

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

The east side of the West of Hatwai cutplane has a significant generation surplus, much of which is hydro that cannot readily be redispatched during the summer because the water would be spilled. Spilling water at several dams would violate ESA conditions. At a minimum, the value of the energy (spilled water) would be lost. Other generation on the east side of the cutplane comes from coal plants in Montana. This generation has relatively low fuel costs, so that the plant operators would not be willing to pay very much for replacement generation west of the cutplane.

Hydro, nuclear and coal resources west of the cutplane tend to run close at their maximum output to serve regional needs and compete in the California market at this time of year. Remaining natural gas resources, if any, are likely to be much more expensive than the coal on the east side. Congestion on paths such as West of Hatwai contributed to overall higher prices and volatility that plagued the western energy markets in 2001. This is not a good candidate for congestion pricing, especially given the magnitude of the constraint.

Therefore, because the alternative would not solve the problem without violating ESA conditions or significantly increase costs to consumers, it is not considered a reasonable alternative and was eliminated from detailed study.

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-1 compares the Agency Proposed Action and alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, to the purposes of the project described in Chapter 1. Table 2-2 provides a summary of the environmental impacts and mitigation for the alternatives.

Table 2-1. Comparison of Alternatives to Project Purposes

Purpose	Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action	No Action Alternative
Maintain transmission system reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replacing a 115-kV line with a 500-kV line provides needed capacity to move power from generation sources in Montana to load centers to the west, even during peak generation periods and even if one transmission line is out of service, thus meeting industry reliability standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The alternative action, which would provide for double-circuit 500-kV towers for a 9-mile section west of Bell Substation, would provide the same system reliability enhancements as the proposed action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintaining the transmission system at its current capacity means it could be required to drop substantial load (up to 2250 MW) in order to meet reliability standards during a transmission line outage, especially during peak seasons. The system would be at a continually increasing risk of overloads and violation of reliability standards.
Continue to meet contractual obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed action would provide adequate capacity to enable BPA to continue to meet contractual obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Alternative Action would also provide adequate capacity to enable BPA to continue to meet contractual obligations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BPA would be unable to continue to meet its present and future contractual obligations to deliver power to its customers in a reliable manner.
Comply with BPA's statutory obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed action is consistent with BPA's obligations under the Federal Columbia River Transmission Act to construct additional transmission lines necessary for transmitting electric power and maintaining electrical stability and reliability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Alternative Action would also comply with BPA's statutory obligations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BPA would not be in compliance with its obligations to construct additional transmission lines necessary for transmitting electric power and maintaining electrical stability and reliability.

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2-1 (cont'd)

Purpose	Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action	No Action Alternative
<p>Minimize environmental impacts</p> <p><i>(see Table 2-2, Summary of Impacts)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ By replacing an existing line in an already developed corridor, the proposed action minimizes environmental impacts compared to the clearing and disturbance required to construct a new line and access roads in an undisturbed area. ▪ The proposed action minimizes visual impact compared to the alternative action by using shorter, single-circuit towers for all but about 1 mile of the 84 miles of line. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Alternative Action would result in environmental impacts that are approximately the same as for the proposed action. The principal difference would be greater impacts associated with the double-circuit towers in the 9-mile section in the Spokane area (potentially greater visual impacts, risk of bird collisions). Conversely, it would benefit land use in the long term by reserving a location for an additional 500-kV line in the 9-mile section for a future unknown need. This line segment could experience future constraints to expansion due to its proximity to a growing population in the Spokane area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The No Action Alternative would not cause any construction-related environmental impacts. ▪ No Action could also result in adverse socioeconomic impacts such as lower employment and income levels, reduced levels of economic activity, and reduced tax revenues and services as a result of reduced capacity and reliability. ▪ Maintenance activities associated with vegetation clearing, vehicle traffic, and human presence could adversely affect water quality, vegetation, wildlife, fish, and wetland resources.
<p>Minimize costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Estimated cost of \$152 million. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Estimated cost of \$160 million. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No direct construction costs would be associated with this alternative.
<p>Solve transmission capacity problem by late 2004</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The new line would be in service by late 2004. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The new line would be in service by late 2004. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Problem would not be solved.

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2. Summary of Impacts and Mitigating Measures for the Proposed Action and Alternatives

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Land Use			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Imposition of a transmission line on 3.5 miles of right-of-way where none now exists; remainder of project would be in existing transmission line corridor or BPA property. ▪ Approximately 24 acres would be needed on a permanent basis for tower sites. ▪ Approximately 40 acres would be needed temporarily for staging areas and conductor pulling/tensioning sites. ▪ Approximately 22 acres would be needed for new permanent access roads and road spurs; mostly in rangeland. ▪ Approximately 52 acres would be needed for access road improvements. ▪ Approximately 12 acres of agricultural land would be removed from production permanently (about 4 acres of prime farm land); net loss would be about 3.3 acres. ▪ Up to 765 acres of cropland would be removed from production for one or two seasons. ▪ Potential interference with farming activities during construction; towers would interfere with farming during operation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide schedule of construction activities to all landowners along the corridor that could be affected by construction. ▪ Coordinate with the City of Grand Coulee to site towers within North Dam Park. ▪ Place gravel on existing roads within North Dam Park to reduce the spread of noxious weeds. ▪ Pre-treat areas of high weed concentrations in North Dam Park during plant emergence to reduce weed spread. ▪ Use Best Management Practices to limit erosion and the spread of noxious weeds. ▪ Plan and schedule construction activities, when practical, to minimize temporary disturbance, displacement of crops, and interference with farming activities. ▪ Restore compacted soil in cropland. ▪ Compensate farmers for crop damage. ▪ Place new towers parallel to existing towers, where practical, to enhance maneuverability of farm equipment. ▪ Revegetate disturbed areas with native species. ▪ Coordinate with Riverside State Park officials to locate access roads to minimize disturbance to vegetation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Land Use (cont'd)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential interference with recreational use at North Dam Park. ▪ Temporary disturbances to recreational use at Riverside State Park and nearby residential uses in the Spokane area. ▪ Commercial activities (recreational vehicle parking) in corridor near U.S. Highway 2 may be incompatible; change in land use may occur. ▪ Potential disruption of traffic during construction. ▪ Potential for spread of noxious weeds by ground disturbance and vehicles. ▪ Consistent with land use plans and zoning; double-circuit towers exceed height restrictions in City of Spokane and Spokane County. ▪ Land use impact levels would be low to moderate. 			

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Noise			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residents at distances up to 400 to 600 feet from construction activity could experience noise levels that exceed Washington noise standards. ▪ Small increase in audible noise levels at the edge of the right-of-way during operation; median noise levels would be within standards. ▪ Noise impact levels would be low to moderate. ▪ Potential radio and television interference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. ▪ Audible noise levels during line operation would be 1 to 2 dBA higher than proposed action, impacts could be slightly greater. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide sound-control devices no less effective than those provided on original equipment. ▪ Provide muffled exhaust on all construction equipment and vehicles. ▪ Limit construction activities to daytime hours. ▪ No noise-generating construction activity will be conducted within 1,000 feet of a residence between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. ▪ Notify landowners directly impacted along the corridor prior to construction activities. ▪ Restore radio or television reception to a quality as good or better than before if interference occurs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.
Public Health/Safety			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential risk of fire and injury associated with use of equipment during construction, and traffic safety issues. ▪ Potential incidence of electric field-induced nuisance shocks. ▪ Potential for health effects from magnetic fields in residential and business areas would be minor due to sparse population or field levels that would decrease or would not change from the current condition (except for 0.6-mile section in a residential and commercial area close to the right-of-way where a slight increase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fire, injury, traffic, and nuisance shock effects would be the same as for the proposed action. ▪ Potential for health effects from exposure to magnetic fields is slightly less than proposed action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare and maintain a safety plan in compliance with Washington requirements. ▪ Hold crew safety meetings at the start of each workday. ▪ Secure the site to protect equipment and the general public at the end of each workday. ▪ Provide employee training in tower climbing, first aid, rescue techniques, and safety equipment inspection. ▪ Assure contractor complies with State regulations regarding on-site fire equipment. ▪ Fuel all highway-authorized vehicles off-site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Public Health/Safety (cont'd)			
would be expected outside of the right-of-way). The overall level of impacts would be low except for the commercial area, where the level would be moderate to high.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When transporting project components, establish helicopter flight paths that avoid populated areas and schools. ▪ Provide notice to public of construction activities, including blasting. Take appropriate safety measures for blasting consistent with state and local codes and regulations. Remove all explosives from the work site at the end of the workday. ▪ Install implosion fittings used to connect the conductors in such a way as to minimize potential health and safety risks. ▪ Require operation and maintenance vehicles to carry fire suppression equipment. ▪ Stay on established access roads during routine operation and maintenance activities. ▪ Keep vegetation cleared according to BPA standards to avoid contact with transmission lines. ▪ Submit final tower locations and heights to the Federal Aviation Administration for review and potential marking and lighting requirements. ▪ Construct and operate the new transmission line to meet or exceed the National Electrical Safety Code. ▪ Follow BPA specifications for grounding fences and other objects on and near the proposed right-of-way. 	

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Visual Resources			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Temporary viewscape changes during construction. ▪ Low to high visual impacts due to change in views for residents in the Grand Coulee and Spokane areas, and for users at North Dam Park and Riverside State Park. ▪ Moderate to high impacts to viewers of line where it crosses the Spokane River. ▪ Moderate to high impacts to residents of housing developments east of Nine Mile Road and in other areas between there and Bell Substation. ▪ Potentially high impact for viewshed from archaeological site near Grand Coulee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be greater in the Spokane area where taller, double-circuit towers would be used. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use tower steel that has been treated to reduce reflectivity. ▪ Use non-specular conductors. ▪ Use non-luminous insulators (i.e., non-ceramic insulators or porcelain). ▪ Plant vegetative screens, do selective clearing/tree topping at Riverside State Park and other selected sites. ▪ Use existing topography and vegetation when ever possible to limit views of lines and structures. ▪ Locate construction staging areas out of site of potential viewers as much as possible. ▪ Require contractors to maintain a clean construction site. ▪ Maintain permanent access roads. ▪ Consult Colville Tribe on impacts to archaeological site near Grand Coulee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.
Air Quality			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Short-term increase in pollutant levels during construction from dust and vehicles. ▪ The level of impacts during construction and operation would be low. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use water trucks to control dust during construction ▪ Use low sulfur fuel for on-road diesel vehicles ▪ Lop and scatter, pile, mulch or chip, or take woody debris and other vegetation off-site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Cultural Resources			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unless avoided by construction activities, potential for direct disturbance effects of several prehistoric and historic sites (low to high impact levels). Four of the archaeological sites are considered to have traditional cultural property values. ▪ Unless avoided, possible disturbance (moderate effect) of two archaeological sites by dismantling of the existing 115-kV line in the Grand Coulee area. ▪ High potential effect on historic site at Bell Substation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoid archaeological sites where practical including spanning them or positioning towers to separate them from cultural resources. ▪ Site new access roads to avoid cultural resources. ▪ Limit road improvements to the existing roadbed near cultural resource sites. ▪ Avoid cultural resource sites when dismantling the portion of the 115-kV line in the Grand Coulee area. ▪ Mitigate impacts for sites that are eligible for NRHP listing and cannot be avoided. ▪ Halt work if resources are discovered during construction activities and engage cultural resource specialists to evaluate the discoveries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.
Socioeconomics			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimal impact on housing to meet construction worker needs. ▪ Beneficial impact on employment, personal income, and local sales tax revenues. ▪ Small amount of foregone agricultural production. ▪ Low potential for trespass and vandalism of homes and businesses. ▪ Low potential for long-term adverse impacts on property values. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compensate landowners at fair market value for any new land rights required for easements for new right-of-way or for access roads. ▪ Compensate farmers for crop damage. Correct soil compaction or compensate landowners. ▪ Site towers to maintain efficient crop patterns and minimize adverse impacts to farming activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No Action could result in lower employment and income levels, reduced levels of economic activity, and reduced tax revenues and services as a

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Socioeconomics (cont'd)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No disproportionate impacts on low-income or minority populations. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> result of reduced capacity and reliability.
Soils and Geology			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disturbance of soils and removal of vegetation during construction increase the risk of soil erosion and mass movement, and may change soil productivity and physical characteristics causing low to high impacts. ▪ Removal of vegetation in areas with loess soils would likely increase the rate of wind erosion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Install runoff and erosion controls. ▪ Use environmental specialist to decide which mitigation approaches are best suited to reduce erosion and runoff, and to stabilize disturbed areas. ▪ Deposit excavated material in upland areas and stabilize. ▪ Promptly seed disturbed sites with an herbaceous seed mixture suited to the site. ▪ Use vegetative buffers and sediment barriers to prevent sediment from moving off site and into water bodies. ▪ Provide assistance to farmers and ranchers for subsoiling where agricultural and rangeland soils are compacted. ▪ Conduct follow-up inspections and maintain erosion and runoff controls and revegetation. ▪ Avoid construction on steep, unstable slopes if possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Water Quality			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Temporary local increases in erosion and sedimentation during, and for a brief time after, construction would have low to moderate impacts. ▪ Potential contamination of surface water resources during project construction from accidental spills or leaks of petroleum products would have a low impact. ▪ Potential increase in wind and water erosion rates. ▪ Potential increase in surface water temperature would have a low impact. ▪ Construction activities generally would not be expected to directly or indirectly impact groundwater aquifers (no to low impact level). ▪ Low risk to groundwater resources from potential spills or leaks of petroleum products (low impact level). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use best management practices to divert flows from exposed soils, store flows, or otherwise limit runoff and erosion on the site ▪ Use properly sized culverts ▪ Start stabilization measures soon after construction activities have ceased ▪ Place devices at all discharge locations and along the length of any outfall channel to slow velocity of water and avoid any significant change in the hydrology of waters downstream ▪ Restrict discharges of solid materials into waters of the United States ▪ Deposit excavated material not reused in an upland area and stabilize ▪ Schedule construction, when practical, during periods when precipitation and runoff possibilities are at a minimum ▪ Set back towers near water crossings from stream banks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.
Wetlands			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential indirect impacts to several wetlands located within 100 feet of the new towers would have low to moderate impacts. ▪ Potential impacts to several wetlands located within 100 feet of access road maintenance activity would have low to moderate impacts . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use standard best management practices to avoid or reduce indirect impacts to wetlands. ▪ Stockpile soil and replace or loosen compacted soils; revegetate disturbed areas adjacent to wetlands with native species. ▪ Avoid construction within flagged wetland and wetlands buffers and on steep unstable slopes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Wetlands (cont'd)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New corridor areas acquired for access roads or tower placements would avoid wetlands (no impact). ▪ Potential impacts to wetlands due to the possible clearing of tall wetland vegetation (trees) during operation and maintenance (low to moderate impact level). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Locate structures, new roads, and staging areas so as to avoid waters of the U.S., including wetlands. ▪ Avoid mechanized land clearing within wetlands and riparian areas. ▪ Regularly inspect and maintain project facilities. ▪ Avoid refueling and/or mixing hazardous materials near wetlands. ▪ Use existing road systems. ▪ All excavated material not reused would be deposited in an upland area and stabilized. ▪ Where feasible, top trees instead of removing trees so roots and soil remain intact. 	
Vegetation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Removal of vegetation from 210 acres for construction of towers would have moderate impacts. ▪ Destruction of plants by construction vehicles would have a low impact. ▪ Continued maintenance involving removal of tall trees would have a low impact level. ▪ Indirect impacts such as soil compaction, damaging root structures, and dust clogging leaf surfaces through use of access roads would have low to moderate impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maximize use of the existing corridor and roads for construction activities. ▪ Restrict vegetation clearing to the minimum needed to maintain safety and operational standards. ▪ Reseed or revegetate disturbed areas following construction. ▪ Implement measures to lessen the spread or introduction of noxious plants during and following construction. ▪ Locate staging areas and conductor tensioning sites outside of good quality native habitat areas, where possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Vegetation (cont'd)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infestation of disturbed areas with noxious plant species would have low to moderate impacts. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restrict travel to one area where spur roads would traverse lithosols to prevent damage to sensitive plant communities. 	
Fish			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Short-term and localized increases in turbidity and sediment in fish-bearing streams would have low impacts, except fish-bearing streams, where impacts could be low to high depending on timing of sedimentation. ▪ Avoidance of immediate work areas by fish due to increases in turbidity would have low impacts. ▪ Potential sediment deposition over spawning areas that could suffocate eggs and fry would have high impacts. ▪ Potential increase in water temperatures above those preferred by fish and reduced rates of wood recruitment into the stream due to removal of riparian vegetation would have moderate to high impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implement WDFW recommendations for culvert replacements. ▪ Install silt fences and straw bales to separate construction activities from watercourses and drainages. ▪ Deposit excavated material not reused in an upland area and stabilize. Restrict deposition from environmentally sensitive areas such as streams, riparian areas, wetlands, or floodplains. ▪ Promptly seed disturbed sites with an herbaceous seed mixture suited to the site. ▪ Use vegetative buffers and sediment barriers to prevent sediment from moving off site and into water bodies. ▪ Avoid construction activities near fish-bearing streams during the April-June period of trout egg incubation to the extent possible. ▪ Minimize vegetation cutting within riparian zones to protect stream banks and maintain water temperature. ▪ Avoid mechanized land clearing within riparian areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.

Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Fish (cont'd)			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoid refueling and/or mixing hazardous materials where accidental spills could enter surface or groundwater. 	
Wildlife			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential impacts on wildlife in shrub steppe, forested, and riparian habitats during the breeding season (March to August) due to noise associated with construction activities would have a high impact. ▪ Reduction in wildlife foraging areas and ground nesting habitat due to vegetation removal during construction would have low to high impacts, depending on time of year. ▪ Avian species could collide with the new transmission line (low impact level). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mark or remove the ground wire at the span crossing the Spokane River and wetlands. ▪ Limit the removal of forest habitat to only those trees that would directly interfere with transmission lines. ▪ Retain or create snags within the corridor at a density of at least 2 snags per 1 acre. ▪ Avoid construction activities within high-use native habitats during the breeding season (March 1 to August 15), when possible. ▪ Gate and lock access to the corridor, when practical, especially where the corridor crosses habitats heavily used by wildlife. ▪ Limit vehicular travel to access roads through sensitive habitat such as shrub/steppe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.
Floodplains			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction within a floodplain would not create obstructions to floodwater and alter flow patterns and floodplain acreage (no impact level). ▪ Removal of riparian vegetation during construction is not expected to impact floodplains (no impact level). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts would be the same as for the Agency Proposed Action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use erosion control measures. ▪ Leave vegetative buffers next to all water bodies where possible. ▪ Span floodplains wherever possible. ▪ Place fill used for temporary access road widening on fabric and remove it to an upland site after construction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new impacts.

2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2-2 (cont'd)

Potential Impact		Mitigation	No Action Potential Impact
Agency Proposed Action	Alternative Action		
Floodplains (cont'd)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No impact on floodplains due to operation and maintenance. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design the project to locate roads and structures to avoid floodplains or to minimize the potential for creating obstructions to floodwaters. ▪ Near floodplain areas, deposit all excavated material not reused in an upland area and stabilize it. 	