





**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
<b>Soils</b>	<p><b>All Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any proposed ground disturbance would result in disruption of soils and potential soil erosion, compaction, reduced productivity, and/or loss of topsoil. The Proposed Action would involve disturbance of about 621 acres of land surface, of which 229 acres would be permanently disturbed. Implementation of the proposed reclamation plans and erosion control measures, plus other measures such as limiting grading and access road building, and use of the directional drilling option, would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.</li> <li>With implementation of the proposed Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and provisions for surface water diversion at the power plant site, no significant impacts would result from stormwater runoff.</li> <li>There would be no significant adverse impacts associated with the installation of the optical ground wire, since the ground disturbance at the pulling and tensioning sites would be minimal, on areas already disturbed, and subject to reclamation and erosion control measures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The potential for significant impacts exists where highly erodible soils coincide with steep slopes (greater than 20 percent). These locations would be avoided during siting of the final alignment and/or be adequately mitigated, such that impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. (There are four such areas</li> </ul>	Same as Proposed Action, except that areas of steep slope plus erodible soils could more easily be avoided.	Same as Proposed Action; contains some areas along corridor segments T2, T3, and C1 where it may be difficult to avoid areas of steep slopes and erodible soils. This route also may cross exposures of soils that uniquely support the Arizona cliffrose. Mitigation includes measures to avoid impacts on this plant species.	The 26 acres of soil disturbed for construction of the production and monitoring wells used during testing and associated well pads and access roads would remain.

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>located in corridor segments R1, C3, T4, and the T2-T3-C1 interchange. The area in the intersection of corridor segments T2, C1, and T3 would be the most difficult to avoid, since it appears to extend across the entire corridor.)</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts are expected with implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts.</p>			
<b>Groundwater</b>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities</b> <b>Groundwater Quantity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater modeling conducted for this Draft EIS predicted that without flow augmentation, water levels in the shallow groundwater could drop by less than 1 foot, and surface water could be reduced. However, the Proposed Action contains measures designed to monitor groundwater levels and provide water to augment shallow groundwater and surface water flows in the Big Sandy River sufficient to prevent changes to these hydrologic systems which may otherwise occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, no changes to shallow groundwater levels or surface water flows in the Big Sandy River are predicted as a result of the Project.</li> <li>• There likely would be a reduction and eventual elimination of water discharged from Cofer Hot Spring. The Proposed Action includes measures to provide compensation to the landowner; however, the loss of the spring would be considered a significant impact.</li> </ul>	Same as Proposed Action	Same as Proposed Action	The groundwater production and monitoring wells used to identify and test the lower aquifer would remain.

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p><b><i>Groundwater Quality</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant impacts from the Proposed Action are expected, given the construction of the evaporation ponds and lack of other sources of groundwater contamination associated with the proposed Project.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline and Communication Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts on groundwater quality or quantity would be expected from these Project elements.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> The loss of Cofer Hot Spring would be a significant adverse impact. With the implementation of the actions proposed to reduce or prevent adverse impacts and other mitigation, no other significant impacts would be expected.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	
<b>Surface Water</b>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities</b> <b><i>Surface Water Flows</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groundwater modeling conducted for this Draft EIS predicted that without flow augmentation, water levels in the shallow groundwater could drop by less than 1 foot, and surface water could be reduced. However, the Proposed Action contains measures designed to monitor groundwater levels and provide water to augment shallow groundwater and surface water flows in the Big Sandy River sufficient to prevent changes to these hydrologic systems which may otherwise occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, no changes to shallow groundwater levels or surface water flows in the Big Sandy River are predicted as a result of the Project.</li> </ul>	Same as Proposed Action	Same as Proposed Action	No impacts

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p><b><i>Surface Water Quality</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The power plant would be a zero discharge facility with no significant impacts on surface water quality. Onsite stormwater generation would be collected and routed to lined evaporation ponds. Offsite stormwater would be routed around the facility and returned to natural drainages using standard erosion control structures.</li> <li>• Agricultural activities should not have a significant impact on surface water quality of the Big Sandy River basin or downstream watercourses. The agricultural area would be operated in a fashion that minimizes the potential for runoff of irrigation water, applied chemicals, and fine-grained soils to surface waters.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Surface Water Rights</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owners of surface water rights along the Big Sandy River downstream of Granite Gorge would not be impacted because no reduction in surface water flow is predicted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline and Access Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of the pipeline and access road across washes or the Big Sandy River likely would cause a temporary, minor, less than significant impact on surface water quality, including increased sedimentation and turbidity with implementation of proposed construction practices and erosion and sedimentation control measures. Special procedures are included in the</li> </ul>			

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>Proposed Action to minimize impacts of the pipeline crossing caused by trenching on the Big Sandy River. Directional drilling under the Big Sandy River would further minimize or eliminate these water quality impacts.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts are expected with the implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts and mitigation.</p>			
<b>Floodplains</b>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the proposed power plant and associated facilities are located outside the 100-and 500-year floodplain zone, no impacts are predicted. Culverts installed along the proposed access road would allow for adequate flows under the road; no significant impacts on floodplains are predicted.</li> <li>• Impacts to floodplains along the optical ground wire route would be eliminated because the area needed for pulling/tensioning sites is small and floodplains could be avoided.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pipeline would cross numerous 100-year floodplains; actual total would depend on final alignment selected within corridor. Temporary disturbance of these floodplains and downstream areas would occur during pipeline installation. With the implementation of proposed erosion and sedimentation control measures, impacts would be reduced to minor, insignificant levels.</li> <li>• If the directional drilling option were selected</li> </ul>	<p><b>All Elements</b>-Same as Proposed Action; possibly would have more floodplain crossings.</p>	<p><b>All Elements</b>-Same as Proposed Action; possibly would have fewer floodplain crossings; directional drilling under the Big Sandy River would not be an option.</p>	<p>No impacts</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>for crossing the Big Sandy River, adverse impacts would be further minimized or eliminated.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts are expected with the implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action without the directional drilling option</p>	
<b>Land Use and Access</b>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant adverse land use impacts would be expected, since there would be conformance with existing zoning, County land use plans, and County transportation planning, and no impacts are expected on residences or businesses.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed pipeline would generally follow existing utility corridor and road rights-of-way. Several residences and businesses are located along these routes, especially fronting the road rights-of-way. Any potential conflict with existing residences or businesses could be avoided by adjusting the final alignment within the proposed corridor to avoid these uses or by providing compensation. Also, potential impacts to the Carrow-Stephens ACEC could be avoided. Construction adjacent to any residence or business is completed within three to five workdays, and impacts would not be considered significant.</li> </ul>	<p>Similar to Proposed Action, but with possibly more potential conflict with use of roads being used or followed. Also, there is more potential for conflict with residences and use of the ACEC along Segment R4 and less space to make adjustments within Segments R2 and R3.</p>	<p>Similar to Proposed Action, but with possibly more difficult access and installation along Segment T5, due to rugged topography. However, there would be fewer residences and businesses to avoid and there would be no potential conflicts with road use during construction.</p>	No impacts

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p><b>Communication Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary communication facilities would be located within the plant site and on existing facilities, causing no adverse impacts to land uses. The optical ground wire option, if installed, would occur within existing right-of-way and on existing transmission line structures, and involve only short-term and limited disturbance; therefore, no adverse impacts to land use would be expected.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts are expected with the implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action but with slightly higher potential for conflicts with existing residences and businesses near roadways</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action, but with slightly less potential for conflicts with residences and businesses primarily due to use of Segment T5</p>	
<b>Grazing Management</b>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To avoid significant impacts from the loss of flow from Cofer Hot Spring, the Proposed Action would provide compensation by replacing the lost stock water using shallow well water.</li> <li>Land available for grazing would be permanently reduced by the forage available for grazing by about one cow and calf for four months. This is a small reduction in forage availability (about 1 percent) and does not constitute a significant impact on livestock production.</li> <li>The Proposed Action includes measures to maintain all range improvements, thereby avoiding significant impacts from loss or damage to these improvements.</li> </ul>	<p><b>All Elements</b> Similar to Proposed Action, except that pipeline construction would permanently disturb 47 acres.</p>	<p><b>All Elements</b> Similar to Proposed Action, except that pipeline construction would permanently disturb 45 acres.</p>	<p>The 26 acres of grazing lands already disturbed for construction of the production and monitoring wells constructed for testing the groundwater aquifers, and the well pads, and well access roads would remain disturbed.</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actions included in Proposed Action would ensure that any range improvement facilities would be maintained during pipeline construction.</li> <li>• Livestock production on land crossed by the pipeline would not be significantly impacted by construction activities because only 48 acres would be permanently disturbed, and the reseeding done per the proposed reclamation plans would restore forage production on other disturbed land.</li> <li>• No significant land disturbance would be expected on BLM grazing allotments along the pipeline during construction.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts are expected with the implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	
<p><b>Recreation, Wilderness, and Visual Resources</b></p>	<p><b>All Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on recreation resources and wildernesses would be low and less than significant over the life of the Project, since there would be a relatively small increase in population and no discernible impacts to visibility in wilderness areas included in the analysis.</li> <li>• Permanent effects on visual resources would be noticeable to co-dominant for the power plant, due to the surface disturbance, introduction of additional industrial facilities into foothill landscapes, intermittent water vapor plumes, and night lighting. Impacts would be low to</li> </ul>	<p>Same as Proposed Action, but with more impacts on viewers (residents and travelers) along roads during pipeline construction.</p>	<p>Same as Proposed Action, but with more impacts on viewers along the path of transmission lines during pipeline construction.</p>	<p>No impacts</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>moderate and less than significant after the application of measures to reduce impacts and due to the presence of a BLM-designated utility corridor.</p> <p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The pipeline would result in low to moderate impacts, since it would generally follow existing rights-of-way with roads and transmission lines, which would reduce the effect of the intrusion of the pipeline into the landscape. Also, application of reclamation measures would reduce the visual contrast of the pipeline with the surroundings. Short-term impacts would result from the visibility of equipment and dust related to the construction process, especially in view of populated areas. These impacts would be reduced by dust control measures included in the Proposed Action and would be moderate and less than significant.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts are expected with the implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts</p>			
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	<p><b>Carrow-Stephens Ranches Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)</b> <b>Pipeline (Corridor Segment T4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An alignment within the corridor to avoid the ACEC would reduce impacts to less than significant. An alignment within the ACEC would require the removal of native plants, which is not consistent with BLM Prescription 10 and would result in a significant impact.</li> </ul>	Corridor segment R4 crosses the ACEC where the ACEC cannot be avoided. If the pipeline is not placed within the US 93 right-of-way, significant impacts would occur because of the proximity of the pipeline to historic buildings, the	Same as Proposed Action	No impacts

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p><b><i>Communication Facilities</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An optical ground wire installation pad may be required within the ACEC. One pad may result a small amount of land disturbance within an existing transmission line right-of-way, away from vegetation, and Section 106 protection provisions would apply, thus limiting impacts to low and less than significant levels.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Three Rivers Riparian ACEC Power Plant and Associated Facilities</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groundwater modeling conducted for this Draft EIS predicted that without flow augmentation, water levels in the shallow groundwater could drop by less than 1 foot, and surface water could be reduced. However, the Proposed Action contains measures designed to monitor groundwater levels and provide water to augment shallow groundwater and surface water flows in the Big Sandy River sufficient to prevent changes to these hydrologic systems which may otherwise occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, no changes to shallow groundwater levels or surface water flows in the Big Sandy River are predicted as a result of the Project.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts would occur with mitigation consisting of avoiding the Carrow-Stephens Ranches ACEC.</p>	<p>cemetery, and inconsistency with the BLM objectives for the ACEC. Any direct impact on graves would be a significant impact. Also, the removal of vegetation within the ACEC would be a significant impact, even with reclamation.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> At Carrow-Stephens ACEC, significant impact would occur due to removal of native plants, and potential for other significant impacts exists. For Three Rivers Riparian ACEC, same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
<b>Vegetation</b>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction and operation of the plant and associated facilities would result in the permanent loss of 181 acres of Sonoran desert scrub, previously disturbed by livestock grazing, which would not be a significant impact on a regional level. Loss of xeroriparian vegetation in drainages could result in significant impact, but losses would be replaced through revegetation and reclamation efforts defined in reclamation plan(s). In all areas, measures in the proposed reclamation plan would reduce loss of state-protected plants and may promote re-vegetation of temporary disturbed areas.</li> <li>Sites for installation of the optical ground wire (5 acres) would be temporarily disturbed and reclaimed per proposed reclamation plans, which would minimize adverse impacts.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction would result in disturbance of approximately 406 acres, of which 48 acres would remain permanently disturbed due to need for access over pipeline.</li> <li>Disturbance of vegetation and xeroriparian vegetation along pipeline would be primarily temporary and would not result in significant impacts, as long as reclamation plans are successful.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts are expected with the implementation of proposed actions and mitigation to reduce or prevent adverse impacts.</p>	<p>Similar to Proposed Action. Pipeline would involve disturbance of approximately 393 acres, of which 47 acres would remain permanently disturbed. As with Proposed Action, most disturbances would be temporary and would not result in significant impacts, as long as reclamation plans are successful and no permanent loss of xeroriparian vegetation would occur.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p>Similar to Proposed Action. Pipeline would involve disturbance of approximately 418 acres, of which 45 acres would remain permanently disturbed. As with Proposed Action, most disturbances would be temporary and would not result in significant impacts, as long as reclamation plans are successful and no permanent loss of xeroriparian vegetation would occur.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p>The loss of vegetation (Sonoran desert scrub) from construction of the production and monitoring well pads and access roads would remain.</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
<p><b>Wetlands, Riparian Areas, and Waters of the United States</b></p>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities</b> <i>Wetlands and Riparian Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The layout of the Proposed Action would avoid direct impacts to the wetland on the plant site, and implementation of erosion control measures included in the Proposed Action would keep indirect impacts to a low, insignificant level. No long-term impacts are expected.</li> <li>• The reduction in flow to Cofer Hot Spring would dry up a small wetland in that area, resulting in a significant impact.</li> <li>• The Proposed Action contains measures designed to prevent changes to the wetland/marsh upstream of Granite Gorge in the Big Sandy River.</li> </ul> <p><i>Waters of the United States</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The combined direct impact on waters of the United States from the proposed power plant and associated facilities would be a loss of approximately 5 acres. There would be no impacts on waters associated with the optical ground wire installation or microwave dish installation. No indirect impacts to downstream waters would be expected with the implementation of the surface water diversions, and erosion and sedimentation control measures included in the Proposed Action.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline</b> <i>Wetlands and Riparian Areas</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If trenching is used to cross the Big Sandy River wetland and riparian area, there would be</li> </ul>	<p>Same as Proposed Action, except with approximately 11 acres of direct impact (loss) on waters of the United States for the pipeline route</p>	<p>Same as Proposed Action, except with approximately 6 acres of direct impacts (loss) on waters of the United States</p>	<p>No impacts</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>temporary impacts on about 1.4 acres of wetland and riparian vegetation. Proposed erosion and sedimentation control and reclamation measures included in the Proposed Action would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. If the directional drilling option is used, then no impacts would be expected.</p> <p><b><i>Waters of the United States</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of the proposed pipeline would result in approximately 8 acres of direct impacts on waters of the United States. Impacts would be on “functions” of these waters discussed in other sections of this Draft EIS.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Significant impacts would occur because of the loss of the Cofer Hot Spring wetland. Otherwise, impacts to wetlands would be less than significant, with the implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts and mitigation.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	
<b>Fisheries and Wildlife</b>	<p><b>All Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction and operation activities would result in loss of habitat and some direct mortality of wildlife. The following significant impacts may occur:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The loss of one active zone-tailed hawk, common black hawk, ferruginous hawk, Swainson’s hawk, or golden eagle nest, or loss of two or more nests of any other raptor species, which would be significant. Preconstruction surveys and the additional mitigation of working around nests and</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Same as Proposed Action	Same as Proposed Action, except there would be no or limited short-term impact to aquatic habitat in the Big Sandy from pipeline construction, since the river has no perennial flow at the Alternative T crossing area.	The 26 acres of wildlife habitat already disturbed for construction of the production and monitoring wells constructed for testing the groundwater aquifers would remain.

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>fledging periods would help to reduce the likelihood of these losses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Mitigation, including habitat management practices to limit bird and other wildlife use of the ponds, use of fences around the ponds, and monitoring programs for waterfowl use and water chemistry would help reduce the potential impacts of wildlife exposure to toxic levels of contaminants in the evaporation ponds to less than significant;</li> <li>3. Mortality of migratory birds using the evaporation ponds as a result of collision with the nearby transmission lines or from the chemicals used on the agricultural area would be reduced by the implementation of measures to exclude birds from the ponds and/or increase visibility of the transmission lines. However, incidental loss of any migratory bird without a permit would be significant.</li> <li>4. Preconstruction surveys would help identify migratory bird nests, eggs, or nestlings. However, incidental loss of any migratory bird without a permit would be significant.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional adverse (but less than significant) impacts that would be expected include direct mortality of fossorial mammals and reptiles from construction activities; mortality of small mammals and reptiles that would fall into the pipeline trench or attempt to cross the access road; interruption of breeding or foraging activities of birds and other mammals in</li> </ul>			

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>proximity to construction activities; interruption of movement of large mammals during construction hours; substrate disturbance and turbidity on fish and other aquatic communities from construction near or in the Big Sandy River; permanent loss of breeding and foraging areas for species that use Arizona Upland vegetation; and long-term loss of habitat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There would be no impacts expected on aquatic species from groundwater withdrawal, and no loss of habitat for riparian species near the plant site would be expected. After reclamation is conducted in all temporarily disturbed areas, there should be no long-term impacts on aquatic resources.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Significant impacts could occur only due to violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, stemming from the accidental collision of birds with transmission lines or disruptional loss of nests.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	
<p><b>Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Other Special Status Species</b></p>	<p><b>All Elements</b> <b><i>Southwestern Willow Flycatcher</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No direct or indirect impacts at plant site would occur. Groundwater modeling conducted for this Draft EIS predicted that without flow augmentation, water levels in the shallow groundwater could drop by less than 1 foot, and surface water could be reduced. However, the Proposed Action contains measures designed to monitor groundwater levels and provide water to augment shallow groundwater and surface water flows in the Big Sandy River sufficient to prevent changes to these hydrologic systems</li> </ul>	<p>Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p>Similar to Proposed Action, except that this alternative does not cross the Big Sandy River in an area of perennial water with associated riparian habitat; therefore, there would be no impacts from construction on southwestern willow flycatcher, and there would be fewer adverse</p>	<p>No impacts</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>which may otherwise occur as a result of the Project. Therefore, no changes to shallow groundwater levels or surface water flows in the Big Sandy River are predicted as a result of the Project. Therefore, no impacts on southwestern willow flycatcher habitat from groundwater pumping is expected. Impacts would occur along corridor segment R5 if trenching is used for crossing the Big Sandy River, due to removal of riparian vegetation (a direct habitat loss and an opportunity for increase in brood parasitism by cowbirds).</p> <p><b><i>Bald Eagle</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proposed Action is unlikely to result in any impacts because of the lack of roosting sites and the eagle's known tolerance to noise. Adverse impacts that could occur in the unlikely event that eagles feed on any waterfowl contaminated by ingesting toxic compounds from the evaporation ponds and /or collision with the transmission line near the ponds would be reduced by measures to avoid waterfowl use of the ponds and pond toxicity.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Yuma Clapper Rail</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts would be expected.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Arizona Cliffrose</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts would occur, since the Proposed Action would not affect any known population and surveys would be required prior to</li> </ul>		<p>impacts expected on amphibians and fish.</p>	

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>construction to detect and avoid any identified populations.</p> <p><b><i>Other Special Status Species – Bats, Birds, Reptiles, Amphibians Fish, Plants</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With pre-construction surveys, anticipated daytime construction, avoidance of sensitive areas by making adjustments in the pipeline route, and implementing the planned reclamation and wildlife protection measures contained in the Proposed Action, there may be minor adverse or short-term impacts, but no significant impacts would occur.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Impacts could occur to the southwestern willow flycatcher because of riparian habitat loss at the Big Sandy River crossing that cannot be avoided or eliminated. Impacts also could occur from bald eagle collisions with transmission lines. The final determination of impact significance will be made through consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the completion of a Biological Assessment, which will be incorporated into the Final EIS. Impacts on sensitive species would be below the level of significance.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Similar to Proposed Action except that there would be no potential for southwestern willow flycatcher – no significant impacts would be expected.</p>	
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction activities would destroy part of one archaeological site; adverse effects to informational values can be adequately mitigated by data recovery studies pursuant to the Section 106 programmatic agreement.</li> <li>Intrusion of the plant into the traditional cultural landscape of the Hualapai Tribe would be a</li> </ul>	Same as Proposed Action	Same as Proposed Action	No impacts

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>significant impact. Even with implementation of mitigation measures, significant impacts would remain.</p> <p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential exists for adverse impacts on archeological and historical sites located within the corridor, depending on the alignment selected. Section 106 programmatic agreement surveys and avoidance or mitigation measures would be implemented along the final alignment. These measures would adequately mitigate impacts on informational values, but the Hualapai Tribe would consider residual impacts on the traditional Hualapai cultural landscape and archaeological sites to be significant.</li> </ul> <p><b>Communication Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction activities associated with the primary or redundant communication systems are not expected to result in adverse effects, but would be reviewed and treated in accordance with the Section 106 programmatic agreement.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Potential impacts are expected to be “adverse” per NHPA regulations, and the disruption to the traditional cultural setting of the Big Sandy Valley represents a significant impact. Impacts on informational values can be adequately mitigated through implementation of treatment measures in accordance with a Section 106 programmatic agreement. Although mitigation measures will</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	reduce the level of impacts on the traditional Hualapai cultural landscape and related archaeological sites, residual impacts would be considered significant.			
<b>Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice</b>	<p><b>Population</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Temporary population increases would occur with construction of the Project, the pipeline, and the access road. A permanent population increase is expected for the operation of the plant, which would be noticeable, but would not be significant or disruptive to the community.</li> <li>• Changes to quality of life in Wikieup would be temporary and not substantial or significant.</li> <li>• Construction and operation of Project including the agricultural development, would increase short-term and long-term employment in Mohave County, a beneficial impact. Since a natural gas connection in Wikieup is uncertain and not under the control of this Project, no impacts can be predicted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Quality of Life</b> – Adverse impacts would be temporary and not significant.</p> <p><b>Employment</b> – The Project would increase short-term and long-term employment in Mohave county, a beneficial but not significant impact; there may be increases in worker salaries and wages.</p> <p><b>Taxes</b> – Taxes paid by the Project would be a beneficial impact on the community, but real estate taxes on houses may increase if housing prices increase.</p>	Same as Proposed Action	Same as Proposed Action	No impacts

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p><b>Education</b> – Construction of the plant would not cause adverse effects on the Mohave County schools since construction workers would most likely not bring families for the duration of the construction period.</p> <p><b>Housing</b> – There would be a temporary demand for housing, but no significant impacts would be expected.</p> <p><b>Health Care, Fire Protection, Law Enforcement</b> – No significant impacts would be expected, since the plant would supply its own fire and security services and adequate health care exists in the area.</p> <p><b>Low Income and Minority Populations</b> – A disproportionate environmental justice impact would not occur because the region is rural and sparsely populated with scattered residences .</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts expected with the implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action</p>	
<p><b>Public Safety and Services</b></p>	<p><b>Power Plant and Associated Facilities Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional adverse impacts would occur. The proposed interconnection, substation, and power plant would create EMF within some areas that are not currently subjected to fields. The proposed new transmission line connection segments would generate EMF at the same strengths of the Mead-Phoenix Project 500-kV</li> </ul>	<p><b>EMF</b> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p><b>EMF</b> Same as Proposed Action</p>	<p>No impacts</p>

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p>transmission line. The Proposed Action would not lead to increase in EMF exposures because the line is in a location generally inaccessible to the public.</p> <p><b>Safety Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term minor traffic increases on US 93 and I-40 would occur due to plant construction. Traffic increases would be noticeable during plant construction and operation. The increases would not be significant and would not result in downgrading the Level of Service for either I-40 or US 93.</li> <li>• Oversized loads would require an oversize load permit. Strict compliance with all provisions of the permit and close coordination with ADOT and provision of turnouts would ensure that significant traffic impacts would not occur.</li> </ul> <p><b>All Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proper measures would be taken to ensure public health and safety as well as worker safety in both the construction and operation of the plant and pipeline.</li> <li>• No additional demands for county public services would result from the construction and operation of the plant or pipeline because the Proposed Action would include all necessary utilities, including fire, security, water, wastewater disposal, and emergency medical care.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Safety Issues</b></p> <p>Effects on traffic are similar to the Proposed Action but potentially more disruptive, since it includes use of Segment R3 and R4, which are also used for equipment deliveries and by commuters.</p>	<p><b>Safety Issues</b></p> <p>Effects on traffic are less than Proposed Action, or Alternative R as Alternative T pipeline construction would take place parallel to a transmission line and not in close proximity to US 93. Other safety issues are the same as the Proposed Action.</p>	

**TABLE S-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES BY ALTERNATIVE**

Affected Environment	Proposed Action	Alternative R Gas Pipeline Corridor	Alternative T Gas Pipeline Corridor	No Action
	<p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proposed Action includes routine maintenance, aerial pipeline patrols, and leak inspection, which would reduce or eliminate potential impacts related to safety.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts are expected with the implementation of proposed actions to reduce or prevent adverse impacts.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	
<b>Noise</b>	<p><b>Power Plant</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During plant operations, sound levels at closest residence would be approximately 54dBA Ldn, and no significant impacts would be expected.</li> </ul> <p><b>All Elements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction activities would result in temporary increases in noise levels in vicinity of construction activity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pipeline</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensitive receptors along the proposed pipeline (residences, businesses ) would experience short-term and temporary noise from construction during weekday daylight hours, although these impacts are not expected to be significant.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No significant impacts expected with the implementation of actions proposed to reduce or prevent adverse impacts.</p>	<p><b>All Elements</b></p> <p>Similar to Proposed Action, but includes more sensitive receptors along corridor segments R3 and R4; would also impact Carrow-Stephens ACEC users.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p><b>All Elements</b></p> <p>Similar to Proposed Action, but with more residences along corridor segment T5 along river and along US 93.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Same as Proposed Action.</p>	No impacts