clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by May 8, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection to Marine Corps Recruiting Command, Code M3280, Russell Road, Quantico, VA 22134.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request additional information or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, contact Major Andrew Fortunato at (703) 784–9433.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Form Title and OMB Number: Marine Corps Advertising Awareness and Attitude Tracking Study; OMB Control Number 0704–0155.

Needs and Uses: The Marine Corps Advertising Awareness and Attitude Tracking Study is used by the Marine Corps to measure the effectiveness of current advertising campaigns. This information is also used to plan future advertising campaigns.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Annual Burden Hours: 980.

Number of Respondents: 1,400.

Responses per Respondent: 2.

Average Burden per Response: 21 minutes.

Frequency: Semi-annually.

(Authority: 44 U.S.C. Sec. 3506(c)(2)(A))

Dated: February 29, 2000.

J. L. Roth,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–5702 Filed 3–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–U

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Record of Decision for the Disposal and Reuse of Naval Air Station Alameda, California, and the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Oakland's Alameda Annex and Facility, Alameda, CA

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy (Navy), pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C) (1994), and the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality that implement NEPA procedures, 40 CFR parts 1500–1508, hereby announces its decision to dispose of Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda and the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Oakland's Alameda Annex and Facility (Alameda Annex), which are located in Alameda, California.

Navy analyzed the impacts of the disposal and reuse of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as required by NEPA. The EIS analyzed four reuse alternatives and identified the NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan (Reuse Plan), adopted by the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority (ARRA) on September 3, 1997, and described in the EIS as the Reuse Plan Alternative, as the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative proposed to use NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex for residential, educational, industrial and commercial activities and to develop parks and recreational areas. The Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority is the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) for NAS Alameda. Department of Defense rule on Revitalizing Base Closure Communities and Community Assistance (DoD Rule), 32 CFR § 176.20(a).

Navy intends to dispose of NAS Alameda in a manner that is consistent with the Reuse Plan. Navy has determined that the mixed land use proposed for NAS Alameda will meet the goals of achieving local economic redevelopment, creating new jobs, and providing additional housing, while limiting adverse environmental impacts and ensuring land uses that are compatible with adjacent property.

Navy plans to dispose of the Alameda Annex under the authority of Section 2834(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484, as amended by Section 2833 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, Public Law 103–160, Section 2821 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, Public Law 103–337, and Section 2867 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, Public Law 104–106. Section 2687 of Public Law 104–106 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to convey property associated with the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center at Oakland to the City of Alameda.

This Record Of Decision does not mandate a specific mix of land uses. Rather, it leaves selection of the particular means to achieve the proposed redevelopment to the acquiring entities and the local zoning authority.

Background

Under the authority of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (DBCRA), Public Law 101–510, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note (1994), the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended the closure of Naval Air Station Alameda. This recommendation was approved by President Clinton and accepted by the One Hundred Third Congress in 1993. The Naval Air Station closed on April 30, 1997.

Nearly all of NAS Alameda is located in the City of Alameda. The southwest corner of the property is located in the City of San Francisco. The Air Station is bounded on the north by the Oakland Inner Harbor; on the east by the City of Alameda and the Alameda Annex; and on the south and west by San Francisco Bay. The Navy property covers about 2,515 acres, of which 960 acres are submerged. Navy controls an additional 159 acres (of which 154 acres are submerged) by way of a lease with the City of Alameda. Navy also controls about two acres by way of easements for utilities.

Under the authority of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101–510, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note (1994), the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended the closure of fleet and Industrial Supply Center (FISC) Oakland. The Alameda Annex and Facility were part of the Navy supply complex at FISC Oakland. This recommendation was approved by President Clinton and accepted by the One Hundred Fourth Congress in 1995. The Alameda Annex closed on September 30, 1998.

Because the Alameda Annex was part of the FISC Oakland property, Section 2867 of Public Law 104–106 authorizes Navy to convey the Annex property to the City of Alameda. This authority is independent of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 as well as the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 40 U.S.C. 484 (1994), and its implementing regulations, the Federal Property Management Regulations, 41 CFR part 101–47.

The Alameda Annex is located adjacent to and east of NAS Alameda and is situated within the boundaries of the City of Alameda. The Alameda Annex property is bounded on the north by the Oakland Inner Harbor; on the east and south by the City of Alameda; and on the south and west by NAS Alameda. This Navy property covers about 147 acres, of which six acres are submerged.

During the Federal screening process, three Federal agencies requested interagency transfers of base closure property at NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex. These included the Department of the Interior's United States Fish And Wildlife Service, the United States Coast Guard, and the Department of Transportation's Maritime Administration (MARAD).

Navy will transfer about 900 acres (of which 375 acres are submerged) in the western and southwestern parts of NAS Alameda to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which will establish the Alameda National Wildlife Refuge. This Refuge will protect the Federally-listed endangered California least tern, the endangered California brown pelican, and several species of migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, 16 U.S.C. 703–712 (1994).

Navy may transfer 582 residential units, an administrative building (Building 545), and about 69 acres in the eastern part of NAS Alameda to the United States Coast Guard. The Coast Guard would continue to use these residences and Building 545 for its housing and administrative requirements.

The Maritime Administration requested piers at both NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex to berth vessels that are elements of the Ready Reserve Force. The Maritime Administration subsequently withdrew its request for piers at NAS Alameda. On March 30, 1998, Navy disapproved MARAD's request for an interagency transfer of piers at the Alameda Annex.

The remaining 1,546 acres of Navy property at NAS Alameda are surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. The entire 147 acres of Navy property at the Alameda Annex are available for disposal under the authority of Public Law 102–484, as amended by Public Law 103–160, Public Law 103–337, and Public Law 104–106.

This Record Of Decision addresses the disposal and reuse of those parts of NAS Alameda that are surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and the entire Alameda Annex property. Navy will transfer its interests in the utility easements at NAS Alameda to local utility providers or the underlying property owners. In addition, Navy will return the 159 acres currently leased from the city of Alameda to the City on or before termination of the lease on June 30, 2005.

The surplus property at NAS Alameda is composed of aviation facilities including parts of the runways and taxiways and seven hangars. Most of the runways and taxiways are located on property that Navy will transfer to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. The Air Station also contains industrial and warehouse buildings, administrative offices, personnel support facilities, residential facilities, recreational facilities and areas, a seaplane lagoon, wharves, and three piers. The Alameda Annex property contains warehouses, wharves, administrative offices, and open storage areas.

Of the 1,546 acres of surplus property at NAS Alameda, there are about 1,482 acres available to the City for economic redevelopment. The City proposes to develop residential, educational, industrial and commercial facilities on this property.

Navy will dispose of the remaining 64 acres of surplus property at NAS Alameda by way of public benefit conveyances. Navy will assign seven acres in the center of the Coast Guard housing property to the United States Department of Education for subsequent conveyance to the Alameda Unified School District to permit the continuing use of the George P. Miller Elementary School and adjacent child care facility. Navy will assign 57 acres in the northern part of NAS Alameda to the United States Department of the Interior for subsequent conveyance to the City of Alameda for use as parks and recreational areas.

Navy plans to dispose of the entire Alameda Annex property, covering about 147 acres, under the authority of Section 2834(b) of Public Law 102–484, as amended by Section 2833 of Public Law 103–160, Section 2821 of Public Law 103–337, and Section 2867 of Public Law 104–106.

Navy published a Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register** on February 22, 1996, announcing that Navy would prepare an EIS for the disposal and reuse of Naval Air Station Alameda and the Alameda Annex. On March 13, 1996, Navy held a public scoping meeting at Alameda High School in Alameda, and the scoping period concluded on March 29, 1996.

Navy distributed the Draft EIS (DEIS) to Federal, State, and local agencies, elected officials, interested parties, and the general public on April 16, 1999, and commenced a 45-day public review and comment period. During this period, Federal, State, and local agencies, community groups and associations, and interested persons submitted oral and written comments concerning the DEIS. On May 18, 1999, Navy held a public hearing at Alameda High School to receive comments on the DEIS.

Navy's responses to the public comments on the DEIS were incorporated in the Final EIS (FEIS), which was distributed to the public on October 29, 1999, for a review period that concluded on November 29, 1999. Navy received nine letters commenting on the FEIS.

Alternatives

NEPA requires Navy to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives for the disposal and reuse of this Federal property. In the FEIS, Navy analyzed the environmental impacts of four reuse alternatives. Navy also evaluated a ''No Action'' alternative that would leave the property in caretaker status with Navy maintaining the physical condition of the property, providing a security force, and making repairs essential to safety.

On July 14, 1993, the City Council of Alameda established the Alameda Base Reuse Advisory Group to advise the City Council concerning base conversion issues. The Advisory Group also provided a forum for public participation in the reuse planning process. The Advisory Group held four public workshops on November 6, 1993, October 12, 1994, October 29, 1994, and January 28, 1995, where it solicited comments concerning reuse of the base.

On April 5, 1994, the City of Alameda and Alameda County established the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority as a joint powers authority responsible for managing the reuse planning process for NAS Alameda. Between April 1994 and January 1996, ARRA issued newsletters and held regular public meetings where it provided status reports and solicited additional comments concerning reuse of the Naval property. On January 31, 1996, ARRA adopted the NAS Alameda Community Reuse Plan, dated January 1996. ARRA Resolution No. 011.

On June 4, 1997, ARRA modified the January 1996 reuse plan by adding office and commercial uses to the center of the Air Station and reducing the amount of property dedicated to educational activities there. It also designated 17 acres in the northwest part of the Air Station for use as a sports complex. On September 3, 1997, ARRA modified the January 1996 reuse plan further to recognize the boundaries and extent of property that Navy will transfer to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

The Reuse Plan divided the property at NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex into six planning areas. The Civic Core, Planning Area One, covers about 334 acres in the center of NAS Alameda. This planning area contains the main administrative buildings and

parade ground, several barracks, a swimming pool and gymnasium complex, medical clinics, a post office, and restaurants. The western and southern parts of this planning area contain industrial buildings, warehouses, and seven aircraft hangars.

The Main Street Neighborhoods, Planning Area Two, covers about 265 acres in the northeastern part of NAS Alameda and the southern part of the Alameda Annex. It lies east of the Civic Core planning area and contains the residential areas on NAS Alameda and industrial buildings at the Alameda Annex.

The Inner Harbor, Planning Area Three, covers about 120 acres in the southeastern part of NAS Alameda. This planning area contains industrial buildings, warehouses, and a park.

The North Waterfront, Planning Area Four, covers about 88 acres situated in the northern part of the Alameda Annex along the Oakland Inner Harbor. This planning areas contains wharves and warehouses.

The Marina, Planning Area Five, covers about 125 acres around the seaplane lagoon in the southern part of NAS Alameda along San Francisco Bay, south of the Civic Core planning area. This planning area contains three piers, two wharves, several buildings and open space.

The northwest part of the Air Station along the Oakland Inner Harbor, designated in the Reuse Plan as the Northwest Territories, Planning Area Six, covers about 272 acres located north of the proposed Alameda National Wildlife Refuge. This planning area includes parts of the runways and taxiways.

The Reuse Plan, identified in the FEIS as the Preferred Alternative, proposed a mix of land uses for each of the six planning areas. The Preferred Alternative would develop residential, educational, industrial, and commercial activities as well as parks and recreational areas. It will be necessary to make extensive utility infrastructure and roadway improvements to support the Reuse Plan's proposed redevelopment of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex.

In the Civic Core planning area, the Preferred Alternative would develop a mixed use office and institutional center, providing about 916,000 square feet of existing space and an additional 2,279,000 square feet of space to be built. This center would be composed of offices and educational and commercial facilities.

On 37 acres in the northern part of the Civic Core, this Alternative would build athletic fields and recreational facilities and expand the existing parade ground into a larger open space mall covering 57 acres. The Preferred Alternative would build 192 townhouses on 16 acres in this part of the base. It would also dedicate 52,000 square feet of space to commercial activities that would support the new residents. The commercial activities would include restaurants, cafes, convenience stores, retail stores, and department stores. About one third of the buildings in this planning area would be demolished to accommodate the proposed redevelopment.

On 236 acres in the Main Streets Neighborhoods planning area, the Preferred Alternative would develop a mix of housing units, with 1,314 single family homes and 174 attached homes composed of existing residential units and new construction. On 21 acres, this Alternative would continue to use the George P. Miller Elementary School and adjacent child care center and build a new elementary school to support the proposed residential complex. This Alternative would use the Navy Lodge as a shelter; build small retail and commercial stores on four acres; and reserve an additional four acres for parks and recreational activities.

In the northern part of the Inner Harbor planning area, the Preferred Alternative would develop about 910,000 square feet of space for light industrial activities. This development would also provide offices, restaurants, and service industries that would support the light industrial activities. On 36 acres in the southern part of the Inner Harbor area, this Alternative would develop a regional park to be included in the Bay Trail System. On 13 acres, it would develop a recreational vehicle park with a capacity of 135 recreational vehicles. Where feasible, the existing roadways in this part of the base would be extended to connect with the residential neighborhood outside the Air Station property.

In the northern part of the North Waterfront planning area, the Preferred Alternative would demolish all of the existing structures and develop 418,000 square feet of space for mixed use facilities including offices. This Alternative would also develop a hotel, restaurants, a passenger ferry service, and a waterfront promenade here. On 12 acres, this Alternative would build 144 units of attached waterfront housing along the Oakland Inner Harbor.

In the southern part of the North Waterfront planning area, the Preferred Alternative would develop 993,000 square feet of space for light industrial and research and develop activities. On eight acres at the western edge of this planning area, east of the George P. Miller Elementary School, it would develop an alternative education high school, a regional kitchen facility, a parking area, a storage area, and maintenance facilities for the Alameda Unified School District.

The Preferred Alternative would develop the Marina planning area as a commercial marina. This Alternative would build a 900-slip marina in the seaplane lagoon to accommodate private and public vessels and facilities for a passenger ferry service and deep draft yachts. The three piers in the southeastern part of the Marina would be used to accommodate large cruise ships and historic vessels such as the former USS Hornet, a World War II Aircraft Carrier that is currently moored at Pier Three under a lease between ARRA and the Aircraft Carriers Hornet Foundation. This Alternative would also develop about 264,000 square feet of space for light industrial and commercial marine activities.

In the northern part of the Marina planning area, the Preferred Alternative would develop a promenade and a civic plaza. Near the plaza, this Alternative would develop facilities for civic uses such as offices, a cultural arts center or theater, and recreational activities. It would also build a hotel and conference center on four acres in this part of the base.

On 32 acres along the eastern shore of the seaplane lagoon, the Preferred Alternative would build 384 residential units composed of artists' lofts, low to moderate income apartments, and townhouses. It would allocate 100 of the 900 marina slips for those who wish to live aboard their vessels. All of the large industrial buildings in this planning area would be demolished to accommodate the proposed redevelopment.

In the western part of the Northwest Territories planning area, the Preferred Alternative would build a 162-acre links golf course, a clubhouse on six acres, and a conference center. This Alternative would also develop a 29-acre park along the shore of the Oakland Inner Harbor.

On 58 areas in the center of the Northwest Territories planning area, the Preferred Alternative would develop an international trade and commerce zone that would provide about 980,000 square feet of space. On 17 acres in the eastern part of the Northwest Territories, this Alternative would develop athletic fields that would be associated with the sports complex proposed for the Civic Core planning area.

Navy analyzed a second ''action'' alternative, described in the FEIS as the Seaport Alternative. Navy considered this Alternative in response to the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's designation (in its San Francisco Bay Plan) of 220 acres in the northwestern part of NAS Alameda along the Oakland Inner Harbor for future use as a port. On September 18, 1997, the Commission removed this port priority use designation when it amended the San Francisco Bay Plan and the San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan.

The Seaport Alternative proposed land uses similar to those in the Reuse Plan. However, the Seaport Alternative proposed to develop a port facility with five container ship berths instead of the golf course and international trade zone in the Northwest Territories and would develop a college campus instead of light industrial facilities in the Civic Core. The proposed port facilities in the Northwest Territories planning area would require construction of an additional transportation link such as a bridge, a tunnel, or a high rise crane in order to transport cargo across the Oakland Inner Harbor between Alameda and the Port of Oakland.

In the Civic Core planning area, the Seaport Alternative would use about 916,000 square feet of existing space for a college campus and would develop an additional 2,279,000 square feet of space for a mixed use office and institutional center. This Alternative would expand the existing parade ground into a larger open space mall covering 57 acres and would build 192 townhouses on 16 acres in this part of the base. It would also dedicate 52,000 square feet of space to commercial activities that would support the new residents. The commercial activities would include restaurants, cafes, convenience stores, retail stores, and department stores. About one third of the buildings in this planning area would be demolished to accommodate the proposed redevelopment.

On 236 acres in the Main Streets Neighborhoods planning area, the Seaport Alternative would develop a mix of housing units, with 1,314 single family homes and 174 attached homes composed of existing residential units and new construction. On 21 acres, this Alternative would continue to use the George P. Miller Elementary School and adjacent child care center and build a new elementary school to support the proposed residential complex. This Alternative would use the Navy Lodge as a shelter; build small retail and commercial stores on four acres; and reserve an additional four acres for parks and recreational activities.

On 63 acres in the northern part of the Inner Harbor planning area, the Seaport Alternative would develop a residential complex with 378 single family homes. This Alternative would reserve eight acres for a school to be built in the future. On 49 acres in the southern part of the Inner Harbor area, the Seaport Alternative would develop a regional park to be included in the Bay Trail System. Where feasible, the existing roadways in this part of the base would be extended to connect with the residential neighborhood outside the Air Station property.

In the northern part of the North Waterfront planning area, the Seaport Alternative would demolish all of the existing structures and develop 418,000 square feet of space for mixed use facilities including offices. This Alternative would also develop restaurants, a passenger ferry service, and a waterfront promenade here. On 46 acres, this Alternative would build 552 units of attached waterfront housing along the Oakland Inner Harbor.

On eight acres at the western edge of this planning area, east of the George P. Miller Elementary School, the Seaport Alternative would develop an alternative education high school, a regional kitchen facility, a parking area, a storage area, and maintenance facilities for the Alameda Unified School District.

The Seaport Alternative would develop the Marina planning area as a commercial marina. It would build a 500-slip marina in the seaplane lagoon to accommodate private and public vessels and facilities for a passenger ferry service and deep draft yachts. The three piers in the southeastern part of this planning area would be used to accommodate large cruise ships and historic vessels such as the former USS *Hornet*. This Alternative would also develop about 264,000 square feet of space of light industrial and commercial marine activities.

In the northern part of the Marina planning area, the Seaport Alternative would develop a promenade and a civic plaza. Near the plaza, this Alternative would develop facilities for civic uses such as offices, a cultural arts center or theater, and recreational activities. It would also build a hotel and conference center on four acres in this part of the base.

On 32 acres along the eastern shore of the seaplane lagoon, the Seaport Alternative would build 384 residential units composed of artists' lofts, low to moderate income apartments, and townhouses. All of the large industrial buildings in this planning area would be demolished to accommodate the proposed redevelopment.

In the Northwest Territories planning area along the Oakland Inner Harbor, the Seaport Alternative would build a five-berth container ship port facility and container storage yard on 220 acres. The port facility would require a substantial amount of dredging in the Inner Harbor and the installation of several large cranes along the waterfront. This Alternative would also develop roads and rail service to move cargo. It would reserve 52 acres for parks and recreational activities.

Navy analyzed a third ''action'' alternative, described in the FEIS as the Residential Alternative. This Alternative would increase the amount of property dedicated to residential uses in the Civic Core, Inner Harbor, North Waterfront and Northwest Territories planning areas compared with that proposed under the Reuse Plan. The Residential Alternative would develop 5,456 residential units compared with the 2,378 residential units that the Preferred Alternative would develop.

In the Civic Core planning area, the Residential Alternative would use about 916,000 square feet of existing space for a college campus and develop an additional 1,278,000 square feet of space for a mixed use office and institutional center. It would also reserve 94 acres as open space. It would build 960 townhouses on 80 acres in this part of the base and use 78,000 square feet of space for commercial activities to support the new residents. The commercial activities would include restaurants, cafes, convenience stores, retail stores, and department stores. About one third of the buildings in this planning area would be demolished to accommodate the proposed redevelopment.

On 236 acres in the Main Streets Neighborhoods planning area, the Residential Alternative would develop a mix of housing units, with 1,314 single family homes and 174 attached homes composed of existing residential units and new construction. On 21 acres, this Alternative would continue to use the George P. Miller Elementary School and adjacent child care center and build a new elementary school to support the proposed residential complex. This Alternative would use the Navy Lodge as a shelter; build small retail and commercial stores on four acres; and reserve an additional four acres for parks and recreational activities.

On 63 acres in the northern part of the Inner Harbor planning area, the Residential Alternative would develop a residential complex with 378 single

family homes. On 13 additional acres, this Alternative would build 156 units of attached housing and reserve eight acres for a school to be built in the future. On 36 acres in the southern part of the Inner Harbor area, the Residential Alternative would develop a regional park to be included in the Bay Trail System. Where feasible, the existing roadways in this part of the base would be extended to connect with the residential neighborhood outside the Air Station Property.

In the northern part of the North Waterfront planning area, the Residential Alternative would demolish all of the existing structures and develop 313,000 square feet of space for mixed use facilities including offices. This Alternative would also develop restaurants, a passenger ferry service, and a waterfront promenade here. On 34 acres, this Alternative would build 408 units of attached waterfront housing along the Oakland Inner Harbor. On 20 acres here, the Residential Alternative would develop a 200-slip marina. On eight acres at the western edge of this planning area, east of the George P. Miller Elementary School, this Alternative would develop an alternative education high school, a regional kitchen facility, a parking area, a storage area, and maintenance facilities for the Alameda Unified School District.

The Residential Alternative would develop the Marina planning area as a commercial marina. This Alternative would build a 900-slip marina in the seaplane lagoon to accommodate private and public vessels and facilities for a passenger ferry service and deep draft yachts. The three piers in the southeastern part of this planning area would be used to accommodate large cruise ships and historic vessels such as the former USS *Hornet.* This Alternative would also develop about 264,000 square feet of space for light industrial and commercial marine activities.

In the northern part of the Marina planning area, the Residential Alternative would develop a promenade and a civic plaza. Near the plaza, this Alternative would develop facilities for civic uses such as offices, a cultural arts center or theater, and recreational activities. This Alternative would build a hotel and conference center on four acres in this part of the base.

On 32 acres along the eastern shore of the seaplane lagoon, the Residential Alternative would build 384 residential units composed of artists' lofts, low to moderate income apartments, and townhouses. It would allocate 100 of the 900 marina slips for those who wish to live aboard their vessels. All of the large industrial buildings in this planning area would be demolished to accommodate the proposed redevelopment.

On 226 acres in the Northwest Territories planning area, the Residential Alternative would build 1,200 single family homes and 312 units of attached housing and reserve eight acres for a school to be built in the future. It would also reserve 38 acres for parks and recreational activities.

Navy analyzed a fourth ''action'' alternative, described in the FESI as the Reduced Density Alternative. The Reduced Density Alternative proposed land uses similar to those advanced in the Preferred Alternative, but the extent of development would be reduced to provide more open space.

In the Civic Core planning area, the Reduced Density Alternative would develop a mixed use office and industrial park providing about 1,822,000 square feet of space. On 37 acres in the northern part of the Civil Core, this Alternative would build athletic fields and recreational facilities. It would expand the existing parade ground into a large open space mall covering 57 acres.

On 16 acres in the Civil Core planning area, the Reduced Density Alternative would build 96 townhouses. It would dedicate 26,000 square feet of space to commercial activities that would support the new residents. The commercial activities would include restaurants, cafes, convenience stores, retail stores, and department stores. On 13 acres, it would a develop a recreation vehicle park with a capacity of 135 recreational vehicles. About one third of the buildings in this planning area would be demolished to accommodate the proposed redevelopment.

On 236 acres in the Main Streets Neighborhoods planning area, the Reduced Density Alternative would develop a mix of housing units, with 793 single family homes and 144 attached homes composed of existing residential units and new construction. On 21 acres, this Alternative would continue to use the George P. Miller Elementary School and adjacent child care center and build a new elementary school to support the proposed residential complex. It would use the Navy Lodge as a shelter; build small retail and commercial stores on four acres; and reserve an additional four acres for parks and recreational activities.

On 76 acres in the northern part of the Inner Harbor planning area, the Reduced Density Alternative would develop a residential complex with 228 single family homes. This Alternative would reserve eight acres for a school to be built in the future. On 36 acres in the southern part of the Inner Harbor area, the Reduced Density Alternative would develop a regional park to be included in the Bay Trail System. Where feasible, the existing roadways in this part of the base would be extended to connect with the residential neighborhood outside the Air Station property.

In the northern part of the North Waterfront planning area, the Reduced Density Alternative would demolish all of the existing structures and develop 418,000 square feet of space for mixed use facilities including offices. This Alternative would also develop restaurants, a passenger ferry service, and a waterfront promenade here. On 12 acres, the Alternative would build 144 units of attached waterfront housing along the Oakland Inner Harbor.

In the southern part of the North Waterfront planning area, the Reduced Density Alternative would develop 381,000 square feet of space for light industrial and research and development activities. On eight acres at the western edge of this planning area, east of the George P. Miller Elementary School, this Alternative would develop an alternative education high school, a regional kitchen facility, a parking area, a storage area, and maintenance facilities for the Alameda Unified School District.

The Reduced Density Alternative would develop the Marina planning area as a commercial marina. It would build a 250-slip marina in the seaplane lagoon to accommodate private and public vessels and facilities for a passenger ferry service and deep draft yachts. The three piers in the southeastern part of this planning area would be used to accommodate large cruise ships and historic vessels such as the former *USS Hornet*. This Alternative would also develop about 115,000 square feet of space for light industrial and commercial marine activities.

In the northern part of the Marina planning area, the Reduced Density Alternative would develop a promenade and a civic plaza. Near the plaza, this Alternative would develop facilities for civic uses such as offices, a cultural arts center or theater, and recreational activities. It would build a hotel and conference center on four acres in this part of the base.

On 32 acres along the eastern shore of the seaplane lagoon, this Alternative would build about 192 residential units composed of artists' lofts, low to moderate income apartments, and townhouses. All of the large industrial buildings in this planning area would be

demolished to accommodate the proposed redevelopment.

In the western part of the Northwest Territories planning area, the Reduced Density Alternative would build a 162-acre links golf course, a clubhouse on six acres, and a conference center. This Alternative would also develop a 29-acre parking along the shore of the Oakland Inner Harbor. On 17 acres in the eastern part of the Northwest Territories, it would develop athletic fields that would be associated with the sports complex proposed for the Civic Core planning area. It would also reserve 58 acres as open space.

Environment Impacts

Navy analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the disposal and reuse of this Federal property. The EIS addressed impacts of the Preferred Alternative, the Seaport Alternative, the Residential Alternative, the Reduced Density Alternative, and the ''No Action'' Alternative for each alternative's effects on land use, visual resources, socioeconomics, public services, utilities, cultural resources, biological resources, geology and soils, water resources, traffic and circulation, air quality, noise, and hazardous materials and waste. This Record of Decision focuses on the impacts that would likely result from implementation of the Reuse Plan, identified in the FEIS as the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on land use. The land uses proposed in the Preferred Alternative would be generally compatible with each other and with adjacent off-site land uses. The development of a recreational vehicle park adjacent to existing residential and recreational uses would be governed by the City of Alameda's zoning and land use ordinances.

The proposed development in four planing areas (Civic Core, Main Street Neighborhoods, Marina, and Northwest Territories) of residential, educational and commercial facilities that are not related to maritime activities could have a significant impact on land use if these facilities were built on tidelands encumbered by a public trust established by California law. The Tidelands Trust mandates that public tidelands and submerged lands must be used for the benefit of the people of California for commerce, navigation, fisheries and recreation. The proposed residential, educational and general commercial development of property in these planning areas would not be consistent with the Trust's restrictions.

The City of Alameda, however, could avoid this impact by entering into an agreement with the California State Lands Commission to impose public trust restrictions on non-trust lands or by making monetary contributions to the Kapiloff Land Bank Fund in exchange for the removal of Tidelands Trust restrictions on property in these planning areas. The Kapiloff Land Bank Fund is a mitigation fund administered by the State Lands Commission.

The Preferred Alternative would have several impacts on visual resources. The development of light industrial facilities in the Northwest Territories planning area could decrease the visual quality of this part of the Air Station from vantage point in Alameda and Oakland. However, the demolition of warehouses and the elimination of open storage areas in the North Waterfront planning area would improve views of the base from the City of Oakland's Jack London Square and from the Oakland Ferry Terminal located across the Oakland Inner Harbor. The proposed golf course and park in the Northwest Territories planning area would also enhance views of the former Air Station from the Oakland side of the Inner Harbor. Additionally, the Preferred Alternative provides public access to the Northwest Territories and Marina planning areas that will introduce new opportunities to view San Francisco Bay and the Oakland Inner Harbor.

The Preferred Alternative would not have an adverse impact on the socioeconomics of the surrounding area. In the full buildout year of 2020, there would be 2,378 residential units on the NAS Alameda and Alameda Annex properties. This would constitute about two percent of the projected housing increase in Alameda County. By the same year, implementation of the Preferred Alternative would increase the number of Alameda County residents by 19,400 persons. This would constitute only seven percent of the County's total projected population growth.

By the year 2020, this Alternative would create 18,978 jobs, which constitutes about seven percent of the projected job growth for Alameda County. The Preferred Alternative would have a greater impact on the City of Alameda, because the number of new jobs constitutes about 84 percent of the City's projected job growth.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on schools. By the year 2020, the Preferred Alternative would generate an increase of 1,103 school age children living in the area. The new elementary school to be built under the Reuse Plan would have a 500-student capacity and would be funded by impact fees, property taxes, and other taxes generated by the reuse of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex.

The proposed redevelopment of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex would increase the demand for policy, fire, and ambulance services with the resultant requirements for increased staffing, equipment, and an additional fire station. These additional City services would be funded by a variety of sources such as impact fees, special taxes and other public revenues.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on utilities. The Reuse Plan's projected demands for potable water and wastewater treatment would be less than the demands generated by Navy's historical usage.

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would reduce the amount of impervious surface on the property. Consequently, the amount of stormwater would also decrease.

The amount of solid waste generated by the Preferred Alternative would increase during demolition and construction activities but would remain within the maximum daily capacity of the landfill that the City of Alameda uses. It would decrease over time as demolition and construction were completed. The City can remain in compliance with California and Alameda County waste diversion requirements by developing a solid waste management program that maximizes reuse and recycling of solid waste.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on cultural resources. Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 16 U.S.C. 470f (1994), Navy performed cultural resource surveys of NAS Alameda and the Alemeda Annex. In 1992, Navy determined that while there were no individual buildings or structures at NAS Alameda that qualified for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, an area in the center of the case containing 38 buildings and structures qualified for listing as an historic district. In a letter dated September 23, 1992, the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred with Navy's determination.

In 1997, Navy and the United States Army Corps of Engineers determined that the Air Station's south jetty on the Oakland Inner Harbor was also eligible for listing on the National Register. In a letter dated October 15, 1997, the SHPO concurred that the south jetty is eligible for listing on the National Register as part of the Oakland Inner Harbor Jetties and Federal Channel Historic District.

Later in 1997, Navy determined that 49 houses in the center of the base were also eligible for listing on the National Register as part of the NAS Alameda Historic District. In a letter dated November 5, 1997, the SHPO concurred that the 49 houses were eligible for listing on the National Register as part of the Historic District.

In 1996, Navy determined that there were no buildings or structures at the Alameda Annex that were eligible for listing on the National Register. In a letter dated July 31, 1996, the SHPO concurred with Navy's determination that no buildings or structures at the Annex were eligible for listing on the National Register.

The Reuse Plan proposes to demolish six of the 87 buildings that constitute the Historic District. It is also likely that other buildings in the District will be demolished or modified or will deteriorate and that new structures will be built there. However, the Historic District as a whole will not be modified to such an extent that it is no longer eligible for listing on the National Register.

Navy has completed consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the California State Historic Preservation Officer. These consultations identified actions that Navy must take before it conveys the NAS Alameda property and actions that acquiring entities must take to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the eligible structures. These obligations were set forth in a Memorandum Of Agreement among Navy, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the California State Historic Preservation Officer dated October 5, 1999.

Navy will nominate the NAS Alameda Historic District for listing on the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with 36 CFR § 60.9. The City of Alameda will adopt an amendment to the Alameda Municipal Code governing Building and Housing, *i.e.,* Article VII, Historical Preservation, Section 13–21, Preservation of Historical Monuments, to require the review of proposed modifications to the exterior of historic structures. This review will ensure that the modifications are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Additionally, the City will designate the NAS Alameda Historic District as an historic monument protected by the City's historic preservation ordinance. Navy will also request that the City of Alameda place the south jetty on the City's Historic Buildings Study List to provide it with the protection afforded such properties.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on biological resources. In a letter dated October 3, 1997, Navy requested formal consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, 16 U.S.C. 1536 (1994). In a letter dated March 22, 1999, the Fish and Wildlife Service set forth its biological opinion that the disposal and reuse of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Federally-listed endangered California least tern or the endangered California brown pelican. The Service also concluded that since no critical habitat has been designated for either species on those parts of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex that lie outside the proposed Alameda National Wildlife Refuge, none will be adversely modified or destroyed.

The Service, however, conditioned its opinion on the implementation of reasonable and prudent measures to minimize incidental take of these species. These measures would protect the species and their critical habitat within the proposed Refuge from intrusion or other dangers originating outside the Refuge. Navy, the City of Alameda, and entities that may acquire property at NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex will be bound by this requirement. To fulfill its obligation, Navy will ensure that notifications, covenants, restrictions, and agreements to protect Federally-listed endangered or threatened species are in place when the property is conveyed.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on geology and soils. The NAS Alameda and Alameda Annex properties are located in a highly active seismic region and consist of a fill placed over submerged land or tidal flats. Thus, the property has a high potential for liquefaction, differential settlement, and dike failure. As a result, it will be necessary for developers to prepare a soils and geology report before the City of Alameda can issue grading and building permits. The City will require developers to take account of the conclusions of the soils and geology report and apply the standards of the California Building Code, the Alameda Building Code, and the Uniform Building Code to the design and construction of buildings on the former Air Station and Annex.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on the quality of surface water. The waters of San Francisco Bay, the Oakland Inner Harbor, and the Seaplane Lagoon would not be significantly affected by the proposed grading and construction if standard soil erosion and sedimentation control measures required by existing laws and regulations were implemented.

Stormwater discharge from the proposed light industrial activities, marina, parking areas, golf course, and routine operations and maintenance in developed areas (such as the application of herbicides and pesticides) could enter and contaminate local water. Stormwater must be managed in accordance with Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, and the acquiring entities will be responsible for building adequate drainage facilities.

Certain areas at NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex could be subject to flooding from high tides, backed up stormwater runoff, a tidal wave, and rising sea level. The City of Alameda's General Plan, dated February 5, 1991, contains a guiding policy regarding flooding, designated 8.3.b, which states that structures to be located in floodplains subject to 100-year floods should have adequate protection from floods. Additionally, in accordance with Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, 3 CFR 117 (1978), Navy will place a notice in the conveyance document that describes those uses that are restricted under Federal, State, and local floodplain regulations.

The Preferred Alternative should have significant impacts on traffic and circulation. By the year 2020, this Alternative would generate about 90,530 average daily trips compared with 29,000 average daily trips that were associated with Navy's use of the property. The traffic generated by the Reuse Plan would cause substantial delays during peak commuting hours at four intersections in the City of Alameda and at three intersections in the City of Oakland. Traffic congestion would increase significantly along two freeway segments and on one local roadway. During peak commuting hours, traffic congestion would also increase significantly on State Route 260 at the Webster and Posey Tubes.

The Preferred Alternative would also generate an increase in traffic on the former Air Station and Annex properties. The Reuse Plan would improve existing roadways on the base and build additional roadways to accommodate the increased traffic there.

The Preferred Alternative would have a significant impact on air quality. Carbon monoxide emissions from traffic generated by the Reuse Plan would exceed Federal and State air quality standards at two intersections, Tinker Avenue and Webster Street in the City

of Alameda and Harrison Street and Seventh Street in the City of Oakland.

Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7506 (1994), requires Federal agencies to review their proposed activities to ensure that these activities do not hamper local efforts to control air pollution. Section 176(c) prohibits Federal agencies from conducting activities in air quality areas such as the San Francisco Bay Area that do not meet one or more of the national standards for ambient air quality, unless the proposed activities conform to an approved implementation plan. The United States Environmental Protection Agency regulations implementing Section 176(c) recognize certain categorically exempt activities. Conveyance of title to real property and certain leases are categorically exempt activities. 40 CFR § 93.153(c)(2) (xiv) and (xix). Therefore, the disposal of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex will not require Navy to conduct a conformity determination.

Navy holds Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) air emission reduction credits (ERCs) for stationary air emission sources such as boilers and furnaces, paint spray booths, fuel storage facilities, and jet engine test cells that historically generated air emissions at NAS Alameda. These annual ERCs include 52.4 tons of precursor organic compounds, 29.9 tons of nitrogen oxides, 61 tons of non-precursor organic compounds, 6.5 tons of particulate matter (PM10), 25.3 tons of carbon monoxide, and 3.1 tons of sulfur oxides.

The BAAQMD Emissions Bank credits can be withdrawn to offset air emissions from new stationary sources. Navy has allocated to ARRA credits for 30 tons of precursor organic compounds to support interim leasing requirements and redevelopment of the base. Navy will retain credits for 15.9 tons of precursor organic compounds and 29.9 tons of nitrogen oxides to meet any future permit requirements for Department of Defense facilities and activities. If there are no future Department of Defense needs, the credits will be reallocated. The remaining credits for precursor organic compounds were previously applied to permitted Navy stationary sources that were either demolished or moved to another base and are no longer available for future allocation.

There were mobile source emissions at NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex associated with sources such as motor vehicles and aircraft and ship operations. These mobile emission sources annually produced about 169 tons of reactive organic compounds, 182 tons of nitrogen oxides, 859 tons of carbon monoxide, ten tons of sulfur oxides, and 30 tons of particulate matter (PM10).

The mobile source emission reductions resulting from the closure of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex can be applied to offset emissions from other Federal mobile sources in the area to satisfy Clean Air Act conformity requirements. Navy will retain these mobile source emission offsets to meet future Clean Air Act conformity requirements.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on noise. Exposure to noise from aircraft operations would be eliminated, because there would no longer be any aircraft operations on the property. Ambient noise levels would not change substantially as a result of the increased vehicular traffic. Noise levels in the vicinity of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex are typical of an urban neighborhood and are already high. Noise arising out of demolition and construction activities would be governed by the City of Alameda's noise ordinance.

Hazardous materials and hazardous waste that may be used and generated by the Preferred Alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts. The quantity of hazardous materials used, stored, and disposed of and the quantity of hazardous waste generated on the properties would be less under the Preferred Alternative than during Navy's use of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex. Hazardous materials used and hazardous waste generated by the Reuse Plan will be managed in accordance with Federal and State laws and regulations.

Implementation of the Preferred Alternative would not have an impact on public health and safety. Navy will inform future property owners about the environmental condition of the property and may, when appropriate, include restrictions, notifications, or covenants in deeds to ensure the protection of human health and the environment in light of the intended use of the property.

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, 3 CFR 859 (1995) requires that Navy determine whether any low income and minority populations will experience disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects from the proposed action. Navy analyzed the impacts on low income and minority populations pursuant to Executive Order 12898. The FEIS addressed the potential environmental, social, and economic impacts associated with the disposal of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex and reuse of the properties under the various proposed alternatives. Minority and low income populations residing within the region would not be disproportionately affected. Indeed, the employment opportunities, housing, and recreational resources generated by the Reuse Plan would have beneficial effects.

Navy also analyzed the impacts on children pursuant to Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health and Safety Risks, 3 CFR 198 (1998). Under the Preferred Alternative, the largest concentration of children would be present in the residential, educational, and recreational areas. The Preferred Alternative would not pose any disproportionate environmental health or safety risks to children.

Mitigation

Implementation of Navy's decision to dispose of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex does not require Navy to implement any mitigation measures. Navy will take certain actions to implement existing agreements and regulations. These actions were treated in the FEIS as agreements or regulatory requirements rather than as mitigation. Before conveying any property at NAS Alameda, navy will nominate the NAS Alameda Historic District for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The FEIS identified and discussed those actions that will be necessary to mitigate the impacts associated with the reuse and redevelopment of NAS Alameda and the Alameda Annex. The acquiring entities, under the direction of Federal, State, and local agencies with regulatory authority over protected resources, will be responsible for implementing necessary mitigation measures.

Comments Received on the FEIS

Navy received comments on the FEIS from two State agencies, three local government agencies, three private organizations, and one person. The State agencies were the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and the Department of Parks and Recreation's Office of Historic Preservation. The local agencies were the City of Oakland, the Port of Oakland, and the East Bay Municipal Utility District. The private organizations were the Golden Gate Audubon Society, the San Francisco Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club, and Arc Ecology. These comments concerned issues already discussed in the FEIS and do not require further clarification.

Regulations Governing the Disposal Decision

Since the proposed action contemplates the disposal of NAS Alameda under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (DBCRA), Public Law 101–510, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note (1994), Navy's decision was based upon the environmental analysis in the FEIS and application of the standards set forth in the DBCRA, the Federal Property Management Regulations (FPMR), 41 CFR part 101–47, and the Department of Defense Rule on Revitalizing Base Closure Communities and Community Assistance (DoD Rule), 32 CFR parts 174 and 175. Navy's decision to dispose of the Alameda Annex was based upon the environmental analysis in the FEIS and Section 2834(b) of Public Law 102–484, as amended by Section 2833 of Public Law 103–160, Section 2821 of Public Law 103–337, and Section 2867 of Public Law 104–106.

Section 104–47.303–1 of the FPMR requires that disposal of Federal property benefit the Federal Government and constitute the ''highest and best use'' of the property. Section 101–47.4909 of the FPMR defines the ''highest and best use'' as that use to which a property can be put that produces the highest monetary return from the property, promotes its maximum value, or serves a public or institutional purpose. The ''highest and best use'' determination must be based upon the property's economic potential, qualitative values inherent in the property, and utilization factors affecting land use such as zoning, physical characteristics, other private and public uses in the vicinity, neighboring improvements, utility services, access, roads, location, and environmental and historical considerations.

After Federal property has been conveyed to non-Federal entities, the property is subject to local and land use regulations, including zoning and subdivision regulations, and building codes. Unless expressly authorized by statute, the disposing Federal agency cannot restrict the future use of surplus Government property. As a result, the local community exercises substantial control over future use of the property. For this reason, local land use plans and zoning affect determination of the ''highest and best use'' of surplus Government property.

The DBCRA directed the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to delegate to the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer and dispose of base closure property. Section 2905(b) of the DBCRA directs the Secretary of Defense to exercise this authority in accordance with GSA's property disposal regulations, set forth in Part 101–47 of the FPMR. By letter dated December 20, 1991, the Secretary of Defense delegated the authority to transfer and dispose of base closure property closed under the DBCRA to the Secretaries of the Military Departments. Under this delegation of authority, the Secretary of the navy must follow FPMR procedures for screening and disposing of real property when implementing base closures. Only where Congress has expressly provided additional authority for disposing of base closure property, *e.g.,* the economic development conveyance authority established in 1993 by Section 2905(b)(4) of the DBCRA or the authority provided in Section 2867 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, Public Law 104–106, may Navy apply disposal procedures other than those in the FPMR.

In Section 2901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, Public Law 103–160, Congress recognized the economic hardship occasioned by base closure, the Federal interest in facilitating economic recovery of base closure communities, and the need to identify and implement reuse and redevelopment of property at closing installations. In Section 2903(c) of Public Law 103–160, Congress directed the Military Departments to consider each base closure community's economic needs and priorities in the property disposal process. Under Section 2905(b)(2)(E) of the DBCRA, Navy must consult with local communities before it disposes of base closure property and must consider local plans developed for reuse and redevelopment of the surplus Federal property.

The Department of Defense's goal, as set forth in Section 174.4 of the DoD Rule, is to help base closure communities achieve rapid economic recovery through expeditious reuse and redevelopment of the assets at closing bases, taking into consideration local market conditions and locally developed reuse plans. Thus, the Department has adopted a consultative approach with each community to ensure that property disposal decisions consider the LRA's reuse plan and encourage job creation. As a part of this cooperative approach, the base closure community's interests, as reflected in its zoning for the area, play a significant role in determining the range of alternatives considered in the environmental analysis for property disposal. Furthermore, Section 175.7(d)(3) of the DoD Rule provides that the LRA's plan generally will be used as the basis for the proposed disposal action.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 40 U.S.C. 484 (1994), as implemented by the FPMR, identifies several mechanisms for disposing of surplus base closure property: by public benefit conveyance (FPMR Sec. 101–47.303–2); by negotiated sale (FPMR Sec. 101–47.304–9); and by competitive sale (FPMR Sec. 101–47.304–7). Additionally, in Section 2905(b)(4), the DBCRA established economic development conveyances as a means of disposing of surplus base closure property. The selection of any particular method of conveyance merely implements the Federal agency's decision to dispose of the property. Decisions concerning whether to undertake a public benefit conveyance or an economic development conveyance, or to sell property by negotiation or by competitive bid, are left to the Federal agency's discretion. Selecting a method of disposal implicates a broad range of factors and rests solely within the Secretary of the Navy's discretion.

Conclusion

The LRA's proposed reuse of NAS Alameda, reflected in the Reuse Plan, is consistent with the requirements of the FPMR and Section 174.4 of the DoD Rule. The LRA has determined in its Reuse Plan that the property should be used for various purposes including residential, educational, industrial, commercial, and park and recreational activities. The property's location, physical characteristics, and existing infrastructure as well as the current uses of adjacent property make it appropriate for the proposed uses.

The proposed reuse of NAS Alameda responds to local economic conditions, promotes rapid economic recovery from the impact of the closure of the base, and its consistent with President Clinton's Five-Part Plan For Revitalizing Base Closure Communities, which emphasizes local economic redevelopment and creation of new jobs as the means to revitalize these communities. 32 CFR parts 174 and 175, 59 FR 16123 (1994).

Although the ''No Action'' Alternative has less potential for causing adverse environmental impacts, this Alternative would not take advantage of the locations, physical characteristics, and infrastructure of the Air Station and Annex or the current uses of adjacent

property. Additionally, it would not foster local economic redevelopment of the base.

The acquiring entities, under the direction of Federal, State, and local agencies with regulatory authority over protected resources, will be responsible for adopting practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm that may result form implementing the Reuse Plan.

Accordingly, Navy will dispose of the surplus Federal property at NAS Alameda in a manner that is consistent with the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority's Reuse Plan for the property. Navy plans to dispose of the Federal property at the Alameda Annex under the authority of Section 2867 of Public Law 104–106.

Dated: February 29, 2000.

William J. Cassidy, Jr.,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Conversion And Redevelopment).

[FR Doc. 00–5824 Filed 3–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–FF–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Meeting of the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Executive Panel

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The CNO Executive Panel is to conduct the final briefing of the Technology Hedging Strategies Task Force to the Chief of Naval Operations. This meeting will consist of discussions relating to proposed Navy Technology Hedging Strategies.

DATES: The meeting will be held on March 23, 2000 from 10:30 am to 11:30 am.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, 2000 Navy Pentagon, Washington, DC 20350–2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Commander Christopher Agan, CNO Executive Panel, 4401 Ford Avenue, Suite 601, Alexandria, Virginia 22302–0268, (703) 681–6205.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 2), these matters constitute classified information that is specifically authorized by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense and are, in fact, properly classified pursuant to such Executive Order. Accordingly, the Secretary of the Navy has determined in writing that the public interest requires that all sessions of the meeting be closed to the public because they will be concerned with matters listed in section 552b(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

Dated: February 29, 2000.

J. L. Roth,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–5700 Filed 3–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–U

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Meeting of the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Executive Panel

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The CNO Executive Panel is to conduct the final briefing of the Warfare in the Information Age Task Force to the Chief of Naval Operations. This meeting will consist of discussions relating to proposed Navy strategies for warfare in the Information Age.

DATES: The meeting will be held on March 22, 2000 from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, 2000 Navy Pentagon, Washington, DC 20350–2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Commander Christopher Agan, CNO Executive Panel, 4401 Ford Avenue, Suite 601, Alexandria, Virginia 22302–0268, (703) 681–6205.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 2), these matters constitute classified information that is specifically authorized by Executive Order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense and are, in fact, properly classified pursuant to such Executive Order. Accordingly, the Secretary of the Navy has determined in writing that the public interest requires that all sessions of the meeting be closed to the public because they will be concerned with matters listed in section 552b(c)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

Dated: February 29, 2000.,

J. L. Roth,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–5701 Filed 3–8–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810–FF–U

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provision of the ''Government in the Sunshine Act'' (5 U.S.C. § 552b), notice is hereby given of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board's (Board) meeting described below.

TIME AND DATE OF MEETING: 6:00 p.m., April 5, 2000.

PLACE: American Museum of Science and Energy (AMSE), Lecture Room, 300 South Tulane, Avenue, Oak Ridge, TN 37830.

STATUS: Open. While the Sunshine Act does not require that the scheduled discussion be conducted in a meeting, the Board has determined that an open meeting in this specific case furthers the public interests underlying both the Sunshine Act and the Board's enabling legislation.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The Board is visiting the Oak Ridge Y–12 Plant as a part of its oversight of the Department of Energy's (DOE) defense nuclear facility safety management program. The Board's enabling legislation requires health and safety oversight encompassing design, construction, operation and decommissioning activities.

The Board wishes also to avail itself of the opportunity of this visit to meet with the stakeholders and local members of the public. The session is intended to be informal and to provide an opportunity for members of the public, DOE, and its contractor employees or their representatives to comment on or provide information directly to the Board regarding matters affecting health or safety at Oak Ridge.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Richard A. Azzaro, General Counsel, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004, (800) 788–4016. This is a toll-free number.

Dated: March 6, 2000.

John T. Conway,

Chairman.

[FR Doc. 00–5862 Filed 3–6–00; 5:00 pm]

BILLING CODE 3670–01–M