Environmental Constraints Matrix

	Natural Resources															Cultur	al Reso	urces	HazMat		Water Wells		Other			
	State and Federal Protected Species ⁸					EMST ⁹ Habitat Observed				Water Resources				Flood Zones			Farmland Protection						tial			
Alternative Alignment Option ^{1,2,3}	Area (acres)	Federally Proposed Threatened Species	Federally Listed Candidate Species	State Threatened and Endangered Species	Species of Greatest Conservation Need	Agriculture	Disturbed Prairie	Edwards Plateau Savannah, Woodland and Shrubland	Riparian	Total Wetlands (acres)	Total Open Waters (acres)	Total Streams (Linear Feet)	Individual Streams	100-Year Floodplain (acres)	Floodway (acres)	500-Year Floodplain (acres)	Prime Farmland (acres)	Statewide Important Farmland Soils	Recorded Archeology Sites ¹⁰	Recorded Historic Properties	Century Farm Sites	Pipeline Crossings	Hazardous Materials Sites of Poter Concern	Public	Private	Airport
Alternative 1	587- 598	2	1	6	29	76-83	191- 222	133-136	32-33	2.04- 2.78	0.78- 1.59	14,760- 15,521	22-23	18.6- 19.0	6.7-8.3	1.4-1.8	120- 136	154- 164	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0
Alternative 2	586- 596	2	1	6	29	76-83	183- 214	134-137	39-40	2.12- 2.85	3.39- 4.20	14,063- 14,825	21-22	17.8- 18.3	4.3-5.8	1.3-1.7	129- 145	152- 162	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0
Alternative 3	594- 607	2	1	6	29	70-79	172- 228	135-152	32-34	3.03- 4.36	2.48- 3.31	13,895- 14,706	19-21	22.3- 24.5	4.3-58	1.3-1.7	124- 143	149- 162	0	0	0	3	0	0	0-1	0
Alternative 4	594- 604	2	1	6	29	96-103	181- 212	128-131	35-36	1.97- 2.71	1.16- 1.98	13,278- 14,039	20-21	12.2- 12.7	6.5-8.1	1.8-2.1	133- 148	167- 176	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0
Recommended Preferred Alternative (Alt 3 Mod B, C & D)	597	2	1	6	29	72	217	136	34	4.36	3.11	14,287	19	24.5	5.8	1.7	128	156	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
No Build	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

1 Estimates provided are current as of July 2022. All information is subject to change. Range of impacts are the result of potential modifications and combinations of modifications of each Alternative. 2 Data derived from both desktop/online resources and field studies where access was granted.

3 Environmental Constraints Matrix will be updated as design and field evaluations continue.

4 Impacts (ranked High, Medium or Low) to community cohesion involve the bisecting, separating, or isolating of neighborhoods. 5 Because a majority of the displacements for this project would necessarily occur in census blocks that meet EJ thresholds and applying a conservative assumption that all displacements would be predominantly borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population, and according to USDOT guidance, there would therefore be a "disproportionately high and adverse effect" on EJ populations. EJ is discussed further in Section 4.4.5.

6 Travel patterns may change as a result of the proposed project; however, negative impacts to access and travel patterns are not anticipated as discussed further in the Community Impact Analysis. 7 The proposed project is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on Public Services, including Emergency Services as discussed further in the Community Impact Analysis. 8 Alternative is within range of and contains suitable habitat for listed species.

9 Ecological Mapping System of Texas (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department).

10 As of the date of the DEIS, field efforts have not identified any sites eligible for NRHP or SAL. Additional Intensive surveys would be required for the Recommended Preferred Alternative for areas which have been not granted field access. Note: A full evaluation matrix is available in the DEIS.

Loop 9, Segment A Public Hearing



