomic Infrastructure	3-63
3.3.2.1 Housing	3-63
3.3.2.2 Education	3-66
3.3.2.3 Health Services and Safety	3-67
3.3.2.4 Government Services	3-71
3.3.2.5 Utilities	3-72
3.3.2.6 Transportation	3-72
3.3.2.7 Recreation	3-73
3.3.2.8 Summary and Analysis of Infrastructure Impacts	3-75
3.4 Impacts on the Sociocultural Environment	3-79
3.4.1 Impacts on Indian People	3-79
3.4.2 Impacts to Historical and Archaeological Features	3-79
3.5 Impacts in Market Area	3-80
3.6 Cumulative Impacts of Coal-Related Development . . .	3-81
 4. Mitigating Measures and Air and Water Quality Aspects . .	 4-1
4.1 Legal and Institutional Requirements	4-1
4.1.1 Contractual Requirements	4-1
4.1.2 Federal and State Standards	4-1
4.1.2.1 Air Quality	4-1
4.1.2.2 Water Quality	4-2
4.1.3 Mining and Reclamation Requirements	4-3
4.1.4 Other Institutional Requirements	4-4
4.1.4.1 Cultural Resources	4-4
4.1.4.2 Railroad Spur	4-4
4.2 Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project	4-5
4.2.1 Air Quality	4-5
4.2.1.1 Atmospheric Emissions	4-5
4.2.1.2 Dust Control	4-5
4.2.1.3 Odor	4-6

	<u>Page No.</u>
4.2.2 Noise	4-6
4.2.3 Biological Systems	4-7
4.2.3.1 Terrestrial Flora	4-7
4.2.3.2 Terrestrial Fauna	4-7
4.2.3.3 Aquatic Systems	4-7
4.2.4 Reclamation	4-8
4.3 Monitoring Programs	4-10
4.3.1 Air Quality	4-10
4.3.2 Water Quality	4-11
4.3.2.1 Surface Water	4-11
4.3.2.2 Ground Water	4-12
4.3.3 Biological Systems	4-13
4.4 Mitigation Measures Related to the Sociocultural Environment	4-14
4.4.1 Socioeconomic Environment	4-14
4.4.2 Cultural Environment	4-14
4.5 Governmental Permit Requirements	4-15
4.5.1 North Dakota State Water Permit Conditions	4-15
4.5.2 Mercer County Rezoning Permit Conditions . .	4-16
4.5.3 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Conditions to Corps of Engineers Permits	4-19
5. Unavoidable Adverse Effects	5-1
5.1 Adverse Impacts to the Physical Environment	5-1
5.1.1 Air	5-1
5.1.2 Water	5-2
5.1.3 Land	5-2
5.2 Adverse Impacts on the Biological Environment . . .	5-3
5.2.1 Flora	5-3
5.2.2 Fauna	5-3
5.2.3 Aquatic Ecosystems	5-4

	<u>Page No.</u>
5.3 Adverse Impacts on the Socioeconomic and Sociocultural Environment	5-4
5.3.1 Socioeconomic Conditions	5-4
5.3.2 Sociocultural Conditions	5-5
6. The Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of Man's Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity	6-1
6.1 Coal	6-1
6.2 Water	6-1
6.3 Oxygen	6-2
6.4 Atmosphere	6-2
6.5 Land	6-2
6.6 Economic and Social Aspects	6-2
6.7 Biota	6-3
6.8 Cultural Resources	6-3
7. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources	7-1
7.1 Coal	7-1
7.2 Land and Ecosystems	7-1
7.3 Water	7-1
7.4 Oxygen	7-1
7.5 Building and Process Materials	7-1
7.6 Labor	7-2
7.7 Capital	7-2
7.8 Services	7-2
7.9 Archeological and Paleontological Artifacts	7-2
7.10 Cultural Values	7-2
8. Alternatives to the Proposed Action	8-1
8.1 ANGCCC's Design and Source Alternatives	8-1

12

	<u>Page No.</u>
8.1.1 No Project	8-1
8.1.2 Alternative Sources of Gas	8-1
8.1.2.1 Importation	8-1
8.1.2.2 Domestic Supplies	8-3
8.1.2.3 Liquid Hydrocarbon Gasification	8-4
8.1.2.4 Nuclear Stimulation	8-5
8.1.3 Alternative Designs, Processes, and Operations	8-6
8.1.3.1 Other Gasification Processes	8-6
8.1.3.2 Alternatives Within the Process	8-7
8.1.3.3 Alternative Sources of Power	8-7
8.1.3.4 Alternative Wastewater Treatments	8-8
8.1.3.5 Other Water Intake Structures	8-8
8.1.3.6 Alternatives to Proposed Mining Plan	8-9
8.2 ANGGC's Siting Alternatives	8-13
8.2.1 Plant Location Alternatives	8-13
8.2.2 Alternative Product Pipeline Routes	8-16
8.2.3 Alternative Railroad Spur Routes	8-19
8.3 Resource Use Alternatives	8-19
8.3.1 Local Use Alternatives	8-19
8.3.1.1 Coal	8-19
8.3.1.2 Water	8-22
8.3.1.3 Land	8-22
8.3.2 Exportation Alternatives	8-22
8.3.2.1 Coal	8-22
8.3.2.2 Water	8-22
8.4 Alternative Energy Sources	8-23
8.4.1 Oil	8-23
8.4.2 Coal	8-23
8.4.3 Generation of Electricity	8-24

	<u>Page No.</u>
8.4.3.1 Hydroelectric	8-24
8.4.3.2 Nuclear	8-24
8.4.4 Geothermal Steam	8-25
8.4.5 Oil Shale	8-25
8.4.6 Solar Energy	8-26
8.4.7 Other Sources	8-26
9. Consultation and Coordination	9-1
9.1 Environmental Statement Coordination	9-1
9.2 Consultation During Preparation of Final Environmental Statement	9-3
9.3 Bibliography	9-9

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1-1	Michigan-Wisconsin: Natural Gas Requirements, Supply, and Priorities Served	1-8
1-2	Summary of Resource Use by Proposed Projects	1-14
1-3	Comparison of Trace Element Analyses of Coal from Beulah-Zap Bed	1-21
1-4	Vehicular Equipment to be Used in Mining	1-22
1-5	Waste Stream to Deep Well Disposal	1-48
1-6	Properties and Quantities of Coal and Liquid Byproduct Fuels	1-50
1-7	Estimated Operating Conditions Due to Fuel Combustion	1-54
1-8	Cooling Tower Characteristics	1-56
1-9	Byproduct and Chemical Storage Tank Characteristics	1-60
2-1	Precipitation and Temperature Data for Bismarck, North Dakota	2-2
2-2	Peak Discharge History Near Proposed Mine	2-18
2-3	Surface Water Use in Mercer County	2-19
2-4	Estimated Monthly Discharge at Surface Water Stations	2-20
2-5	Estimates of Study Area Flood Magnitudes	2-21
2-6	Cumulative Tabulation of Proposed Pipeline Water Crossings	2-24
2-7	Pipeline Water Crossings - Proposed Route	2-26
2-8	Groundwater Use in Mercer County	2-28
2-9	Municipal Wells in Mercer County	2-28
2-10	Stratigraphy and Physical Parameters of Study Area Aquifers	2-30
2-11	TDS Concentrations for Study Area Surface Waters	2-47
2-12	Degree of Limitation for Reclamation of Disturbed Areas	2-54
2-13	Maximum Expected Earthquake Intensities and Ground Accelerations	2-55
2-14	Areas of Mass Movement Along the Product Pipeline Route	2-56

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
2-15	Plant Communities Found in 49-Section Biological Study Area	2-60
2-16	Inventory of Wetland Impoundments - Product Pipeline	2-65
2-17	Bird Species Observed in 49-Section Biological Study Area	2-68
2-18	Breeding Populations and Productivity of Waterfowl on Study Area	2-69
2-19	Small Mammals Captured on Study Area	2-72
2-20	Medium-Sized and Large Mammals Observed on Study Area	2-73
2-21	Amphibians and Reptiles Observed on and near Study Area	2-75
2-22	Fish Collected from Aquatic Ecosystems in Mercer County	2-75
2-23	Total Fish Taken from Each Area of the Knife River Drainage	2-77
2-24	Population Data for Project Area	2-81
2-25	Primary Work Force in Related Construction Jobs	2-81
2-26	Secondary Construction Work Force Available, 1970	2-82
2-27	Construction Related Unions in North Dakota	2-82
2-28	Employment by Industry and County, 1970	2-84
2-29	Employment-Occupation Breakdown by County, 1970	2-84
2-30	Number and Types of Industries in 3-County Area, 1972	2-84
2-31	Taxable Valuation Property Subject to Property Tax, 1975	2-85
2-32	Family Income Distribution in 3-County Area, 1969	2-87
2-33	Employment by Counties and State for North Dakota and Minnesota	2-87
2-34	Summary of Educational Information for Selected School Districts	2-89
2-35	Fire Department Status and Fire Protection Classification	2-90
2-36	Community Water and Sewer Facilities, 1973	2-91
2-37	Medical Facilities in the Involved Counties	2-93
2-38	Incorporated Communities Affected by the Proposed Product Pipeline	2-95

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
2-39	Archaeological Sites Along the Proposed Pipeline Route	2-99
3-1	Estimated On-Site Engine Emissions During Plant Construction	3-2
3-2	Estimated Ground-Level Pollutant Concentrations During Construction	3-3
3-3	Engine Emissions per Mile of Pipeline Construction	3-4
3-4	Expected Vehicle Emissions from Mining Operations	3-5
3-5	Maximum Ground-Level Pollutant Concentrations from ANCGC Project	3-8
3-6	Total Emissions from Proposed ANCGC and Basin Electric Projects	3-10
3-7	Maximum Ground-Level Pollutant Concentrations from ANCGC and Basin Electric Projects	3-11
3-8	Summary of Visibility Reductions from ANCGC and Basin Electric Projects	3-15
3-9	Typical Noise Levels at Construction Sites	3-20
3-10	Noisiest Equipment at Construction Sites	3-20
3-11	Peak Noise Levels of Equipment Used During Pipeline Construction	3-21
3-12	Potential Soil Hazard Problems of Proposed Pipeline Route	3-31
3-13	Habitats Affected by Construction of the Proposed Gasification Facility	3-35
3-14	Habitat Acreages Within the Proposed Mine Area	3-36
3-15	Woodland Areas Along the Proposed Product Pipeline Route	3-40
3-16	Habitats to be Affected by Construction and Operation of the ANCGC Gasification Complex	3-42
3-17	Projected Biological Impacts to Aquatic Ecosystems, Product Pipeline	3-51
3-18	Estimated Average Annual Employment of Gasification Plant, Powerplant, and Associated Facilities	3-53
3-19	Average Annual Number of Construction Workers Required, by Skill	3-54
3-20	Average Annual Indirect Employment and Total New Employment in Impact Area from ANCGC and Basin Electric Projects	3-56

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	
3-21	Estimated Average Annual New Population from the ANGCGC and Basin Electric Projects and Possible In-Migration to Impact Area Cities	3-57
3-22	Estimated Income Generated in Impact Area by the ANGCGC and Basin Electric Projects, 1976 Dollars	3-59
3-23	Number and Distribution of Housing Units Required in the Impact Area to House New Direct and Indirect Employment Population	3-64
3-24	New Housing Unit Needs of Impact Area Cities During the Peak Population Year	3-66
3-25	Inventory of Temporary Housing for North Dakota Counties	3-67
3-26	Projected Annual Increase in Student Population for Each of the Impact Area School Districts	3-68
3-27	North Dakota Recommended Minimum Recreation Standards and Facilities Required in Impact Area During Peak Construction Year	3-75
3-28	Total Emissions from Proposed Coal-Related Developments Near Beulah	3-81
3-29	Approximate Annual Average Worker Requirements of Proposed Coal-Related Developments Near Beulah	3-85
8-1	Ranking of Various Alternative Sites According to Socioeconomic, Geotechnical, and Meteorological Factors	8-14
8-2	Biological Ranking	8-15
8-3	Site Evaluation Summary	8-15

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1-1	American Natural Resources System	1-2
1-2	National Energy Consumption	1-4
1-3	U.S. Natural Gas Reserves (excluding Alaska)	1-5
1-4	Location of Plant Site Within the Northern Great Plains	1-16
1-5	Mercer County Complex - Location in North Dakota	1-16
1-6	Generalized Area Map of North Dakota Coal Gasification Project	1-17
1-7	Beulah-Hazen Coal Field - Sequence of Mining	1-19
1-8	Typical Strip-Mining Operation	1-25
1-9	North Dakota Mining with Topsoil Replaced	1-26
1-10	Plan and Elevation Views of Typical Dragline Mining	1-26
1-11	Artists Concept - ANGCCG Gasification Plant	1-28
1-12	ANGCGC Plot Plan	1-30
1-13	Coal and Ash Handling Flow Diagram	1-31
1-14	Lurgi Pressure Gasifier	1-36
1-15	Process Train Flow Diagram	1-38
1-16	Liquid Waste Effluent Treatment	1-44
1-17	Gaseous Emissions to Stack Flow Diagram	1-55
1-18	Proposed Route of Product Pipeline	1-61
1-19	Typical Pipeline Construction Spread	1-62
1-20	Raw Water Intake	1-65
1-21	Profile of Raw Water Intake	1-66
1-22	Raw Water Supply Line	1-68
2-1	Sulfation Plate and Dustfall Sampling Network	2-4
2-2	Annual Frequency of Wind Speed and Direction at Plant-Mine Site	2-5
2-3	Plant-Mine Site SO ₂ Concentrations 6/17/74-7/31/74	2-7
2-4	Plant-Mine Site SO ₂ Concentrations 8/1/74-9/15/74	2-7
2-5	Daily Distribution of Suspended Particulate Matter - Plant-Mine Site	2-9

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
2-6	Concentrations of TSP at North Dakota State Stations	2-9
2-7	Photochemical Oxidant Concentrations: Plant-Mine Site 6/2/74-6/30/74	2-10
2-8	Hydrocarbon Concentrations: Plant-Mine Site 6/28/74-7/31/74	2-11
2-9	NO ₂ Concentrations: Plant-Mine Site 6/16/74-7/31/74	2-11
2-10	Noise Monitoring Locations	2-12
2-11	Mean dBA Noise Level versus Wind Speed	2-13
2-12	Mean dBA Noise Level versus HUD's Acceptability Criteria	2-13
2-13	Odor Monitoring Points	2-15
2-14	Sub-basins and Drainages	2-16
2-15	Location of Surface Water Stations	2-20
2-16	Generalized Soil Drainage Characteristics	2-22
2-17	Watersheds and Major Drainages in the Project Region	2-23
2-18	Major Waterways in the Project Region	2-25
2-19	Location of Springs and Wells Investigated	2-30
2-20	Historic Water Levels, Deep Artesian Aquifers	2-31
2-21	Historic Water Levels, Tongue River-Sentinel Butte Aquifer	2-31
2-22	Baseline Water Levels, Tongue River-Sentinel Butte Aquifer	2-32
2-23	Baseline Water Levels, Glacial Outwash Aquifers	2-32
2-24	Hydrographs of Selected Wells with Precipitation	2-33
2-25	Generalized Cross Sections of Test Wells	2-35
2-26	Generalized Cross Sections of Test Wells	2-35
2-27	Diagrammatic Hydrogeologic Section	2-37
2-28	Detail of Diagrammatic Hydrogeologic Section	2-37
2-29	Location of Wells in Figures 2-27 and 2-28	2-38
2-30	Cross Sections of Sedimentary Rocks of Mercer and Oliver Counties	2-40
2-31	Temperature Distribution with Depth, Renner Bay	2-41

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
2-32	Dissolved Oxygen Distribution with Depth, Lake Sakakawea	2-41
2-33	Water Quality Sampling Locations	2-43
2-34	Locations of Springs and Wells with Aquifer Designations	2-45
2-35	Gasification Facility Geologic Map	2-49
2-36	Gasification Facility Geologic Cross Section	2-50
2-37	General Soil Suitability and Thickness Map	2-52
2-38	Geologic Logs of Test Holes	2-53
2-39	49-Section Biological Study Area	2-59
2-40	Communities Along the Proposed Route	2-94
2-41	Locations of Known Archaeological and Historical Sites, Product Pipeline	2-98
3-1	Isopleths of Annual Average SO ₂ Concentrations	3-12
3-2	Isopleths of Annual Average NO _x Concentrations	3-13
3-3	Isopleths of Annual Average TSP Concentrations	3-14
3-4	Proposed Mercer County Road Changes	3-74
4-1	Locations of Recommended Surface Water Monitoring Stations	4-12
4-2	Locations of Recommended Ground Water Monitoring Stations	4-13
8-1	Federal Coal Reserves and ANCCGC Proposed Mining Plan	8-10
8-2	Garrison Diversion Unit with Proposed Pipeline Route and Alternatives	8-17
8-3	Plant Access Railroad - Alternative Alignments	8-20

LIST OF APPENDICIES

Appendix

- A / Glossary
- B Flow Diagrams for Rectisol, Gas Liquor Separation, and Ammonia Recovery
Gasification Material Balance
Plant Energy Balance
Pollutant Emissions and Abatement
Sulfur Disposition Diagram
- C Environmental Studies
- D Annual Wind Roses for Williston and Bismarck
North Dakota Air Quality Data
Plant Site SO₂, Sulfation, Suspended Particulates, and Dustfall Data
- E Water Inventory and Quality Data
- F Drill Hole Core Data
- G Plant Species
Botanical Composition of Habitat Types
Aquatic Sampling Data
- H Animal Numbers Lost During Construction and Mining
- I ANGCCG's Air Quality Dispersion Analysis
- J Written Comments on Draft Environmental Statement and Bureau of Reclamation Responses