



TABLE OF CONTENTS



**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION
OF TACTICAL INFRASTRUCTURE
RIO GRANDE VALLEY SECTOR, TEXAS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6

7 **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... ES-1**

8 **1. INTRODUCTION 1-1**

9 1.1 USBP BACKGROUND..... 1-3

10 1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED 1-4

11 1.3 PROPOSED ACTION 1-4

12 1.4 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS 1-4

13 1.5 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT 1-6

14 1.6 COOPERATING AND COORDINATING AGENCIES..... 1-9

15 **2. PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES..... 2-1**

16 2.1 SCREENING CRITERIA FOR ALTERNATIVES..... 2-1

17 2.2 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS..... 2-2

18 2.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative..... 2-2

19 2.2.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B..... 2-2

20 2.2.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative..... 2-9

21 2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER

22 DETAILED ANALYSIS..... 2-11

23 2.3.1 Additional USBP Agents in Lieu of Tactical Infrastructure..... 2-11

24 2.3.2 Technology in Lieu of Tactical Infrastructure..... 2-12

25 2.3.3 Native Thorny Scrub Hedge in Lieu of Tactical Infrastructure..... 2-12

26 2.3.4 Fence Within the Rio Grande..... 2-12

27 2.3.5 Brownsville Weir and Reservoir Project in Lieu of Tactical

28 Infrastructure..... 2-13

29 2.3.6 Raising Levees in Lieu of Tactical Infrastructure..... 2-13

30 2.4 SUMMARY COMPARISON OF ACTION ALTERNATIVES 2-14

31 2.5 IDENTIFICATION OF THE PREFERRED, LEAST-DAMAGING

32 PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE 2-14

33 **3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 3-1**

34 3.1 INTRODUCTION 3-1

35 3.2 AIR QUALITY..... 3-2

36 3.3 NOISE..... 3-5

37 3.4 LAND USE..... 3-9

38 3.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 3-11

39 3.6 WATER RESOURCES 3-16

40 3.7 VEGETATION..... 3-25

41 3.8 WILDLIFE AND AQUATIC RESOURCES 3-29

42 3.9 SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES 3-31

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)**

2 3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES 3-39

3 3.11 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES..... 3-43

4 3.12 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND

5 SAFETY 3-54

6 3.13 UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE 3-70

7 3.14 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTE 3-73

8 **4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 4-1**

9 4.1 INTRODUCTION..... 4-1

10 4.2 AIR QUALITY..... 4-2

11 4.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-2

12 4.2.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-2

13 4.2.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-5

14 4.3 NOISE..... 4-8

15 4.3.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-8

16 4.3.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-9

17 4.3.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-10

18 4.4 LAND USE 4-10

19 4.4.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-10

20 4.4.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-10

21 4.4.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-13

22 4.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 4-13

23 4.5.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-13

24 4.5.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-13

25 4.5.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-15

26 4.6 WATER RESOURCES 4-15

27 4.6.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-15

28 4.6.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-16

29 4.6.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-19

30 4.7 VEGETATION 4-20

31 4.7.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-20

32 4.7.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-20

33 4.7.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-22

34 4.8 WILDLIFE AND AQUATIC RESOURCES..... 4-23

35 4.8.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-23

36 4.8.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-24

37 4.8.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-27

38 4.9 SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES 4-27

39 4.9.1 Federal Species 4-27

40 4.9.2 State Species 4-29

41 4.9.3 Migratory Birds 4-31

42 4.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES 4-33

43 4.10.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-33

44

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)**

2 4.10.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-34

3 4.10.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-38

4 4.10.4 Treatment of Historic Properties 4-38

5 4.11 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES 4-38

6 4.11.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-39

7 4.11.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-39

8 4.11.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-51

9 4.12 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND

10 SAFETY 4-52

11 4.12.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-52

12 4.12.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-52

13 4.12.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-56

14 4.13 UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE 4-57

15 4.13.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-57

16 4.13.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-57

17 4.13.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-59

18 4.14 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTE 4-59

19 4.14.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative 4-59

20 4.14.2 Alternative 2: Routes A and B 4-59

21 4.14.3 Alternative 3: Secure Fence Act Alignment Alternative 4-60

22 **5. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 5-1**

23 5.1 AIR QUALITY 5-4

24 5.2 NOISE 5-4

25 5.3 LAND USE 5-12

26 5.4 GEOLOGY AND SOILS 5-12

27 5.5 WATER RESOURCES 5-12

28 5.6 VEGETATION 5-13

29 5.7 WILDLIFE AND AQUATIC RESOURCES 5-14

30 5.8 SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES 5-14

31 5.9 CULTURAL RESOURCES 5-15

32 5.10 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES 5-16

33 5.11 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND

34 SAFETY 5-16

35 5.12 UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE 5-17

36 5.13 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTE 5-18

37 5.14 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES 5-18

38 5.15 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SHORT-TERM USE OF THE

39 ENVIRONMENT AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY 5-19

40 **6. REFERENCES 6-1**

41 **7. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 7-1**

42 **8. LIST OF PREPARERS 8-1**

43

APPENDICES

- 1
- 2
- 3 A. Applicable Laws and Executive Orders
- 4 B. Draft Scoping Report
- 5 C. Public Comments on the Draft EIS (Reserved Space)
- 6 D. Detailed Descriptions of Each Discrete Fence Section Under Routes A and B
- 7 E. Standard Design for Tactical Infrastructure
- 8 F. Detailed Maps of the Proposed Fence Sections
- 9 G. Detailed Maps of the Proposed Fence Sections Showing Soils
- 10 H. Soil Properties of Starr, Hidalgo, and Cameron Counties
- 11 I. Draft Biological Survey Report
- 12 J. Preliminary Cultural Resources Findings
- 13 K. Air Quality Information
- 14

FIGURES

- 15
- 16 1-1. General Location of the Proposed Action – Rio Grande Valley Sector, Texas 1-2
- 17 2-1. Locations of the Proposed Rio Grande Valley Sector Tactical Infrastructure
- 18 (Map 1 of 3) 2-3
- 19 2-2. Locations of the Proposed Rio Grande Valley Sector Tactical Infrastructure
- 20 (Map 2 of 3) 2-4
- 21 2-3. Locations of the Proposed Rio Grande Valley Sector Tactical Infrastructure
- 22 (Map 3 of 3) 2-5
- 23 2-4. Schematic of Proposed Project Corridor – Alternative 2 2-8
- 24 2-5. Schematic of Proposed Project Corridor – Alternative 3 2-10
- 25 3.3-1. Common Noise Levels 3-7
- 26 3.4-1. Parks and Refuges in the Rio Grande Valley 3-12
- 27 3.11-1. Photograph View of Arroyo within Wildlife Refuge (Section O-1) 3-47
- 28 3.11-2. Photograph View of Typical Rural Land Unit (Section O-17) 3-47
- 29 3.11-3. Photograph View of Town of Los Ebanos (Section O-3) 3-48
- 30 3.11-4. Photograph View of Rio Grande City POE (Section O-2) 3-49
- 31 3.11-5. Schematic Showing Visibility of Fencing at Various Distances 3-52
- 32 4.11-1. Typical Views Towards Proposed Project Corridor, Showing How the Park/Refuge
- 33 Land Unit Would Appear with a Fence and Patrol Road 4-44
- 34 4.11-2. Typical Views Towards Proposed Project Corridor, Showing How the Rural Land
- 35 Unit Would Appear with a Fence and Patrol Road 4-45
- 36 4.11-3. Typical Views Towards Proposed Project Corridor, Showing How the
- 37 Town/Suburban Land Unit Would Appear with a Fence and Patrol Road 4-46
- 38 4.11-4. Typical Views Towards Proposed Project Corridor, Showing How the
- 39 Urban/Industrial Land Unit Would Appear with a Fence and Patrol Road 4-47
- 40

1

TABLES

2 1-1. Major Permits, Approvals, and Interagency Coordination..... 1-6

3 2-1. Proposed Fence Sections Under the Proposed Action..... 2-6

4 2-2. Comparison of Action Alternatives 2-14

5 3.2-1. National Ambient Air Quality Standards 3-3

6 3.3-1. Predicted Noise Levels for Construction Equipment..... 3-8

7 3.6-1. NWI Identified Wetlands that Occur Within the Proposed Project Corridor for

8 Route A 3-22

9 3.6-2. NWI Identified Wetlands that Occur within the Proposed Project Corridor for

10 Route B 3-25

11 3.7-1. Ecological Systems Present in Each Proposed Tactical Infrastructure Section..... 3-28

12 3.9-1. Federal- and State-Threatened and Endangered Species in Texas, by County..... 3-33

13 3.11-1. Character of Visual Resources within Typical Rio Grande Valley Land Units

14 (Current Conditions) 3-50

15 3.11-2. Quality of Visual Resources within Typical Rio Grande Valley Land Units (Current

16 Conditions) 3-51

17 3.12-1. State and County Population Trends Comparison in the ROI 1980 to 2006..... 3-56

18 3.12-2. County Population Trends, 2000 to 2020 3-56

19 3.12-3. Racial and Ethnic Characteristics in the ROI, 2000 to 2006 3-58

20 3.12-4. Employment by Industrial Sector in the ROI, 2005 3-60

21 3.12-5. State and ROI Labor Force and Unemployment Rate Averages 3-62

22 3.12-6. Poverty Rates and Median Income 3-63

23 3.12-7. Characteristics of Local Agriculture, 2002 3-64

24 3.12-8. Ethnic and Racial Distribution by County and Independent School District (ISD) in

25 the ROI..... 3-65

26 3.12-9. Law Enforcement Agencies and Personnel in the ROI * 3-66

27 3.12-10. Racial and Ethnic Population Composition in Geographic Comparison Areas 3-67

28 3.12-11. Census Tract Detail of Demographic Characteristics Relevant to Environmental

29 Justice 3-69

30 3.13-1. Known Water Supply, Drainage, and Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure Within the

31 Proposed Project Corridor 3-71

32 3.13-2. Remaining Capacity of Local Municipal Landfills as of 2005 3-72

33 3.13-3. Location of Utility Infrastructure Located Within the Proposed Project Corridor 3-73

34 4.2-1. Estimates of Total Proposed Construction Emissions from Route A in Tons Per Year .. 4-4

35 4.2-2. Estimates of Total Proposed Construction Emissions from Route B in Tons Per Year .. 4-6

36 4.2-3. Estimates of Total Proposed Construction Emissions from Alternative 3 in Tons

37 Per Year 4-7

38 4.4-1. Communities Potentially Affected by Route A 4-11

39 4.11-1. Impact on the Character of Visual Resources within Typical Rio Grande Valley

40 Land Units 4-41

41 4.11-2. Quality of Visual Resources within Typical Rio Grande Valley Land Units After

42 Proposed Construction 4-43

43 5.0-1. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions by Proposed Tactical Infrastructure

44 Sections for the USBP Rio Grande Valley Sector 5-5

45 5.0-2. Summary of Potential Cumulative Effects 5-8

46

1

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK