Transfer of Excess Property and Development of an Outpatient Clinic, Offices, and National Cemetery at the Former Naval Air Station Alameda, California

Draft Environmental Assessment

Prepared by:

Department of Veterans Affairs -
Northern California Health Care System and
National Cemetery Administration

and

Department of the Navy -
Naval Facilities Engineering Command,
Base Realignment and Closure Program Management Office West

January 2013

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
TRANSFER OF EXCESS PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN OUTPATIENT CLINIC, OFFICES, AND NATIONAL CEMETERY AT THE FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA
JANUARY 2013

Lead Agencies:	Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the Department of the Navy (Navy)
Title of Proposed Action:	Transfer of Excess Property and Development of an Outpatient Clinic, Offices, and National Cemetery at the Former Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda, California
Affected Jurisdiction:	City of Alameda, County of Alameda, California
Designation:	Draft Environmental Assessment (EA)

ABSTRACT

This Draft EA evaluates the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the human and natural environment resulting from the Navy and VA Proposed Action to transfer excess federal property at the former NAS Alameda and its subsequent reuse by the VA. The Navy's Proposed Action is to dispose of excess property at the former NAS Alameda via a federal-to-federal (fed-to-fed) transfer to VA. The Navy's need for the Proposed Action is to comply with the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Act of 1990, as amended (Public Law 101-510, 10 USC 2687 [1994]). VA's Proposed Action is to establish a single location for combined services consistent with the national "One VA" goal, which advocates consolidating services wherever possible to ensure that the most centralized, coordinated, and efficient care and services are provided to Veterans in a local area. VA's need for the Proposed Action is to serve, care for, honor, and memorialize San Francisco Bay Area Veterans in a manner that addresses the area's current and future capacity needs and provides a greater range of services at one location.

This Draft EA analyzes two action alternatives that would involve a fed-to-fed transfer of excess federal property. The land transferred would consist of approximately 549 acres under Alternative 1 or approximately 624 acres under Alternative 2. Both action alternatives would include the construction and operation of a VA outpatient clinic, outreach office, National Cemetery, and associated infrastructure on approximately 112 acres. The remaining acreage would remain undeveloped. Also evaluated is the No Action Alternative, in which the Navy would retain ownership of the property under caretaker status. Alternative 2 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative by the VA. This Draft EA has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Pub. L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. 4321-4370f) and the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR 1500-1508).The Navy and VA are joint lead agencies for the Proposed Action.

For additional information concerning this document, please contact:

Navy Base Realignment and Closure
Program Management Office West
Attn: Mr. Ronald Bochenek
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, California 92108
Phone: (619) 532-0906
Fax: (619) 532-9858
Email: ronald.bochenek.ctr@navy.mil

or

Department of Veterans Affairs VISN 21
Attn: Mr. Douglas Roaldson
201 Walnut Avenue, Room 1020
Mare Island, CA 94592-1107
Phone: (707) 562-8426
Fax: (707) 562-8369
Email: Douglas.Roaldson@va.gov

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluates the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the human and natural environment resulting from the Department of the Navy (Navy) and Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Proposed Action to transfer excess federal property at the former NAS Alameda and its subsequent reuse by the VA. The Navy's Proposed Action is to dispose of excess property at the former Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda via a federal-to-federal (fed-to-fed) transfer to VA. The VA Proposed Action is to establish a single location for combined services consistent with the national "One VA" goal, which advocates consolidating services wherever possible to ensure that the most centralized, coordinated, and efficient care and services are provided to Veterans in a local area. The Navy would be responsible for transfer of excess federal property, and VA would be responsible for site preparation activities and the construction and operation of the proposed facilities. In addition, VA would be responsible for implementation of mitigation measures identified in this EA.

This Draft EA has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (Pub. L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. 4321-4370f) and the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR 1500-1508).The Navy and VA are joint lead agencies for the Proposed Action.

PURPOSE AND NEED

The Navy's purpose for the Proposed Action is to transfer excess property at the former NAS Alameda via a fed-to-fed transfer to VA. The Navy's need for the Proposed Action is to comply with the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Act of 1990, as amended. The 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission recommended the closure of NAS Alameda.

VA's purpose is to establish a single location for combined services consistent with the national "One VA" goal, which advocates consolidating services wherever possible to ensure that the most centralized, coordinated, and efficient care and services are provided to Veterans in a local area. VA's need for the Proposed Action is to serve, care for, honor, and memorialize San Francisco Bay Area (Bay Area) Veterans in a manner that addresses the area's current and future capacity needs and provides a greater range of services at one location.

PROJECT AREA

The project area, referred to as the VA Transfer Parcel, is located within the southwest corner of the former NAS Alameda property. The VA Transfer Parcel is comprised of the airfield area of the former NAS Alameda, which consists of inactive runways and support facilities. In addition, a California Least Tern[1] (CLT) colony is located within a 9.7-acre fenced area of the former airfield (see Figure ES-1). The VA Transfer Parcel is bordered by the San Francisco Bay to the west and south, and the remainder of the former NAS Alameda property, now referred to as Alameda Point, to the east and north. The City of Alameda is located east of the VA Transfer Parcel and the City of Oakland is located farther to the northeast. The majority of the VA Transfer Parcel is located within Alameda County, but a small portion in the southwest corner of the parcel is located in San Francisco County.

[1] The California Least Tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*) is a federally listed endangered migratory bird.

Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2012

Figure ES-1: Project Area, Former NAS Alameda, Alameda, California

Depending on the action alternative selected, the VA Transfer Parcel would be either approximately 549 acres (Alternative 1) or 624 acres (Alternative 2) in size. Both action alternatives would include an approximate 112-acre VA Development Area within the larger VA Transfer Parcel. The remaining acreage within the VA Transfer Parcel, including the CLT colony, would remain undeveloped. The VA would also construct an off-site access utility/road corridor on approximately 6 acres of land to the east of the VA Transfer Parcel.

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) has been reducing its basing and staffing requirements to match current force structure plans. As part of the process the 1993 BRAC Commission recommended the closure of NAS Alameda. In 1996, in response to the federal screening process, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) submitted a request for a portion of the land area that is the subject of VA's current request for property transfer. This property included the CLT colony and surrounding lands (including submerged lands) and was identified by USFWS as a proposed area for a national wildlife refuge. During a period from 2000–2001, USFWS and the Navy attempted to negotiate a memorandum of understanding for the property transfer to occur in 2003, however, the agencies reached an impasse regarding transfer of this property. Subsequently, the Navy engaged in discussions with other federal entities that had a long-term need to acquire lands to support their missions. VA expressed interest in the property and submitted a formal request for the property in 2006 through a fed-to-fed property transfer. The submerged lands considered for transfer in USFWS's prior property request are not included in the proposed fed-to-fed transfer to VA.

The VA (i.e., Veterans Health Administration [VHA], Veterans Benefits Administration [VBA], and National Cemetery Administration [NCA]) currently provides services in the Bay Area. However, existing VA facilities are undersized and lack necessary specialty services to serve the Bay Area's current and projected Veteran populations. Additionally, these services are provided in multiple locations within a radius of nearly 100 miles, thus often requiring Veterans to travel substantial distances to receive necessary services and care. The VA Transfer Parcel has been identified by VA as the preferred location for its Proposed Action (i.e., construction and operation of a new OPC, VBA Outreach Office, and NCA Cemetery). The VA Transfer Parcel site best meets VA's purpose and need and siting criteria, including:

- Located within the desired VHA and NCA service areas, in this case Northern Alameda County and the Bay Area, respectively;
- The site is large enough to co-locate all components of the Proposed Action (i.e., OPC, VBA Outreach Office, and NCA Cemetery) at one site to meet the One VA goal, which advocates consolidating services wherever possible to ensure that the most centralized, coordinated, and efficient care and services are provided to Veterans in a local area;
- The site is not located in close proximity to sensitive land uses such as churches, schools, and aircraft flight paths;
- The site has sufficient space to meet future needs for NCA Cemetery internments (i.e., space to expand for at least 100 years);
- The fed-to-fed transfer would allow VA to own the property; and
- The site is accessible to existing utility infrastructure and transportation networks.

The One VA goal allows VA to create synergies and realize operational efficiencies by closely aligning the physical spaces used for various VHA, VBA, and NCA functions and services. Synergies and operational efficiencies include using shared space to reduce duplicate facility and utility expenses, aligning staff and programs to increase efficiency, and improving accessibility to multiple services to meet Veterans' needs.

SCOPE OF THE DRAFT EA

This Draft EA evaluates the potential direct, indirect, short-term, and long-term impacts on the human and natural environment resulting from the Proposed Action. The Draft EA also addresses potential cumulative impacts that may result from reasonably foreseeable projects in the region. The analysis of potential impacts is based on the full build-out of the Proposed Action. The Draft EA documents the Navy's and VA's compliance with the requirements of NEPA, as amended and the CEQ regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR Sections 1500-1508).

Resource areas examined in this Draft EA and potentially impacted include biological resources; water resources; transportation, traffic, circulation, and parking; cultural resources; visual resources and aesthetics; land use; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions and climate change; socioeconomics and environmental justice; hazards and hazardous substances; utilities; noise; public services; and geology and soils.

NEPA PROCESS AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

NEPA establishes an environmental review process for actions undertaken by federal agencies. The review process is intended to help public officials make decisions based on an understanding of the environmental consequences and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment (40 CFR 1500.1). Further, the NEPA process recognizes the importance of public involvement in the agency decision-making process.

Public Scoping Period

In accordance with CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1506.6, "Public Involvement"), the Navy and VA initiated a scoping period in December 2008 by mailing and publishing a notice of public scoping to federal, State, and local agencies, and members of the public known or expected to be interested in the Proposed Action. The purpose of the scoping period was to provide an opportunity for agencies and members of the public to comment on the potential environmental issues and concerns regarding the Proposed Action and to determine the scope of issues to be addressed in this Draft EA. The scoping period began on December 8, 2008 and ended on January 20, 2009 (total of 43 days). In addition, a public information meeting was held on December 18, 2008, at the *USS Hornet* Museum (707 West Hornet Avenue, Alameda, CA). Comments received addressed a variety of concerns, including increased traffic; the effects of a community hospital and helipad that was initially proposed as part of the VA development; and the effect of the project on the CLT.

The Navy and VA considered the comments received during the scoping process to help determine the range of issues and alternatives to be evaluated in this Draft EA. Further, based on agency and public concerns received during the scoping period, VA modified the total scale of development in its original 2008 Proposed Action, by eliminating a proposed VA hospital (250,000 gross square feet [gsf]) and helipad and by reducing the total area of office space.

Public Review of Draft EA

As part of the NEPA process, the Navy and VA have released this Draft EA for a minimum 30-day public review period. A Notice of Availability (NOA) announcing the review period and public hearing was published in the local newspapers (*Alameda Times-Star*, *Oakland Tribune*, and *San Francisco Chronicle*) and mailed to federal, State, and local agencies, and interested members of the public. In addition, the Navy and VA will conduct a public hearing on the Draft EA. Federal, State, and local agencies and members of the public are encouraged to review and comment on the Draft EA during the minimum 30-day public review period. Hard- and electronic-copies of the Draft EA were mailed to federal, State, and local agencies, and interested members of the public; posted to the Navy's BRAC PMO Website (http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil) and VA Website (http://www.northerncalifornia.va.gov/planning/Alameda) and made available for review at the Alameda, Oakland, and San Francisco Public Libraries.

The public's comments on the Draft EA, as well as feedback from applicable resource and permitting agencies, will be responded to in writing as part of a final EA and considered by VA and the Navy to evaluate the project's alternatives and environmental impacts before a final decision is made.

IDENTIFICATION OF ALTERNATIVES

To identify alternatives, VA and the Navy rigorously explored and objectively considered other potentially reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action. As part of the alternatives planning process, a range of preliminary site alternatives were identified and then screened against the Proposed Action's purpose and need as well as VA siting criteria. Through this process, some alternatives were eliminated from further consideration and the remaining alternatives were studied in detail as part of this NEPA review.

The planning process for establishing a new VA facility to serve Bay Area Veterans began in 2004. At the start of the planning process, various alternative locations in the Bay Area were considered. The alternatives ranged from consideration of separate sites for each of the VA Administrations (i.e., VHA, VBA, and NCA) to a single site large enough to fit all of the project components (i.e., One VA goal). For each of the three VA Administrations, alternative site locations were evaluated against specific siting criteria that were developed and used to screen and reduce the number of alternatives considered. Geographic location, site size, and land use compatibility were the primary screening factors, along with the ability of each alternative to meet the Proposed Action's purpose and need. In addition, the planning process considered the One VA goal, which advocates consolidating services wherever possible to ensure that the most centralized, coordinated, and efficient care and services are provided to Veterans in a local area. Chapter 2 of the Draft EA describes the VA's siting criteria.

On August 30, 2011, the Navy and VA submitted a Biological Assessment (BA) to the USFWS and requested formal Section 7 consultation, pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), for the Proposed Action, which at the time was the project as described under Alternative 1 in this EA. Following submission of the BA, the USFWS notified the Navy and VA on September 29, 2011 that USFWS was unable to initiate formal consultation, citing a desire for additional information. The USFWS, Navy, and VA then met numerous times to discuss the additional information needs as well as concerns regarding potential impacts of the project on the CLT. As a result of these discussions, the USFWS, Navy, VA, City of Alameda, and East Bay Regional Parks

District (EBRPD) worked collaboratively to revise the project to minimize potential adverse affects of the Proposed Action on the CLT. This collaborative process resulted in the development of Alternative 2, which moved the proposed VA Development Area north, farther away from the CLT colony.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE DRAFT EA

This Draft EA analyzes two action alternatives that would involve a fed-to-fed transfer of excess federal property; this area is referred to as the VA Transfer Parcel. The land transferred would consist of approximately 549 acres under Alternative 1 or approximately 624 acres under Alternative 2. Both action alternatives would include the construction and operation of a VHA Outpatient Clinic, VBA Outreach Office, Conservation Management Office, NCA Cemetery, and associated infrastructure on approximately 112 acres; this area is referred to as the VA Development Area. The remaining acreage would remain undeveloped. VA would also construct an off-site utility/road corridor on approximately 6 acres of land to the east of the VA Transfer Parcel. Also evaluated is the No Action Alternative, in which the Navy would retain ownership of the property under caretaker status. Alternative 2 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative by the VA. The alternatives examined are described below.

Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, the Navy would transfer approximately 549 acres to VA via a fed-to-fed transfer. Following the fed-to-fed transfer, VA would construct and operate a VHA OPC, VBA Outreach Office, NCA Cemetery, Conservation Management Office, and associated infrastructure on approximately 111 acres of the total VA Transfer Parcel VA would also construct an off-site utility/road corridor on approximately 6 acres of land to the east of the VA Transfer Parcel. The remaining 438 acres of the VA Transfer Parcel, including the existing CLT colony, would remain undeveloped. The undeveloped portion of the VA Transfer Parcel would be managed for the long-term persistence and sustainability of the CLT colony and access would be restricted during the CLT breeding/nesting season (April 1 through August 15).

Construction would take approximately 18 months to complete and would include development of the VHA OPC and associated parking on 20 acres; access road and utilities infrastructure on 11 acres; the Conservation Management Office; and the first phase of the cemetery development on an estimated 20 acres of the total 80-acre cemetery area. The remainder of the cemetery area would remain undeveloped until there is a need for additional columbarium niches. VA typically phases cemetery development based on the demand expected during a 10-year period; VA estimates that approximately 25,000 columbarium niches (on approximately 6 acres) would be developed approximately every 10 years to meet the burial needs of Bay Area Veterans. Based on this phasing schedule, the final phase of the cemetery would be constructed around the year 2116.

The project components of Alternative 1 are summarized in Table ES-1 and illustrated in Figure ES-2. Additional information on the various project components are described in Chapter 2 of the Draft EA.

Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 2, the Navy would transfer approximately 624 acres to VA via a fed-to-fed transfer. Following property transfer, VA would construct and operate the identical development components as identified in

Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2012

Figure ES-2: Alternative 1 Site Plan

Alternative 1, including an OPC, VBA Outreach Office, NCA Cemetery, Conservation Management Office, and associated infrastructure on approximately 112 acres of the total VA Transfer Parcel. VA would also construct an off-site utility/road corridor on approximately 6 acres of land to the east of the VA Transfer Parcel. Under Alternative 2, the VA Development Area is located farther north than under Alternative 1. The placement of the VA Development Area under Alternative 2 moves the proposed development farther away from the CLT colony. In addition, the OPC, NCA Cemetery, Conservation Management Office, and access road would have a different configuration than under Alternative 1. The project components of Alternative 2 are summarized in Table ES-1 and illustrated in Figure ES-3.

The remaining 512 acres of the VA Transfer Parcel, including the existing CLT colony, would remain undeveloped. The undeveloped portion of the VA Transfer Parcel would be managed for the long-term persistence and sustainability of the CLT colony and access would be restricted during the CLT breeding/nesting season (April 1 through August 15).

No Action Alternative

Under this alternative, the fed-to-fed transfer would not take place, and no VA facilities would be constructed on the site. Under the No Action Alternative, the property would be retained by the Navy in caretaker status until another action was taken on the property. No construction or redevelopment of the property would take place. On-site activities would be limited to maintenance, cleanup, and other actions associated with the Navy's caretaker status of the site. The Navy would continue its environmental cleanup under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

The VHA and VBA services would remain at the current locations, or because leasing arrangements would expire for some facilities, they would be relocated to other locations. For the NCA Cemetery, Bay Area Veterans would use the San Joaquin National Cemetery in Santa Nella, California (approximately 100 miles away), the Sacramento Valley National Cemetery (65 miles away), or a private cemetery.

The No Action Alternative is evaluated in detail in this EA as prescribed by CEQ regulations and provides a baseline for analysis of the action alternatives.

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The impact analysis compares projected future conditions to the affected environment. For each resource area, the potential construction or operational impacts are identified, if applicable. Table ES-2 presents a summary of the potential impacts resulting from the Proposed Action. More information on the impacts analysis for each resource area, including a description of the existing environment, assessment methodology, and description of potential effects is included in Chapter 3.

Each identified impact is characterized according to its significance. Impacts are either significant (with corresponding mitigation, as feasible) or not significant, or significant and unavoidable where mitigation is not feasible or would not eliminate or reduce the impact to not significant. The Navy would be responsible for transfer of excess federal property and VA would be responsible for the construction and operation of the proposed facilities. In addition, VA would be responsible for implementation of, if applicable, the mitigation and avoidance measures identified in this EA.

Table ES-1: Summary of Proposed Development (Alternative 1 and 2)

Project Component	Alternative 1		Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	
	GSF	Acres	GSF	Acres
VA Development Area				
Outpatient Clinic	**158,000**	**20**	**158,000**	**20**
VHA Ambulatory Care Services	50,000		50,000	
VHA Specialty Services	25,000		25,000	
VHA Mental Health Services	25,000		25,000	
VHA Pharmacy/Lab/Radiology Services	18,500		18,500	
VHA Clinic Management/Education Space	4,000		4,000	
VHA Lobby	1,500		1,500	
EMS/Medical Administration	12,500		12,500	
Canteen	7,500		7,500	
Police Services	1,500		1,500	
VBA Outreach Offices	5,000		5,000	
Courtyard	NA		NA	
Surface Parking (632 spaces)	NA		NA	
NCA Offices and Public Information Center	7,500		7,500	
NCA Cemetery	**2,700**	**80**	**2,700**	**80**
West Cemetery Committal Service Shelters	1,800	50	NA	NA
East Cemetery Committal Service Shelters	900	30	NA	NA
Conservation Management Office	**2,500**	**See note[1]**	**2,500**	**2**
On-site Utility/Road Infrastructure	**NA**	**11**	**NA**	**10**
SUBTOTAL	163,200	111	163,200	112
VA Undeveloped Area				
Undeveloped Managed Open Space[2]	NA	438	NA	512
Total VA Transfer Parcel				
TOTAL	163,200	549	163,200	624
Off-site Utility/Road Corridor				
Off-site Utility/Road Corridor	NA	6	NA	6

Notes: GSF = gross square feet; NA = not applicable; NCA = National Cemetery Administration; VA = Department of Veterans Affairs; VBA = Veterans Benefits Administration; VHA = Veterans Health Administration; EMS =emergency medical service

[1] Acreage is part of gross square footage for East Cemetery Committal Service Shelters.

[2] The undeveloped portion of the VA Transfer Parcel would be managed for the long-term persistence and sustainability of the CLT colony and access would be restricted during the CLT breeding/nesting season (estimated to be from April 1 through August 15).

Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2012

Figure ES-3: Alternative 2 Site Plan

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Biological Resources (see Draft EA Section 3.1 for more information)			
Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat	No significant impact. Alternative 1 would result in the modification or loss of the existing vegetation and wildlife habitat area in an area limited to the VA Development Area. The majority of this area is comprised of marginal habitat (i.e., ruderal disturbed and nonnative annual grassland). To reduce the adverse impact (i.e., direct removal of, placement of fill into, or hydrological interruption of federally protected wetlands resulting in a net loss) to the northern coastal salt marsh and seasonal wetlands habitat within the VA Development Area to less than significant, the VA will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-1. With implementation there would be no significant impact to northern coastal salt marsh and seasonal wetlands habitats. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 The Proposed Action is within the USACE San Francisco District's San Francisco Bay Wetland Mitigation Bank (Bank). Nontidal/seasonal wetland and other waters within the service area may be eligible to use the Bank for mitigation on a case-by-case basis (i.e., for projects with impacts to nontidal/seasonal wetlands or other waters that may have been historic tidal wetlands or other waters). VA proposes a replacement ratio of 1:1 and shall consult with USACE to determine if a Bank, in-lieu fee, or permittee-responsible mitigation is the appropriate mitigation. Should mitigation credits be unavailable at the Bank to suit the needs of the project, VA shall seek out other methods to mitigate permanent impacts to nontidal/seasonal wetlands in consultation with the USACE.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	There is the potential for indirect adverse effects from construction-related activities including sources of noise (e.g., construction traffic and the operation of construction equipment) and increased human presence during construction to spill over into the remaining VA Transfer Parcel, including the CLT colony. To minimize and avoid adverse effects on the CLT, the VA, would implement avoidance and minimizations measures to control noise and other potential adverse effects that would be expected during construction. In addition, habitat within the VA Development Area would be improved with the introduction of managed landscaping and the majority of the VA Transfer Parcel, including the CLT colony and other existing wetlands (e.g., Runway and West Wetlands) would be left undeveloped open space.		
Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species	A description of the potential effects to the CLT and western snowy plover and a summary of the avoidance and minimization measures that VA would implement to minimize adverse impacts to the CLT and western snowy plover is provided in Section 3.1 (Biological Resources) of this EA. If VA were to proceed with Alternative 1, VA would complete formal consultation under Section 7 of the ESA as is legally required. Subsequent NEPA analysis would also be required to incorporate the findings and conclusions of the Section 7 formal consultation into the biological resources analysis for Alternative 1.	No significant impact. Alternative 2, with the implementation of specific avoidance and minimization efforts, would not result in a significant adverse impact to the CLT. All activities would take place within the VA Development Area, approximately 1,400 to 1,800 feet from the CLT colony. The remaining VA Transfer Parcel (approximately 511 acres), including the CLT colony would be left undeveloped open space. No direct activities would occur outside the VA Development Area and would not result in the modification or direct disturbance of the CLT colony or the	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
		habitat immediately surrounding it. However, implementation of Alternative 2 would result in the development of approximately 112 acres of currently vacant land (i.e., VA Development Area). The alignment of the majority of the VA Development Area under Alternative 2 is now located within a portion of the area known as the Northwest Territories, as identified in the City of Alameda 1996 Reuse Plan, which is farther away from the CLT colony than under Alternative 1. The development footprint under Alternative 2, was specifically designed to reduce the potential effects of the Proposed Action on the CLT, including providing and maintaining most of the site as undeveloped open space which provides a large buffer between the CLT colony and development. However, the reintroduction of uses within this former military airfield area would have the potential to have an effect on the CLT, including predation, perceived predation and human disturbance, and reduce the ability to conduct effective predator management at the site. Direct effects to the CLT would primarily consist of increased noise and traffic, which could have an effect on the CLT colony. In addition, increased human activities may increase habitat for predators of the CLT. There is the potential for indirect adverse effects from activities including sources of noise (e.g., traffic) and increased	

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
		human presence. To reduce the adverse effects as described above, to the CLT to less than significant, the VA will implement Mitigation Measure BIO-2 to minimize the potential for harm and harassment of the CLT resulting from the project related activities. With implementation there would be no significant impact to the CLT from construction. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 To minimize potential adverse effects of the VA's Proposed Action, the VA will implement specific avoidance and minimization measures, as identified in the 2012 USFWS BO (see Appendix B [Biological Resources Supporting Information]). The measures pertain to the Navy's fed-to-fed transfer and VA's subsequent construction and operation of the Proposed Action as described under Alternative 2 in this EA. The measures provide for the long-term conservation and management of the CLT, including implementing land use restrictions for long-term maintenance, management, and monitoring of the CLT. A summary of the avoidance and minimization measures that the VA will implement is included in Section 3.1 (Biological Resources) of the EA. Western Snowy Plover Current evidence suggests that western snowy plover visits the surrounding	

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
		area sporadically as a foraging migrant. The increased presence of humans and equipment during construction would increase the likelihood of disturbances (e.g., noise, light, etc.) to foraging and resting birds. These impacts would be intermittent, and are unlikely to affect the use of the site by snowy plover. Potential indirect effects of the project action on western snowy plover are generally shared and similar to those identified for CLT. Potential indirect effects would arise from increased human activity near foraging and potential nesting areas (CLT colony) and the daily use of new structures in the vicinity of the of these areas. Should the western snowy plover reestablish itself as a nesting species in the action area, effects on the species are likely to be identical to those identified for the CLT and thus the proposed avoidance and minimization measures for the CLT are also adequately protective. For additional information on the CLT, potential impacts, and proposed avoidance and mitigation measures see Section 3.1 (Biological Resources) of the EA.	
Common Wildlife	*No significant impact*. Common species would be affected through the removal of marginal habitat (non-native grasslands), and removal of existing vegetated areas within the VA Development Area. In addition, common wildlife in the VA Development Area would be subjected to increases in noise and dust	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	associated with construction. As a result, some habitats would be reduced in extent during construction and some common species would temporarily decline in local abundance. However, potential impacts to common species and habitats would not be substantial due to the current low abundance of wildlife on the site. Consequently, any impacts of the project on common species and habitats would have a negligible effect on regional populations. In addition, habitat within the VA Development Area would be improved with the introduction of managed landscaping and the majority of the VA Transfer Parcel would be left undeveloped open space, which could be utilized by common wildlife.		
Habitat Linkages and Corridors	*No significant impact*. Because activities would be confined to the VA Development Area, impacts to migratory corridors are not expected to occur. Further, because the CLT colony would be preserved, and potential future public access would be limited to the perimeter of this area these areas are anticipated to be utilized by wildlife through the operational period of the VA facilities.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Water Resources (see Draft EA Section 3.2 for more information)			
Water Quality	*No significant impact.* During the construction period, excavation and grading activities would expose soil to water runoff and entrain sediment in the runoff. Through compliance with these requirements and regulations, construction-related impacts on water quality would not be significant.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Groundwater Resources	***No significant impact.***	**Same as Alternative 1.**	**No significant impact.**
Floodplains	*No significant impact.* The proposed final elevation for the developed areas would be 13.6	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	feet above msl. Thus, the finished elevation of the project facilities would be located above the FEMA base 100-year flood elevation of 7 feet above msl.		
Coastal Consistency	*No significant adverse impact would be expected.* Alternative 1 is consistent with the provisions of the San Francisco Bay Plan and related San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan. The VA is coordinating with San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission and the Final EA will include a description of the outcome of this coordination.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Transportation, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking (see Draft EA Section 3.3 for more information)			
Transportation, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking	*No significant impact.* Construction-related transportation impacts would be temporary and would not have an adverse effect on weekday peak-hour traffic conditions. Operationally, the Proposed Action (year 2017) would not adversely affect any of the 11 study intersections during the weekday a.m. peak hour, weekday p.m. peak hour, and Saturday peak hour. All study intersections would operate at level of service (LOS) D or better. In addition, Alternative 1 would add additional passengers to the municipal transit system, provide new pedestrian and bicycle amenities, add pedestrian users and bicyclist, provide on-site user specific surface parking, and improve site access and on-site circulation. None of these components would result in a significant adverse impact.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Cultural Resources (see Draft EA Section 3.4 for more information)			
Archaeological Resources	*No significant impact*. No known archaeological resources would be directly or indirectly affected by construction, because no such resources are located within the boundary of the VA Transfer Parcel. The Proposed Action would have no adverse effect on known archaeological resources.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Historic Resources	*No significant impact*. No known historic resources would be directly affected by construction because no such resources are present in that area. The proposed development would not detract from location, design, character, setting, materials, workmanship, and feeling of the NAS Alameda Historic District, and the historic district would still be able to convey its significance as a naval station dating to the 1930s and World War II designed in the Moderne style.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Visual Resources and Aesthetics (see Draft EA Section 3.5 for more information)			
Views and Visual Character	*No significant impact*. Landscaping, landform, and perimeter barrier measures would not add any substantial vertical elements, but they would serve to reduce the amount of new development visible from surrounding areas. The structures proposed would be located in the central and/or inner portions of the VA Development Area that are less visible from outside the boundary than locations along the perimeter. For the most part, the buildings proposed would not be visually dominant relative to the flat foreground portions of the site. In addition, views of these new buildings from	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	outside the VA Development Area would be set back sufficiently from the boundaries to render them visually subordinate to other visible features. In addition, the visual character would be improved compared to existing conditions.		
Light and Glare	*No significant impact*. Construction activity would occur during daytime hours. Some security lighting would be required in construction staging areas, which would have a small effect on the area's ambient light levels. The construction contractor would use lighting features that would be shielded and directed downward to minimize light spillover to neighboring undeveloped land. This construction-related impact related to light would not be significant. Most proposed operations would take place during daytime hours. Nighttime lighting would consist primarily of shielded and downward-directed low-level security lights. Because the proposed facilities would be set back from the boundaries of the VA Transfer Parcel, night lighting would not be substantially noticeable from the east or to the CLT colony to the south. No substantial increase in glare would result from operation under Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Land Use (see Draft EA Section 3.6 for more information)			
Existing and Surrounding Land Uses	*No significant impact.* Alternative 1 would not physically divide an established community; conflict with substantive requirements of local land use plans or policies (as federally owned property, the VA Transfer Parcel would be outside the jurisdiction of local and State planning and zoning laws and regulations); and is compatible with and would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	character and planned uses of the surrounding community.		
Air Quality (see Draft EA Section 3.7 for more information)			
Criteria Air Pollutants	*No significant impact.* Construction related emissions would be short-term and primarily occur within the VA Development Area. All construction activities would meet applicable regulations and pollution control requirements to prevent exceedance of air quality standards during construction. Construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants would be less than *de minimis* thresholds. Proposed operations would generate criteria pollutant emissions from onsite area sources and vehicles that access the project site. Annual operational emissions would not exceed any of the *de minimis* thresholds.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Odors	*No significant impact.* Because of the distance between the nearest receptor and the area's high winds, there would be no significant construction-related impact from odors. The land uses proposed for the VA Transfer Parcel are not land uses that would typically generate substantial concentrations of odors. Therefore, it is unlikely that operation would expose sensitive receptors to substantial odor concentrations.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions (see Draft EA Section 3.8 for more information)			
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	GHG emissions resulting from construction and operation would not exceed the CEQ reference point of 25,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e), which serves as a minimum standard for reporting emissions under the Clean Air Act (CAA). Based on sea level rise predictions, sea level rise could cause flooding in some of the coastal areas of Alameda Island, including the VA Transfer	Same as Alternative 1.	No effect.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	Parcel and the VA Development Area. Specifically, the VA Development Area would be located in an area identified as potentially exposed to sea level rise. As part of construction of VA facilities, the ground elevation would be raised to a higher elevation than projected sea level rise. As a result, there would be no climate change–related sea level rise impacts at the proposed facilities through the year 2099.		
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice (see Draft EA Section 3.9 for more information)			
Population, Employment, and Income	*No significant impact.* Construction and operation would result in a positive growth in both construction and operational employment. No significant adverse impact related to displacement of persons, residences, and/or businesses would occur.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Environmental Justice	*No significant impact.* The communities surrounding the VA Transfer Parcel do not have a disproportionally high minority or low-income population. In addition, there are no specific impacts on general health or quality of life that would adversely or disproportionately impact the surrounding population. Therefore, no disproportionate adverse environmental justice effects would occur.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (see Draft EA Section 3.10 for more information)			
Releases of Hazardous Substances, Pollutants, or Contaminants	*No significant impact.* The Navy would continue to perform its ongoing CERCLA obligations, including managing the investigation, remedy selection and remedial action phases, following the property transfer until completion of such obligations and approval by the regulatory agencies. Implementation of institutional controls (ICs) will allow the property to be developed for its intended use, subject to land use restrictions designed to prevent exposure to	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	residual levels of hazardous materials. VA will comply with the CERCLA ICs and would not use the property for any use or activity that is prohibited by the ICs. Such compliance will ensure that the property after transfer will be used in a manner that is adequately protective of the environment and human health as required by CERCLA. Further, VA would be required to manage hazardous materials and wastes in accordance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. VA would, as the Federal land manager and lead Federal agency after transfer, be responsible for the release of environmental contaminants on the property identified after the date of transfer and for future and/or newly identified releases of environmental contaminants at, or from, the property that occur after the transfer. VA would not use the VA Transfer Parcel for any use or activity that is prohibited by CERCLA ICs. In addition, be responsible for any and all additional necessary remedial or corrective actions resulting from a change in land use set forth in VA land use plans revised following the date of property transfer. For any petroleum sites identified prior to transfer of the property, the Navy would continue to manage the investigation, corrective action plan, and corrective action implementation phases. The Navy's responsibility for managing petroleum sites will cease upon the completion of corrective action or a no further action determination. VA would be responsible for managing VA would lead-based paint, lead in soil, and asbestos in accordance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws, regulations, or other requirements.		

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Routine Use, Storage, Transport, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	*No significant impact.* Hazardous materials uses and waste generation from proposed action operations and routine maintenance operations would not pose a substantial public health or safety hazard to the project vicinity.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Exposure to Hazardous Materials via Upset and Accident Conditions	*No significant impact.* Compliance with applicable city, State, and federal laws would minimize potential exposure to hazardous materials/waste, via upset and accident conditions and there would be no significant impact.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Utilities (see Draft EA Section 3.11 for more information)			
Water Supply and Wastewater	*No significant impact*. The existing municipal system would be expected to have sufficient capacity to meet any future water supply and wastewater demands.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Stormwater Drainage Systems	*No significant impact*. With implementation of best management practices, stormwater infrastructure that would be constructed as part of the project would be appropriately sized.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Energy (Electricity, Natural Gas, and Fuel)	*No significant impact*. The existing electric and natural gas system would be expected to have sufficient capacity to meet any future energy demands.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Solid Waste Disposal	*No significant impact*. The anticipated volume of waste would be expected to be accommodated by landfills located in the region.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Noise (see Draft EA Section 3.12 for more information)			
Noise	*No significant impact.* Construction and operation would not result in a substantial increase in the ambient noise environment.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
Vibration	*No significant impact.* Construction and operation would not expose any sensitive human receptors to excessive levels of vibration.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Public Services (see Draft EA Section 3.13 for more information)			
Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS)	*No significant impact.* Construction and operational activities would not have a significant impact on fire and EMS services, including response times, site access, water supplies for fire suppression, or require an expansion of existing services.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Police Services	*No significant impact.* Development and use would not be expected to generate demand for additional municipal police services that would exceed existing capacity or result in an adverse impact to current service levels or require the need for an expansion of services.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Parks and Recreation	No significant impact. Alternative 1 includes an access road and sidewalk along the northern VA Development Area allowing limited access to additional open space and the shoreline. Further, the undeveloped portion of the VA Transfer Parcel, including the existing CLT colony, would remain undeveloped. The undeveloped area would add to the cumulative open space within the City of Alameda, a beneficial impact.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Geology (see Draft EA Section 3.14 for more information)			
Erosion and Loss of Topsoil	No significant impact. Construction would require temporary disturbance of surface soils and removal of existing on-site pavement and existing subsurface infrastructure. Exposed fill materials would be susceptible to erosion during construction-related excavation. Stormwater runoff could cause erosion during project construction. With implementation of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP),	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	the construction-related impact of initial construction related to erosion and loss of topsoil would not be significant.		
Alteration of Topography	No significant impact. Construction would not involve any below-grade development or substantial change in the current topography. However, the topography in the VA Development Area would be raised above the current topography, but these changes would be contoured gradually over the development area.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Seismically Induced Ground Shaking and Associated Ground Failure	No significant impact. The project design would be required to include seismic safety–related features to mitigate the potential for seismically induced ground failure.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Seismically Induced Landslides or Slope Failures	No significant impact. No operational impact related to seismically induced landslides or slope failures would occur.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Expansive or Corrosive Soils	No significant impact.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant impact.
Cumulative Impacts (see Chapter 4 for more information)			
Water Resources; Cultural Resources; Visual Resources and Aesthetics; Land Use; Air Quality; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice; Hazards and Hazardous Substances; Utilities; Noise; Public Services; and Geology and Soils	No significant cumulative impact.	No significant cumulative impact.	No significant cumulative impact.
Biological Resources	If VA were to proceed with Alternative 1, VA would complete formal consultation under Section 7 of the ESA as is legally required. Subsequent NEPA analysis would also be required to incorporate the findings and conclusions of the Section 7 formal consultation	No significant cumulative impact. There would be no significant adverse cumulative impacts from implementation of Alternative 2.	No significant cumulative impact.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives – Potential Impacts

Resource Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)	No Action Alternative
	into the biological resources analysis for Alternative 1.		
Transportation, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking	No significant cumulative impact. During year 2035, the three intersections are projected to perform at unacceptable levels without the contribution of the Proposed Actions traffic. The deterioration of the performance of these intersections is a result from other foreseeable non-project actions occurring in the study area, including the redevelopment of Alameda Point. Importantly, with the Proposed Action, the intersections would already be performing at unacceptable levels by the year 2035. The minimal additional traffic resulting from the Proposed Action, will not, cumulatively, make the already unacceptable intersections significantly worse. Further, the total effect on the whole resource within the study area, even with the three intersections performing at unacceptable levels, would continue to operate at acceptable levels. Unlike a direct or indirect effect, a cumulative impact is an impact on the whole and not the individual parts or components of a resource. Therefore, there may not be a significant adverse cumulative impact even with three individual underperforming intersections. Therefore, as a total cumulatively impact, the Proposed Action would only minimally contribute to an adverse cumulative impact (i.e., minimal increase of projected delay at three already unacceptably performing intersections). However, the magnitude and significance of the cumulative effects, resulting from the Proposed Action, does not reach a level of magnitude to be considered a significant adverse cumulative impact on the total resource.	Same as Alternative 1.	No significant cumulative impact.

Under NEPA, the federal agency proposing an action must evaluate the environmental effects (impacts) that can reasonably be anticipated to be caused by or result from the Proposed Action and alternatives. The Proposed Action will be required to comply with federal, State, and local laws and regulations. The potential environmental impacts that have been evaluated are those impacts which can reasonably be expected to result from the lawful implementation of the Proposed Action. In identifying direct impacts and reasonably foreseeable indirect impacts, the Navy and VA have taken into account all applicable measures and restrictions protective of human health and the environment that are required by existing laws and regulations. In many instances, the existence of such laws and regulations renders impacts that might have occurred in the absence of such laws highly unlikely and not reasonably foreseeable. In other instances, such laws and regulations work to lessen potential impacts to levels that are not significant. Because compliance with applicable laws is mandatory for the action proponent, compliance with the requirements of such laws and regulations is generally not identified separately as mitigation. Measures or controls that can be taken to reduce impacts to a level that is not significant are suggested for each alternative, as appropriate.

The Navy's Proposed Action is to dispose of excess property at the former NAS Alameda via a fed-to-fed transfer to VA. Transfer of the property by the Navy to the VA, an administrative action, would not, in itself, have a direct adverse impact on the human and natural environment. Therefore, this EA's impact analysis is focused on the potential impacts resulting from the VA's subsequent construction and operation of a VHA OPC, VBA Outreach Office, Conservation and Management Office, NCA Cemetery, off-site utility/road corridor, and associated infrastructure.

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

Appendices

Figures

Tables

Acronyms

°F	Fahrenheit
µin/sec	1 microinch per second
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
AB	Assembly Bill
AC Transit	Alameda–Contra Costa Transit District
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ACTC	Alameda County Transportation Commission
AFD	Alameda Fire Department
ALS	advanced life support
ANPR	Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
AOCs	Areas of Concern
APD	Alameda Police Department
ARB	Air Resources Board
Army	U.S. Department of the Army
ARRA	Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority
ASTs	aboveground storage tanks
B.P.	Before Present
BA	biological assessment
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Bank	San Francisco Bay Wetland Mitigation Bank
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
Bay Area	San Francisco Bay Area
Bay Plan	San Francisco Bay Plan
BCDC	Bay Conservation and Development Commission
BGM	Greenhouse Gas Model
BH	Behavioral Health
BMPs	best management practices
BO	biological opinion
BRAC	Navy Base Realignment and Closure
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
CAAQS	California ambient air quality standards
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CCSF	City and County of San Francisco
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality

CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulation
CH_4	methane
CHP	combined heat and power
clay	Bay Mud
CMP	Congestion Management Plan
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNG	compressed natural gas
CO	carbon monoxide
CO2	carbon dioxide
CO_2e	carbon dioxide equivalent
CUPA	Certified United Program Agency
CWA	Clean Water Act
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
dB	decibels
dBA	A-weighted decibels
dBC	C-weighted decibels
DERP	Defense Environmental Restoration Program
diesel PM	diesel-fueled engines
DoD	U.S. Department of Defense
DPH	Department of Public Health
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EA	Environmental Assessment
EBMUD	East Bay Municipal Utility District
EBRPD	East Bay Regional Park District
EBS	environmental baseline survey
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FFA	Federal Facility Agreement
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FY	fiscal year
General Plan Amendment	Alameda Point General Plan Amendment
GHG	greenhouse gas
gsf	gross square feet

GWh	gigawatt-hours
GWP	global warming potential
HAP	hazardous air pollutants
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HFC	hydrofluorocarbon
high GWP gases	high global warming potential gases
HSWA	Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
I-880	Interstate 880
I-980	Interstate 980
IBC	International Building Code
ICC	International Code Council
ICs	institutional controls
in/sec	inches per second
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IR	Installation Restoration
IRP	Installation Restoration Program
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
L_{dn}	day/night average sound level
LEED®	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
L_{eq}	energy-equivalent noise level
LID	low-impact development
LNG	liquefied natural gas
LOS	level of service
MACT or BACT	maximum or best available control technology
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
mgd	gallons per day
MMI	Modified Mercalli Intensity
mph	miles per hour
MPPEH	munitions potentially presenting an explosive hazard
MS4s	municipal separate storm sewer systems
MSAs	munitions storage areas
msl	mean sea level
MT	metric tons
MTC's	Metropolitan Transportation Commission's
MTS	Metropolitan Transportation System
MUN	Municipal and Domestic Supply
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

NAS	Naval Air Station
Navy	U.S. Department of the Navy
NCA	National Cemetery Administration
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan
NEHRPA	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Act
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NESHAPs	national emissions standards for HAPs
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NO	nitric oxide
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NO_X	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL	National Priorities List
NPRA	National Park and Recreation Association
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWIC	Northwest Information Center
O_3	ozone
OAB	Oakland Army Base
OBRA	Oakland Base Reuse Authority
ODSs	ozone-depleting substances
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPC	Outpatient Clinic
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PA/SI	Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyls
PFC	perfluorocarbon
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PM	particulate matter
PM_{10}	10 micrometers or less
$PM_{2.5}$	fine particulate matter
POV	Personnel Occupied Vehicles
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	part per million
ppT	parts per trillion
PPV	peak particle velocity
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976
Region GC	Alameda and West Oakland

Reuse Plan	NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan
RHB	Radiological Health Branch
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
RMS	root mean square
ROD	Record of Decision
ROG	reactive organic gases
RWQCBs	regional water quality control boards
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SF_6	sulfur hexafluoride
SFBAAB	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SR	State Route
Sr-90	strontium-90
stratosphere	upper atmosphere
SVOC	semivolatile organic compounds
SVP	Society of Vertebrate Paleontology
SWMUs	solid waste management units
SWPPP	stormwater pollution prevention plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TACs	toxic air contaminants
TCRAs	time-critical removal actions
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TPH	total petroleum hydrocarbons
tpy	tons per year
troposphere	lower atmosphere
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act
URBEMIS	URBEMIS2007
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UWMPs	Urban water management plans
V/C	volume-to-capacity
VA	U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs
VA SSPP	Veterans Affairs Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan
VBA	Veterans Benefits Administration
VdB	vibration decibels
VHA	Veterans Health Administration
VOC	volatile organic compound
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

µg/L	micrograms per liter
µg/m	microgram per cubic meter