SUMMARY

SUMMARY

This final environmental impact statement/ final environmental impact report (FEIS/FEIR) has been prepared to evaluate the environmental aspects of a proposed project to control seepage from the All-American Canal (AAC). The project lies along a 29.9-mile reach of the existing unlined AAC which begins just south of Pilot Knob and ends at Drop 4, where the canal approaches the irrigated area of the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) in Imperial County, California (general location map). The reach traverses the East Mesa and runs along the international boundary with Mexico. The proposed action is to "line" a 23-mile section of the canal by constructing a concrete-lined canal parallel to the existing canal.

PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the AAC Lining Project is to conserve seepage lost from the unlined AAC. The conserved water is needed in the southern California coastal area to offset a projected water shortage of 1.2 million acre-feet that is expected by the year 2010. The proposed project has the potential to conserve about 67,700 acre-feet per year.

BACKGROUND

The existing unlined AAC, authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act (Public Law (P.L.) 70-642, December 1928), was constructed in the 1930's by the Bureau of

Photo 1.—View looks west over the All-American Canal as it approaches the sand dunes. The Interstate 8 highway crossing is in the foreground.

Reclamation (Reclamation) and began delivering water in the 1940's. The unlined canal was constructed in sandy desert soils. Its width varies from 196 to 171 feet in the section under consideration. The AAC conveys over 3 million acre-feet of water from the Colorado River annually for the Imperial and Coachella Valleys. The water is diverted from the Colorado River at Imperial Dam. The AAC supplies irrigation water on a year-round basis.

Although lining the AAC has been considered for decades, incentives to do so have not materialized until recently. On November 17, 1988, P.L. 100-675 authorized the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to line the canal or recover the seepage from the canal using construction funds from California water agencies entitled to the use of Colorado River water (attachment A).

ALTERNATIVES

The canal must remain in service continually. Thus, the range of physical options was limited to lining the existing canal under water, constructing a new concrete-lined canal parallel to the existing canal, or recovering the seepage from wells along the canal.

Although the greatest seepage reduction would be attained by lining the entire 29.9-mile section of canal under consideration, an expensive program would be required to mitigate the impacts on seepage-induced wetlands. Thus, the canal lengths considered for lining were Pilot Knob to Drop 3 and Pilot Knob to Drop 4. These alternatives were developed using both physical options; namely, lining the existing canal or constructing a new parallel canal. A well field alternative was developed with wells along the canal between Pilot Knob and midway between Drops 1 and 2. Farther west, well pumping would have increased seepage from the canal. The required No Action Alternative was included for comparison.

The scoping process produced the alternatives listed in the box below.

Alternative	Description
Parallel Canal Alternative	**Preferred Alternative** - New parallel canal from 1 mile west of Pilot Knob to Drop 3 (23 miles)
Drop 3 Alternative	In-place lining from Pilot Knob to Drop 3 (24.6 miles)
Drop 4 Alternative	In-place lining from Pilot Knob to Drop 4 (29.9 miles)
Well Field Alternative	Wells along the canal between Pilot Knob and Drop 2 (15 miles)
No Action	Canal remains unlined (29.9 miles)

The preferred alternative would be to construct a parallel canal along the existing canal from 1 mile west of Pilot Knob to Drop 3. The new canal would have a top width about two-thirds as wide as the existing canal and would be about 40 percent deeper.

USE OF THE CONSERVED WATER

Public Law 100-675 provides that the conserved water would be made available to specified California contracting water agencies according to established priorities. The priorities are structured so that if the conserved water is not used by IID, Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD), or Palo Verde Irrigation District, the conserved water would be available for use by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD).

Public Law 100-675 provides that California agencies currently having contracts with the Secretary may contract with the Secretary to line the canal and gives IID the option of becoming the sole participating contractor for a period not to exceed 15 months after enactment.

MWD has expressed interest in funding the project in return for use of the conserved water when available. This is the general premise under which the project is being developed. The existing Colorado River Aqueduct, capable of diverting 1.3 million acre-feet per year, would be used to transport the conserved water from Lake Havasu to the southern California coastal area.

SUMMARY OF PHYSICAL PROPERTIES AND COSTS

Table S-1 presents a comparison of the physical differences and cost variations among the alternatives.

The project cost includes the cost of mitigation. The cost per acre-foot of water conserved indicates the relative cost effectiveness of each alternative. The cost per acre-foot was computed by combining the estimated costs of implementing and operating the project, converting those costs to an annual equivalent cost, and then dividing by the amount of water conserved.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The environmental aspects of primary concern are the potential loss of seepage-induced wetlands habitat along the canal and the reduction in the fish population in the canal. The mitigation plans developed for each of the action alternatives would permit their implementation with no significant loss of environmental resources. Moreover, the preferred alternative achieves a national wetlands planning objective of "avoidance" of impact to a 1,422-acre wetlands complex between Drops 3 and 4.

Ground Water

A large ground-water aquifer, known locally as the Colorado River Aquifer, lies under the canal. This aquifer extends north under the East Mesa of the Imperial Valley and south across the international boundary with Mexico under the Mexicali

Table S-1.—Summary of physical properties and design elements and costs

Dimension	Existing canal	Parallel Canal Alternative	Drop 3 Alternative	Drop 4 Alternative	Well Field Alternative
Length involved (miles)	[1]29.9	23.0	24.6	29.9	15.0
Excavation volume (million cubic yards)	—	25.0	0.8	1.0	—
Concrete volume (cubic yards)	—	214,000	265,000	320,000	800
Sand and gravel volume (cubic yards)	—	185,000	355,000	535,000	41,000
Top width[2] (feet)	196	120	215	215	196
Water depth[2] (feet)	16.6	23.1	[3]15.5	[3]15.5	16.6
Sideslopes[4]	2:1	1-1/2:1	2-1/2:1	2-1/2:1	2:1
Water volume[5] (acre-feet)	8,630	6,800	8,900	9,300	8,620
Water velocity at full flow[6] (feet per second)	3.8	5.2	4.1	4.1	3.8
Water conserved annually (acre-feet)	—	67,700	66,700	68,700	68,000
Construction cost[7] (1990 $ millions)	—	86.4	105.7	137.9	21.0
Cost per acre-foot of water conserved (1990 $)[8]	—	109	135	171	69
Operation and maintenance annual cost increase (1990 $)	—	14,000	14,000	26,000	[9]2,930,000

[1] From Rock Section 2 at Pilot Knob to Drop 4.
[2] Between Pilot Knob and Drop 1 at full canal flow. Downstream from Drop 1, the dimensions are approximately 88 percent of values shown.
[3] Checked to depth of 16.6 feet at upstream end of Drop 1.
[4] Horizontal distance to vertical distance.
[5] Entire 29.9 miles. Does not include effect of silt deposition in canal.
[6] Average velocity in canal at maximum waterflow (10,155 cubic feet per second). Velocity at sides of canal is less than average. Velocity at center of canal is greater than average.
[7] Includes cost of mitigation.
[8] For comparison purposes; based on cost recovery at 8-percent interest over an assumed 50-year period.
[9] Annual equivalent; based on future price escalation of 5 percent per year.

Valley. The seepage through the unlined canal bottom has raised the ground-water level under the canal as much as 40 feet. There has been extensive pumping from wells in Mexico since the 1950's. Since that time, the ground-water gradient is to the south, which causes most of the seepage to flow under the international boundary into the Mexicali Valley of Mexico, where seepage augments local ground water pumped from wells for irrigation. The high ground water also has induced wetlands vegetation along the canal.

The preferred alternative would reduce seepage from the canal by approximately 67,700 acre-feet per year. This would allow the ground-water level under the canal upstream from Drop 3 to decline and would reduce one source of ground-water recharge for the Mexicali Valley. Seepage from the AAC contributes 10 to 12 percent of the Mexicali Valley ground-water recharge. If pumping in Mexico continues at the current rate, it would cause the ground water under the canal to decline to a greater depth than prior to operation of the canal and would ultimately withdraw water from under the East Mesa of Imperial County. The ground-water table under part of the northeastern portion of the Mexicali Valley would decline.

The Lower Colorado Water Supply Project well field is being constructed along the canal in the Sand Hills area. Lining of the AAC was taken into account as the project was planned, and the wells have been designed to operate with a lower ground-water table.

Surface Water

The preferred alternative would increase the usable supply of water in the Colorado River by 67,700 acre-feet per year. It would reduce the amount of water diverted into the AAC by that amount, which is about 2 percent. Diversion of the conserved water at Lake Havasu would reduce the flow in the Colorado River downstream from Parker Dam by an average of approximately 94 cubic feet per second.

After canal flow is diverted into the parallel canal, the volume of water in the entire 29.9-mile canal section under study would reduce from 8,630 acre-feet to 6,800 acre-feet under full flow conditions, less under partial flow conditions.

Water Quality

Under the preferred alternative, salinity of the Colorado River below Parker Dam would tend to increase very slightly (unmeasurable increase). Therefore, the preferred alternative would have no significant impacts on the quality of water in the AAC or in the Colorado River. The salinity of the pumped ground water under the AAC at the Lower Colorado Water Supply well field is projected to increase by 2 milligrams per liter per year as a maximum probable impact estimate. The quality of current drainage water in the northeastern portion of the Mexicali Valley would deteriorate, based on information provided by the Government of Mexico.

Air Quality

The preferred alternative would not have any permanent impacts on air quality. Construction emission of dust and exhaust products would be controlled under regulations of the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District. Typical construction dust would be controlled by water spray.

Wetlands Habitat

The seepage-caused high ground water along the canal has resulted in moist soil conditions in topographically low areas along the canal. These conditions have resulted in wetlands vegetation being established in these places, mainly in the wetlands complex between Drops 3 and 4. The wetlands vegetation provides habitat for various species of wildlife; therefore, the potential loss of wetlands is of particular concern because the wetlands in question provide habitat for the endangered Yuma clapper rail, and because of the national goal of no overall net loss of wetlands.

An interagency biological work group was formed to analyze the potential impact on wetlands habitat. Representatives of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the California Department of Fish and Game, MWD, IID, and CVWD developed a habitat rating system that was used to plan mitigation features for the potential habitat losses.

The preferred alternative and Drop 3 Alternative avoid impact to a 1,422-acre wetlands complex between Drops 3 and 4. To compensate for the loss of isolated tracts of wetlands and canal vegetation along the canal upstream from Drop 3, the wetlands complex between Drops 3 and 4 would be enlarged slightly.

Wetlands Habitat Along the Colorado River

Beginning about halfway between Blythe and the Imperial Dam, the Colorado River changes from being extensively channelized to having an irregular channel with numerous backwaters on the flood plain. Here the dominant vegetation of cattails and reeds creates a substantial band of vegetation around the backwaters. The wetlands along the river are host to a variety of wildlife, including the federally endangered Yuma clapper rail.

To ensure that the project does not cause an adverse change to wetlands along the Colorado River, future habitat restoration work along the river would include funding of $100,000 to improve backwater along the lower river. Reclamation, in cooperation with the Lower Colorado River Work Group Backwaters Committee, is planning several backwater restoration or enlargement projects along the river. Mitigation for the AAC lining would be accomplished as part of such an improvement project.

Terrestrial Habitat

The canal runs through four terrestrial plant communities—creosotebush scrub, wash woodland, sand dune, and wetlands. At its maximum impact, the preferred alternative would eliminate an estimated 587 acres of desert scrub habitat and 916 acres of sand dune habitat. Project mitigation plans would consist of acre-for-acre replacement of lost habitat. Selection of replacement habitat would be based on ecological equivalency.

This acreage estimate is considered maximum probable impact. After final design of project facilities and determination of staging areas, access roads, and other uses, total acreage will be adjusted based on results of 1993 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service habitat surveys and in accordance with the Reclamation environmental commitment plan.

Special Status Species

Special status species affected by the project include the federally endangered Yuma clapper rail and the California black rail, birds that depend on marsh habitat. Also included are the flat-tailed horned lizard, the Colorado fringe-toed lizard, and the Andrew's dune scarab beetle, whose habitat is found in the sparsely vegetated desert landscape along the canal.

The preferred alternative avoids a significant effect on the Yuma clapper rail and the California black rail by not lining the canal between Drops 3 and 4. The project mitigation plans would prevent significant impact to other special status species upstream from Drop 3.

Large Mammal Escape

Although there is no documented population of mule deer in the AAC project area, the possibility exists that large mammals could occasionally drink from the canal or cross it. The parallel canal would have concrete sideslopes of 1-1/2 horizontal to 1 vertical and faster velocities than the present canal, which could pose a drowning risk to large mammals. This risk would be mitigated by continuous escape ridges slipformed on the concrete lining. Deflector systems, such as cables with visible buoys, would be installed and maintained upstream of all drop structures to direct large mammals to escape ridges.

Canal Fishery

The canal contains game and nongamefish. The fishery is dominated by channel catfish (about 90 percent) and also contains populations of largemouth bass, sunfish, and flathead catfish. Other species are common carp, threadfin shad, and striped bass. Channel catfish, bass, and sunfish provide recreational fishing, which is permitted.

The preferred alternative would reduce canal bank vegetation that provides food and cover, particularly for shoreline gamefish. The flow velocity also would inhibit spawning. These changes would cause the number of fish in the canal to decline. Mitigation for the changes, aimed at maintaining the recreational fishery, would consist of installing artificial reefs in the lined canal. These artificial reefs would provide cover for hatchling fish and habitat for aquatic organisms on which the hatchlings feed. Alternative mitigation methods would be stocking fish and providing fishery habitat in regulating reservoirs.

Cultural Resources

From Pilot Knob to Drop 4, the AAC occupies land that contains remnants of cultural activity from prehistoric times to recent historical times. The Pilot Knob area, adjacent to the AAC near Yuma, is one of the most significant and sensitive areas of cultural resources in the Colorado Desert and has been designated the Pilot Knob Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), administered by BLM. Scattered archeological sites also lie along the canal route.

The preferred alternative would avoid the Pilot Knob ACEC. Additional class III archeological surveys would be made prior to construction, and the cultural resources identified would be avoided or professionally recovered and/or documented.

Recreation

Construction activities along the canal would pose minor limitations to off-road recreationists in the Sand Hills area. This impact would be controlled through an interim recreation management plan to be developed with BLM. The potential reduction in gamefish caused by the concrete lining would be mitigated by installing artificial reefs in the lined canal, a measure aimed at maintaining fishing along the canal.

Land Ownership and Use

The preferred alternative would use approximately 1,503 acres of previously disturbed land. The parallel canal would be constructed on Federal land previously set aside for canal construction and operation. The project may require acquisition of land for mitigation.

Sand and Gravel Supplies

The preferred alternative would require approximately 185,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel, in an area in which gravel supplies are not plentiful. Gravel would come from established quarry areas in Imperial County, and possibly from a new source on the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation. Federal, State, and county regulations would be followed.

Transportation

Construction workers and their materials would reach the jobsite via Interstate 8 (I-8) and various local paved and unpaved roads between El Centro and Yuma. Traffic on I-8 and most of the local roads is below capacity, so construction traffic would not significantly affect local transportation.

Hydroelectric Power

Because of reduced diversions, the preferred alternative would reduce hydroelectric power generation along the AAC by approximately 220,000 kilowatthours (kWh) per year, and along the Colorado River at Parker, Davis, and Hoover Dams by a combined amount of approximately 5 million kWh per year.

Project Operating Energy Requirements

The preferred alternative would not require energy to operate.

Public Safety

Public contact with the canal occurs through fishing and swimming in the canal and visitation. Even though the canal is posted against swimming, numerous drownings occur. Most of the drownings take place when illegal aliens attempt to cross the international boundary.

The preferred alternative would make swimming more hazardous due to increased waterflow velocity. Also, the concrete lining eventually would become slippery at and below the water surface because of accumulated silt and aquatic vegetation. This slipperiness would make climbing out of the canal difficult, but its effect would be mitigated by placement of escape ridges on the canal lining. In

addition, signs would be posted on both sides of the canal to warn people of the dangerous waters.

Employment and Income During Construction

The Imperial County unemployment rate has varied from 19.9 percent to over 30 percent during the last decade. This includes workers from Mexicali who work in the Imperial Valley. Construction of the proposed project would provide employment for local citizens and for construction workers from outside of the area. Under the preferred alternative, contractor manpower requirements are estimated at 415 work years, of which about 75 percent are expected to be filled locally.

Local Community Structure

Under the preferred alternative, the number of construction workers and family members arriving from outside the area is expected to be 200. Compared to the populations of El Centro (31,650) and Yuma (about 49,000) and to the Imperial County population of 115,700, the construction arrivals would be small in number and are not expected to have a significant effect on the structure and utilities of local communities. Because of the short duration of the construction period and the mild climate, many workers will bring mobile homes and travel trailers.

Immigration From Mexico

The preferred alternative would not have a significant effect on the operations of the Immigration and Naturalization Services' Border Patrol (Border Patrol). The Border Patrol would need to increase its surveillance activities during active project construction.

Growth Inducement

The preferred alternative would not induce growth in the Imperial Valley, where the project would be constructed, or in the southern California coastal area, which contemplates use of the water to meet existing needs.

Indian Trust Assets

During the environmental impact statement process, Reclamation representatives met and corresponded with the Quechan Indian Tribe (Tribe) regarding the project, the alternatives, and potential impacts to Indian trust assets.

Two potentially affected assets were identified: construction workers may need to cross reservation lands, and the Tribe would like to sell gravel for use in project construction. The Tribe was receptive to negotiating an agreement to allow workers to cross reservation lands. A final agreement to allow workers to cross reservation lands would be reached after the final environmental impact statement is filed and a record of decision issued. Reclamation is receptive to purchasing gravel from the Tribe; however, this gravel would have to be tested for suitability by the contractor.

Table S-2 presents a comparison of the principal differences among alternatives. Table S-3 summarizes proposed mitigation measures and their estimated costs for the preferred alternative.

Table S-2.—Summary of principal environmental aspects for All-American Canal

RESOURCE CATEGORY	PARALLEL CANAL ALTERNATIVE		DROP 3 ALTERNATIVE	
	POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACT	NET IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION	POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACT	NET IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION
GROUND WATER	Water table would drop to precanal levels under 23 miles of canal.	Same.	Water table would drop to precanal levels under 24.6 miles of canal.	Same.
WATER QUALITY	Turbidity during construction. No permanent change in. canal water quality. Unmeasurable increase in salinity of Colorado River.	Same.	Turbidity and possible pH change during construction. No permanent change in canal water quality. Unmeasurable increase in salinity of Colorado River.	Same.
WETLANDS ALONG THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL	123 acres of scattered habitat along canal would be lost.	No net loss of habitat value.	123 acres of scattered habitat along canal would be lost.	No net loss of habitat value.
SURFACE WATER AND WETLANDS ALONG THE COLORADO RIVER	Lower Colorado River and backwaters: 1/2-inch reduction in water level. 4-1/2-acre reduction in water surface area.	No net loss of habitat value.	Lower Colorado River and backwaters: 1/2-inch reduction in water level 4-1/2-acre reduction in water surface area.	No net loss of habitat value.
TERRESTRIAL HABITAT	Acres of habitat lost: 587 desert scrub 916 sand dune.	No net loss of habitat value.	Acres of habitat lost: 134 desert scrub 153 sand dune.	No net loss of habitat value.
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES	Loss of habitat for flat-tailed horned lizard and rare plants.	No net loss of habitat for flat-tailed horned lizard or rare plants. Reduction of rare plants.	Minor impacts during construction.	No impact.
CANAL FISHERY	Species and numbers of fish would be greatly reduced.	Numbers would be reduced, but gamefish would be maintained.	Species and numbers of fish would be greatly reduced.	Numbers would be reduced, but gamefish would be maintained.
CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potential disturbance of some archeological sites.	No significant impact.	Potential disturbance of some archeological sites.	No significant impact.
HYDROELECTRIC POWER	Annual power loss: AAC - 220,000 kWh[1] Colorado River - 5.1 MkWh[2]	Same.	Annual power loss: AAC - 168,000 kWh Colorado River - 5.0 MkWh.	Same.
EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME DURING CONSTRUCTION	415 contractor work years. Economic impact - $40 million to local economy.	Same.	420 contractor work years. Economic impact - $50 million to local economy.	Same.
PROJECT ENERGY OPERATING REQUIREMENTS	No impact.	Same.	No impact.	Same.

[1] kWh = kilowatthour
[2] MkWh = million kilowatthours

Table S-2.—Summary of principal environmental aspects for All-American Canal (continued)

DROP 4 ALTERNATIVE		WELL FIELD ALTERNATIVE		
POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACT	NET IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION	POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACT	NET IMPACT AFTER MITIGATION	NO FEDERAL ACTION
Water table would drop to precanal levels under 29.9 miles of canal.	Same.	Water table would drop to precanal levels under 17 miles of canal.	Same.	No impact.
Turbidity and possible pH change during construction. No permanent change in canal water. Unmeasurable increase in salinity of Colorado River.	Same.	Potential slight increase in salinity of canal water. No change in salinity of Colorado River.	Same.	No impact.
1,518 acres in wetlands complex along canal would be lost.	No net loss of habitat value.	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.
Lower Colorado River and backwaters: 1/2-inch reduction in water level. 4-1/2-acre reduction in water surface area.	No net loss of habitat value.	Lower Colorado River and backwaters: 1/2-inch reduction in water level. 4-1/2-acre reduction in water surface area.	No net loss of habitat value.	No impact.
Acres of habitat lost: 183 desert scrub 153 sand dune.	No net loss of habitat value.	Acres of habitat lost: 5 desert scrub 1 sand dune.	No net loss of habitat value.	No impact.
Minor impacts during construction. Impacts to Yuma clapper rail and California black rail.	No impact.	No significant impact.	No significant impact.	No impact.
Species and numbers of fish would be greatly reduced.	Numbers would be reduced, but gamefish would be maintained.	No impact.	No impact.	No impact.
Potential disturbance of some archeological sites.	No significant impact.	No significant impact.	No significant impact.	No impact.
Annual power loss: AAC - 267,000 kWh Colorado River - 5.2 MkWh.	Same.	Annual power loss: AAC - 105,000 kWh Colorado River - 5.1 MkWh.	Same.	No impact.
440 contractor work years. Economic impact - $56 million to local economy.	Same.	14.9 contractor work years. Economic impact - $1.3 million to local economy.	Same.	No impact.
No impact.	Same.	Increased power demand of 10.7 MkWh per year.	Same.	No impact.

Table S-3.—Estimated costs of mitigation commitments for the preferred alternative

Mitigation commitment	Cost
Lower Colorado River backwater restoration fund	[1]$100,000
Wetlands mitigation	[2]150,000
One-to-one replacement of disturbed flat-tailed horned lizard habitat and sand dune habitat. Purchase of up to approximately 1,503 acres[3] at $500 per acre	[4]751,500
Installation of tire reefs to replace lost shoreline canal fishery habitat	[2]250,000
Large mammal/human escape ridges	[5]___
Archeological surveys	[2]100,000
Stockpiling and recontouring of surface soils	[6]60,000
Develop interim recreation plan	[7]5,000
Total capital costs	$1,416,500
Mitigation annual operation and maintenance	[2]$46,000

[1] From chapter III, "Wetlands Along the Colorado River."
[2] From Engineering Appendix to the draft environmental impact statement/environmental impact report.
[3] Maximum probable impact estimate, from chapter III, "Special Status Species."
[4] Assumed price of $500 per acre for undeveloped land in Imperial Valley. Replacement lands would be acquired in accordance with section 203(a)(2) of Public Law 100-675 (attachment A of the FEIS/FEIR). In addition, acreage may be reduced based on actual construction impacts.
[5] Cost of incorporating this measure is included in the cost of constructing the canal lining.
[6] U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service estimate for Coachella Canal Lining Project. Assumed to be approximately accurate for the All-American Canal Lining Project.
[7] Bureau of Reclamation estimates. Implementation costs are included in the cost of constructing the canal lining.

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Development of the canal lining alternatives and mitigation measures has been coordinated with the California water agencies affected, Federal and State agencies having responsibility for natural resources, the Quechan Indian Tribe, and the general public. Numerous working sessions and meetings occurred among interested agencies, and public meetings were held in the project area. Through the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, the United States has held consultations with Mexico regarding the lining project as stipulated in Commission Minute No. 242, Point 6, pursuant to the 1944 Water Treaty between the United States and Mexico.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	S-1
Chapter I—Purpose and need	I-1
Location	I-1
Project purpose	I-1
Authorization	I-1
Water need	I-2
Background	I-2
All-American Canal water conservation planning	I-2
Colorado River priorities	I-3
Water systems involved	I-5
Relationship to other projects	I-5
Coachella Canal Prototype Lining Project	I-5
Coachella Canal Lining Project	I-5
Colorado River Water Underground Storage and Recovery Study, Imperial County, California	I-6
Current IID-MWD Phase I Water Conservation Program	I-6
Future IID-MWD Phase II Water Conservation Program	I-6
Lower Colorado Water Supply Project	I-7
Mexican Treaty Deliveries	I-7
San Luis Rey Indian Water Right Settlement Act	I-7
Chapter II—Alternatives	II-1
Scope of alternatives	II-1
Parallel Canal Alternative (preferred alternative)	II-2
Canal design	II-2
Construction activities	II-6
Relocations	II-7
Mitigation features	II-7
Permits and agreements	II-8
Construction cost	II-9
Construction schedule	II-9
Project operation	II-9
Canal operation	II-9
Use of conserved water	II-9
Operation and maintenance cost	II-10
Drop 3 Alternative	II-10
Lining design	II-10
Construction activities	II-12
Mitigation features	II-12
Permits	II-12
Construction cost	II-12
Construction schedule	II-13
Project operation	II-13
Operation and maintenance cost	II-13

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Chapter II—Alternatives (continued)
Drop 4 Alternative II-13
Lining design and construction II-13
Mitigation features II-13
Permits II-13
Construction cost II-14
Construction schedule II-14
Project operation II-14
Operation and maintenance cost II-14
Well Field Alternative II-14
Well field design II-14
Construction activities II-15
Mitigation features II-15
Permits and agreements II-15
Construction cost II-15
Construction schedule II-16
Project operation II-16
Operation, maintenance, and replacement cost II-16
No Action Alternative II-16
Alternatives considered but eliminated II-16
Parallel canal to Drop 4 . . . . . II-16
Combination of in-place lining and parallel canal construction II-16

Chapter III—Affected environment and environmental consequences III-1
General project setting III-1
Climate III-1
Geographic and geologic setting III-1
Seismicity III-2
Ground water III-2
Affected environment III-3
Canal seepage III-3
Water table elevation III-3
Parallel Canal Alternative III-4
Canal seepage III-4
Water table elevation III-5
Drop 3 Alternative III-6
Canal seepage III-6
Water table elevation III-6
Drop 4 Alternative III-6
Canal seepage III-6
Water table elevation III-6

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Chapter III—Affected environment and environmental consequences (continued)

Ground water (continued)

Well Field Alternative III-7
Canal seepage III-7
Water table elevation III-7
No Action Alternative III-7
Canal seepage III-7
Water table elevation III-7
Surface water III-8
Affected environment III-9
All-American Canal III-9
Colorado River III-9
Salton Sea III-9
Parallel Canal Alternative III-9
All-American Canal III-9
Colorado River III-10
Salton Sea III-10
Drop 3 Alternative III-10
All-American Canal III-10
Colorado River III-11
Salton Sea III-11
Drop 4 Alternative III-11
All-American Canal III-11
Colorado River III-11
Salton Sea III-11
Well Field Alternative III-11
All-American Canal III-11
Colorado River III-11
Salton Sea III-11
No Action Alternative III-11
All-American Canal III-11
Colorado River III-11
Salton Sea III-11
Water quality III-12
Affected environment III-12
Parallel Canal Alternative III-13
Permanent impacts III-13
Impacts during construction III-13
Drop 3 Alternative III-14
Permanent impacts III-14
Impacts during construction III-14
Drop 4 Alternative III-15
Permanent impacts III-15
Impacts during construction III-15

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Chapter III—Affected environment and environmental consequences (continued)

Water quality (continued)

Well Field Alternative III-15
Permanent impacts III-15
Impacts during construction III-15
No Action Alternative III-16
Air quality III-16
Affected environment III-16
Parallel Canal Alternative III-17
Drop 3 Alternative III-17
Drop 4 Alternative III-17
Well Field Alternative III-18
No Action Alternative III-18
Wetlands habitat along the All-American Canal III-18
Affected environment III-18
Location of wetlands III-18
Classification of wetlands III-20
Assignment of habitat values III-20
Wetlands goal III-22
Parallel Canal Alternative III-23
Effect on wetlands III-23
Mitigation plan III-24
Monitoring plan III-24
Drop 3 Alternative III-24
Drop 4 Alternative III-25
Effect on wetlands III-25
Mitigation plan III-25
Well Field Alternative III-26
No Action Alternative III-26
Wetlands habitat along the Colorado River III-27
Affected environment III-27
Parallel Canal Alternative III-27
Drop 3 Alternative III-28
Drop 4 Alternative III-28
Well Field Alternative III-28
No Action Alternative III-28
Terrestrial habitat III-28
Affected environment III-29
Creosotebush scrub community III-30
Wash woodland community III-30
Sand dune community III-30
Parallel Canal Alternative III-31
Drop 3 Alternative III-31
Drop 4 Alternative III-32

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Chapter III—Affected environment and environmental consequences (continued)

Terrestrial habitat (continued)

Well Field Alternative III-32
No Action Alternative III-32
Special status species III-32
Affected environment III-32
Parallel Canal Alternative III-34
Special status species habitat III-34
Flat-tailed horned lizard habitat III-35
Sand dune habitat III-35
Drop 3 Alternative III-35
Drop 4 Alternative III-36
Well Field Alternative III-36
No Action Alternative III-36
Endangered species consultation (section 7 consultation) III-36
Large mammal escape III-37
Affected environment III-37
Parallel Canal Alternative III-37
Drop 3 Alternative III-38
Drop 4 Alternative III-38
Well Field Alternative III-39
No Action Alternative III-39
Canal fishery III-39
Affected environment III-39
Channel habitat III-41
Shoreline habitat III-41
Drop habitat III-41
Parallel Canal Alternative III-42
Mitigation III-42
Artificial reefs III-42
Channel catfish stocking III-43
Regulating reservoir III-43
Adequacy of mitigation III-44
Drop 3 Alternative III-44
Impact without mitigation III-44
Mitigation III-45
Adequacy of mitigation III-45
Drop 4 Alternative III-45
Impact without mitigation III-45
Mitigation III-45
Adequacy of mitigation III-45
Well Field Alternative III-45
No Action Alternative III-45

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Chapter III—Affected environment and environmental consequences (continued)

Cultural resources III-45
Affected environment III-46
Parallel Canal Alternative III-48
Drop 3 Alternative III-49
Drop 4 Alternative III-49
Well Field Alternative III-49
No Action Alternative III-50
Recreation III-50
Affected environment III-50
Parallel Canal Alternative III-51
Drop 3 Alternative III-53
Drop 4 Alternative III-53
Well Field Alternative III-53
No Action Alternative III-53
Land ownership and use III-54
Affected environment III-54
Parallel Canal Alternative III-54
Drop 3 Alternative III-54
Drop 4 Alternative III-55
Well Field Alternative III-55
No Action Alternative III-55
Sand and gravel supplies III-55
Affected environment III-55
Parallel Canal Alternative III-56
Drop 3 Alternative III-56
Drop 4 Alternative III-56
Well Field Alternative III-57
No Action Alternative III-57
Transportation III-57
Affected environment III-57
Parallel Canal Alternative III-57
Drop 3 Alternative III-57
Drop 4 Alternative III-57
Well Field Alternative III-58
No Action Alternative III-58
Hydroelectric power III-58
Affected power systems III-58
All-American Canal powerplants III-58
Colorado River powerplants III-58
Parallel Canal Alternative III-58
All-American Canal powerplants III-58
Colorado River powerplants III-60
Drop 3 Alternative III-60
Drop 4 Alternative III-60

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Chapter III—Affected environment and environmental consequences (continued)

Hydroelectric power (continued)

Well Field Alternative III-60
No Action Alternative III-61
Project operating energy requirements III-61
Parallel Canal Alternative III-61
Drop 3 Alternative III-61
Drop 4 Alternative III-61
Well Field Alternative III-61
No Action Alternative III-61
Public safety III-61
Affected environment III-61
Parallel Canal Alternative III-62
Drop 3 Alternative III-62
Drop 4 Alternative III-63
Well Field Alternative III-63
No Action Alternative III-63
Employment and income during construction III-63
Affected environment III-63
Parallel Canal Alternative III-63
Drop 3 Alternative III-64
Drop 4 Alternative III-66
Well Field Alternative III-66
No Action Alternative III-66
Local community structure III-68
Parallel Canal Alternative III-68
Drop 3 Alternative III-69
Drop 4 Alternative III-69
Well Field Alternative III-69
No Action Alternative III-69
Immigration from Mexico III-70
Affected environment III-70
Parallel Canal Alternative III-70
Drop 3 Alternative III-70
Drop 4 Alternative III-70
Well Field Alternative III-70
No Action Alternative III-71
Growth inducement III-71
Affected environment III-71
Parallel Canal Alternative III-71
Imperial Valley III-71
Southern California coastal area III-71
Drop 3 Alternative III-71
Drop 4 Alternative III-71

CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Chapter III—Affected environment and environmental consequences (continued)
Growth enducement (continued)
Well Field Alternative III-71
No Action Alternative III-71
Indian trust assets III-71
Affected environment III-71
Parallel Canal Alternative III-72
Drop 3 Alternative III-72
Drop 4 Alternative III-72
Well Field Alternative III-72
No Action Alternative III-72

Chapter IV—Cumulative impacts IV-1
Colorado River IV-1
Projects proposed IV-1
Assessment of impacts IV-2
Hydroelectric power along the All-American Canal IV-4
Hydroelectric power along the Colorado River IV-4

Chapter V—Short-term use of man's environment versus maintenance of long-term productivity V-1
Cultural values V-1
Parallel Canal construction V-1
In-place lining and well field V-1
Native vegetation V-1
Parallel canal construction V-1
In-place lining and well field V-1

Chapter VI—Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources VI-1
Cultural resources VI-1
Land ownership and use VI-1
Sand and gravel VI-1
Hydroelectric power VI-2

Chapter VII—Environmental commitments VII-1
Air quality VII-1
Wetlands habitat along the All-American Canal VII-1
Mitigation plan VII-1
Monitoring plan VII-2
Wetlands habitat along the Colorado River VII-2
Terrestrial habitat VII-2

CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Chapter VII—Environmental commitments (continued)	
Special status species	VII-2
Yuma clapper rail and California black rail	VII-3
Flat-tailed horned lizard	VII-3
Plants	VII-3
Colorado fringe-toed lizard and Andrew's dune scarab beetle	VII-3
Postconstruction survey	VII-4
Large mammal escape	VII-4
Canal fishery	VII-4
Cultural resources	VII-4
Recreation	VII-5
Sand and gravel supplies	VII-5
Transportation	VII-6
Public safety	VII-6
Immigration from Mexico	VII-6
Geodetic survey monuments	VII-6
Indian trust assets	VII-6
Chapter VIII—Consultation and coordination	VIII-1
Lead and participating agencies	VIII-1
Public involvement	VIII-1
Agency coordination	VIII-2
International coordination	VIII-3
Quechan Indian Tribe	VIII-3
Indian trust assets	VIII-3
Cultural resources	VIII-3
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommendations	VIII-3
National Environmental Policy Act and California Environmental Quality Act compliance	VIII-4
Unresolved issues	VIII-4
Comments on the proposed project	VIII-4
Permits, agreements, and construction coordination	VIII-5
References	
List of preparers	
Abbreviations and acronyms	
Index	

TABLES

Number		Page
S-1	Summary of physical properties and design elements and costs	S-4
S-2	Summary of principle environmental aspects for All-American Canal	S-10
S-3	Estimated costs of mitigation commitments for the preferred alternative	S-12
I-1	Priorities in seven-party agreement and water delivery contracts	I-4
II-1	Summary of physical properties and design elements and costs	II-4
II-2	Estimated costs of mitigation commitments for the preferred alternative	II-8
III-1	Canal seepage by reach	III-4
III-2	Water conserved by each action alternative	III-5
III-3	All-American Canal water quality data, 1987	III-12
III-4	Relative habitat values of riparian vegetation communities as used in the All-American Canal wetlands analysis	III-21
III-5	Marsh classification system for the Lower Colorado River region	III-21
III-6	Summary of existing seepage wetlands vegetation along the All-American Canal from Pilot Knob to Drop 4	III-22
III-7	Summary of All-American Canal seepage wetlands acreage for current conditions (no action) and future scenarios (without mitigation)	III-23
III-8	Seepage wetlands mitigation for Drop 4 Alternative	III-25
III-9	Summary of impacts on special status species from the Parallel Canal Alternative	III-33
III-10	Estimated quantity of habitat losses for listed and candidate species without mitigation	III-34
III-11	All-American Canal existing fishery - Pilot Knob to Drop 4	III-40
III-12	Surface area of fish habitat types - Pilot Knob to Drop 4	III-40
III-13	Species composition and density of fishery by habitat type	III-41
III-14	Summary of fishery impacts and artificial reef mitigation requirements	III-43
III-15	Reduction in hydroelectric power	III-59
III-16	Contractor and project management employment - Parallel Canal Alternative	III-64
III-17	Contractor employment - Drop 3 Alternative	III-65
III-18	Project management employment - Drop 3 Alternative	III-65
III-19	Contractor employment - Drop 4 Alternative	III-67
III-20	Project management employment - Drop 4 Alternative	III-67
IV-1	Cumulative hydroelectric power reduction along AAC	IV-4

FIGURES

Number		Page
Frontispiece map		
II-1	Location map . . . . . follows page	II-2
II-2	Well Field Alternative	II-3
II-3	Typical parallel canal section	II-5
II-4	Prototype lining typical canal section	II-11
III-1	Existing wetlands	III-19
III-2	Escape ridges	III-38
III-3	Cultural resources	III-47
III-4	Buttercup/Gordon's Well area	III-52
IV-1	Average monthly flow in 2021, Colorado River at Cibola Lake	IV-3

PHOTOS

Number		Page
1	Interstate 8 highway crossing All-American Canal	S-1
2	All-American Canal Drop 3 with hydroelectric powerplant	II-6
3	Colorado River upstream from Imperial Dam	III-8
4	Wetlands upstream from Drop 3	III-16
5	Wetlands complex between Drops 3 and 4	III-17
6	All-American Canal (parallel canal would be to right)	III-28
7	All-American Canal between Drops 1 and 2	III-29
8	Artificial reef	III-44
9	Gravel terraces	III-48

ATTACHMENTS

A Public Law 100-675
B Endangered species
C U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommendations
D Distribution list
E Letters from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding special status species
F Comments and responses