

CHAPTER 4.0

Environmental Consequences

This page intentionally left blank.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

1 Chapter 4 of this EIS addresses the environmental consequences of the proposed disposal and
2 reuse of NSTI with respect to 13 environmental issue areas. Each issue is addressed in its own
3 section, numbered as follows:

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 4.1 Land Use | 4.8 Biological Resources |
| 4.2 Visual Resources | 4.9 Geology and Soils |
| 4.3 Socioeconomics | 4.10 Water Resources |
| 4.4 Cultural Resources | 4.11 Utilities |
| 4.5 Transportation | 4.12 Public Services |
| 4.6 Air Quality | 4.13 Hazardous Materials and Waste |
| 4.7 Noise | |

4 Each of the disposal/reuse alternatives is analyzed from the viewpoint of these 13
5 environmental issues. Navy disposal is assumed as part of each reuse alternative. Each
6 discussion is organized as follows:

- 7 • Alternative 1—This subsection addresses the environmental consequences of the LRA's
8 Draft Reuse Plan for NSTI (San Francisco 1996e). The Draft Reuse Plan can be
9 characterized by a combination of publicly oriented development, open space and
10 recreation, and extensive residential development at full build-out.
- 11 • Alternative 2—This subsection analyzes the environmental consequences of a reuse
12 alternative based on development of the site with a land use plan characterized by an
13 emphasis on open space and recreation and publicly oriented uses with low residential
14 use.
- 15 • Alternative 3—This subsection analyzes the environmental consequences of a reuse
16 alternative based on development of the site with a land use plan characterized by little
17 new development and extensive reuse of existing facilities.
- 18 • No Action Alternative—This subsection addresses the environmental consequences of
19 retaining NSTI in caretaker status in Navy ownership.

20 Measures that can be taken to reduce impacts to a level below significant are suggested for each
21 alternative, as appropriate. Navy would be responsible for mitigation measures identified in its
22 ROD for the proposed disposal action. As reuse would occur after the property is transferred
23 from federal ownership, mitigation measures identified for impacts associated with reuse are
24 the responsibility of the acquiring entity, under the direction of federal, state, and local agencies
25 with regulatory authority over and responsibility for such resources. Mitigation for impacts
26 associated with reuse is not the responsibility of the Navy.

27 As discussed in Chapter 3, the environmental baseline year for the EIS is 1993, the year that
28 NSTI was designated for closure. Because data from 1993 was not available for some resource
29 areas, baseline data from the most recent year that represents 1993 conditions was used. The
30 impacts presented in this chapter have been evaluated against the baseline environmental
31 conditions presented in Chapter 3. The Navy recognizes that changes in the environmental

4.1 Land Use

1 conditions may have occurred in the period between the baseline years and the present and that
2 these changes may result in different, and in many cases, lesser impacts to certain resources.
3 Since baseline environmental conditions are used as the benchmark for analysis, it would be
4 inappropriate to alter the impact analysis based on any interim change in resource conditions.

5 4.1 LAND USE

6 The following discussion focuses on compatibility of proposed actions with land uses on the
7 site, compatibility with existing uses adjacent to the reuse plan area (e.g., non-Navy land uses,
8 such as the US Coast Guard Station and FHWA/Caltrans land for the SFOBB on Yerba Buena
9 Island, and Job Corps on Treasure Island), and consistency with the City and County of San
10 Francisco General Plan and zoning ordinance.

11 Factors considered in determining whether an alternative would have a significant land use
12 impact included the extent or degree to which implementation of the alternative would:

- 13 1. Result in non-attainment of policies of applicable plans of the City and County of San
14 Francisco or BCDC; or
- 15 2. Result in proposed uses that are incompatible with existing or adjacent land uses.

16 4.1.1 Alternative 1

17 *Significant and Mitigable Impact*

18 Impact: Land use policy (Factor 1). The City and County of San Francisco General Plan land use
19 designation for NSTI is Military. The zone classifications that would be required for Alternative
20 1 (i.e., Public, Residential, Mixed Use) would be inconsistent with the existing general plan
21 designation and zoning classification.

22 Mitigation. To achieve consistency between the selected reuse alternative and city policies, it
23 will be necessary to amend the San Francisco General Plan to include land use designations for
24 surplus property on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island prior to approving future land use
25 actions. NSTI would not be rezoned until the final reuse plan is adopted, at which time the City
26 and County of San Francisco should amend its Planning Code to be consistent with planned
27 land uses. Upon receiving a zoning designation, the area would be subject to the land use and
28 height and bulk regulations established by the zoning. These controls would be subject to the
29 Redevelopment Plan and its design for development standards and would likely include site
30 design measures, such as buffering, landscaping, screening, and setbacks, to ensure high quality
31 development and compatibility between land uses.

32 *Not Significant Impacts*

33 Land use policy (Factor 1). Implementing Alternative 1 would increase public access to existing
34 open space areas, including the San Francisco Bay shoreline, and would allow development of
35 recreational facilities, which would be substantially consistent with the anticipated priority use
36 designations for NSTI in the San Francisco Bay Plan. Specific development plans for reuse of
37 NSTI would be subject to BCDC permit authority, which would ensure consistency with the

1 Bay Plan. Implementation of Alternative 1, in accordance with the Draft Reuse Plan, would not
2 conflict with Sustainability Plan objectives.

3 Land use compatibility—Treasure Island (Factor 2). As a result of implementing this alternative,
4 proposed reuse of Treasure Island would change the intensity of use and develop publicly
5 oriented land uses in place of former military uses. Introduced and expanded uses would
6 require demolishing some buildings and constructing others.

7 At full build-out, implementing this alternative would result in a higher development density
8 than existed before the closure decision. However, proposed reuse of Treasure Island would
9 provide additional opportunities for public access to open space and recreational resources,
10 publicly oriented attractions, and access to the Bay. These land use changes would be
11 consistent with the Draft Reuse Plan guiding policies to ensure land use compatibility under
12 reuse and therefore would not be a significant land use impact. No mitigation is proposed.

13 At the time of the closure decision, there were no non-Navy land uses on Treasure Island.
14 However, after the federal agency screening process, approximately 36 acres and 12 buildings
15 were provided to the US Department of Labor for developing a Job Corps facility. Proposed
16 publicly oriented land uses, including the themed attraction, hotels, retail and specialty stores,
17 and film production, would provide a compatible land use relationship with the Job Corps
18 facility and would provide employment opportunities for the resident population. Proposed
19 reuse of Treasure Island would therefore not result in a significant land use impact to the Job
20 Corps facility. No mitigation is proposed.

21 Land use compatibility—Yerba Buena Island (Factor 2). Proposed reuse of Yerba Buena Island
22 would represent a change in the intensity of some uses and would introduce publicly oriented
23 use of the island. Proposed land use changes would convert the senior officers quarters
24 (Quarters 1-7), an NRHP listed historic district, to publicly oriented facilities, would develop
25 new residential areas and infill existing residential areas, and would develop a bed and
26 breakfast and restaurant in place of existing residential units on the Yerba Buena hilltop.
27 Introduced and expanded uses would require demolishing some buildings and constructing
28 others. If Quarters 1-7 were to continue in residential use, then fewer dwelling units would be
29 included elsewhere at NSTI so that the total number of units available would remain the same.

30 At full build-out, implementing Alternative 1 would result in a higher development density
31 than existed at the time of the closure. However, the proposed reuse of Yerba Buena Island
32 would provide additional opportunities for public access to open space, recreational resources,
33 publicly oriented attractions, and access to the Bay. These land use changes would be
34 consistent with applicable Draft Reuse Plan policies guiding future development and would not
35 be considered a significant land use impact. No mitigation is proposed.

36 Existing non-Navy land uses on Yerba Buena Island include an active US Coast Guard Station
37 and the SFOBB and tunnel structures. The approximately 30-acre (12-ha) US Coast Guard
38 Station is physically separated from land proposed for community reuse, and consequently the
39 physical arrangement of the station would not be disrupted or divided by proposed land use
40 changes. As a result of the federal agency screening process, the US Coast Guard was provided
41 an additional 11 acres (5 ha) of dry land and associated facilities on the southeastern Yerba
42 Buena Island hilltop. This property is physically separated from the land proposed for

4.1 Land Use

1 community reuse, and the physical arrangement of either would not be disrupted or divided by
2 proposed land use changes.

3 The existing SFOBB or the proposed realignment would not be affected by changes in land use
4 that are part of community reuse. Land on Yerba Buena Island permanently conveyed in fee to
5 Caltrans to accommodate the SFOBB realignment is no longer available for transfer and reuse
6 and consequently no land use conflict exists. Cumulative impacts from community reuse and
7 the SFOBB are discussed in Chapter 5. Please refer to the EIS for the east spans realignment for
8 discussion of impacts of that project (see <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/sfobb/sfobbfeis.htm>).
9 There would be no significant land use impact, and no mitigation is proposed.

10 4.1.2 Alternative 2

11 *Significant and Mitigable Impact*

12 Impact: Land use policy (Factor 1). The City and County of San Francisco General Plan land use
13 designation for NSTI is Military. The zone classifications that would be required for Alternative
14 2 (i.e., Public, Residential, Mixed Use) would be inconsistent with the existing general plan
15 designation and zoning classification.

16 Mitigation. To achieve consistency between the selected reuse alternative and city policies, it
17 will be necessary to amend the San Francisco General Plan to include land use designations for
18 surplus property on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island prior to approving future land use
19 actions. NSTI would not be rezoned until the final reuse plan is adopted, at which time the City
20 and County of San Francisco should amend its Planning Code to be consistent with planned
21 land uses. Upon receiving a zoning designation, the area would be subject to the land use and
22 height and bulk regulations established by the zoning. These controls would be subject to the
23 Redevelopment Plan and its design for development standards and would likely include site
24 design measures, such as buffering, landscaping, screening, and setbacks, to ensure high quality
25 development and compatibility between land uses.

26 *Not Significant Impacts*

27 Land use policy (Factor 1). Implementing Alternative 2 would increase public access to existing
28 open space areas, including the San Francisco Bay shoreline, and would allow development of
29 recreational facilities, which would be substantially consistent with the anticipated priority use
30 designations for NSTI in the San Francisco Bay Plan. Specific development plans for reuse of
31 NSTI would be subject to BCDC permit authority, which would ensure consistency with the
32 Bay Plan. Alternative 2 would be in accordance with the Draft Reuse Plan guidelines and
33 would not conflict with Sustainability Plan objectives.

34 Land use compatibility—Treasure Island (Factor 2). This alternative would affect the vicinity
35 character by increasing the amount of land devoted to open space and recreation, decreasing
36 the amount of land used for institutional purposes, eliminating former military housing, and
37 introducing new publicly oriented uses. Land use changes would include constructing an
38 approximately 150-acre (61-ha) golf course, approximately 20-acre (8-ha) wildlife habitat and
39 observation area or possible wetlands, amphitheater, entertainment center, 2 hotels, a

1 conference center, and an expanded marina. This alternative would involve more demolition
2 than Alternative 1.

3 With the exception of Building 1, the wedding chapel, firefighter training school, brig, fitness
4 center, and gym, the buildings on Treasure Island would be demolished to accommodate
5 proposed reuses. Implementing this alternative would involve more building demolition and,
6 with the proposed golf course and wildlife area, would create more open space and recreation
7 areas than Alternative 1. As with Alternative 1, proposed reuse of Treasure Island would
8 provide additional opportunities for public access to open space and recreational resources,
9 publicly oriented attractions, and access to the Bay. These land use changes would be
10 consistent with applicable Draft Reuse Plan policies, which guide future development to ensure
11 land use compatibility under reuse, and therefore would not be considered a significant land
12 use impact. No mitigation is proposed.

13 As with Alternative 1, proposed land uses would provide a compatible land use relationship
14 with the Job Corps facility and would provide trainees with employment opportunities.
15 Proposed reuse of Treasure Island would therefore not result in a significant land use impact to
16 the Job Corps facility. No mitigation is proposed.

17 Land use compatibility—Yerba Buena Island (Factor 2). As a result of implementing this alternative,
18 proposed reuse of Yerba Buena Island would affect the vicinity character by converting the
19 senior officers quarters to publicly oriented facilities, by developing new residential areas and
20 infilling existing residential areas, and by developing a bed and breakfast in place of existing
21 residential units on the Yerba Buena Island hilltop.

22 Proposed Yerba Buena Island development would be similar to Alternative 1, but more land
23 would be set aside for publicly oriented uses (i.e., hotel or bed and breakfast, conference center,
24 or restaurant facilities), and less would be devoted to residential uses. This development would
25 involve more demolition and construction than under Alternative 1. As with Alternative 1, the
26 proposed reuse of Yerba Buena Island would provide additional opportunities for public access
27 to open space and recreational resources, publicly oriented attractions, and access to the Bay.
28 These land use changes would be consistent with applicable Draft Reuse Plan policies, which
29 guide future development to ensure land use compatibility under reuse, and therefore would
30 not be considered a significant land use impact. No mitigation is proposed.

31 As with Alternative 1, proposed land use changes on Yerba Buena Island would be separate
32 and distinct from existing uses, and as such, implementing this alternative would not disrupt or
33 divide the physical arrangement of existing uses. The existing SFOBB or the proposed
34 realignment would not be affected by changes in land use that are part of community reuse.
35 Land on Yerba Buena Island permanently conveyed in fee to Caltrans to accommodate the
36 SFOBB realignment is no longer available for transfer and reuse and consequently no land use
37 conflict exists. Cumulative impacts from community reuse and the SFOBB are discussed in
38 Chapter 5. Please refer to the EIS for the east spans realignment for discussion of impacts of
39 that project (see <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/sfobb/sfobbfeis.htm>). Therefore, there would
40 be no significant land use impact, and no mitigation is proposed.

4.1 Land Use

1 4.1.3 Alternative 3

2 *Significant and Mitigable Impact*

3 Impact: Land use policy (Factor 1). The City and County of San Francisco General Plan land use
4 designation for NSTI is Military. The zone classifications that would be required for Alternative
5 3 (i.e., Public, Residential, Mixed Use) would be inconsistent with the existing general plan
6 designation and zoning classification.

7 *Mitigation.* To achieve consistency between the selected reuse alternative and city policies, it
8 will be necessary to amend the San Francisco General Plan to include land use designations for
9 surplus property on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island prior to approving future land use
10 actions. NSTI would not be rezoned until the final reuse plan is adopted, at which time the City
11 and County of San Francisco should amend its Planning Code to be consistent with planned
12 land uses. Upon receiving a zoning designation, the area would be subject to the land use and
13 height and bulk regulations established by the zoning. These controls would be subject to the
14 Redevelopment Plan and its design for development standards and would likely include site
15 design measures, such as buffering, landscaping, screening, and setbacks, to ensure high quality
16 development and compatibility between land uses.

17 *Not Significant Impacts*

18 Land use policy (Factor 1). Implementing Alternative 3 would increase public access to existing
19 open space areas, including the San Francisco Bay shoreline, and would allow development of
20 recreational facilities, which would be substantially consistent with the anticipated priority use
21 designations for NSTI in the San Francisco Bay Plan. Specific development plans for reuse of
22 NSTI would be subject to BCDC permit authority, which would ensure consistency with the
23 Bay Plan. Alternative 3 would be in accordance with the Draft Reuse Plan guidelines and
24 would not conflict with Sustainability Plan objectives.

25 Land use compatibility—Treasure Island (Factor 2). With the exception of the themed attraction
26 and sports complex, proposed reuse of Treasure Island under Alternative 3 would be
27 accommodated within existing facilities. Existing city leases on Treasure Island, including
28 leases for film production, a firefighting school, brig, marina, and elementary school, would
29 continue through 2015 under this alternative. Implementing this alternative would require
30 minimal demolition and construction. As with Alternative 1, proposed reuse of Treasure Island
31 would provide additional opportunities for public access to open space and recreational
32 resources, publicly oriented attractions, and access to the Bay. Proposed land uses under
33 Alternative 3 would be less responsive to the objectives of the Draft Reuse Plan than those of
34 Alternatives 1 and 2; however, land use changes would be consistent with applicable Draft
35 Reuse Plan policies, which guide future development to ensure land use compatibility under
36 reuse, and therefore would not be considered a significant land use impact on the vicinity
37 character of Treasure Island. No mitigation is proposed.

38 As with Alternatives 1 and 2, proposed land uses would provide a compatible land use
39 relationship with the Job Corps facility and would provide trainees with employment
40 opportunities. Proposed reuse of Treasure Island would therefore not result in a significant
41 land use impact to the Job Corps facility. No mitigation is proposed.

1 Land use compatibility—Yerba Buena Island (Factor 2). As a result of implementing this alternative,
2 proposed reuse of Yerba Buena Island would represent a change in the intensity of some land
3 uses and would introduce publicly oriented use of the island. Proposed land use changes
4 would affect the vicinity character by converting the senior officer quarters to publicly oriented
5 facilities, by developing new residential areas and infilling existing residential areas, and by
6 developing a bed and breakfast in place of existing residential units on the Yerba Buena hilltop.
7 New uses would require expanding some existing buildings, demolition, and new construction.
8 Using the Nimitz House (Quarters 1), a NRHP listed property, as a conference center would
9 continue through 2015 under this alternative.

10 At full buildout, overall land uses would be similar to Alternative 1 at a reduced scale. Fewer
11 residential units would be constructed, and only the senior officers quarters would be
12 developed as a conference facility. As with Alternative 1, proposed reuse of Yerba Buena Island
13 would provide additional opportunities for public access to open space and recreational
14 resources, publicly oriented attractions, and access to the Bay. These land use changes would
15 be consistent with applicable Draft Reuse Plan policies, which guide future development to
16 ensure land use compatibility under reuse, and therefore would not be considered a significant
17 land use impact on the vicinity character of Yerba Buena Island. No mitigation is proposed.

18 As with Alternatives 1 and 2, proposed land use changes on Yerba Buena Island would be
19 separate and distinct from existing uses, and as such, implementing this alternative would not
20 disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of existing uses. The existing SFOBB or the
21 proposed realignment would not be affected by changes in land use that are part of community
22 reuse. Land on Yerba Buena Island permanently conveyed in fee to Caltrans to accommodate
23 the SFOBB realignment is no longer available for transfer and reuse and consequently no land
24 use conflict exists. Cumulative impacts from community reuse and the SFOBB are discussed in
25 Chapter 5. Please refer to the EIS for the east spans realignment for discussion of impacts of
26 that project (see <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/sfobb/sfobbfeis.htm>). There would be no
27 significant land use impact, and no mitigation is proposed.

28 4.1.4 No Action Alternative

29 The No Action Alternative would retain NSTI in a caretaker status under Navy control. No
30 disposal action would occur. Existing structures and grounds would be maintained to
31 minimize deterioration. Environmental cleanup would continue in conformance with federal
32 requirements and ongoing military programs, but cleanup would occur over a longer period of
33 time than Alternatives 1 through 3, as no reuse requirements would need to be met.

34 Land use policy (Factor 1). The No Action Alternative would be consistent with the existing
35 General Plan and zoning designation (Military). There would be no need for the City and
36 County of San Francisco to amend its General Plan. There would be no land use impact.

37 Land use compatibility—Treasure Island (Factor 2). Continuing use of Treasure Island would be
38 accommodated within existing facilities. Existing city leases on Treasure Island, including
39 leases for film production, a firefighting school, brig, marina, and elementary school, would
40 continue through 2015 under this alternative. These leases would continue until expired or
41 terminated. Implementing this alternative would require minimal demolition and construction

4.1 Land Use

1 by Navy to comply with safety standards. There are no proposed land use changes, and there
2 would be no impact on the vicinity character of Treasure Island.

3 As there are no proposed land use changes, this alternative would provide a compatible land
4 use relationship with the Job Corps. There would be no land use impact.

5 Land use compatibility—Yerba Buena Island (Factor 2). Continuing use of Yerba Buena Island
6 would be accommodated within existing facilities. Existing leases on Yerba Buena Island
7 would continue until expired or terminated. Implementing this alternative would require
8 minimal demolition and construction by Navy to comply with safety standards. There are no
9 proposed land use changes, and there would be no impact on the vicinity character of Yerba
10 Buena Island.