

# DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

## River Management Alternatives for the Rio Grande Canalization Project

*Prepared for:*

**United States Section  
International Boundary and  
Water Commission**  
El Paso, Texas



*Cooperating Agency:*

**U.S. Department of the  
Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation**



**December 2003**

*Prepared by:*

**PARSONS**  
Austin, Texas

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**River Management Alternatives for the  
Rio Grande Canalization Project**

*Prepared for:*

**UNITED STATES SECTION,  
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION**

The Commons, Building C, Suite 100  
4171 North Mesa Street  
El Paso, TX 79902-1441

*In Cooperation with:*

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, ALBUQUERQUE AREA OFFICE**  
Albuquerque, New Mexico

*Prepared by:*

**PARSONS**  
Austin, Texas

**December 2003**

## **Cover Sheet**

**RIVER MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR THE RIO GRANDE CANALIZATION PROJECT**

**(X) Draft    () Final**

**Lead Agency**

United States Section, International  
Boundary and Water Commission,  
United States and Mexico (USIBWC)  
El Paso, Texas

**Cooperating Agency**

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau  
of Reclamation (USBR)  
Albuquerque Area Office, Albuquerque,  
New Mexico

**Abstract**

The USIBWC is evaluating long-term river management alternatives for the Rio Grande Canalization Project (RGCP), a 105.4-mile narrow river corridor that extends from below Percha Dam in Sierra County, New Mexico to American Dam in El Paso, Texas. The RGCP, operated and maintained by the USIBWC since its completion in 1944, facilitates water deliveries and provides flood control.

The No Action Alternative and three action alternatives are evaluated in the Draft EIS. The alternatives were developed in a manner that enhances and restores the riparian ecosystem while maintaining the flood control and water delivery requirements of the RGCP. Alternatives formulation was the result of a three-year public consultation process that included regulatory agencies, irrigation districts, and environmental organizations.

Measures under consideration as part of the alternatives include grazing leases modification to improve erosion control, changes in floodway vegetation management, riparian restoration and aquatic habitat diversification. The USIBWC will select a preferred

alternative following the public comment period on the Draft EIS.

**Other Requirements Served**

This Draft EIS is intended to serve other environmental review and consultation requirements pursuant to:  
40 CFR 1502.25(a)

**Comments Submittal**

Comments on this Draft EIS should be directed to:

Mr. Douglas Echlin, Lead  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
Environmental Management Division,  
USIBWC  
4171 North Mesa Street, C-310  
El Paso, Texas 79902

**Date Draft EIS available to EPA and the Public:**

December 26, 2003

**Date by Which Comments on the Draft EIS Must be Received to be Considered in the Preparation of the Draft EIS:**

February 10, 2004

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### ***Purpose of and Need For Action***

The United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC) is evaluating long-term river management alternatives for the Rio Grande Canalization Project (RGCP), a narrow river corridor that extends 105.4 miles along the Rio Grande, from below Percha Dam in Sierra County, New Mexico to American Dam in El Paso, Texas. The RGCP, operated and maintained by the USIBWC since its completion in 1943, was constructed to facilitate water deliveries to the Rincon and Mesilla Valleys in New Mexico, El Paso Valley in Texas, and Juárez Valley in Mexico, and provide flood control. A levee system for flood control extends 57 and 74 miles over the right and left stream banks, respectively. Figure ES-1 shows the RGCP location.

The USIBWC currently implements operation and maintenance procedures to enhance ecosystem functions within the RGCP. However, the river and floodway will remain highly altered from events pre-dating RGCP construction. Thus, the USIBWC recognizes the need to accomplish flood control, water delivery, and operation and maintenance activities in a manner that enhances or restores the riparian ecosystem.

River management alternatives under consideration address practices such as stream bank stabilization, erosion reduction, and flood control as well as environmental measures intended to support restoration of native riparian vegetation and diversification of aquatic habitats along the RGCP. Potential effects of the alternatives are evaluated in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) prepared for agency and public review.

### ***Alternatives Considered in Detail***

Throughout an extended public consultation process, an interdisciplinary team considered several river management alternatives and selected four for detailed analysis. Features of these alternatives are described below. Alternatives were initially formulated in a March 2001 report issued following an 18-month stakeholder consultation period, and subsequently modified to address further input from representatives of regulatory agencies, irrigation districts, environmental organizations and the general public. A Reformulation of River Management Alternatives Report documenting those modifications and the rationale for their adoption was completed in August 2003 as the basis for the DEIS. The USIBWC will select an alternative for implementation after the public comments on the DEIS.

Table ES-1 presents a comparison of measures by management category for the No Action Alternative and three action alternatives. Levee rehabilitation is the core action of the Flood Control Improvement Alternative, along with changes in grazing leases to improve erosion control. These two measures apply to all action alternatives. Most other measures under consideration are associated with floodway management under the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative and Targeted River Restoration Alternative. The latter alternative also considers measures for aquatic habitat diversification such as modified dredging of arroyos and reopening of meanders, as well as riparian vegetation development by induced overbank flows.

### ***No-Action Alternative***

The No Action Alternative consists of continuing RGCP operation and maintenance activities as currently conducted by the USIBWC. Those activities are directed toward flood protection and water delivery, with some activities involving environmental improvements. Key features of this alternative are management of the levee system, floodway maintenance through mowing and grazing leases, maintenance of pilot channel and irrigation facilities, and sediment control and disposal.

Mowing of the floodway is conducted annually, or as circumstances warrant, to control weeds, brush, and tree growth, including salt cedar. The USIBWC administers a land lease program that covers approximately 43 percent of the RGCP floodway. Pilot channel maintenance is performed during non-irrigation periods when water levels are lowest by removing debris and deposits, including sand bars. The USIBWC is also responsible for maintaining five NRCS sediment control dams in tributary arroyos and associated access roads. The agency conducts dredging at the mouth of arroyos to maintain grade of the channel bed and ensure the channel conveys irrigation deliveries.

### ***Flood Control Improvement Alternative***


This alternative takes into consideration a potential increase in flood containment capacity. A 1996 hydraulic modeling study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) identified a number of potential deficiencies in the RGCP in the event of the 100-year storm event. Those findings were partially re-evaluated as part of the DEIS to include potential effects of environmental measures such as additional vegetation growth in the floodway. Most of the potential levee deficiencies were identified within urbanized reaches of the RGCP.

The assumption used for the DEIS was that existing levees would be raised to meet freeboard design criteria, and new levees would be constructed in unconfined areas where flood levels could extend past the ROW boundary. Based on this assumption, levee rehabilitation included 60.1 miles of levees needing a 2 feet average height increase, 6 miles of new levees, and a 2.8 mile floodwall in the Canutillo area. As part of this alternative the grazing lease management program would be modified to improve erosion control. The modified program would include a variety of vegetation treatments to control salt cedar in lease areas.

### ***Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative***

In addition to measures for flood control improvement and erosion protection, this alternative incorporates environmental measures within the floodway. All environmental measures would be limited to lands under USIBWC jurisdiction. A key feature of the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative is the development of a riparian corridor for bank stabilization and wildlife habitat by planting and stream bank reconfiguration at selected locations. Stream bank reconfiguration would allow overbank flows within the floodway to provide conditions suitable for establishment of native riparian species, particularly cottonwoods. Under this alternative, some currently mowed floodway vegetation would be managed to promote native grass development in combination with salt cedar control treatments.

J:\736\736620\GIS-Mapping\USIBWC\_location\_map\_fig1.mxd



SCALE = 1 : 1,000,000 or 1 INCH = 83,333 FEET  
UTM Zone 13 N / NAD 83



**Figure ES-1**  
**Location of the Rio Grande Canalization Project (RGCP)**

United States Section,  
International Boundary Water Commission  
December 2003

**Table ES-1 Comparison of Alternative Features**

Management Category	No Action Alternative	Flood Control Improvement Alternative	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative	Targeted River Restoration Alternative
Levee System Management	Routine levee and road maintenance	No change	No change	No change
	n/a	Levee system improvements	Levee system improvements	Levee system improvements
Floodway Management	Unmodified grazing leases	Modified leases for erosion control (3,552 ac)	Modified leases for erosion control (3,552 ac)	Modified leases for erosion control (3,493 ac)
	Continue seasonal mowing (4,657 ac)	No change	Continued mowing (2,674 ac)	Continued mowing (2,223 ac)
			Modified grassland management (1,641 ac)	Modified grassland management (1,641 ac)
			Native vegetation planting (223 ac)	Native vegetation planting (189 ac)
			Stream bank reconfiguration (127 ac)	Seasonal peak flows / bank preparation (516 ac)
n/a	n/a	n/a	Voluntary conservation easements (1,618 ac)	
Channel and Irrigation Facilities Management	Debris removal and channel protection	No change	No change	No change
	American Dam and irrigation structures maintenance	No change	No change	No change
	n/a	n/a	n/a	Reopening of six former meanders (147 ac)
Sediment Management	NRCS sediment dam maintenance	No change	No change	No change
	Sediment removal from arroyos / mitigation actions	No change	No change	Modified arroyo dredging for aquatic habitat (12 arroyos)
	Disposal from dredging channel within ROW*	Disposal mainly outside ROW*	Disposal mainly outside ROW*	Disposal mainly outside ROW*
	n/a	n/a	Disposal from environmental measure excavation inside ROW*	Disposal from environmental measure excavation inside ROW*

\* Right-of-way of the Rio Grande Canalization Project (lands under USIBWC jurisdiction)

### ***Targeted River Restoration Alternative***

This alternative emphasizes environmental measures associated with partial restoration of the RGCP, such as pulse flows to promote riparian corridor development, and opening of meanders and modification of arroyos to increase aquatic habitat diversification. This alternative includes measures previously identified for flood control improvement and modification of grazing leases.

Vegetation management for this alternative includes planting and enhancement of existing native woody vegetation, and modified grassland management, as previously indicated for the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative. These measures would be complemented by use of seasonal peak flows to promote natural regeneration of riparian bosque, and the use of conservation easements.

Seasonal peak flows are controlled water releases from Caballo Dam during high storage conditions in Elephant Butte Reservoir. Environmental measures would extend beyond the ROW through the use of voluntary conservation easements to preserve existing wildlife habitat and encourage native bosque development.

Re-establishment of six former meanders eliminated during construction of the RGCP would be conducted to diversify aquatic habitat, required for breeding and spawning of native fish species. In addition, dredging of some arroyos would be modified to create backwaters for additional diversification of aquatic habitats.

### ***Implementation Strategy***

*Program Management.* Use of adaptive management is anticipated in implementing river management alternatives. Adaptive management is a science-based decision process that will lead to better management through a systematic process of prediction, application, monitoring, feedback, and improvement.

It is envisioned that adaptive management would be implemented through coordination with the Paso del Norte Watershed Council established by the New Mexico-Texas Water Commission. The Council would serve in an advisory capacity regarding selection, planning, and implementation of environmental measures. It would also recommend policies for cooperation and sharing information concerning planning and management activities of other projects potentially affecting the operation and management of the RGCP. Guidance for future project needs and measures would be provided by an External Advisory Committee to obtain impartial, scientifically informed evaluations based on a long-term monitoring and evaluation program.

*Water Acquisition and Cooperative Programs.* Because a number of measures under consideration would result in water consumption, water rights acquisition and cooperation with the irrigation districts become critical elements in the viability and long-term sustainability of environmental measures. Given that the USIBWC does not likely have any water rights within the RGCP, options for acquisition were evaluated. Support of water conservation by financing on-farm water conservation programs was identified as the most viable strategy to secure water. Conservation programs would not only be consistent with stated interests and ongoing programs of the irrigation districts, but would

also facilitate seeking funds from high-priority state and federal programs. Cooperation agreements would be established with other agencies for increased sediment control at a watershed level, and to secure and manage voluntary conservation easements.

*Implementation Timetable.* Levee rehabilitation, improvements in erosion control, establishment of a riparian corridor and diversification of aquatic habitats are envisioned as long-term processes that will evolve as the effectiveness of individual projects are documented. A 20-year timeline was adopted for implementation of alternatives under consideration. During an initial 5-year phase, implementation plans would be developed and funded, agreements would be reached for interagency cooperation and water acquisition, selected projects would be tested at a pilot scale and monitoring conducted. Priority projects would be implemented during a second 5-year phase. A 10-year final phase would be used for implementation of the remaining projects.

### ***Potential Effects of the Alternatives***

Thirteen resource areas were evaluated to assess potential effects of the river management alternatives. For each resource area, evaluation criteria were identified and applied to the various measures under consideration. Table ES-2 presents a comparison of alternatives in terms of potential effects.

**Table ES-2 Summary Comparison of the Effects of the Alternatives**

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Flood Control Improvement Alternative	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative	Targeted River Restoration Alternative
Water Resources	<p>No-mow zones would be maintained, with a potential consumption of up to 35.3 ac-ft/yr (0.62 ft/yr water use over 57 acres).</p> <p>No effects on water delivery or water quality are anticipated as current practices would be maintained.</p>	<p>A potential 1,078 ac-ft/yr increase in water consumption due to environmental measures. Water consumption would increase 0.17 percent of the combined diversions of Rio Grande Project water along the RGCP.</p> <p>No impacts on water delivery are anticipated for levee system rehabilitation, or changes in grazing leases in uplands.</p> <p>Water quality could decrease in terms of total suspended solids during construction, but it would improve in the long-term by a reduced sediment load and lower nutrient input from grazing areas with improved vegetative cover.</p>	<p>A potential water consumption increase of 2,203 ac-ft/yr at the completion of the 20-year implementation period (0.36 percent of the combined water diversions along the RGCP).</p> <p>Development of riparian vegetation on stream banks would have a long-term positive effect on water delivery as cottonwood, once established, would provide stability to the stream bank. Short-term increases in debris and sediment in the river would be expected prior to establishment of vegetative cover.</p> <p>Water quality is likely to improve as more extensive vegetative cover on the RGCP floodway and uplands improve erosion control and nutrient release from grazing areas.</p>	<p>A potential for a water consumption increase of approximately 9,461 ac-ft/yr at the completion of the 20-year implementation period. This value would be equivalent to 1.55 percent of the combined water diversions along the RGCP.</p> <p>Effects on water delivery and water quality would be similar to those of the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative.</p>
Flood Control	<p>The risk of flooding and overtopping the levees from the 100-year flood would remain as currently quantified.</p>	<p>Additional protection would be provided to life and public and private property beyond that which is already provided by the existing levee system.</p>	<p>Similar to the Flood Control Improvement Alternative. There would also be a potential for a small reduction in flood containment capacity due to increased vegetation growth along the floodway.</p>	<p>Similar to the Flood Control Improvement Alternative. There would also be a potential for a small reduction in flood containment capacity due to increased vegetation growth along the floodway.</p>
Soils	<p>No change from baseline condition.</p>	<p>Levee rehabilitation would mobilize 898 ac-ft of soil for construction. Modified grazing leases would reduce uplands erosion 0.45 ac-ft annually and improved riparian conditions by reducing bank erosion and increasing ground cover.</p>	<p>Levee rehabilitation and modified grazing leases would result in similar effects as the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.</p> <p>An additional 157 ac-ft of soil would be displaced as a result of bank shave-downs. Mitigation procedures were established to reduce erosion.</p>	<p>Levee rehabilitation and modified grazing leases would result in similar effects as the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.</p> <p>An additional 300 ac-ft of soil would be displaced as a result of opening former meanders, excavating arroyos and scour during seasonal peak flows. Mitigation procedures were established to reduce erosion.</p>

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Flood Control Improvement Alternative	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative	Targeted River Restoration Alternative
Vegetation and Wetlands	No change from baseline condition.	<p>Modified grazing in uplands and riparian zones would affect 3,552 acres increasing plant species, richness and structural diversity. Levee construction would have a minor effect on vegetation communities.</p> <p>Mowing by USIBWC would continue at the same level as the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Effects of modified grazing leases and levee construction would be similar to the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.</p> <p>Mowing by USIBWC would be reduced by 1,983 acres.</p> <p>Restoration of 350 acres of native bosque by bank shavements and plantings, and development of native grasslands (1651 acres) would increase the amount of native vegetation within the ROW.</p> <p>Wetland areas would increase by 13 acres.</p>	<p>Effects of modified grazing leases and levee construction would be similar to the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.</p> <p>Mowing by USIBWC would be reduced by 2,434 acres.</p> <p>Restoration of 1,549 acres of native bosque by seasonal peak flows, opening meanders, plantings and development of native grasslands (1,029 acres) would increase the amount of native vegetation within and outside the ROW.</p> <p>Wetland areas would increase by 96 acres.</p> <p>Conservation easements would add 1,601 acres under management.</p>
Wildlife Habitat	No change from baseline condition.	<p>Wildlife habitat quality would increase 30% due to modified grazing in 3,552 acres of uplands and riparian areas. However, the majority of the ROW would continue to be considered as below average to poor wildlife quality due to mowing of vegetation.</p> <p>Construction associated with levee rehabilitation would be a short minor effect.</p> <p>Modification of salt cedar management in grazing leases methods would result in long-term beneficial effects.</p>	<p>Wildlife habitat quality would increase 51% due to modified grazing in 3,552 acres of uplands and riparian areas, and development of 350 acres of native bosque and 1,641 acres of native grassland.</p> <p>Construction associated with levee rehabilitation and environmental measures would be a short minor effect.</p> <p>Modification of salt cedar management in grazing leases methods would result in long-term beneficial effects.</p>	<p>Wildlife habitat quality would increase 72% due to modified grazing in 3,493 acres of uplands and riparian areas, and development of 1,549 acres of native bosque and 1,929 acres of native grassland. A total of 1,618 acres of conservation easements significantly increases the amount of high quality wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Construction associated with levee rehabilitation and environmental measures would be a short minor effect</p> <p>Modification of salt cedar management methods for grazing leases would result in long-term beneficial effects.</p>

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Flood Control Improvement Alternative	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative	Targeted River Restoration Alternative
Endangered and Other Special Status Species	No change from baseline condition.	Levee construction activities would not affect endangered and other special status species .  Modified grazing in uplands and riparian would benefit some species of concern (SOCs).	Levee rehabilitation and modified grazing leases would result in similar effects as the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.  Development of native bosque using bank shavements could potentially create suitable southwestern willow flycatcher habitat and benefit some SOCs.	Levee rehabilitation and modified grazing leases would result in similar effects as the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.  Development of native bosque along meanders could potentially create suitable southwestern willow flycatcher habitat and benefit some SOCs.  Suitable habitat for listed species may exist within conservation easements outside the ROW. Adverse effects would be entirely mitagable.
Aquatic Biota	No change from baseline condition.	No significant change from baseline condition would occur.  The RGCP would continue to be characterized as poor aquatic habitat, however modified grazing in the riparian area would beneficially effect stream bank stability, water quality and stream side vegetation.	No significant change from baseline condition would occur.  The RGCP would continue to be characterized as poor aquatic habitat, however modified grazing in the riparian area in conjunction with bosque development would beneficially effect stream bank stability, water quality and stream side vegetation.	Aquatic biota would be beneficially affected as a result of diversifying aquatic habitat through modified dredging of arroyos and opening former meanders. A total of 59 acres of backwater habitat would be developed. In addition, modified grazing in the riparian area and bosque development would beneficially effect stream bank stability, water quality and stream side vegetation.
Land Use	Land use in the potential area of influence would remain unaffected relative to current conditions.  Beneficial effects are expected from ongoing recreational initiatives.  The RGCP operation and maintenance would not change from the current practices.	Levee rehabilitation would be the only action with potential effects on land use adjacent to the RGCP. Up to 50 acres of the approximately 149 acres of borrow sites would be likely located in agricultural areas. Land use change would not be significant relative to 19,020 acres of farmlands in the potential area of influence.  Beneficial effects are expected from ongoing recreational initiatives.	Up to 50 acres of agricultural land would be needed as borrow sites. With implementation of an on-farm water conservation program, no other changes in land use are anticipated.  With direct purchase of water rights, environmental measure implementation could result in 734 acres of cropland retirement (3.9 percent of the potential 19,020 acres in the area of influence).  Beneficial effects are expected from ongoing recreational initiatives.	Conservation easements would affect up to 288 acres of cropland in addition to 50 acres of borrow sites. Current use would be maintained for another 1,330 acres of remnant bosques.  Without a water conservation program, environmental measure implementation could result in 3,154 acres of cropland retirement (16.6 percent of farmland in the area of influence).  Beneficial effects are expected from ongoing recreational initiatives.

Resource Area	No Action Alternative	Flood Control Improvement Alternative	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative	Targeted River Restoration Alternative
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	There would be no changes in population and housing, employment, or a disproportionate number of minority population affected	Similar to the No Action Alternative, except there would be additional short-term jobs as a result of levee rehabilitation activities.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, with the addition of short-term jobs as a result of an increase in construction activities. With on-farm conservation, no adverse effects on agricultural communities are anticipated.  For direct water acquisition, the potential annual loss in crop value would be approximately \$900,000.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, except there would be additional short-term jobs by increase in construction activities. With on-farm conservation, no adverse effects on agricultural communities are anticipated.  For direct water acquisition, the potential annual loss in crop value would be approximately \$4 million.
Cultural Resources	The No Action Alternative will not affect, or adversely affect, any architectural resources, traditional cultural properties or archaeological resources.	Similar to the No Action Alternative.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, except there would be a potential for undiscovered sites at two locations near shavedown projects.	Similar to the No Action Alternative, except there would be a potential for undiscovered sites at three sites located near arroyo or meander projects.
Air Quality	Emissions generating activities would be the same as the current ongoing activities.	Criteria pollutant increases in the Air Quality Control Region (AQCR) would range from 0.05 to 0.93 percent and would not be regionally significant.	Criteria pollutant increases in the AQCR would range from 0.01 to 1.25 percent and would not be regionally significant.	Criteria pollutant increases in the AQCR would range from 0.12 to 1.62 percent and would not be regionally significant.
Noise	Noise levels from existing maintenance and operation activities would not change relative to current conditions.	Similar to the No Action Alternative. Noise from additional construction activities would be intermittent and short-term in duration. Typical noise levels generated by these activities range from 75 to 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source.	Similar to the No Action Alternative. Noise from additional construction activities would be intermittent and short-term in duration. Typical noise levels generated by these activities range from 75 to 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source.	Similar to the No Action Alternative. Noise from additional construction activities would be intermittent and short-term in duration. Typical noise levels generated by these activities range from 75 to 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source.
Transportation	There would be no increases in traffic or adverse affect on a roadway's existing level of service (LOS).	The LOS of all listed roadways would not change from existing conditions.	The LOS of all listed roadways would not change from existing conditions.	The LOS of all listed roadways would not change from existing conditions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SECTION 1 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION.....	1-1
1.1.1 Proposed Action and Need .....	1-1
1.1.2 Criteria for Alternatives Formulation.....	1-2
1.1.3 Authority .....	1-3
1.2 BACKGROUND .....	1-3
1.2.1 USIBWC Organization and Mission .....	1-3
1.2.2 Rio Grande Canalization Project.....	1-7
1.3 DEIS PREPARATION.....	1-8
1.3.1 Memorandum of Understanding.....	1-8
1.3.2 Agency and Public Participation.....	1-9
1.3.3 Significant Issues by Resource Category .....	1-9
1.3.4 Opportunities and Constraints.....	1-12
1.3.5 Prior Environmental Evaluations and Support Documents .....	1-14
1.4 AUTHORITY AND INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT .....	1-15
1.5 SCOPE OF THE IMPACT ANALYSIS .....	1-16
1.6 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION .....	1-16
<b>SECTION 2 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY .....	2-1
2.2 THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE .....	2-1
2.2.1 Levee System Management .....	2-2
2.2.2 Floodway Management.....	2-5
2.2.3 Maintenance of Pilot Channel and Irrigation Facilities .....	2-6
2.2.4 Sediment Management.....	2-7
2.3 FLOOD CONTROL IMPROVEMENT ALTERNATIVE .....	2-8
2.3.1 Levee System Management .....	2-8
2.3.2 Floodway Management.....	2-10
2.3.3 Maintenance of Pilot Channel and Irrigation Facilities .....	2-11
2.3.4 Sediment Management.....	2-11
2.4 INTEGRATED USIBWC LAND MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVE .....	2-11
2.4.1 Levee System Management .....	2-12
2.4.2 Floodway Management.....	2-12
2.4.3 Maintenance of Pilot Channel and Irrigation Facilities .....	2-17
2.4.4 Sediment Management.....	2-17
2.5 TARGETED RIVER RESTORATION ALTERNATIVE.....	2-17
2.5.1 Levee System Management .....	2-18
2.5.2 Floodway Management.....	2-18
2.5.3 Maintenance of Pilot Channel and Irrigation Facilities .....	2-19
2.5.4 Sediment Management.....	2-20

---

---

2.6	PROJECTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE ALTERNATIVES .....	2-23
2.6.1	Linear Projects .....	2-23
2.6.2	Point Projects .....	2-24
2.6.3	Summary of Projects .....	2-26
2.7	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD.....	2-35
2.7.1	RGCP Partial Decommissioning Alternative .....	2-35
2.7.2	Multipurpose Watershed Management Alternative .....	2-35
2.7.3	Restoration Alternative Based on Non-Structural Flood Control .....	2-36
2.8	PROJECTS AND ACTIONS WITH POTENTIAL CUMULATIVE EFFECTS .....	2-39
2.8.1	Regional Water Management Plans .....	2-39
2.8.2	Analysis of Structural Condition of the Levees .....	2-39
2.9	IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY .....	2-40
2.9.1	Program Management .....	2-40
2.9.2	Water Acquisition .....	2-41
2.9.3	Cooperation Agreements .....	2-43
2.10	IMPLEMENTATION TIMETABLE .....	2-44
2.10.1	Linear Projects .....	2-45
2.10.2	Point Projects .....	2-46
2.11	CAPITAL COST EVALUATION .....	2-47
2.11.1	Flood Control Improvements.....	2-48
2.11.2	Environmental Measure Implementation.....	2-48
2.11.3	Water Acquisition .....	2-48
2.12	SUMMARY COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES AND EFFECTS .....	2-48
<b>SECTION 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT.....</b>		<b>3-1</b>
3.1	WATER RESOURCES.....	3-1
3.1.1	Water Consumption.....	3-1
3.1.2	Water Delivery.....	3-6
3.1.3	Water Quality.....	3-9
3.2	FLOOD CONTROL.....	3-11
3.2.1	Existing Flood Control .....	3-11
3.2.2	Flood Containment Capacity Evaluation .....	3-12
3.3	SOILS.....	3-15
3.3.1	Soil Characterization .....	3-15
3.3.2	Soil Distribution within the RGCP .....	3-17
3.3.3	Soil Erosion .....	3-17
3.4	VEGETATION AND WETLANDS .....	3-19
3.4.1	Ecological Region.....	3-19
3.4.2	Riparian Communities .....	3-19
3.4.3	Vegetation Communities Descriptions .....	3-24
3.4.4	Invasive Species .....	3-27
3.4.5	Vegetation Management within the ROW .....	3-28

---

3.5	WILDLIFE HABITAT .....	3-31
3.5.1	Quantification of Habitat Value.....	3-31
3.6	ENDANGERED AND OTHER SPECIAL STATUS WILDLIFE SPECIES .....	3-33
3.6.1	Threatened and Endangered Species .....	3-33
3.6.2	Species of Concern .....	3-33
3.7	AQUATIC BIOTA .....	3-37
3.7.1	Habitat Characterization.....	3-37
3.7.2	Habitat Suitability.....	3-37
3.7.3	Fish Species Composition.....	3-41
3.8	LAND USE .....	3-43
3.8.1	Land Use Analysis.....	3-43
3.8.2	Land Use Corridor.....	3-44
3.8.3	Recreational Use.....	3-45
3.9	SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE .....	3-52
3.9.1	Socioeconomic Criteria .....	3-52
3.9.2	Environmental Justice .....	3-56
3.10	CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	3-58
3.10.1	Architectural Resources .....	3-58
3.10.2	Traditional Cultural Properties.....	3-60
3.10.3	Archaeological Resources .....	3-60
3.10.4	Summary of Findings .....	3-63
3.11	AIR QUALITY.....	3-64
3.11.1	Air Pollutants and Regulations .....	3-64
3.11.2	Regional Air Quality.....	3-67
3.11.3	Baseline Air Emissions.....	3-67
3.12	NOISE.....	3-69
3.12.1	Guidelines .....	3-69
3.12.2	Baseline Noise Levels.....	3-70
3.13	TRANSPORTATION .....	3-71
<b>SECTION 4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES .....</b>		<b>4-1</b>
4.1	WATER RESOURCES.....	4-2
4.1.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-2
4.1.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-2
4.1.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-2
4.1.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-4
4.1.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-4
4.1.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative .....	4-5
4.2	FLOOD CONTROL.....	4-7
4.2.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-7
4.2.2	Summary of Effects .....	4-8
4.2.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-9
4.2.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-9

---

---

4.2.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-9
4.2.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative .....	4-10
4.3	SOILS.....	4-11
4.3.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-11
4.3.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-14
4.3.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-14
4.3.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-14
4.3.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-16
4.3.6	Targeted River Restoration .....	4-17
4.4	VEGETATION AND WETLANDS .....	4-18
4.4.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-18
4.4.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-23
4.4.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-23
4.4.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-25
4.4.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-27
4.4.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-29
4.5	WILDLIFE HABITAT .....	4-32
4.5.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-32
4.5.2	Summary of Effects.....	4-35
4.5.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-35
4.5.4	Flood Control Improvement.....	4-36
4.5.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-37
4.5.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-38
4.6	ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES OF CONCERN .....	4-40
4.6.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-40
4.6.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-42
4.6.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-43
4.6.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-43
4.6.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-44
4.6.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-45
4.7	AQUATIC BIOTA .....	4-46
4.7.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-46
4.7.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-47
4.7.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-48
4.7.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-48
4.7.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-48
4.7.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-48
4.8	LAND USE .....	4-49
4.8.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-49
4.8.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-50
4.8.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-50
4.8.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-51
4.8.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-51
4.8.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-52
4.9	SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.....	4-52
4.9.1	Method of Analysis .....	4-53
4.9.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-54

---

4.9.3	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-56
4.9.4	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-57
4.9.5	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-58
4.10	CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	4-59
4.10.1	Method of Analysis.....	4-60
4.10.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-61
4.10.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-61
4.10.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-62
4.10.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management.....	4-62
4.10.6	Targeted River Restoration .....	4-63
4.11	AIR QUALITY.....	4-65
4.11.1	Method of Analysis.....	4-65
4.11.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-67
4.11.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-67
4.11.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-68
4.11.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-71
4.11.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-72
4.12	NOISE.....	4-73
4.12.1	Method of Analysis.....	4-73
4.12.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-74
4.12.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-74
4.12.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-75
4.12.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-75
4.12.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-76
4.13	TRANSPORTATION .....	4-76
4.13.1	Method of Analysis.....	4-76
4.13.2	Summary of Potential Effects.....	4-77
4.13.3	No Action Alternative.....	4-77
4.13.4	Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-77
4.13.5	Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-79
4.13.6	Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-79
4.14	MITIGATION MEASURES .....	4-80
4.14.1	Water Resources.....	4-81
4.14.2	Flood Control and Soil Excavation .....	4-82
4.14.3	Biological Resources.....	4-82
4.14.4	Land Use, Socioeconomics and Cultural Resources.....	4-84
4.14.5	Air, Noise and Transportation .....	4-84
4.15	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.....	4-85
4.15.1	Regional Plans.....	4-86
4.15.2	Analysis of Structural Condition of the Levees .....	4-86
4.16	UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS .....	4-87
4.17	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SHORT-TERM USE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY .....	4-87
4.18	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES.....	4-88

---

---

<b>SECTION 5 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION</b> .....	<b>5-1</b>
5.1 DEIS PREPARATION OVERVIEW.....	5-1
5.1.1 Public Scoping Meetings.....	5-1
5.1.2 Consultation for Formulation of Alternatives.....	5-2
5.1.3 Reformulation of Alternatives.....	5-3
5.2 LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS.....	5-6
5.3 DISTRIBUTION LIST.....	5-8
<b>SECTION 6 GLOSSARY AND REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>6-1</b>
6.1 GLOSSARY.....	6-1
6.2 REFERENCES.....	6-9

**APPENDICES:**

Appendix A	River Management Unit Description
Appendix B	Flood Control Improvement Project Summary (USACE 1996)
Appendix C	Aquatic Habitat Evaluation
Appendix D	Scientific Name List
Appendix E	Flood Containment Capacity Analysis
Appendix F	Controlled Water Releases for Overbank Flows
Appendix G	Preliminary Cost Estimates for the Alternatives
Appendix H	Comments to the Reformulation Report and USIBWC Responses
Appendix I	Reformulation of Alternatives Report (Parsons 2003a; CD format)

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Location of the Rio Grande Canalization Project (RGCP) .....	1-5
Figure 1-2	Comparison of Current Channel and Pre-RGCP Conditions in the Rincon and Mesilla Valleys .....	1-6
Figure 2-1	Location of River Management Units .....	2-4
Figure 2-2	Magnitude of the 100-Year Flood along the RGCP Relative to Design Flow ....	2-5
Figure 2-3	Overbank Flow in the Upper Rincon Valley by Controlled Releases from Caballo Dam .....	2-21
Figure 2-4	Aquatic Habitat Diversification in the Upper Rincon Valley .....	2-22
Figure 2-5	Environmental Measures to be Implemented as Linear Projects .....	2-27
Figure 2-6	Distribution of Point Projects in the Rincon and Mesilla Valleys .....	2-28
Figure 2-7	Mile 105 Oxbow Restoration .....	2-29
Figure 2-8	Mile 104 Tipton Arroyo .....	2-29
Figure 2-9	Mile 103 Trujillo Arroyo .....	2-29
Figure 2-10	Mile 102 Montoya Arroyo .....	2-30
Figure 2-11	Mile 101 Holguin Arroyo .....	2-30
Figure 2-12	Mile 99 Green-Tierra Blanca .....	2-30
Figure 2-13	Mile 98 Sibley Point Bar .....	2-31
Figure 2-14	Mile 97 Jaralosa Arroyo .....	2-31
Figure 2-15	Mile 95 Jaralosa South .....	2-31
Figure 2-16	Mile 78 Mile 94 Yeso Arroyo .....	2-32
Figure 2-17	Mile 92 Crow Canyon .....	2-32
Figure 2-18	Mile 83 Remnant Bosque .....	2-32
Figure 2-19	Mile 78 Rincon/Reed Arroyo .....	2-33
Figure 2-20	Mile 76 Bignell Arroyo .....	2-33
Figure 2-21	Mile 54 Channel Cut .....	2-33
Figure 2-22	Miles 49 & 48 spillways .....	2-34
Figure 2-23	Mile 42 Clark Lateral .....	2-34
Figure 2-24	Mile 41 Picacho and NMGF .....	2-34
Figure 3-1	Historic Storage Levels in Elephant Butte Reservoir (NMOSE 2001) .....	3-3
Figure 3-2	Long-Term Record of New Mexico Rainfall (NMOSE 2001) .....	3-3
Figure 3-3	Flow Distribution Along the RGCP .....	3-4
Figure 3-4	RGCP Characterization in Terms of Potential Levee Deficiencies and Adjacent Land Use .....	3-14
Figure 3-5	Comparison Between Fish Habitat Preference and the RGCP Habitat Availability at Two Reference Flows .....	3-39
Figure 3-6	Land Use Classification: Miles 75-105 .....	3-47
Figure 3-7	Land Use Classification: Miles 47-75 .....	3-48
Figure 3-8	Land Use Classification: Miles 25-50 .....	3-49
Figure 3-9	Land Use Classifications: Miles 0-25 .....	3-50

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.3-1	Summary of Issues Identified During Public Scoping and Alternatives Formulation.....	1-11
Table 1.3-2	Opportunities and Constraints Related to RGCP Continued Flood Control.....	1-12
Table 1.3-3	Opportunities and Constraints Related to Water Issues .....	1-13
Table 1.3-4	Opportunities and Constraints for Riparian Corridor Development.....	1-13
Table 1.3-5	Opportunities and Constraints for Aquatic Habitat Diversification.....	1-14
Table 1.4-1	Potentially Required Federal Permits, Licenses or Entitlements .....	1-17
Table 1.4-2	Potentially Required Permits, Licenses or Entitlements from State and Local Agencies or Organizations.....	1-18
Table 2.1-1	Comparison of Alternative Features.....	2-3
Table 2.3-1	Potential Need for Levee Rehabilitation for the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	2-9
Table 2.4-1	Potential Levee Rehabilitation for the Integrated USIBWC Land Management and Targeted River Restoration Alternatives .....	2-12
Table 2.4-2	Potential Flow Exceedance Along the RGCP Based on Historical Data .....	2-15
Table 2.6-2	Linear Project Identification and Acreage.....	2-24
Table 2.6-3	Point Projects Associated with the Integrated USIBWC Land Management and Targeted River Restoration Alternatives .....	2-25
Table 2.6-4	Summary of Projects by Measure and Alternative .....	2-26
Table 2.7-1	Peak Floods of Record at El Paso, Texas.....	2-37
Table 2.10-1	Implementation Timetable for Linear Projects.....	2-46
Table 2.10-2	Implementation Timetable for Point Projects.....	2-47
Table 2.11-1	Preliminary Capital Cost Evaluation .....	2-48
Table 2.12-1	Summary Comparison of the Effects of the Alternatives.....	2-49
Table 3.1-1	Climatological Data for the North and Central Portions of the RGCP .....	3-2
Table 3.1-2	Significant Sediment Loads Reaching the RGCP (USACE 1996) .....	3-8
Table 3.1-3	Water Quality Concerns for Segment 2314 of the Rio Grande Basin (TCEQ 2002).....	3-10
Table 3.1-4	Rio Grande Monitoring Data at El Paso from March 2000 to August 2002 ....	3-10
Table 3.2-1	Design Flows for Irrigation and 100-Year Flood.....	3-13
Table 3.2-2	Hydraulic Model Results for the 100-Year Flood Conditions .....	3-13
Table 3.3-1	Soil Distribution Along the RGCP .....	3-17
Table 3.3-2	Potential Sediment Load from Upland Erosion .....	3-18
Table 3.4-1	Reference Flows Used to Identify Hydrologic Floodplain.....	3-22
Table 3.4-2	Lands Within the Hydrologic Floodplain and Meeting Criteria for Potential Environmental Measures.....	3-22
Table 3.4-3	Wetland Inventory from Two Sources .....	3-23

Table 3.4-4	Vegetation Communities and Open Water Habitat Within the RGCP.....	3-24
Table 3.4-5	Vegetation Management Within the ROW .....	3-29
Table 3.4-6	Acreage Leased in the RGCP .....	3-29
Table 3.4-7	Salt Cedar Control Within the Floodway .....	3-30
Table 3.5-1	WHAP Ranking System Used in the RGCP.....	3-31
Table 3.5-2	Habitat Units for the RGCP .....	3-32
Table 3.6-1	Habitat Requirements for Federally-Listed T&E Species and Potential Presence within the RGCP .....	3-34
Table 3.6-2	Presence/Absence of Federally-Listed Species Habitat Based on Field Surveys.....	3-35
Table 3.6-3	Summary of SOC Potentially Associated with Vegetation Communities in the RGCP .....	3-36
Table 3.7-1	Aquatic Habitat Characterization at Selected RGCP Sampling Sites .....	3-40
Table 3.7-2	Habitat Suitability Indices for Largemouth Bass and Flathead Catfish .....	3-41
Table 3.7-3	Habitat Units by River Management Unit .....	3-41
Table 3.7-4	Fish Species Collected During Biological Surveys of the RGCP .....	3-42
Table 3.7-5	Fish Species Collected at USFWS Mitigation Sites .....	3-42
Table 3.8-1	Land Use Acreage Within 0.25 Mile Outside and Adjacent to the RGCP Right-of-Way.....	3-51
Table 3.9-1	Population in El Paso, Doña Ana and Sierra Counties .....	3-53
Table 3.9-2	Employment Data for El Paso, Doña Ana and Sierra Counties .....	3-54
Table 3.9-3	Major Non- Agricultural Employment Sectors in El Paso, Doña Ana and Sierra Counties.....	3-54
Table 3.9-4	Agricultural Data for El Paso, Doña Ana and Sierra Counties .....	3-55
Table 3.9-5	Housing Data for El Paso, Doña Ana and Sierra Counties .....	3-56
Table 3.9-6	Minority Populations for El Paso County, Doña Ana County, Sierra County and Poverty Rates .....	3-57
Table 3.10-1	Known Architectural Resources in the RGCP ROW .....	3-59
Table 3.10-2	Summary of Consultation on Traditional Cultural Properties .....	3-61
Table 3.10-3	Known Archaeological Resources in the RGCP ROW .....	3-61
Table 3.10-4	Historical and Archaeological Sites, and Areas with a Higher Potential for Preservation of Cultural Resources.....	3-63
Table 3.11-1	National and Texas Ambient Air Quality Standards .....	3-65
Table 3.11-2	New Mexico Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	3-66
Table 3.11-3	<i>De minimis</i> Thresholds in Nonattainment Areas .....	3-67
Table 3.11-4	Air Quality Status for Counties in Air Quality Control Region 153.....	3-68
Table 3.11-5	Baseline Air Emissions for Sierra, Doña Ana, and El Paso Counties .....	3-68
Table 3.11-6	Estimated Air Emissions from Current RGCP Operation and Maintenance Activity.....	3-69

---

Table 3.13-1	Roadway Characteristics, Average Daily Traffic and Existing Level of Service .....	3-72
Table 4.1-1	Water Consumption Estimates for Rio Grande Vegetation .....	4-2
Table 4.1-2	Assumptions for Water Consumption Estimates and Changes in Water Delivery Efficiency.....	4-3
Table 4.1-3	Summary of Potential Effects on Water Resources .....	4-3
Table 4.1-4	Water Consumption Estimates for the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative.....	4-4
Table 4.1-5	Water Consumption Estimates for the Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-6
Table 4.2-1	Summary of Potential Effects on Flood Control .....	4-8
Table 4.2-2	Estimates of Levee Rehabilitation Needs for the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-9
Table 4.2-3	Point Projects with a Potential to Reduce Freeboard Below Design Values.....	4-10
Table 4.3-1	Basis for Soil Calculations .....	4-12
Table 4.3-2	Construction Estimates for Levee System Rehabilitation .....	4-13
Table 4.3-3	Soil Excavation Estimates for Conducting Bank Shavedowns.....	4-13
Table 4.3-4	Soil Excavation Estimates for Opening Meanders .....	4-14
Table 4.3-5	Soils Summary of Potential Effects .....	4-14
Table 4.3-6	Soil Effects of the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-15
Table 4.3-7	Soil Effects of the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-16
Table 4.3-8	Soil Effects of the Targeted River Restoration Alternative .....	4-17
Table 4.4-1	Reference Communities Associated with Environmental Measures.....	4-19
Table 4.4-2	Assumptions Used to Assess Effects Associated with Vegetation Management.....	4-22
Table 4.4-3	Summary of Effects for Vegetation and Wetland .....	4-23
Table 4.4-4	Invasive Species Management in the Floodway Under the No Action Alternative.....	4-24
Table 4.4-5	Effect Summary of Flood Control Improvement Alternative .....	4-25
Table 4.4-6	Invasive Species Management in the Floodway Under the Flood Control Improvement Alternative.....	4-27
Table 4.4-7	Effects Summary of Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-28
Table 4.4-8	Invasive Species Management in the Floodway Under the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-29
Table 4.4-9	Effects Summary of Targeted River Restoration Alternative.....	4-30
Table 4.4-10	Potential Restoration for Conservation Easement .....	4-31
Table 4.4-11	Invasive Species Management in the ROW Under the Targeted River Restoration Alternative .....	4-32
Table 4.5-1	Potential Wildlife Habitat Quality From Reference Communities .....	4-33

---

Table 4.5-2	Basis for Habitat Quality Calculations .....	4-34
Table 4.5-3	Baseline Values Used For Analyses .....	4-34
Table 4.5-4	Summary of Effects .....	4-35
Table 4.5-5	Wildlife Habitat Effects of the Flood Control Improvement Alternative .....	4-36
Table 4.5-6	Wildlife Habitat Effects of the Integrated Land Management Alternative .....	4-37
Table 4.5-7	Wildlife Habitat Effects of the Targeted River Restoration Alternative .....	4-39
Table 4.6-1	Potential Effect of O&M Activities and Environmental Measures on Listed Species .....	4-41
Table 4.6-2	Summary of Reference Community Development for T&E Species .....	4-42
Table 4.6-3	Assumptions Regarding T&E Species for Reference Communities .....	4-43
Table 4.6-4	Summary Reference Community Development for Flood Control Improvement Alternative .....	4-44
Table 4.6-5	Summary of Reference Community Development for Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-44
Table 4.6-6	Summary of Reference Community Development for Targeted River Restoration Alternative .....	4-46
Table 4.7-1	Habitat Suitability Indices for Largemouth Bass and Flathead Catfish .....	4-47
Table 4.7-2	Summary of Alternative Effects on Aquatic Habitat .....	4-47
Table 4.8-1	Summary of Potential Effects on Land Use .....	4-50
Table 4.9-1	Summary of Potential Effects on Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice, Levee Construction .....	4-54
Table 4.9-2	Summary of Potential Impacts on Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice, Cropland/Farm Labor .....	4-55
Table 4.10-1	Assumptions for Cultural Resources Effects Analysis .....	4-60
Table 4.10-2	Summary of Potential Effects on Cultural Resources .....	4-61
Table 4.10-3	Cultural Resources Locations Relative to Point Projects for the Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-63
Table 4.10-4	Cultural Resources Locations Relative to Point Projects for the Targeted River Restoration Alternative .....	4-64
Table 4.11-1	Assumptions and Basis for Calculation of Air Emissions .....	4-66
Table 4.11-2	Calculated Unit Air Emissions by Measure .....	4-67
Table 4.11-3	Summary of Air Quality Effects .....	4-67
Table 4.11-4	Estimated Annual Emissions for No Action Alternative .....	4-68
Table 4.11-5	Estimated Annual Emissions for Flood Control Improvement Alternative .....	4-70
Table 4.11-6	Estimated Annual Emissions for El Paso and Doña Ana Counties .....	4-70
Table 4.11-7	Estimated Annual Emissions for Integrated USIBWC Land Management Alternative .....	4-71
Table 4.11-8	Estimated Annual Emissions for Las Cruces Area .....	4-71
Table 4.11-9	Estimated Annual Emissions for Targeted River Restoration Alternative .....	4-72

---

Table 4.11-10	Estimated Annual Emissions for Las Cruces Area.....	4-73
Table 4.12-1	Heavy Equipment Noise Levels at 50 Feet .....	4-74
Table 4.12-2	Summary of Noise Effects .....	4-74
Table 4.13-1	Summary of Transportation Effects.....	4-77
Table 4.13-2	Construction Duration and Estimated Daily Vehicle Trips.....	4-78
Table 4.13-3	Expected Additional Traffic During the Construction Period .....	4-78
Table 4.13-4	Expected Increase in Existing Average Daily Traffic and Expected Level of Service During Construction.....	4-80
Table 4.14-1	Mitigation Measures for Water Resources .....	4-81
Table 4.14-2	Mitigation Measures for Flood Control and Soil Excavation.....	4-82
Table 4.14-3	Mitigation Measures for Biological Resources .....	4-83
Table 4.14-4	Mitigation Measures for Land Use, Socioeconomics and Cultural Resources .....	4-84
Table 4.14-5	Mitigation Measures for Air, Noise and Transportation .....	4-85
Table 5.1-1	Stakeholder Consultation for Preparation of the Alternatives Formulation Report.....	5-2
Table 5.1-2	Issues and Concerns Discussed with Stakeholders During the Alternatives Reformulation Consultation Process .....	5-3
Table 5.1-3	Stakeholder Consultation for Preparation of the Reformulation of Alternatives Report .....	5-4
Table 5.1-4	List of Correspondence Regarding Preparation of the Reformulation of Alternatives Report .....	5-5
Table 5.2-1	List of DEIS Reviewers.....	5-6
Table 5.2-2	List of Preparers .....	5-7
Table 5.3-1	Distribution List by Organization.....	5-8

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Micrograms per cubic meter
ac	Acre
ac-ft	Acre-feet (of water or sediment)
ac-ft/yr	Acre-feet per year
AQCR	Air Quality Control Region
ARPA	Archaeological Resources Protection Act
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMP	Best Management Practices
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	Cubic feet per second
CO	Carbon monoxide
cy	Cubic yards
dBA	Air-weighted sound level (decibels)
DNL	Day-night average sound level
EBID	Elephant Butte Irrigation District
EIFS	Economic Impact Forecast System
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPCWID#1	El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1
EPWU/PSB	El Paso Water Utilities/Public Service Board
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ft/yr	Feet of water (acre-feet per acre) per year
FWCA	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act
HEP	Habitat Evaluation Procedure
HQ	Habitat Quality
HSI	Habitat Suitability Index
HU	Habitat Units
lbs	Pounds
LOS	Level of service
Lp	Sound pressure level
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
MUSLE	Modified Universal Soil Loss Equation
MVEDA	Mesilla Valley Economic Development Alliance
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)
nc	No change
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMDGF	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish

NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NMOSE	New Mexico Office of the State Engineer
NO <sub>2</sub>	Nitrogen dioxide
NOX	Nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O&M	Operation and maintenance
PM <sub>10</sub>	Particulate matter less than or equal to 10 micrometers in diameter
RGCP	Rio Grande Canalization Project
RMU	River Management Unit
ROD	Record of Decision
ROW	Right-of-way
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
RTV	Rational Threshold Value
SOC	Species of Concern
SOX	Sulfur oxides
spp	Species
SWEC	Southwest Environmental Center
T&E	Threatened and endangered
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TPWD	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
tpy	Tons per year
TSP	Total suspended particulates
URGWOM	Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USBR	United States Bureau of Reclamation
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USIBWC	United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission
VOC	Volatile organic carbohydrates
WHAP	Wildlife Habitat Appraisal Procedure