

Table 2. Summary of Environmental Consequences.

Issue	Alternative 1 (No Federal Funding)	Alternative 2 (Provided only by private development)	Alternative 3 (Utilizing Federal Funding)
Listed species	Would be reviewed within state to avoid adverse impacts.	No review unless U.S. Corps of Engineer permit required.	Would be reviewed by both DFW and Service personnel to ensure no adverse impact. If possibility of unacceptable impact, closer environment review may be done.
Cultural resources	Would be reviewed by SHPO under Indian laws.	No review or concern unless through Corps permit.	Would be reviewed by SHPO under both State and Federal law. If possibility of adverse impact, closer environmental review may be done.
Floodplains	Would be reviewed within State under Indiana laws and permitting process.	Protection only through Corps permitting.	Would be reviewed by both DFW and Service personnel to ensure no adverse impact. If possibility of unacceptable impact, closer environmental review may be done.
Wetlands	Would be reviewed within State under Indiana laws and permitting process.	Largely protected through Corps permitting.	Would be reviewed by both DFW and Service personnel to ensure no adverse impact. If possibility of unacceptable impact, closer environmental review may be done.
Invasive Species	State would attempt to minimize the chance of introductions through public education and facility design considerations.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both DFW and Service personnel to minimize risk of adverse impact. If possibility of unreasonable risk to sensitive areas, closer environmental review may be done.
Environmental Justice	State would address identified issues.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both DFW and Service to ensure that all issues are identified. If possibility of adverse impact, closer review may be done.

Public controversy	State would still address controversy.	Public would typically have minimal input.	Public notification of intended plans, if controversy continues, may result in site specific NEPA process which would tend to be more open because it has both State and Federal oversight.
No Access Waterway	State would give consideration if an issue.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both DFW and Service to determine if an issue. If possibility of adverse impact, closer review may be done.
Traffic Flow and Safety	State would give consideration if an issue.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both DFW and Service to determine if an issue. If possibility of adverse impact, closer review may be done.
Accessibility	State would still design sites to be accessible according to law.	Legally required to provide, only enforcement is civil suits.	Would assure compliance and provide more funds to allow opportunity to consider additional options.
Ability to meet public demand for more facilities	Diminished because of reduced funding available.	Would be large unmet except in few instances where it would be economically viable.	Would maximize the ability to address the current demand.
Cumulative Impacts	State would give consideration if an issue.	Little if any consideration given.	Would be reviewed by both DFW and Service to determine if an issue. If possibility of adverse impact, closer review may be done.
Ability to utilize dedicated Federal Aid boating funds	Would not be done through construction, some may be utilized for maintenance.	Funds may be reverted or if not, would be under utilized.	Would ensure that all boating funds were fully utilized.