

CHAPTER 7.0

Consultation and Coordination

This page intentionally left blank.

7.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

1 7.1 AGENCY COORDINATION

2 The federal, state, and local agencies were consulted prior to and during the preparation of this
3 EIS. Agencies were notified of plans for closure and disposal activities by mail; by scheduled
4 public meetings associated with the reuse planning process; by publication of an NOI
5 announcing preparation of a Draft EIS; by a public scoping meeting; by publication of an NOA
6 announcing the availability of the Draft EIS, and by a public hearing on the Draft EIS. The
7 agencies' viewpoints were solicited with regard to activities and issues within their jurisdiction.
8 Agency correspondence with US Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA Fisheries, US Department of
9 Housing and Urban Development, and SHPO, is provided in Appendix C. The agencies
10 contacted are listed below.

11 7.1.1 Federal Agencies

12 Department of Defense

13 US Navy, Naval Station Treasure Island

14 US Navy, Engineering Field Activity West

15 US Navy, Public Works Center San Francisco Bay

16 Department of the Interior

17 US Fish and Wildlife Service

18 Department of Labor

19 Department of Transportation

20 US Coast Guard

21 Federal Highways Administration

22 7.1.2 State Agencies

23 State Department of Transportation

24 Caltrans - District 4

25 State Lands Commission

26 State Office of Historic Preservation

27 7.1.3 Regional Agencies

28 San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

29 East Bay Municipal Utilities District

7.0 Consultation and Coordination

1 San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

2 **7.1.4 City and County of San Francisco**

3 California Academy of Science

4 Department of Public Health

5 Department of Public Works

6 Fire Department

7 Hetch Hetchy Water and Power

8 Municipal Railway (Muni)

9 Office of Emergency Services

10 Planning Department

11 Police Department

12 Public Utilities Commission

13 Solid Waste Management Program

14 Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative

15 Unified School District

16 Water Department

17 **7.1.5 Public Service Agencies**

18 Altamont Landfill and Resource Recovery Facility

19 **7.2 PUBLIC COORDINATION**

20 Extensive public coordination has occurred, and will continue to occur, as part of this proposed
21 action. Public involvement opportunities to date include the reuse planning process and the EIS
22 notification process, including the NOI and one scoping meeting. Sections 7.2.1 through 7.2.5
23 provide more information on the outreach activities and responses associated with the reuse
24 planning process, NOI process, public scoping meeting, public review of the Draft EIS, and
25 release of the Final EIS.

26 **7.2.1 Reuse Planning Process**

27 The process to convert NSTI to civilian use involved an extensive reuse planning and
28 community outreach process San Francisco, acting as the LRA, prepared the reuse plan for
29 NSTI. During the reuse planning process, efforts were made to encourage and incorporate
30 public participation and communication into the reuse planning process. Community outreach
31 and involvement were critical components in the reuse plan development. This process
32 provided several opportunities to inform agencies and the public of the availability of NSTI
33 assets and to identify potential commercial interests in surplus military property.

1 A major portion of the outreach process involved conducting community workshops to define
2 issues and to discuss reuse opportunities. In addition to the community workshops, all meetings of
3 the Treasure Island Citizens Reuse Committee (CRC) were open to the public.

4 Based on the community outreach program and public interest, the LRA Draft Reuse Plan was
5 prepared. Section 2.2 of this EIS summarizes the alternatives development and screening
6 process leading to the final selection of a reuse plan.

7 **7.2.2 Notice of Intent to Prepare the Draft EIS/EIR**

8 The scoping process was conducted jointly with San Francisco. In conformance with the
9 requirements of NEPA, an NOI to prepare an EIS for the Disposal and Reuse of NSTI was
10 published by Navy in the Federal Register and distributed to potentially interested parties,
11 including regulatory agencies, local jurisdictions, service providers, and others. A copy of the
12 NOI is provided in Appendix D.

13 **7.2.3 Public Scoping Meeting**

14 An additional effort to inform the public and to solicit input on the scope of the EIS from
15 affected jurisdictions, interested members of the public, and organized groups was afforded
16 through a public scoping meeting held by Navy and San Francisco. The NSTI public scoping
17 meeting was held on October 9, 1996 at the San Francisco Ferry Building. Presentations were
18 given by representatives of Navy and San Francisco. An opportunity for oral comments
19 followed. Six oral comments were received; no written comments were received at the meeting.
20 Twelve written comments on the NOI were received via mail.

21 A complete transcript of the public scoping meeting is available from:

22 Timarie Seneca
23 US Navy, Southwest Division
24 BRAC Operations Office
25 1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100
26 San Diego, California 92101-8517
27 (619) 532-0955

28 The environmental issues raised in the six oral and twelve written comments were considered
29 during the course of the impact assessment process, and are briefly summarized below.

30 *Oral Comment Summary*

31 *Public Involvement Process*

32 A commentor expressed concern about the public comment period and notice for the reuse
33 plan, as well as inadequate discussion of alternatives in the reuse plan.

7.0 Consultation and Coordination

1 Land Use

2 A request was made for analysis of different land use intensities. It was suggested that a new
3 alternative that reuses housing without the addition of any new housing be analyzed.
4 Expanding the marina facilities and increasing parking areas with the marina were proposed.

5 Socioeconomics

6 Issues were raised regarding the inclusion of the concerns of veterans, as well as inclusion of
7 economic, educational, and technical programs in the reuse plan.

8 Biological Resources

9 It was recommended that wildlife habitat and wildlife viewing opportunities be included on
10 Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The addition of wetlands was a suggested alternative.
11 A point was made that such opportunities also had economic, recreational, and sewage
12 treatment benefits.

13 Public Plans, Policies, and Regulatory Agencies

14 Concerns were expressed for the consistency of development with the Tidelands Trust and the
15 Sustainable San Francisco Plan.

16 Written Comment Summary

17 Alternatives

- 18 • Navy was encouraged to examine a full range of alternatives that maximize environmental
19 quality and that incorporate pollution prevention and conservation measures.
- 20 • A clear definition of the region of influence and an unambiguous statement of purpose and
21 need must be provided.
- 22 • Navy is required to identify both a Preferred Alternative and an Environmentally Preferable
23 Alternative.
- 24 • The public should be able to participate in the refinement of the reuse alternatives during
25 the EIS process beyond the minimum requirements of NEPA.
- 26 • The reuse plan developed by the Urban Lands Institute should be considered as an
27 alternative.
- 28 • The Reduced Impact Alternative should include reuse of the existing housing on Treasure
29 Island, as well as 300 units on Yerba Buena Island for affordable housing.

30 Land Use

- 31 • The US Coast Guard's current and future land use on Yerba Buena Island should be
32 considered in the EIS.

- 1 • Existing and projected land use conflicts should be identified, and the EIS should offer
2 opportunities that would reduce them.
- 3 • A portion of the lands comprising NSTI remains subject to the common law tidelands trust.
4 Upon the cessation of military use, the State Lands Commission has agreed to allow San
5 Francisco the continued use of existing buildings located on public trust lands (submerged
6 and tidal lands) for their intended use for an appropriate period, even where the uses do not
7 fall within the range of public trust uses.
- 8 • Designate the shoreline promenade, referred to in the Draft Reuse Plan, as part of the
9 planned 400-mile recreational Bay Trail system.
- 10 • It appears that the reuse alternatives involve land uses that are not permitted on public trust
11 land; the impacts of non-compliance with the Tidelands Trust Doctrine must be fully
12 detailed and mitigated.

13 *Visual Resources and Urban Design*

- 14 • The EIS should identify potential aesthetic effects particularly on the Bay shoreline.

15 *Socioeconomics and Population*

- 16 • Nearby residential areas should be documented and the potential effects on these areas fully
17 analyzed.
- 18 • The effects on minority communities should be analyzed in accordance with Executive
19 Order 12898, and opportunities for minority input should be presented in the EIS process.
- 20 • The potential for providing affordable housing on Treasure Island and parts of Yerba Buena
21 Island by reusing existing housing should be considered.

22 *Cultural Resources*

- 23 • In accordance with the NHPA, the EIS should identify all historic, prehistoric and
24 archeological resources at Treasure Island and provisions should be made to protect any
25 cultural resources encountered during project implementation.
- 26 • The reuse plan should incorporate systematic inventory and recording of historic resources,
27 protection of historic resources, and cultural resource reviews.

28 *Transportation*

- 29 • Transportation across the Bay Bridge and over the Bay by ferry should be given particular
30 consideration.
- 31 • Transportation effects should be taken in context with other transit changes in the region.
- 32 • Direct and indirect effects of reuse, which should be fully documented in the EIS, might
33 result in increased transit if additional employment is generated.

7.0 Consultation and Coordination

1 • A complete traffic study was recommended to identify the impacts to State Route 80. A
2 request was made that the impact of additional traffic on the Bay Bridge, the inadequate
3 design of the existing on/off ramps, and the need for restricted accessibility to pedestrians
4 be addressed.

5 • Give consideration to safe pedestrian and bicycle access to Treasure Island, particularly
6 shoreline areas.

7 Air Quality

8 • Information regarding the current air quality attainment status and the generation of criteria
9 pollutants under the proposed alternatives should be analyzed with respect to attainment
10 status.

11 Noise

12 • Noise contours should be used to show existing and proposed noise levels. These should be
13 overlain by known sensitive areas to indicate potential impacts.

14 Biological Resources

15 • It is important that the project's effects on protected and endangered species and critical
16 fisheries habitat be addressed.

17 • A wildlife habitat component should be included in the alternatives.

18 • Consideration should be given to the preservation of remnant indigenous biological
19 communities on Yerba Buena Island in land use planning.

20 • The current reuse options should be more ecologically sustainable; the current options use
21 large amounts of natural resources and generate waste.

22 • Seabird nesting sites for MBTA-protected species at NSTI, such as the western gull, the
23 Brandt's cormorant, pelagic cormorant, and the black oystercatcher, should be protected
24 from development or other disturbance.

25 Water Resources

26 • The proposed development and reuse should not hinder the Department of Defense's
27 obligation to meet water quality standards.

28 • The EIS should address NPDES requirements, effects on Waters of the United States,
29 baseline conditions, and dredging.

30 Public Services and Utilities

31 • The EIS should discuss and encourage pollution prevention and energy conservation
32 opportunities.

- 1 • The net effect on regional water supplies and demand as a result of the project's actions
2 should be surveyed.

- 3 • Water conservation measures should be encouraged.

4 *Hazardous Materials and Waste*

- 5 • Areas of existing and historical hazardous waste storage, disposal, and contamination
6 should be identified and any plans to disturb these areas discussed. Of particular concern
7 was the potential for adverse health effects on people who consume fish caught in the bay.

- 8 • The EIS should ensure that the reuse alternatives do not expose people to contaminated
9 soils on Treasure Island. Petroleum pollution on Treasure Island poses a threat to both
10 surface and ground water, and the stormwater conveyance system conducts the
11 contaminants throughout the island and into the Bay. It was suggested as mitigation that
12 stormwater be treated prior to its return to the Bay.

13 *Public Plans, Policies, and Regulatory Agencies*

- 14 • The regional planning efforts of the City, County, and Port of San Francisco and the City
15 and Port of Oakland should be taken into account to avoid potential future conflicts.

16 *Cumulative Effects*

- 17 • The EIS should contain a discussion of the cumulative effects of the project on its region of
18 influence. The discussion should describe the incremental impact of an alternative in
19 conjunction with past, current, and future projects. Special consideration should be given to
20 disposal and reuse of Hunter's Point Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Alameda NAS, the Fleet
21 and Industrial Supply Center, the Oakland Naval Medical Center, and the Oakland Army
22 Base, as well as long term plans for the San Francisco waterfront.

23 *Impacts*

- 24 • Significance criteria and baseline conditions should be clearly defined.
25 • There are more environmental effects to consider than those identified on the Initial Study
26 checklist.

27 *Mitigation*

- 28 • Potential mitigation measures should be identified in the Draft EIS that would provide the
29 basis for specific commitments that would be carried forward through the rest of the
30 environmental process.

31 **7.2.4 Public Review of the Draft EIS**

32 The public was invited to review and comment on the Draft EIS. An NOA was published in the
33 Federal Register on May 10, 2002 and notices were published in the *San Francisco Chronicle* and
34 *Oakland Tribune* on May 25 and 26, 2002. Copies of the Draft EIS and NOA were mailed to those

7.0 Consultation and Coordination

1 on the mailing list (Chapter 10 of the Draft EIS), beginning a 45-day public comment period. A
2 public hearing on the Draft EIS was also held at Building 140 on Treasure Island on June 11,
3 2002.

4 During the public comment period, 22 comment letters on the Draft EIS were received from
5 agencies or individuals. In addition, four persons provided oral comments on the Draft EIS at
6 the public hearing. Comments on the Draft EIS and responses to those comments are provided
7 in Chapter 11, Responses to Comments. The Final EIS has been revised, as appropriate, in
8 response to public comments.

9 7.25 Final EIS

10 The Final EIS incorporates and responds to comments received on the Draft EIS and has been
11 provided to all agencies or individuals that officially commented on the document or otherwise
12 requested a copy (see Chapter 10, EIS Distribution List). An NOA of the Final EIS was
13 published in the Federal Register on June 27, 2003.

14 As required under NEPA, there will be a 30-day review period after publication of the Final EIS.
15 During this period, the public may comment on the adequacy of responses to comments and the
16 Final EIS. After the 30-day review period, Navy can issue a NEPA ROD.