

## Alternative Segments Omitted from Further Consideration and Reasons for Omission

No.	Reason for Segment Omission	No.	Reason for Segment Omission
51	Traverses several plugged and abandoned wells avoided by Alternative 4.	67	Connection not used.
52	Leads to crossing determined to be circuitous and inferior to Alternative 4 crossing.	68	Greater residential impacts than present alignment of Alternative 4.
53	Leads to crossing determined to be circuitous and inferior to Alternative 4 crossing.	68.1	Connection not uses [northwest of Segment 68]
54	Leads to crossing determined to be circuitous and inferior to Alternative 4 crossing.	69	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
55	Leads to crossing determined to be circuitous and inferior to Alternative 4 crossing.	70	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
56	Crossing of railroad too oblique of angle, and geometric configuration undesirable.	71	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
57	Crossing seen far less desirable ((circuitous and requires separate railroad and Bayou Dorcheat crossing structures)) than present crossing for Alternative 4.	72	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
58	Crossing seen far less desirable (circuitous and requires separate railroad and Bayou Dorcheat crossing structures) than present crossing for Alternative 4.	73	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville
59	Crossing requires a far longer structure for separate railroad and waterway crossings than the present combined crossing for Alternative 4.	74	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
60	Abutting Segment 56 unreasonable.	75	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
61	Abutting segments 58 and 57 unreasonable.	76	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
62	Abutting segments 60 and 61 unreasonable, and may affect church and cemetery.	77	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
63	Geometric configuration undesirable compared to present alignment of for Alternative 4.	78	Connection not used.
64	Requires right of way purchase and construction in the Kisatchie National Forest.	79	Connection not used.
65	May affect a cemetery and cultural resource site that is avoided to a great extent by the present alignment of Alternative 4; also greater wetland impact than Alternative 4.	80	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.
66	Connection not used.	81	Commits to an alignment south of Haynesville that does not allow interception of hazardous materials north of Haynesville, an established project purpose.

- Notes:**
- A 100-foot buffer is required between liquid petroleum pipelines and the proposed I-69 right-of-way for emergency spill response.
  - To enable display of all alternatives in this report, different scales are used for each map of this set.
  - Areas that do not show locations of wetlands and structures are not necessarily absent of these features. Detailed wetland and structure identification was conducted from aerial photography interpretation and does not extend throughout the entire graphic view.
  - Determination of the use of the structures (i.e., residential, commercial, or institutional) is based on aerial photography interpretation and reference to known features mapped from the USGS Geographic Names Information System. Comprehensive field verification has not been completed for all structures.
  - Figure 3.3 pp. 1-4 represents a composite alignment from Corridor Section F and connecting Corridor Segments C, D and E. That is, the northern sections illustrated on Figures 3.3 pp. 3 and 4 are the same as Alternative 1. Therefore, omitted segments for Alternative 4 as shown on Figures 3.1 pp 1-4 includes only those omitted segments that are *not* displayed on Figures 3.1A-E.
  - Sources for constraint data not addressed in the *Sources* discussion below are data already obtained for an earlier phase of this study. Sources for these data are described in the reports incorporated by reference where these data were initially used.

- Sources:**
- 3001. Aerial photography for study area. Spring, 2003.
  - Louisiana Oil Spill Contingency Office. 1998 Color Aerial Infrared Imagery.
  - Louisiana Department of Natural Resources. 2004. Oils and Gas Well Locations, Current Record Version 05/01/04.
  - Federal Communications Commission. 2004. Communication tower locations from wireless2.fcc.gov.
  - Geologic Consulting Service. 2004. Oils and Gas Well Locations, Current Record Version 05/01/04. Houston, TX.
  - GeoSearch. 2004. 3-Mile Corridor Search along Corridor 1D for potentially hazardous sites. Databases reviewed are discussed in the body of the *Alternatives Development and Screening Report*.
  - URS Corporation. 2003 and 2004. Aerial photography interpretation and field visits to the project site; Digitization of wetland limits, prime and unique farmland soil units and 100-year floodplains; and evaluation of land coverage.

### Legend of Constraints and other Map Features

<p><b>Structures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> Church</li> <li> Cemetery</li> <li> Hospital</li> <li> School</li> <li> Commercial</li> <li> Institution</li> <li> Mobile Home</li> <li> Residential</li> </ul>	<p><b>Oil and Gas Wells</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> Active</li> <li> Inactive</li> <li> Plugged/Abandoned</li> <li> Known Hazardous Sites</li> <li> Known Potentially Hazardous Sites</li> <li> Communication Towers</li> <li> Interchange Locations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> Interstate</li> <li> US Highway</li> <li> State Highway</li> <li> Local Roads</li> <li> Railroads</li> <li> Pipelines</li> <li> Powerlines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> Omitted Segments</li> <li> Alt 3 &amp; Alt 4</li> <li> 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> 1/4 Mile Lignite Site Buffer</li> <li> 1/2 Mile CERCLA Site Buffer</li> <li> Federal and State Lands</li> <li> Scenic Stream Buffer</li> <li> Wetlands</li> <li> Parish - County Line</li> <li> State Boundary</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---	---

**Interstate 69**  
**Section of Independent Utility No. 14**

Louisiana State Project No. 736.99.1032  
Arkansas State Project No. 070212  
Federal Aid Project No. CBI 9901(516)  
Junction I-20 to US 82 near El Dorado, Arkansas  
Bossier, Claiborne, and Webster Parishes, Louisiana  
Columbia and Union Counties, Arkansas

**Figure 3.3Notes**  
**Omitted and Retained Segments:**  
**Alternative 4**