CLEAN WATER COALITION SYSTEMS CONVEYANCE AND OPERATIONS PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

DRAFT

SEPTEMBER 2005

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
LAKE MEAD RECREATION AREA

U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
LOWER COLORADO REGION

09018-AM-05

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA
601 NEVADA HIGHWAY
BOULDER CITY, NEVADA 89005

IN REPLY REFER TO:

LAME 3031 (LAME-RM)

September 15, 2005

Dear Reader:

Enclosed for your review and comment is the Clean Water Coalition Systems Conveyance and Operations Program (SCOP) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). This document describes and analyzes the potential environmental impacts of four alternatives for the SCOP, which would be a system of pipelines and tunnels that discharges highly treated effluent to an alternate location in Lake Mead. The SCOP includes activities and infrastructure that would be located on lands owned and/or managed by the City of Las Vegas, City of Henderson, Clark County, United States (U.S.) Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), National Park Service (NPS), and U.S. Bureau of Land Management. The alternatives include the Boulder Islands North Alternative, Boulder Islands South Alternative, Las Vegas Bay Alternative, and the No Action Alternative.

Written comments regarding the DEIS must be received via email or postmarked no later than 60 days after the Environmental Protection Agency's publication of the Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register*. Please direct your comments to:

SCOP EIS Project Manager
PBS&J
2270 Corporate Circle, Suite 100
Henderson, NV 89074-6382
E-mail: eis@cleanwatercoalition.com

Opportunities to present oral comments will occur at public hearings to be held in southern Nevada, Arizona, and California during October 2005. Additional information regarding the public meeting dates and locations will be published in the Las Vegas *Review Journal*, Henderson *Home News*, *Arizona Republic*, *Desert Sun*, Los Angeles *Times*, and San Diego *Union-Tribune* at least 15 days prior to the meetings.

Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or street address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations and businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be available for public inspection in their entirety.

The purpose of this review is to achieve the best possible conservation planning and environmental impact analysis by fully understanding public interests pertaining to the proposal

and to ensure that issues and concerns expressed during public scoping are addressed as well as possible. Comments will be fully considered and evaluated in the Final EIS.

Reclamation and NPS appreciate your interest in this project. Should you require any additional information, please contact Mr. Michael Boyles, National Park Service, Lake Mead National Recreation Area, at (702) 293-8978 or Mr. Anthony Vigil, Bureau of Reclamation, at (702) 293-8674.

Sincerely,

for William K. Dickinson
Superintendent

Enclosure

Clean Water Coalition
Systems Conveyance and Operations Program

Draft
Environmental Impact Statement

Prepared by:

U.S. Department of Interior

National Park Service, Lake Mead National Recreation Area

and

Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado Region

Technical Assistance:

PBS&J

2270 Corporate Circle, Suite 100

Henderson, Nevada 89074

September 2005

Table of Contents

Cover Sheet CS-1
ES.0 Executive Summary ES-1
ES.1 Purpose and Need ES-2
ES.2 Summary of Proposed Alternatives ES-2
ES.2.1 No Action Alternative ES-3
ES.2.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative ES-3
ES.2.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative ES-4
ES.2.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative ES-4
ES.3 Environmental Consequences ES-4
ES.3.1 Water Resources ES-5
ES.3.2 Biological Resources ES-7
ES.3.3 Cultural Resources ES-10
ES.3.4 Recreation ES-11
ES.3.5 Hazardous Materials ES-12
ES.3.6 Noise ES-13
ES.3.7 Air Quality ES-13
ES.3.8 Earth Resources ES-14
ES.3.9 Land Use ES-14
ES.3.10 Visual Resources ES-15
ES.3.11 Socioeconomics ES-16
ES.3.12 Environmental Justice ES-16
ES.3.13 Transportation and Traffic ES-16
ES.3.14 Paleontological Resources ES-17

1.0 Purpose and Need for the Action 1-1
1.1 Introduction 1-1
1.2 Lead and Cooperating Agencies 1-4
1.3 Project History 1-4

1.4 Additional Background Information 1-7
1.4.1 Las Vegas Valley Water Cycle 1-8
1.4.2 Water Quality Issues 1-10
1.5 Purpose of and Need for the Action 1-12
1.6 Scoping and Public Participation Relating to the EIS 1-14
1.6.1 Scoping 1-15
1.6.2 Clean Water Coalition Citizens Advisory Committee 1-16
1.7 Regulatory Requirements 1-18
1.7.1 Environmental Policy 1-19
1.7.2 Air Quality 1-19
1.7.3 Water Quality 1-22
1.7.4 Biological Resources 1-22
1.7.5 Cultural Resources 1-23
1.7.6 Noise 1-24
1.8 Related Documents 1-24
1.9 Organization of the Environmental Impact Statement 1-26

2.0 Description of the Alternatives 2-1
2.1 No Action Alternative 2-1
2.1.1 City of Las Vegas 2-3
2.1.2 Clark County Water Reclamation District 2-4
2.1.3 City of Henderson 2-4
2.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative, Preferred Alternative 2-5
2.2.1 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment A 2-5
2.2.2 Lake Conveyance System, Boulder Islands North 2-17
2.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 2-30
2.3.1 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment B 2-31
2.3.2 Lake Conveyance System, Boulder Islands South 2-41
2.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 2-50
2.4.1 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment B 2-50
2.4.2 Lake Conveyance System, Las Vegas Bay 2-50

2.5 Alternatives Development 2-59
2.5.1 Alternate Discharge Study 2-61
2.5.2 Clean Water Coalition Citizens Advisory Committee 2-61
2.6 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis 2-62
2.6.1 Alternate Alignments for the Effluent Interceptor 2-63
2.6.2 Off-channel Wetlands 2-67
2.6.3 Floating Wetlands 2-68
2.6.4 Impoundment for Creation of Wetlands 2-69
2.6.5 North Shore Pipeline and Wetlands 2-70
2.6.6 North Shore Pipeline and Outfalls 2-71
2.6.7 Aeration 2-71
2.6.8 Discharge Downstream of Hoover Dam 2-72
2.6.9 Discharge Upstream of Hoover Dam in the Vicinity of Promontory Point 2-74
2.6.10 Discharge in the Vicinity of Callville Bay 2-75
2.6.11 Discharge Effluent near the Narrows 2-76
2.7 Environmentally and Agency-preferred Alternative 2-76
2.8 Comparison of Alternatives by Resource and Potential Impacts 2-77

3.0 Affected Environment 3-1
3.1 Water Resources 3-1
3.1.1 Surface Water & Drainage 3-1
3.1.2 Groundwater 3-10
3.1.3 Surface Water Quality 3-13
3.2 Biological Resources 3-30
3.2.1 Vegetation 3-30
3.2.2 Wildlife 3-35
3.2.3 Aquatic Resources 3-42
3.3 Cultural Resources 3-45
3.3.1 Cultural Overview 3-46
3.3.2 Effluent Interceptor 3-49
3.3.3 Lake Conveyance System 3-53

3.4 Recreation 3-59
3.4.1 Lake Mead National Recreation Area 3-62
3.4.2 Sunrise Management Area 3-64
3.4.3 River Mountains Loop Trail 3-64
3.4.4 Clark County Wetlands Park 3-65
3.4.5 Las Vegas Valley Primary Trails System 3-65
3.5 Hazardous Materials and Items of Special Concern 3-65
3.5.1 Environmental Databases Reviewed 3-65
3.5.2 Site Reconnaissance 3-66
3.5.3 Recognizable Environmental Conditions 3-67
3.6 Noise and Vibration 3-68
3.6.1 Applicable Regulations and Policies 3-68
3.6.2 Sensitive Receptors 3-70
3.7 Air Quality 3-73
3.7.1 Regulatory Background 3-73
3.7.2 Existing Air Quality Conditions 3-77
3.8 Earth Resources 3-78
3.8.1 Topography 3-78
3.8.2 Geology 3-80
3.8.3 Subsidence 3-84
3.8.4 Soils 3-85
3.9 Land Use 3-85
3.9.1 Land Ownership 3-85
3.9.2 Existing Land Use 3-85
3.9.3 Land Use Planning 3-88
3.9.4 Zoning 3-92
3.10 Visual Resources 3-92
3.10.1 Effluent Interceptor 3-93
3.10.2 Lake Conveyance System 3-96
3.11 Socioeconomics 3-98
3.11.1 Employment and Economy 3-98

3.11.2 Population 3-102
3.11.3 Urban Growth and Housing 3-103
3.11.4 Schools 3-106
3.11.5 Government Taxation and Revenue 3-106
3.12 Environmental Justice 3-107
3.12.1 Environmental Justice Populations 3-108
3.12.2 Income and Poverty Levels 3-110
3.13 Traffic 3-110
3.13.1 Existing Roadway Network 3-112
3.13.2 Level of Service 3-113
3.14 Paleontological Resources 3-116

4.0 Environmental Consequences 4-1
4.1 Water Resources 4-4
4.1.1 No Action Alternative 4-10
4.1.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-21
4.1.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-35
4.1.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-36
4.1.5 Mitigation 4-44
4.2 Biological Resources 4-47
4.2.1 No Action Alternative 4-48
4.2.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-50
4.2.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-58
4.2.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-60
4.2.5 Mitigation 4-62
4.3 Cultural Resources 4-63
4.3.1 No Action Alternative 4-65
4.3.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-65
4.3.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-67
4.3.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-69
4.3.5 Mitigation 4-69

4.4 Recreation 4-70
4.4.1 No Action Alternative 4-71
4.4.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-71
4.4.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-73
4.4.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-74
4.4.5 Mitigation 4-76
4.5 Hazardous Materials 4-76
4.5.1 No Action Alternative 4-76
4.5.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-77
4.5.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-79
4.5.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-80
4.5.5 Mitigation 4-80
4.6 Noise and Vibration Impacts 4-81
4.6.1 No Action Alternative 4-81
4.6.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-82
4.6.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-83
4.6.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-84
4.6.5 Mitigation Measures 4-85
4.7 Air Quality 4-86
4.7.1 No Action Alternative 4-90
4.7.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-90
4.7.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-94
4.7.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-98
4.7.5 Mitigation 4-99
4.8 Earth Resources 4-100
4.8.1 No Action Alternative 4-100
4.8.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-101
4.8.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-102
4.8.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-103
4.8.5 Mitigation Measures 4-103
4.9 Land Use 4-103

4.9.1 No Action Alternative 4-103
4.9.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-103
4.9.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-105
4.9.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-106
4.9.5 Mitigation 4-106
4.10 Visual Resources 4-107
4.10.1 No Action Alternative 4-108
4.10.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-108
4.10.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-110
4.10.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-114
4.10.5 Mitigation 4-115
4.11 Socioeconomics 4-115
4.11.1 No Action Alternative 4-116
4.11.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-118
4.11.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-121
4.11.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-123
4.11.5 Mitigation 4-125
4.12 Environmental Justice 4-126
4.12.1 No Action Alternative 4-126
4.12.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-127
4.12.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-127
4.12.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-127
4.12.5 Mitigation 4-127
4.13 Traffic 4-127
4.13.1 No Action Alternative 4-128
4.13.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-128
4.13.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-130
4.13.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-130
4.13.5 Mitigation 4-130
4.14 Paleontological Resources 4-131
4.14.1 No Action Alternative 4-132

4.14.2 Boulder Islands North Alternative 4-132
4.14.3 Boulder Islands South Alternative 4-133
4.14.4 Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-133
4.14.5 Mitigation 4-133

5.0 Cumulative Impacts 5-1
5.1 Methodology 5-1
5.2 Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions 5-2
5.2.1 Past Actions 5-2
5.2.2 Present Actions 5-4
5.2.3 Future Actions 5-5
5.3 Cumulative Impacts 5-6
5.3.1 Water Resources 5-6
5.3.2 Biological Resources 5-8
5.3.3 Cultural Resources 5-9
5.3.4 Recreation 5-9
5.3.5 Noise 5-9
5.3.6 Air Quality 5-10
5.3.7 Earth Resources 5-15
5.3.8 Visual Resources 5-15
5.3.9 Socioeconomics 5-16
5.3.10 Transportation and Traffic 5-16

6.0 Commitment of Resources, Unavoidable Impacts, and Relationship Between Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity 6-1
6.1 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources 6-1
6.2 Unavoidable Impacts 6-2
6.3 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity 6-2

7.0 Consultation and Coordination 7-1
7.1 Cooperating Agencies 7-1
7.2 Native Americans 7-2

7.3 Consultations 7-2
7.3.1 Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultation 7-2
7.3.2 National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 7-4
7.4 Public Participation 7-5
7.4.1 Scoping 7-5
7.4.2 Clean Water Coalition Citizens Advisory Committee 7-6
7.4.3 Draft EIS Public Hearings (TBD) 7-6

8.0 Preparers and Contributors 8-1

9.0 References 9-1
9.1 Regulation, Order, Law 9-1
9.2 General 9-3

10.0 Libraries and Distribution List 10-1
10.1 Libraries 10-1
10.2 Distribution List 10-2
10.2.1 Federal Agencies 10-2
10.2.2 Native American Organizations 10-3
10.2.3 State of Nevada 10-3
10.2.4 State of Arizona 10-3
10.2.5 State of California 10-4
10.2.6 State of Utah 10-4
10.2.7 County Agencies 10-4
10.2.8 City Agencies 10-4
10.2.9 Schools and Colleges 10-5
10.2.10 Non-governmental Organizations 10-5
10.2.11 U.S. National Park Service Concessionaires 10-6
10.2.12 Area Media – Newspapers 10-6
10.2.13 Private Individuals 10-6
10.2.14 Elected Officials 10-8

11.0 Glossary 11-1

12.0 Index 12-1

Appendices

A.0 Notice of Intent
B.0 Scoping Comments
C.0 Native America Scoping Comments
D.0 Water Resources
E.0 Biological Resources Technical Report
F.0 Noise
G.0 Air Quality
H.0 Visual Resources
I.0 Socioeconomics
J.0 Realty Program Situations
K.0 Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care Products
L.0 Acronyms and Abbreviations

List of Figures

Figure 1.1-1 Project Location 1-2
Figure 1.1-2 Land Ownership 1-3
Figure 1.3-1 City of Las Vegas Water Pollution Control Facility 1-5
Figure 1.3-2 Clark County Water Reclamation Central Plant 1-5
Figure 1.3-3 City of Henderson Water Reclamation Facility 1-6
Figure 1.4-1 Las Vegas Water Cycle 1-8
Figure 2.2-1 Alternatives 2-6
Figure 2.2-2 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment A and Ancillary Facilities 2-7
Figure 2.2-3 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment A Terminus Site 2-13
Figure 2.2-4 Maintenance and Access Roads 2-14

Figure 2.2-5 Boulder Islands North Lake Conveyance System 2-19
Figure 2.2-6 NRMT3-West, SRMT3-West, and LVBT1 Working Shaft 2-20
Figure 2.2-7 NRMT3-East Working Shaft and HPRS 2-21
Figure 2.3-1 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment B and Ancillary Facilities. 2-32
Figure 2.3-2 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment B Terminus Facility. 2-37
Figure 2.3-3 Wash Return Structure 2-39
Figure 2.3-4 Boulder Islands South Lake Conveyance System. 2-43
Figure 2.3-5 Ventilation Shaft 2-44
Figure 2.3-6 SRMT3 – East Working Shaft 2-45
Figure 2.4-1 Las Vegas Bay Lake Conveyance System 2-52
Figure 2.4-2 LVBT2 Working Shaft 2-54
Figure 2.4-3 Las Vegas Bay Pressure Regulating Station 2-55
Figure 2.4-4 Old Marina Staging Area 2-59
Figure 2.6-1 Effluent Interceptor Alignments Eliminated 2-65
Figure 2.6-2 Lake Conveyance System Alternatives Eliminated 2-74
Figure 3.1-1 Hydrographic Basins 3-2
Figure 3.1-2 Major Tributaries 3-3
Figure 3.1-3 Potential Waters of the United States – Effluent Interceptor Segment 3-5
Figure 3.1-4 Potential Waters of the United States – Lake Conveyance System Segment 3-6
Figure 3.1-5 Floodplain Map 3-8
Figure 3.1-6 Erosion Control Structures 3-11
Figure 3.1-7 Las Vegas Bay Delta 3-12
Figure 3.1-8 Location of Groundwater Wells, Depth to Groundwater, and Groundwater Flow in the Vicinity of the Effluent Interceptor 3-14
Figure 3.1-9 Areas Designated for Beneficial Use 3-16
Figure 3.1-10 Water Quality Sampling Locations in Boulder Basin 3-23
Figure 3.1-11 Baseline Chlorophyll levels in Boulder Basin 3-29
Figure 3.2-1 Sensitive Species – Effluent Interceptor Segment 3-34
Figure 3.2-2 Sensitive Species – Lake Conveyance System Segment 3-41
Figure 3.3-1 Areas Investigated for Cultural Resources in the Vicinity of the Effluent Interceptor 3-54

Figure 3.3-2 Terrestrial Areas Investigated for Cultural Resources in the Vicinity of the LCS Alignments 3-58
Figure 3.4-1 Recreation Areas in the Project Vicinity – Effluent Interceptor Segment 3-60
Figure 3.4-2 Recreation Areas in the Project Vicinity – Lake Conveyance System Segment 3-61
Figure 3.6-1 Sensitive Noise Receptor Locations 3-72
Figure 3.7-1 Clark County Airsheds 3-74
Figure 3.7-2 BLM Land Disposal Boundary 3-79
Figure 3.8-1 Faults in the Vicinity of the Effluent Interceptor 3-82
Figure 3.8-2 Faults in the Vicinity of the Lake Conveyance System 3-83
Figure 3.9-1 Effluent Interceptor, Utilities and Rights-of-way 3-87
Figure 3.9-2 Existing Land Use, Utilities, and Rights-of-way in the Vicinity of the Proposed Lake Conveyance System Alignments 3-89
Figure 3.9-3 Lands Designated for Mineral Segregation and R&PP Leases 3-90
Figure 3.10-1 Key Observation Points 3-94
Figure 3.11-1 Socioeconomic Study Area and Census Tracts 3-99
Figure 3.12-1 Population Demographics Census Tracts 3-108
Figure 3.12-2 Percent of Population Below Poverty Census Tracts 3-110
Figure 3.14-1 Areas of Potentially High Paleontological Sensitivity 3-117
Figure 4.1-1 Water Quality Modeling/Sampling and Discharge Locations in Lake Mead 4-7
Figure 4.1-2 Water Quality Analysis Approach 4-9
Figure 4.1-3 Chlorophyll Concentrations at a Lake Level of 1,178 ft (359 m) for year 2030 Flows 4-16
Figure 4.1-4 Chlorophyll Growing Season Average in Lake Mead for Baseline (Year 2002) Conditions and the No Action Alternative in 2030 with Lake Levels of 1,178 ft and 1,000 ft 4-17
Figure 4.1-5 Chlorophyll Concentrations at a Lake Level of 1,000 ft for 2030 Flows 4-21
Figure 4.1-6 Chlorophyll Growing Season Average in Lake Mead for Baseline (Year 2002) Conditions and the Boulder Islands North Alternative in 2030 with Lake Levels of 1,178 ft and 1,000 ft 4-31
Figure 4.1-7 Simulated Annual Average Total Phosphorus Concentrations at Hoover Dam 4-34

Figure 4.1-8 Chlorophyll Growing Season Average in Lake Mead for Baseline (Year 2002) Conditions and the Las Vegas Bay Alternative in 2030 with Lake Levels of 1,178 ft and 1,000 ft 4-40

Figure 4.10-1 Effluent Interceptor Terminus Facility 4-112

Figure 5.2-1 Cumulative Impacts – Project Considered 5-3

List of Tables

Table 1.7-1 Permit Summary 1-19

Table 2.1-1 Wastewater Discharge Projections 2-2

Table 2.2-1 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment A, Total Dimensions of Construction Techniques 2-8

Table 2.2-2 Staging Areas (EI – Alignment A). 2-10

Table 2.2-3 Spoils Generated and Backfill Material Required for the EI – Alignment A... 2-17

Table 2.2-4 Construction Activities, Duration, and Equipment for the Boulder Islands North Lake Conveyance System. 2-24

Table 2.2-5 Material and Equipment Deliveries for the Boulder Islands North Lake Conveyance System 2-25

Table 2.2-6 Spoils Removed for the Boulder Islands North Lake Conveyance System. 2-26

Table 2.3-1 Effluent Interceptor – Alignment B, Total Dimensions of Construction Techniques 2-31

Table 2.3-2 Staging Areas (EI – Alignment B) 2-34

Table 2.3-3 Spoils Generated and Backfill Material Required for EI-Alignment B 2-41

Table 2.3-4 Construction Activities, Duration, and Equipment for the Boulder Islands South Lake Conveyance System 2-48

Table 2.3-5 Material and Equipment Deliveries for the Boulder Islands South Lake Conveyance System 2-49

Table 2.3-6 Spoils Removed for the Boulder Islands South Lake Conveyance System 2-50

Table 2.4-1 Construction Activities, Duration, and Equipment for the Las Vegas Bay Lake Conveyance System 2-57

Table 2.4-2 Material and Equipment Deliveries for the Las Vegas Bay Lake Conveyance System 2-58

Table 2.4-3 Spoils Removed for the Las Vegas Bay Lake Conveyance System..... 2-60

Table 2.5-1 Chronology of Events for Development of the SCOP Alternatives..... 2-61

Table 2.8-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts 2-79
Table 2.8-2 Summary of Mitigation Measures 2-83
Table 3.1-1 Beneficial Uses 3-17
Table 3.1-2 Water Quality Standards 3-18
Table 3.1-3 Baseline Water Quality Conditions in the Las Vegas Wash 3-22
Table 3.1-4 Baseline Water Quality Conditions in Boulder Basin (1,178 ft for year 2002 with effluent flows of 150 mgd [231 cfs] and effluent TP = 292 lbs/day) 3-27
Table 3.2-1 Special Status Plant Species Evaluated for Potential Occurrence in the SCOP Study Area 3-32
Table 3.2-2 Special Status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Potential Occurrence in the SCOP Study Area 3-36
Table 3.2-3 Special Status Aquatic Species Evaluated for Potential Occurrence in the SCOP Study Area 3-43
Table 3.3-1 Previously Identified Archaeological Sites within the Effluent Interceptor Project Area 3-51
Table 3.3-2 Previously Identified Archaeological Sites in the Project Area 3-56
Table 3.5-1 Summary of Environmental Database Search 3-66
Table 3.6-1 Typical Sound Pressure Levels Associated with Common Noise Sources 3-69
Table 3.6-2 Maximum Permitted Sound Levels Clark County 3-70
Table 3.7-1 Local, State, and National Ambient Air Quality Standards 3-76
Table 3.11-1 Employment and Earnings by Industry in Clark County, Nevada, 1990 – 2002 3-100
Table 3.11-2 Labor Force and Unemployment Las Vegas MSA, Clark County, and State of Nevada, 1990 – 2003 3-102
Table 3.11-3 Twenty Largest Employers, Clark County, Nevada, 2003 3-103
Table 3.11-4 Project Region Historic Population Trends, 1990 – 2003 3-104
Table 3.11-5 Project Region and Study Area Housing Characteristics, 2000 3-105
Table 3.11-6 Study Area Tax Jurisdictions 3-107
Table 3.12-1 Study Area Ethnic Profile 3-109
Table 3.12-2 Income and Poverty Levels State, Region, and Census Tracts 3-111
Table 3.13-1 Level of Service Criteria for Roadway Segments 3-114
Table 3.13-2 Level of Service E Maximum Traffic-Carrying Capacities 3-115
Table 3.13-3 Existing Roadway Characteristics 3-115

Table 4.1-1 Estimated Model Confidence Levels for Parameters 4-5

Table 4.1-2 Effluent Flows and Phosphorus Loading 4-8

Table 4.1-3 Las Vegas Wash Baseline Conditions and Modeling Results for the No Action Alternative1 (effluent TP = 334 lbs/day [152 kg/day]) 4-13

Table 4.1-4 Lake Mead Modeling Results for the No Action Alternative1 (1,178 ft lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 334 lbs/day)..... 4-14

Table 4.1-5 Lake Mead Chlorophyll Concentrations for Baseline Conditions and the No Action Alternative1 (1,178 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 334 lbs/day) 4-16

Table 4.1-6 Lake Mead Modeling Results for the No Action Alternative1 (1,000 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 334 lbs/day)..... 4-18

Table 4.1-7 Lake Mead Chlorophyll Concentrations for Baseline Conditions and No Action Alternative (1,000 ft Lake level for year 2002 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [cfs] and effluent TP = 334 lbs/day) 4-20

Table 4.1-8 Groundwater Depths as Compared to Proposed Tunnel Depths 4-26

Table 4.1-9 Las Vegas Wash Baseline Conditions and Modeling Results for the Boulder Islands North Alternative1 (effluent TP = 467 lbs/day) 4-28

Table 4.1-10 Lake Mead Modeling Results for the Boulder Islands North Alternative1 (1,178 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 467 lbs/day) 4-29

Table 4.1-11 Lake Mead Chlorophyll Concentrations for Baseline Conditions and the Boulder Islands North Alternative1 (1,178 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 467 lbs/day) 4-30

Table 4.1-12 Lake Mead Modeling Results for the Boulder Islands North Alternative1 (1,000 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 467 lbs/day)..... 4-33

Table 4.1-13 Lake Mead Chlorophyll Concentrations for Baseline Conditions and the Boulder Islands North Alternative1 (1,000 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 467 lbs/day) 4-34

Table 4.1-14 Lake Mead Modeling Results for the Las Vegas Bay Alternative1 (1,178 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 467 lbs/day)..... 4-37

Table 4.1-15 Lake Mead Chlorophyll Concentrations for Baseline Conditions and the Las Vegas Bay Alternative1 (1,178 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP=467 lbs/day) 4-39

Table 4.1-16 Lake Mead Modeling Results for the Las Vegas Bay Alternative1 (1,000 ft lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 467 lbs/day) 4-42

Table 4.1-17 Lake Mead Chlorophyll Concentrations for Baseline Conditions and the Las Vegas Bay Alternative 1 (1,000 ft Lake level for year 2030 with effluent flows of 300 mgd [462 cfs] and effluent TP = 467 lbs/day) 4-43

Table 4.7-1 Fugitive Dust Emissions from Construction Activities (Tons) EI-Alignment A 4-91

Table 4.7-2 Total Construction Emissions Compared to Major Source Thresholds EI-Alignment A 4-92

Table 4.7-3 Fugitive Dust Emissions from Construction Activities (Tons) Boulder Islands North LCS 4-93

Table 4.7-4 Total Construction Emissions Compared to Major Source Thresholds Boulder Islands North LCS 4-94

Table 4.7-5 Fugitive Dust Emissions from Construction Activities (Tons) EI-Alignment B 4-95

Table 4.7-6 Total Construction Emissions Compared to Major Source Thresholds EI - Alignment B 4-96

Table 4.7-7 Fugitive Dust Emissions from Construction Activities (Tons) Boulder Islands South LCS 4-97

Table 4.7-8 Total Construction Emissions Compared to Major Source Thresholds Boulder Islands South LCS 4-98

Table 4.7-9 Fugitive Dust Emissions from Construction Activities (Tons) Las Vegas Bay LCS 4-99

Table 4.7-10 Total Construction Emissions Compared to Major Source Thresholds Las Vegas Bay LCS 4-99

Table 4.11-1 Estimated Pipeline Construction Costs – EI and Action Alternatives..... 4-118

Table 4.11-2 Total Socioeconomic Impacts – Boulder Islands North Alternative (Pipeline Only) 4-119

Table 4.11-3 Total Socioeconomic Impacts – Boulder Islands North Alternative (Hydroelectric Power Generation Facility Only) 4-119

Table 4.11-4 Total Socioeconomic Impacts – Boulder Islands South Alternative..... 4-122

Table 4.11-5 Total Socioeconomic Impacts – Las Vegas Bay Alternative 4-124

Table 4.11-6 Total Socioeconomic Impacts – No Action Alternative Mitigation..... 4-126

Table 5.3-1 Cumulative Effects 5-7

Table 5.3-2 Estimated Equipment Used for Past, Present, and Future Projects 5-11

Table 5.3-3 Estimated Equipment Exhaust for Past, Present, and Future Projects..... 5-12

Table 5.3-4 Estimated Fugitive Dust Generated from Construction of Past, Present, and Future Projects 5-13

Table 7.2-1 Native American Tribes Contacted 7-4

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

UNITED STATES
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
CLEAN WATER COALITION
SYSTEMS CONVEYANCE AND OPERATIONS PROGRAM

Clark County, Nevada

Lead Agencies: National Park Service and Bureau of Reclamation

Cooperating Agencies: U.S Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Colorado River Commission of Nevada, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Applicant: Clean Water Coalition

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes the potential impacts resulting from the construction and implementation of the Systems Conveyance and Operations Program (SCOP). The City of Las Vegas, Clark County Water Reclamation District, and City of Henderson comprise the Clean Water Coalition (CWC), which was created to address the management of the increasing wastewater flows in the Las Vegas Valley. The CWC proposes to implement the SCOP, which would be a system of pipelines and tunnels that discharges highly treated effluent to an alternate location in Lake Mead. Effluent is wastewater that has been treated in a wastewater treatment plant. The SCOP system would be designed to collect the treated effluent flows from the three treatment facilities, for conveyance to an area in the lower Colorado River system, while the majority of the flows bypass the lower Las Vegas Wash. The SCOP would be located in Clark County, Nevada and would include activities and infrastructure located on lands owned and/or managed by the City of Las Vegas, Clark County, City of Henderson, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Lower Colorado Region (Reclamation), and National Park Service (NPS) Lake Mead National Recreation Area. This EIS analyzes the potential impacts of four alternatives including the No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative the pipeline would not be constructed. Highly treated effluent would continue to be discharged to the Las Vegas Wash at the existing discharge locations. The three agencies currently responsible for municipal wastewater treatment and discharge would expand and optimize their facilities to handle the increasing quantities of wastewater through 2050. Facility additions would occur on lands currently owned by the cities and county. Under the Boulder Islands North Alternative, a pipeline would be constructed that collects and transports highly treated effluent from the three treatment facilities to a receiving area in the vicinity of Boulder Islands. The Boulder Islands North Alternative includes the generation of electricity at a hydroelectric generation facility to be located on NPS land. Under the Boulder Islands South Alternative, a pipeline would be constructed that collects and transports highly treated effluent from the three treatment facilities to a receiving area in the vicinity of Boulder Islands, but there would be no power generation facility. Under the Las Vegas Bay Alternative, a pipeline would be constructed that collects and transports highly treated effluent from the three treatment facilities to a receiving area in the Las Vegas Bay.

Written comments or inquiries regarding this document should be directed to:

PBS&J
SCOP EIS Project Manager
2270 Corporate Circle, Suite 100
Henderson, NV 89074

For further information contact:
Mr. William K. Dickinson, Superintendent
National Park Service
Lake Mead National Recreation Area
601 Nevada Way
Boulder City, NV 89005

or

Mr. Anthony Vigil
Bureau of Reclamation
Lower Colorado Region
LC-2530, P.O. Box 61470 (LC-2621)
Boulder City, NV 89006-1470