

*DRAFT*

*SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
FOR INFRASTRUCTURE WITHIN  
U.S. BORDER PATROL NACO-DOUGLAS CORRIDOR  
COCHISE COUNTY, ARIZONA*

*U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY  
WASHINGTON, D.C.*

*MAY 2003*

**DRAFT**

**SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**FOR INFRASTRUCTURE WITHIN**

**U.S. BORDER PATROL NACO-DOUGLAS CORRIDOR**

**COCHISE COUNTY, ARIZONA**

**May 2003**

---

**Lead Agency:**  
Department of Homeland Security  
Headquarters Facilities and Engineering  
425 I Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20536

**Point of Contact:**  
**Mr. Charles Parsons**  
Environmental Officer  
P.O. Box 30080  
24000 Avila Road  
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-0080  
Fax 949-360-2985

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### **PROPOSED ACTION:**

This document supplements the current and future alternatives analyzed in the Final EA for Infrastructure within U.S. Border Patrol Naco-Douglas Corridor, Cochise County, Arizona (INS 2000), herein referred to as the Corridor EA. This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) addresses the potential for effects, beneficial and adverse, of proposed infrastructure construction and improvements along the U.S.-Mexico border by the Department of Homeland Security and U.S. Border Patrol (USBP).

The Preferred Alternative (Proposed Action) involves infrastructure construction activities that consist of primary and secondary pedestrian barrier fencing, vehicle barrier fencing, roads (all weather patrol, maintenance, and drag), lighting, and associated drainage structures within the USBP Naco and Douglas Stations' Areas of Operation (AO).

### **PURPOSE AND NEED:**

The purpose of the programs and improvements discussed in this SEA is to facilitate USBP law enforcement along the identified section of the U.S.-Mexico border as mandated by Federal laws. The need for these programs is to gain, maintain, and extend control of the U.S.-Mexico border. The major goals of the USBP enforcement strategy and the purpose of the proposed infrastructure components in this document are:

- Deter illegal entries
- Enhance the safety of USBP agents
- Reduce the current enforcement footprint
- Create a defensible and enforceable zone that reduces illegal crossings and drug smuggling operations
- Enhance response time for USBP agents

The USBP's primary function is to detect and deter the unlawful entry of undocumented aliens (UDAS) and smuggling along the U.S. land borders. Deterrence can be created only when certainty of apprehension is achieved. The degree of current illegal activity, in addition to the level of enforcement advantage needed to gain, maintain and extend control of the border are the key factors that represent a strong need for the proposed border infrastructure system. In addition to the purpose and need stated above, the proposed border infrastructure system has been planned in compliance with the *Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA)* of 1996.

**ALTERNATIVES  
ADDRESSED:**

Three alternatives were carried forward in this SEA for detailed analysis of potential impacts to the natural and human environment. They include the No Action, the Preferred Alternative and the Full Build Out Alternative. Other alternatives were considered throughout the development of the SEA, but have been eliminated from further consideration as operationally non-effective and/or non-responsive relative to the spirit and intent of IIRIRA. Those alternatives carried forward are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The No Action Alternative would allow for the planned or current infrastructure projects which were identified in the 2000 Corridor EA. This SEA would suffice as the subsequent NEPA document required by the 2000 Corridor EA Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The infrastructure to be completed under the No Action Alternative include: 14 miles of primary pedestrian fence, 3.25 miles of vehicle barriers, 29 miles of patrol roads upgrade improvements, and 11 miles of permanent lighting.

The Preferred Alternative includes only those infrastructure components that are considered essential to gain and maintain immediate control of the border. This alternative includes various types of infrastructure such as roads, fences, and lights at specified locations throughout the project corridor to develop an effective, safe, and defensible border control system. The infrastructure to be completed within the guidelines of the Preferred Alternative include: 22.4 miles of primary fence and primary fence maintenance roads, 18 miles of secondary fence, 8.2 miles of vehicle barriers, 44.7 miles of patrol roads, 7 miles of maintenance roads, 12.8 miles of drag roads, 60 low water crossings, and 13 miles of permanent lighting. The USBP believes that some areas can be controlled using vehicle barriers rather than fencing. Vehicle barriers would be installed to the maximum extent practicable in lieu of pedestrian fences, based on intelligence data gathered by the USBP.

The Full Build Out Alternative would require major construction activities and involves the combination of primary and secondary fencing, permanent lighting, and upgrades to various roadways across the 49-mile project corridor. The infrastructure to be implemented includes: 30.6 miles of primary fence, 49 miles of secondary fence, 43.8 miles of patrol roads, 46.8 miles of maintenance roads, 43.6 miles of drag roads, 60 new low water crossings, and 31 miles of permanent lighting.

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACTS OF THE  
PREFERRED  
ALTERNATIVE:**

The Preferred Alternative would result in direct impacts to 420 acres of vegetation/wildlife habitat, including 19 acres of floodplain, 5 acres of potential jurisdictional wetlands and 12 acres of Waters of the U.S. Approximately 12 National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible cultural resource sites would be impacted; however, proper mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure mitigation of each impacted site. Approximately 0.2 acres of the spikedace (*Meda fulgida*) and loach minnow (*Tiaroga cobitis*) critical habitat would be impacted as a result of installation of vehicle barriers and low water crossings across the San Pedro River. Withdrawals from the Douglas and Upper San Pedro ground water basins would contribute to the yearly recharge deficit that has been occurring in these basins for some time.

Other impacts associated with this alternative are temporary impacts (i.e., regional income, air quality, noise, etc.) associated with the construction process of the border infrastructure system. Existing conditions of these resources would return upon completion of the proposed project. The indirect beneficial impacts associated with this alternative include reduction and possible elimination of trampling of sensitive habitats, reduced soil erosion, reduced fugitive dust due to USBP operations, and a safer environment in the border region.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b><i>ii</i></b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Background.....	1-6
1.1.1 INS Organization and Authority.....	1-7
1.1.2 Naco Station .....	1-8
1.1.3 Douglas Station .....	1-9
1.1.4 Infrastructure Components.....	1-10
1.1.4.1 Primary and Secondary Fencing .....	1-11
1.1.4.2 Vehicle Barriers.....	1-13
1.1.4.3 Roadway Construction .....	1-14
1.1.4.4 Permanent Lighting .....	1-16
1.1.4.5 Drainage Structures .....	1-17
1.1.4.6 Remote Video Surveillance (RVS).....	1-18
1.2 Purpose and Need.....	1-19
1.3 Report Organization .....	1-23
1.4 Applicable Environmental Statutes and Regulations .....	1-24
<b>2.0 ALTERNATIVES.....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 No Action Alternative .....	2-2
2.2 Preferred Alternative.....	2-21
2.2.1 Infrastructure Components.....	2-33
2.2.1.1 Roadways .....	2-37
2.2.2 Permanent Lighting.....	2-38
2.2.3 Drainage Structures.....	2-39
2.3 Full Build Out Alternative .....	2-39
2.3.1 Infrastructure Components.....	2-40
2.3.1.1 Primary and Secondary Fences .....	2-47
2.3.1.2 Roadways .....	2-47
2.3.1.3 Earthwork.....	2-47
2.3.1.4 Permanent Lighting .....	2-48
2.3.1.5 Drainage Structures .....	2-48
2.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis.....	2-48
2.5 Possible Contractors and Staging Sites .....	2-49
2.6 Summary.....	2-50
<b>3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Land Use.....	3-1
3.1.1 Land Use in Cochise County.....	3-1
3.1.1.1 Cochise County Comprehensive Plan .....	3-5
3.1.2 Land Use in the Project Corridor .....	3-6
3.2 Aesthetics and Visual Resources .....	3-6
3.3 Transportation .....	3-8
3.3.1 Roadways.....	3-8
3.3.2 Railroads .....	3-8
3.3.3 Airports .....	3-11
3.3.4 Mining Operations.....	3-11
3.4 Geology, Soils, and Prime Farmland .....	3-11
3.4.1 Geologic Formations.....	3-11

3.4.2	Soils.....	3-12
3.4.3	Hydric Soils.....	3-17
3.4.4	Prime Farmland .....	3-17
3.5	Vegetation.....	3-17
3.5.1	Vegetative Communities.....	3-21
3.5.1.1	Semi-desert Grassland Scrub.....	3-21
3.5.1.2	Chihuahuan Scrub.....	3-22
3.5.1.3	Riparian Scrub.....	3-22
3.5.1.4	Ecinal Mixed Oak .....	3-22
3.5.1.5	Interior Chaparral .....	3-23
3.5.1.6	Interior Riparian Forest.....	3-23
3.6	Wildlife .....	3-23
3.7	Aquatic Communities.....	3-25
3.8	Unique or Sensitive Areas .....	3-26
3.8.1	San Pedro National Conservation Area.....	3-26
3.8.2	Coronado National Memorial.....	3-29
3.8.3	Coronado National Forest.....	3-29
3.9	Protected Species and Critical Habitat.....	3-29
3.9.1	Federally Listed Species .....	3-30
3.9.1.1	Chiricahua Leopard Frog.....	3-35
3.9.1.2	Lesser Long-nosed Bat .....	3-35
3.9.1.3	Mexican Spotted Owl.....	3-36
3.9.1.4	Spikedace and Loach Minnow.....	3-37
3.9.1.5	Huachuca Water Umbel .....	3-37
3.9.1.6	Gila Chub .....	3-38
3.9.1.7	Gila Topminnow .....	3-38
3.9.2	Critical Habitat .....	3-39
3.9.3	State Listed Species .....	3-39
3.10	Cultural Resources.....	3-40
3.10.1	Cultural Resources Overview.....	3-40
3.10.2	Previous Investigations .....	3-41
3.10.3	Current Investigations .....	3-41
3.11	Air Quality.....	3-42
3.12	Water Resources.....	3-44
3.12.1	Surface Watersheds .....	3-44
3.12.1.1	Upper San Pedro Basin.....	3-44
3.12.1.2	Whitewater Draw.....	3-48
3.12.1.3	Rio Yaqui .....	3-48
3.12.2	Groundwater Resources .....	3-48
3.12.2.1	Upper San Pedro Basin.....	3-49
3.12.2.2	Douglas Basin.....	3-51
3.12.3	Floodplains, Waters of the U.S., and Wetlands .....	3-54
3.13	Socioeconomics .....	3-55
3.13.1	Population.....	3-55
3.13.2	Employment and Income .....	3-56
3.13.3	Housing .....	3-57
3.14	Noise.....	3-58
3.15	Solid and Hazardous Waste .....	3-60
<b>4.0</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1	Land Use.....	4-3

4.1.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-3
4.1.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-3
4.1.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-4
4.2	Aesthetic and Visual Resources .....	4-5
4.2.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-5
4.2.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-5
4.2.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-6
4.3	Transportation .....	4-7
4.3.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-7
4.3.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-7
4.3.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-7
4.4	Geology, Soils and Prime Farmland .....	4-8
4.4.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-8
4.4.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-8
4.4.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-10
4.5	Vegetation .....	4-10
4.5.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-10
4.5.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-11
4.5.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-13
4.6	Wildlife .....	4-13
4.6.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-13
4.6.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-13
4.6.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-15
4.7	Aquatic Communities.....	4-17
4.7.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-17
4.7.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-17
4.7.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-18
4.8	Unique and Sensitive Areas .....	4-19
4.8.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-19
4.8.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-19
4.8.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-19
4.9	Protected Species and Critical Habitats.....	4-20
4.9.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-20
4.9.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-20
4.9.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-21
4.10	Cultural Resources .....	4-21
4.10.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-21
4.10.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-23
4.10.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-23
4.11	Air Quality.....	4-24
4.11.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-24
4.11.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-24
4.11.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-25
4.12	Water Resources.....	4-27
4.12.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-27
4.12.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-28
4.12.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-30
4.13	Socioeconomics .....	4-31
4.13.1	No Action Alternative .....	4-32
4.13.2	Preferred Alternative .....	4-32
4.13.3	Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-33

4.14	Environmental Justice .....	4-34
4.15	Noise .....	4-35
	4.15.1 No Action Alternative .....	4-35
	4.15.2 Preferred Alternative .....	4-36
	4.15.3 Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-36
4.16	Solid and Hazardous Wastes .....	4-37
	4.16.1 No Action Alternative .....	4-37
	4.16.2 Preferred Alternative .....	4-37
	4.16.3 Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-38
4.17	Cumulative Effects.....	4-38
	4.17.1 No Action Alternative .....	4-41
	4.17.2 Preferred Alternative .....	4-44
	4.17.3 Full Build Out Alternative.....	4-45
<b>5.0</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN FEATURES.....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	General Construction Activities.....	5-1
5.2	Soils .....	5-2
5.3	Vegetation .....	5-2
5.4	Wildlife .....	5-3
5.5	Protected Species and Critical Habitat.....	5-4
5.6	Cultural Resources .....	5-5
5.7	Water Resources.....	5-6
5.8	Air Quality.....	5-7
5.9	Noise .....	5-7
5.10	Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice.....	5-8
<b>6.0</b>	<b>PUBLIC INVOLVMENT .....</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	Agency Coordination .....	6-1
6.2	Public Review.....	6-1
6.3	Public Scoping Comments.....	6-5
	6.3.1 Mr. Ladd's comments to the USBP .....	6-5
<b>7.0</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>9.0</b>	<b>LIST OF PREPARERS .....</b>	<b>9-1</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>Naco Station Vegetative Survey Analysis of the 300 foot Corridor along the International Border (April 2002)</b>	
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	<b>Agency Correspondence</b>	
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	<b>List of Arizona Protected Species occurring in Cochise County</b>	
<b>APPENDIX D</b>	<b>Naco and Douglas Stations Level Infrastructure Projects Environmental Assessment Air Quality and Conformity Analysis (September 2002)</b>	
<b>APPENDIX E</b>	<b>Public Involvement</b>	

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1.	Naco/Douglas Project Corridor Map .....	1-3
Figure 1-2.	Typical Patrol Road and Drag Road Layout .....	1-16
Figure 1-3.	USBP Staffing Levels and UDA Apprehensions at Naco and Douglas Stations.....	1-20
Figure 1-4.	Total Marijuana Seizures and Total Pounds, For the USBP Douglas and Naco Stations Combined (1994-2002).....	1-21
Figure 2-1a.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Project under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-5
Figure 2-1b.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Project under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-6
Figure 2-1c.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-7
Figure 2-1d.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-8
Figure 2-1e.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-9
Figure 2-1f.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-10
Figure 2-1g.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-11
Figure 2-1h.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-12
Figure 2-1i.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-13
Figure 2-1j.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-14
Figure 2-1k.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-15
Figure 2-1l.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-16
Figure 2-1m.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-17
Figure 2-1n.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-18
Figure 2-1o.	Existing, Ongoing, and Remaining Infrastructure Projects under the No Action Alternative/Naco West .....	2-19
Figure 2-2.	Summary – Preferred Alternative .....	2-23
Figure 2-2a.	Preferred Alternative .....	2-24
Figure 2-2b.	Preferred Alternative .....	2-25
Figure 2-2c.	Preferred Alternative .....	2-26
Figure 2-2d.	Preferred Alternative .....	2-27
Figure 2-2e.	Preferred Alternative .....	2-28
Figure 2-3.	Schematic Cross Section of Infrastructure Components in Areas that would Experience Roadway Upgrades Only.....	2-29
Figure 2-4.	Typical Schematic Cross Section of Infrastructure Components where secondary Fences would be Positioned 270 feet North of the U.S.-Mexico Border.....	2-30
Figure 2-5.	Schematic Cross Section Of Infrastructure Components Where Secondary Fence Would Not Exist.....	2-31

Figure 2-6.	Schematic Cross Section Of Infrastructure Components Where Secondary Fences would be Positioned 60 Feet North of the U.S./Mexico Border .....	2-35
Figure 2-7.	Typical Schematic Cross Section of Infrastructure along the International Ditch in the City of Douglas .....	2-36
Figure 2-8a.	Full Build Out Alternative .....	2-41
Figure 2-8b.	Full Build Out Alternative .....	2-42
Figure 2-8c.	Full Build Out Alternative .....	2-43
Figure 2-8d.	Full Build Out Alternative .....	2-44
Figure 2-8e.	Full Build Out Alternative .....	2-45
Figure 3-1.	Naco/Douglas Project Corridor Land Ownership .....	3-3
Figure 3-2.	Naco/Douglas Project Corridor Transportation and Mining Operations ...	3-9
Figure 3-3a.	SSURGO Soil Classifications and General Soil Map Associations in Naco AO.....	3-15
Figure 3-3b.	SSURGO Soil Classifications in Douglas Project Area .....	3-16
Figure 3-4.	Naco/Douglas Project Corridor Prime Farmland.....	3-19
Figure 3-5.	Unique and Sensitive Areas in the Project Corridor .....	3-27
Figure 3-6.	Critical Habitat and Occurrence Locations in the Project Corridor .....	3-33
Figure 3-7.	Naco/Douglas Project Corridor Water Resources.....	3-45
Figure 3-8.	Typical Sound Levels of Common Noise Sources .....	3-59

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1.	Applicable Environmental Statues and Regulations .....	1-24
Table 2-1.	Status of Projects Identified in the 2000 Corridor EA .....	2-3
Table 2-2.	Summary of Remaining Projects Identified under the No Action Alternative.....	2-4
Table 2-3.	Summary of Construction Required for the Preferred Alternative .....	2-33
Table 2-4.	Summary of New Construction Requirements for the Full Build Out Alternative.....	2-40
Table 2-5.	Summary Matrix of How Alternatives Meet the Goals of the Stated Purpose and Need.....	2-51
Table 2-6.	Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts.....	2-52
Table 3-1.	SSURGO Soil Complex Descriptions Based on 2002 Data .....	3-13
Table 3-2.	Historic and Current Fish Species of the San Pedro River, Cochise County, Arizona.....	3-25
Table 3-3.	Federally Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species Potentially Occurring within Cochise County, Arizona.....	3-31
Table 3-4.	Summary of Previously Recorded Sites .....	3-33
Table 3-5.	Summary of Newly Recorded Sites .....	3-42
Table 3-6.	National Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	3-43
Table 3-7.	Water Company Pumpage and Treated Effluent in the San Pedro Basin.....	3-52
Table 3-8.	Water Company Pumpage and Treated Effluent in the Douglas Basin ..	3-53
Table 4-1.	Approximate Impacts from Infrastructure Component Systems to the Natural Environment for Each Action Alternative .....	4-2
Table 4-2.	Acres of Impacts to Disturbed and Undisturbed Areas .....	4-3
Table 4-3.	Summary of Direct Impacts to Soils .....	4-9
Table 4-4.	Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts by Vegetation Community .....	4-11
Table 4-5.	Summary of Direct Impacts to Cultural Resources.....	4-22

---

Table 4-6.	Summary of SO <sub>2</sub> Emissions from Construction Equipment.....	4-26
Table 4-7.	Summary of PM <sub>10</sub> Emissions from Construction Activities.....	4-26
Table 4-8.	ADOT Current and Future Projects .....	4-42

### LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

Photograph 1-1	Landing Mat Style Fence.....	1-12
Photograph 1-2	Picket Style Fence .....	1-12
Photograph 1-3	Bollard Style Fence .....	1-12
Photograph 1-4	Sandia Style Fence .....	1-12
Photograph 1-5	Primary Vehicle Barrier (railroad track).....	1-13
Photograph 1-6	Primary Vehicle Barrier (pipe) .....	1-13
Photograph 1-7	Temporary Vehicle Barrier (railroad track) .....	1-14
Photograph 1-8	Temporary Vehicle Barrier being loaded .....	1-14
Photograph 1-9	Typical Drag Road .....	1-15
Photograph 1-10	Typical Permanent Lighting .....	1-16
Photograph 1-11	Typical Low-water Crossing .....	1-17

(This page intentionally left blank)