

1 INTRODUCTION

Executive Order (E.O.) 10485 (September 9, 1953), as amended by E.O. 12038 (February 7, 1978), requires that a Presidential permit be issued by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) before electric transmission facilities may be constructed, operated, maintained, or connected at the U.S. international border. On February 27, 2001, Baja California Power, Inc. (hereafter referred to as Intergen), filed an application with the Office of Fossil Energy of DOE for a Presidential permit. Intergen proposed to construct a double-circuit, 230,000-volt (230-kV) transmission line across the U.S.-Mexico border. In a separate but similar proceeding, Sempra Energy Resources (hereafter referred to as Sempra) applied to DOE for a Presidential permit on March 7, 2001, also proposing to construct a double-circuit, 230-kV transmission line across the U.S.-Mexico border.

In each of these projects, the applicants would use the proposed international transmission lines to connect separate natural gas-fired power plants in Mexico to the existing San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) Imperial Valley (IV) Substation located about 6 mi (10 km) north of the border in Imperial County, California. Within the United States, both transmission lines are proposed to be constructed on lands managed by the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), parallel and adjacent to the existing SDG&E 230-kV transmission line (IV-La Rosita line) that connects the IV Substation with Mexico's La Rosita Substation. Both Intergen and Sempra applied to BLM for right-of-way (ROW) grants in order to be able to construct their respective projects across Federal land. Construction of the two natural gas-fired power plants in Mexico started in 2001 and has been completed.

Both DOE and BLM are required by law to review the potential environmental impacts of these projects under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), *United States Code*, Title 42, Sections 4321–4347 (42 USC §§ 4321–4347).

1.1 BACKGROUND

1.1.1 Previous NEPA Review and Litigation

DOE and BLM originally determined that the appropriate level of NEPA review for the Intergen and Sempra Presidential permit applications was an environmental assessment (EA). DOE and BLM prepared a single EA that assessed the potential impacts that would accrue in the United States from the two transmission lines and from operation of the two related power plants in Mexico. DOE and BLM completed and issued the EA in December 2001 (DOE 2001). DOE relied on the EA to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Presidential permits for both projects on December 5, 2001. The Presidential permits authorized each company to construct, operate, maintain, and connect electric transmission facilities crossing the international border between the United States and Mexico. BLM issued two FONSI's on December 19, 2001, and two Decision Records to grant the ROWs on December 20, 2001, which allowed Intergen and Sempra to construct and maintain transmission facilities on Federal land. Following the

authorizations by DOE and BLM, Intergen and Sempra constructed the transmission lines¹ and began commercial operation to export electricity from Mexico in July 2003.

On March 19, 2002, the Border Power Plant Working Group (hereafter referred to as Border Power) sued DOE and BLM in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California (Case No. 02-CV-513-IEG (POR)), alleging violations of NEPA and the Administrative Procedure Act. Border Power sought to have the EA, DOE FONSI, Presidential permits, and ROW grants determined to be illegal and requested an injunction forbidding the use of the transmission lines. The District Court issued two orders in May and July of 2003 (Appendix A) after briefings and oral arguments by the various parties. On May 2, 2003, the court held that the EA and the FONSI did not comply with NEPA. On July 8, 2003, the court sent the matter back to DOE and BLM for additional environmental review. The court declined to enjoin operation of the transmission lines immediately, instead, deferring the setting aside of the Presidential permits and the FONSI until July 1, 2004, or until such time as superseding NEPA documents and permits are issued, whichever is earlier. Thus, the transmission lines have operated while DOE and BLM conducted additional NEPA review. In light of the concerns raised by the court and to increase opportunities for public and stakeholder participation in the environmental review process, DOE and BLM have decided to prepare this environmental impact statement (EIS).

In its July 8, 2003, order, the court expressly prohibited DOE and BLM from considering completion of construction and interim operation of the transmission lines or the court's analyses of environmental impacts of the proposed actions in conducting additional NEPA analyses. DOE and BLM have interpreted this language to require that they are to conduct their NEPA review from a fresh slate, as if the transmission lines had not been built. Accordingly, DOE and BLM will base their EIS analysis on the same purpose and need as was evaluated in the EA: whether to grant or deny Presidential permits and ROWs to Intergen and Sempra. The discussion of the transmission lines (proposed) and the environmental analysis will be presented as if the lines did not yet exist.

This EIS was prepared in accordance with Section 102(2)c of NEPA, Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations (*Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 40, Parts 1500–1508 [40 CFR Parts 1500–1508]) and DOE NEPA Implementing Procedures (10 CFR Part 1021). DOE is the lead Federal agency as defined by 40 CFR 1501.5. BLM is a cooperating agency.

¹ The Sempra Presidential permit and ROW grant were subsequently reissued and transferred to Termoeléctrica-U.S., LLC, after appropriate applications to DOE and BLM, respectively.

1.1.2 Overview of the Transmission Line Projects

The projects time line describes the milestones and sequence of events for construction and operation of the transmission lines and power plants. Also included are dates of DOE and BLM actions that pertain to the Presidential permit and grant of ROW approvals, and subsequent actions leading to the publication of this Draft EIS.

1.1.2.1 Intergen Transmission Line Project

Intergen proposed to construct and operate a double-circuit, 230-kV transmission line that would extend from the La Rosita Power Complex (LRPC), located about 10 mi (16 km) west of Mexicali, Mexico (see Figure 1.1-1), northward for approximately 3 mi (4.8 km) to the U.S-Mexico border at a point west of Calexico, California. From the border, the line would extend about 6 mi (10 km) north across Federal land managed by BLM and terminate at the IV Substation. The LRPC consists of two natural gas-fired combined-cycle generating units. The first unit (LR-1) is owned by Energía Azteca X, S. de R.L. de C.V. (EAX) and consists of three 160-MW gas turbines and one 270-MW steam turbine, for a total generating capacity of 750 MW. The second combined-cycle unit (LR-2) is owned by Energía de Baja California (EBC) and consists of one 160-MW gas turbine and one 150-MW steam turbine, for a total generating capacity of 310 MW. The capacity of the entire LRPC is a nominal 1,060 MW. See Figure 1.1-2.

The electrical output of LR-2 is designated exclusively to the U.S. market and can be exported to the United States only over the proposed new international transmission line. The electrical output of one gas turbine at LR-1 and one-third (90 MW) of the 160-MW electrical output of the LR-1 steam turbine are also designated for export to the U.S. market. However, the 160-MW electrical output of the LR-1 export gas turbine could be transmitted to the United States over either the proposed new international transmission line or over the existing IV-La Rosita line owned by SDG&E. The 90-MW electrical output of the LR-1 steam turbine designated for export to the United States may be transmitted to the United States only over the

230-kV Transmission Lines Imperial-Mexicali Projects Time Line	
2001	
February	Intergen applies to DOE for Presidential permit. Intergen and Sempra apply separately to BLM for ROWs.
March	Intergen initiates construction of LRPC.
March	Sempra applies to DOE for Presidential permit.
December	DOE issues EA, FONSI, and Presidential permits to Intergen and Sempra allowing interconnection of transmission lines at the U.S.-Mexico border.
December	BLM issues FONSIs and Decision Records to grant ROWs.
2002	
January	Sempra initiates construction of TDM.
September	Intergen places transmission line in service.
November	Sempra places transmission line in service.
2003	
May	The court issues an order that the EA and the FONSIs do not comply with NEPA.
July	Sempra begins commercial operation of TDM.
July	Intergen begins commercial operation of LRPC.
July	The court orders additional environmental analyses.
October	DOE publishes Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS.
November	Public scoping meetings held in El Centro and Calexico, California.
2004	
March	Intergen completes installation of SCR on LR-1 export gas turbine.

existing IV-La Rosita line. In addition, at times, there may be as much as 40 to 50 MW of additional output from the EAX plant that would be available for export over the existing IV-LaRosita line. Delivery of the electrical output of the export turbines would be scheduled by the California Independent System Operator (Cal-ISO). The remaining two EAX gas turbines and two-thirds of the electrical output of the EAX steam turbine are designated directly for the Mexico market and are connected to the Mexican electrical grid operated by Comisión-Federal de Electricidad (CFE), the national electric utility of Mexico.

California Independent System Operator

The Cal-ISO is the independent system operator of California's wholesale power grid, maintaining reliability and directing the flow of electric power along the long-distance, high-voltage power lines that connect California with neighboring states, as well as Mexico and British Columbia. The Cal-ISO evaluates energy schedules in the so-called "day-ahead" and "hour-ahead" markets and allocates the available transmission capacity to support the implementation of these schedules.

To reduce nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions, all gas turbines at the LRPC would be equipped with dry low- NO_x burners, and ultimately with selective catalytic reduction (SCR) systems. The EBC export gas turbine (310 MW) would be built with SCR. The other three gas turbines would have SCR systems installed by March 2005. The combination of dry low- NO_x burners and SCR would limit NO_x emissions to 4 parts per million (ppm). Carbon monoxide (CO) emissions are guaranteed by the gas turbine vendor to not exceed 30 ppm.

Cooling water for operation of the LRPC would be obtained from the inlet to the Zaragoza Oxidation Lagoons and treated before use.

1.1.2.2 Sempra Transmission Line Project

Sempra proposed to construct a double-circuit, 230-kV transmission line that would extend from a natural gas-fired power plant located 13 mi (21 km) west of Mexicali, Mexico, developed by Termoeléctrica de Mexicali (TDM), northward approximately 3 mi (4.8 km) to the U.S.-Mexico border west of Calexico, California. The line would parallel the existing IV-La Rosita line in the United States northward from the border, across Federal land managed by BLM, a distance of about 6 mi (10 km) to the IV Substation.

The power plant would consist of one natural-gas fired combined-cycle generating unit, with a nominal capacity of 650 MW. The unit would consist of two 170-MW gas turbines and one 310-MW steam turbine. The power plant would produce electricity exclusively for export to the United States that could be transmitted only over the proposed new transmission line. Delivery of the electrical output of the export turbines would be scheduled by Cal-ISO.

The power plant would be equipped with dry low- NO_x burners and SCR systems to reduce NO_x emissions to a maximum of 2.5 ppm, and an oxidizing catalyst system to reduce CO emissions to a maximum of 4 ppm.

Cooling water for operation of the power plant would be obtained from the outlet of the Zaragoza Oxidation Lagoons and treated before use.

1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

Intergen and Sempra each need approvals from BLM and DOE, respectively, to allow construction of the approximately 6 mi (10 km) of new 230-kV transmission lines in the United States and connection of the lines at the U.S.-Mexico border, with similar facilities in Mexico. DOE and BLM will use the Final EIS to ensure that they have the environmental information needed for purposes of informed decision making. The decisions will be issued subsequently in the form of a Record of Decision (ROD) by DOE and a ROD by BLM.

1.2.1 DOE

DOE will use this EIS to determine whether it is in the public interest to grant Presidential permits to Sempra and Intergen for the construction, operation, maintenance, and connection of the proposed 230-kV transmission lines that would cross the U.S.-Mexico border. DOE's action responds to each applicant's request for a Presidential permit. DOE must comply with NEPA, and in this instance, is the lead Federal agency for NEPA compliance.

In determining whether a proposed action is in the public interest, DOE considers the impact of the proposed action on the environment and on the reliability of the U.S. electric power supply system. DOE also must obtain the concurrence of the Departments of State and Defense before it may grant a Presidential permit. If DOE determines that granting a Presidential permit is in the public interest, the information contained in the EIS will provide a basis upon which DOE decides which alternative(s) and mitigation measures, if any, are appropriate for the applicants to implement. In a process that is separate from NEPA, DOE will determine whether a proposed action will adversely impact the reliability of the U.S. electric system. Issuance of a Presidential permit only indicates that DOE has no objection to the project; it does not mandate that the project be completed.

Both the Sempra and Intergen proposed transmission lines would be used to export small amounts of electricity from the United States for the purpose of initial startup and restarting their respective power plants in the event of a plant shutdown. This is known as "black start." In order to export power from the United States, both companies must obtain separate export authorizations from DOE under Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act. Before authorizing exports to Mexico over the proposed transmission lines, DOE must ensure that the export would not impair the sufficiency of the electrical power supply within the United States and would not impede, or tend to impede, the coordinated use of the regional transmission system.

1.2.2 BLM

BLM will use this EIS to determine whether to approve electric transmission line ROW requests for the projects proposed by Sempra and Intergen. To obtain the ROW approval, Sempra submitted an “Application for Transportation and Utility Systems and Facilities on Federal Lands” to BLM on February 13, 2001. The proposed ROW would be within Utility Corridor N (Figure 1.1-1) of the BLM’s California Desert Conservation Area Plan (the Desert Plan). Intergen filed its application for ROW approval with BLM on February 6, 2001, also for use of a ROW in Utility Corridor N of the Desert Plan. The Sempra and Intergen transmission line ROWs would each be 120 ft (36 m) wide and are both proposed to be located along the east side of the existing IV-La Rosita line. In reviewing the applications for ROW grants, BLM must consider land status, consistency with land use plans, affected resources, resource values, environmental conditions, and concerns of various interested parties. Complete guidance for implementing the NEPA process within BLM can be found in *H-1790-1 — National Environmental Policy Act Handbook* (DOI 1988) and DOI guidance (1977).

These projects must be consistent with BLM’s regional and local plans. The proposed projects fall within the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA). BLM administers a comprehensive land use management plan for this area, which is referred to in this EIS as the CDCA Plan. The goal of the CDCA Plan is to provide for the educational, scientific, and recreational uses of public lands and resources within the CDCA in a manner that enhances and does not diminish the environmental, cultural, and aesthetic values of the desert and its productivity. According to the CDCA Plan, this goal is to be achieved through the direction given for management actions and resolution of conflicts. Direction is stated first on a geographic basis in guidelines set forth in each of four multiple-use classes. Within those guidelines, further refinement of direction is expressed in the goals for each CDCA Plan element (e.g., cultural resources, wildlife, vegetation, wilderness, recreation, motorized-vehicle access, geology, and energy production and utility corridors).

The proposed projects are located within an area designated as Multiple Use Class L (limited) in the CDCA Plan. Class L protects sensitive, natural, scenic, ecological, and cultural resource values. Public lands designated as Class L are managed to provide for generally lower-intensity, carefully controlled multiple use of resources, while ensuring that sensitive values are not significantly diminished.

The CDCA Plan states that “applications for utility rights-of-way will be encouraged by BLM management to use designated corridors.” The proposed projects are consistent with the CDCA Plan because they are located entirely within a designated utility corridor (N). Utility needs that do not conform to the corridor system would require a plan amendment.

The project area for the proposed transmission lines is located in the Yuha Basin Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), designated by the CDCA Plan. The Yuha Basin ACEC Management Plan (BLM 1981) was prepared to give additional protection to unique cultural resource and wildlife values found in the region while also providing for multiple use management. The ACEC Management Plan allows for the “traversing of the ACEC by proposed

transmission lines and associated facilities if environmental analysis demonstrates that it is environmentally sound to do so.”

The Flat-tailed Horned Lizard Rangewide Management Strategy (hereafter referred to as the Strategy) was prepared to provide guidance for the conservation and management of sufficient habitat to maintain extant populations of flat-tailed horned lizards, a BLM sensitive species, in each of five Management Areas within the CDCA in perpetuity. The project area is within the Yuha Desert Management Area. The Strategy encourages surface-disturbing projects to be located outside of Management Areas. However, it does not preclude such projects from the Management Area. If a project must be located within a Management Area, effort should be made to locate the project in a previously disturbed area or in an area where habitat quality is poor, and be timed to minimize mortality. The applicants have agreed to accept all applicable mitigation measures identified in the Strategy (Section 2.2.1.4.1).

1.2.3 Applicants’ Purpose and Need

The Sempra and Intergen Presidential permit applications each described a need for the 230-kV transmission line to transport electrical power generated by the Mexico power plants to the United States. In its application, Sempra indicated that all power generated by its proposed Mexico power plant would be exported to the United States to “reduce the region’s dependence upon conventional oil-burning generation plants, and improve the region’s ability to meet future electrical capacity and energy requirements.”

In its application, Intergen stated it would utilize its 230-kV transmission line to export 310 MW from its EBC unit and 250 MW from its EAX unit to the United States. Intergen stated that this would reduce the need for power producers in southern California to build new oil- or gas-fired generation facilities, provide additional reserve capacity to California, and improve system reliability.

1.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The “Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and to Conduct Public Scoping Meetings and Notice of Floodplain and Wetlands Involvement” was published in the *Federal Register* (68 FR 61796) on October 30, 2003. Announcements were also placed in local newspapers. A project web site maintained for DOE (<http://web.ead.anl.gov/bajatermoeis>) provides background information on the proposed projects, including previous NEPA review and DOE’s NEPA process. Public scoping meetings were held by DOE and BLM at two California locations on November 20, 2003 — the City Hall of El Centro and the City of Calexico City Hall. A total of 20 individuals presented oral comments at the two public scoping meetings. Written comments were also solicited. Seventeen individuals submitted written comments during the scoping period, which closed on December 1, 2003.

An additional opportunity for public participation will be provided during the public comment period on this draft EIS. At that time, interested or potentially affected agencies, tribes,

organizations, and members of the public can comment on the draft document (this document) and participate in public hearings.

Commentors focused mainly, but not exclusively, on the impacts of construction and operation of the two transmission lines and operation of the two power plants to environmental resources in Imperial County, California. An account of comments received during public scoping is included in Appendix B. To ensure that all issues with respect to the permit applications are considered, this Draft EIS addresses issues that were raised during the litigation before the United States Ninth District Court. The major issues raised in the declarations and their disposition in this Draft EIS are included in Appendix C.

The issues raised that are within the scope of the EIS are summarized first below; then the issues raised that are outside the scope of the EIS are discussed.

1.3.1 Issues within the Scope of the EIS

Several commentors suggested that operation of the natural gas-fired power plants in Mexico would have adverse impacts on water volume and water quality of the New River and the Salton Sea and water availability to the Imperial Valley in California. Specific issues included impacts to the New River caused by an increase in temperature, the increase in total dissolved solids (TDS), and the reduction of dissolved oxygen (DO).

Many commentors were concerned that the two power plants would lead to further degradation of air quality in the region. Imperial County is classified as nonattainment for particulate matter (particles with a mean aerodynamic diameter of 10 μm or less [PM_{10}]) and ozone (O_3). Specifically, issues were raised about possible increases in NO_x , CO, O_3 , and particulate matter (both $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}) that would be caused by power plant operations. Commentors questioned the assumptions presented in the court declarations for the ammonia (NH_3) concentrations released at the plants used in calculations of secondary PM_{10} generation. One commentor suggested that the air samples taken at the border do not reflect maximum exposure concentrations and requested that stack heights and proximity to the border of the power plants be taken into consideration when estimating air emission concentrations.

There were several requests that a comprehensive health risk assessment related to air pollution be conducted as part of the EIS process. Appendix H contains a health risk assessment.

Many commentors were concerned about human health impacts from the power plants. Individuals expressed concern over possible effects of emissions on incidences of asthma in Imperial Valley.

Many commentors expressed the need for the EIS to discuss mitigation measures to offset impacts from power plant operations, mainly related to air emissions. Suggestions included establishing a mitigation fund, identifying offsets (ways to reduce air emission amounts from other sources to compensate for emissions from the power plants in Mexico) in the United States, and completing projects to mitigate impacts from power plant operations.

Commentors raised issues related to alternative technologies that could be used at the power plants to reduce water use in plant cooling and air emissions from the facilities. Issues included the use of dry cooling or a combination of wet-dry cooling to reduce water required for plant operation, installation of CO controls and SCR systems on all power plant units, and use of best available technology to reduce air emissions.

Ecological concerns raised by commentors related to transmission line construction and operation included potential impacts to endangered species and suggestions that birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act be addressed in the impact analysis. Issues raised related to aquatic habitats included salinity increases in the New River and Salton Sea, potential effects on fish and bird populations in the Salton Sea, and water quality degradation that would affect recreational fishing in the Salton Sea.

Commentors suggested that the EIS examine the visual impact of the two new transmission lines and that the EIS analysis address the potential effects of the projects on tourism and recreational fishing in the Salton Sea. Environmental justice was raised as an issue by a commentor who said that the new power plants could affect low-income populations. One commentor requested that the EIS address impacts of the project on cultural resources.

1.3.2 Issues outside the Scope of the EIS

Executive Order 12114 (January 9, 1979) requires Federal agencies to prepare an analysis of significant impacts from a Federal action in certain defined circumstances and exempts agencies from preparing analyses in others. The Federal action here, the granting of one or both permits and ROWs, does not fall within the requirements for an EIS set forth in the Executive Order. First, the Federal action does not affect the global commons. Second, the Federal action will not significantly affect “the environment of a foreign nation not participating with the United States and not otherwise involved in the action.” Mexico, not the United States, has issued permits for construction and operation of the power plants in Mexico. Moreover, the Federal action here is not to build the power plants, but only to permit the transmission lines to be built in the United States. The power plants are, at best, cumulative actions. Third, the Federal action does not produce a product, emission, or effluent that is “prohibited or strictly regulated by Federal law in the United States because its toxic effects on the environment create a serious public health risk,” or which involves regulated or prohibited radioactive materials.

Several commentors suggested that the Intergen and Sempra applications for Presidential permits, construction of the two power plants in Mexico, and approval of the North Baja Pipeline, LLC, by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) are related actions and should be assessed as a single undertaking because the power plants would burn natural gas supplied by the pipeline. While the transmission lines and pipeline are related and complementary in that they would facilitate the operation of the electric generating facilities in Mexico, they are independent actions that serve distinct functions and that can proceed separately. Intergen and Sempra stated that if the FERC had chosen not to grant a Presidential permit for the gas pipeline, the power plants would operate by using alternate fuel sources.

North Baja Pipeline, LLC, submitted information to FERC indicating that the gas pipeline would be a viable project even without the Intergen and Sempra power plants.

A commentator suggested that a 50-year comprehensive cumulative impact assessment be conducted as part of the EIS. This EIS does contain a cumulative analysis (Chapter 5). CEQ guidance (1997b) on conducting cumulative impact assessments states that projects be reasonably foreseeable. DOE and BLM believe that reasonably foreseeable projects tend to have a planning period of 10 years or less. Projects that may be developed during a 50-year period and beyond a 10-year planning horizon are too speculative to be considered reasonably foreseeable.

A commentator requested that a national policy be developed to define the minimum distance that transmission lines can be constructed relative to gas pipelines. It is not the purpose of this EIS to consider such a national policy; therefore, this issue is outside the scope of the EIS.

Commentors requested that information pertaining to emergency outage plans and homeland security issues be examined as part of the EIS. The development of emergency outage response plans is the purview of local public safety officials and is outside the scope of the EIS. The proposed transmission lines and power plants present no greater target for terrorists than any other high-voltage transmission lines or power plants in the United States. Also, outside of the NEPA process, DOE will perform an electric reliability study to ensure that the existing U.S. power supply system would remain fully operational upon the sudden loss of power, regardless of the cause of the outage.

1.4 ORGANIZATION OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This Imperial-Mexicali 230-kV Transmission Lines Projects EIS consists of 14 chapters and 9 appendixes. Brief summaries of the main components of the EIS follow:

- Chapter 1 introduces the EIS, discussing pertinent background information; the purpose of and need for the DOE, BLM, and applicant actions; public participation; and EIS organization.
- Chapter 2 defines the alternatives considered in the EIS.
- Chapter 3 discusses the environmental setting in the project area.
- Chapter 4 discusses the potential environmental impacts of the alternatives.
- Chapter 5 discusses the potential cumulative impacts.
- Chapter 6 identifies the unavoidable adverse impacts.
- Chapter 7 discusses the major irreversible and irretrievable commitments of natural and man-made resources.

- Chapter 8 discusses the relationship between short-term use of the environment and long-term productivity.
- Chapter 9 identifies the major laws, regulations, and other applicable requirements.
- Chapter 10 provides a list of agencies and individuals contacted during preparation of this EIS.
- Chapter 11 is an alphabetical listing of the references cited in the main text of the EIS.
- Chapter 12 lists the name, education, and experience of persons who helped prepare the EIS. Also included are the subject areas for which each preparer was responsible.
- Chapter 13 presents brief definitions of the technical terminology used in the EIS.
- Chapter 14 is a subject matter index that provides the page numbers where important terms and concepts are discussed.
- Appendix A contains copies of the court orders.
- Appendix B summarizes the comments received during public scoping.
- Appendix C is an index for major issues that arose in scoping, in court declarations, and in court orders, and that have been addressed in the EIS.
- Appendix D presents ambient air quality data used in preparing this EIS.
- Appendix E contains copies of consultation letters regarding the preparation of this EIS that were sent to and received from Federal and State agencies.
- Appendix F discusses water modeling used to support calculations for assessing water resource impacts.
- Appendix G provides data in support of the air quality analysis.
- Appendix H contains the health risk assessment for the proposed projects.
- Appendix I contains the contractor disclosure statements.