

ROUTINE USES OF RECORDS MAINTAINED IN THE SYSTEM, INCLUDING CATEGORIES OF USERS AND THE PURPOSES OF SUCH USES:

In addition to those disclosures generally permitted under 5 U.S.C. 552a(b) of the Privacy Act, these records or information contained therein may specifically be disclosed outside the DoD as a routine use pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(b)(3) as follows:

The 'Blanket Routine Uses' set forth at the beginning of the Army's compilation of systems of records notices also apply to this system.

POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR STORING, RETRIEVING, ACCESSING, RETAINING, AND DISPOSING OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

STORAGE:

Paper records in file folders, CD ROM; computer disks, and magnetic tape.

RETRIEVABILITY:

By individual's name and/or Social Security Number. For research purposes, the data are usually retrieved and analyzed with respect to relative times of entry into service, training performance, and demographic values. Scheduled data for follow-up data collections however, are retrieved by month of scheduled follow-up and by name.

SAFEGUARDS:

Access to records is restricted to authorized personnel having official need therefor. Automated data are further protected by controlled system procedures and code numbers governing access.

RETENTION AND DISPOSAL:

Information is retained until completion of appropriate study or report, after which it is destroyed by shredding or erasing.

SYSTEM MANAGER(S) AND ADDRESS:

Director, U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-AS (Privacy Act Officer), 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600.

NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE:

Individuals seeking to determine if information about themselves is contained in this record system should address written inquiries to the Director, U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-AS (Privacy Act Officer), 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600.

Individual should provide the full name, Social Security Number, current address, subject area, and the year of survey, if known.

RECORD ACCESS PROCEDURES:

Individuals seeking access to records about themselves contained in this record system should address written inquiries to the Director, U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-AS (Privacy Act Officer), 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600.

Individual should provide the full name, Social Security Number, current address, subject area, and the year of survey, if known.

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURES:

The Army's rules for accessing records, and for contesting contents and appealing initial agency determinations are contained in Army Regulation 340-21; 32 CFR part 505; or may be obtained from the system manager.

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

From the individual, his or her peers, or, in the case of ratings and evaluations, from supervisors.

EXEMPTIONS CLAIMED FOR THE SYSTEM:

None.

[FR Doc. 97-32871 Filed 12-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Record of Decision for the Disposal and Reuse of Naval Station Puget Sound at Sand Point, Seattle, Washington

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), 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 Station Puget Sound at Sand Point, Seattle, Washington, (Sand Point).

Navy intends to dispose of the property in a manner that is consistent with the City of Seattle Community Preferred Reuse Plan for Sand Point (Reuse Plan) that was submitted in November 1993 by the City of Seattle, the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) for the base, as modified by certain revisions endorsed by the City Council in June 1997 and designated as Options to the City's 1993 Reuse Plan. The 1993 Reuse Plan and the 1997 Options are described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative proposes a mixed

land use consisting of educational facilities, community facilities, arts and cultural facilities, open space and recreational areas, residential areas, and institutional land uses.

In deciding to dispose of Sand Point in a manner consistent with the Preferred Alternative, Navy has determined that this mixed land use will enhance community and cultural resources, provide housing for the homeless, limit adverse environmental impacts, and ensure land uses that are compatible with surrounding properties. This Record Of Decision (ROD) does not mandate a specific mix of land uses. Rather, it leaves selection of the particular means to achieve the mixed use redevelopment to the acquiring entity and the local zoning authority.

Background:

Sand Point is located in King County, Washington, and lies within the limits of the City of Seattle. The base occupies 152 acres on the western shore of Lake Washington, about 6 miles northeast of downtown Seattle.

Under the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1988, Pub. L. 100-526, the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure recommended "closing the portion of Naval Station Puget Sound (Sand Point) whose mission is to serve fleet units at Naval Station Puget Sound (Everett)." The Commission's recommendation was approved by the Secretary of Defense and accepted by the One Hundred First Congress in April 1989. In 1991, under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-510, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended the complete closure of Sand Point. This recommendation was approved by President Bush and accepted by the One Hundred Second Congress in September 1991. On September 28, 1995, Navy ceased operations at Sand Point and placed the property in caretaker status.

Two Federal agencies, the Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Department of the Interior's U.S. Geological Survey (Biological Resources Division) requested interagency transfers of base closure property at Sand Point. Navy will transfer to NOAA Building 27 and Building 409 and about 10 acres of land in the northern part of the base adjacent to NOAA's Sand Point area facilities, as well as the access road that covers about 1.2 acres. Navy will transfer Building 61 and about 5 acres of land at the southeast corner of the base to Interior for use as the National

Fisheries Research Center. Navy declared the remaining property surplus to the needs of the Federal Government in the Notice published in the **Federal Register** on October 11, 1995.

Navy published a Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register** on November 19, 1993, announcing that Navy would prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that would analyze the impacts of disposal and reuse of the land, buildings, and infrastructure at Sand Point. Navy conducted the public scoping process between November 19, 1993 and January 14, 1994. A public scoping meeting was held at NOAA's Building 9 Theater, adjacent to the base, on December 16, 1993.

On November 8, 1996, Navy distributed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to Federal, State, and local agencies, elected officials, the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, and interested persons. Navy held a public hearing on December 2, 1996, at the Eckstein Middle School in Seattle. The forty-five day public comment period on the DEIS expired on December 23, 1996, but was extended to January 17, 1997, to permit submission of additional comments.

Federal and State agencies, local governments, community groups and associations, and the general public submitted comments on the DEIS. The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe did not submit comments on the DEIS. These comments and Navy's responses were incorporated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, which was distributed to the public on October 24, 1997, for a review period that concluded on November 24, 1997. Navy received two letter comments 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 NEPA process, Navy analyzed the environmental impacts of various proposed land uses that could result from disposal of the Sand Point property. Navy also evaluated a "No action" alternative that would leave the property in a caretaker status with Navy maintaining the physical condition of the property, providing a security force, and making repairs essential to safety. For its analysis, Navy relied upon the reuse and redevelopment plan proposed by the City of Seattle and a redevelopment plan proposed by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe.

The City of Seattle presented its Reuse Plan to the Department of the Navy in November 1993. In a letter to the Navy dated February 22, 1996, the City set forth several revisions to the 1993 Reuse

Plan. These changes, endorsed by the City Council in June 1997, were designated in the FEIS as Options to the City Plan.

The 1993 Reuse Plan proposed a mixed use of the Sand Point property that divided the base into six activity areas: (1) A waterfront park in the northern part of the base known as the north shore recreation area; (2) the education and community activities area in the western part of the base composed of educational and community activity buildings, a firefighter training facility, and a commercial film studio; (3) the Magnuson Park Arts, Culture and Community Center in the eastern part of the base composed of an indoor community center and an outdoor amphitheater for community events; (4) the Magnuson Park open space/recreation expansion area, composed of public parkland, athletic fields, pedestrian paths, bicycle paths and expanded bus routes in the southeastern part of the base adjacent to Magnuson Park, a new entrance to Magnuson Park at the intersection of Sand Point Way and Northeast 65th Street, and wetland restoration at the former Mud Lake in the southeastern part of the base; (5) the residential area composed of 50 low income housing units in a barracks building and 200 transitional housing units for the homeless in the southwestern part of the base; and (6) institutional uses reflected in the activities of the Federal agencies that will occupy property at Sand Point.

The 1997 Options to the City Plan eliminated the 50 low income housing units and instead proposed to use the former barracks building for educational classrooms and school administrative spaces. The Options proposed to use other facilities to train City employees such as police officers and to provide an activity center for senior citizens. The Options also proposed expanding the boundaries of the north shore recreation area to include Buildings 2 and 67. The Options would eliminate the fire training center that the 1993 Reuse Plan intended for Building 67 and replace it with a cultural and community activities center. The Options would also eliminate the film studio initially planned for Building 2 and instead use the building as an indoor athletic facility.

The Preferred Alternative in the FEIS is a combination of the 1993 Reuse Plan and the 1997 Options to the City Plan. This alternative also reflects the 1997 discussions between the City of Seattle and the University of Washington that resulted in the LRA's proposal to use certain facilities at Sand Point for

classrooms and administrative activities.

In June 1993, the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe submitted a draft plan to Navy proposing reuse of the entire 152-acre base. The FEIS refers to this proposal as the Muckleshoot Plan. In a letter dated July 26, 1993, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) submitted a request on behalf of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 40 U.S.C 471, seeking an interagency transfer of 85 acres of base closure property in the northern part of Sand Point. On September 7, 1995, BIA withdrew its request for transfer of the 85-acre Sand Point property. Nevertheless, Navy analyzed the Muckleshoot Plan in the FEIS as a reasonable alternative under NEPA.

The Muckleshoot Plan proposed a mixed use of the Sand Point property that included: (1) a commercial marina in the northern part of the base that would accommodate tribal fishing vessels and activities, fishing net storage, fisheries research, and recreational activities; (2) light industrial and warehousing activities in the north central part of the base; (3) social services, including a drug and alcohol treatment facility, a health clinic, a senior citizens center, and a student counseling facility in the central part of the base; (4) a vocational technical school for 5,000 to 7,000 Native American students with housing for the school's staff and approximately 600 students in the south central part of the base; (5) commercial activities in the southern part of the base; and (6) a new entrance to Magnuson Park at the intersection of Sand Point Way and Northeast 65th Street.

Environmental Impacts

Navy analyzed the potential impacts of the Preferred Alternative, the Muckleshoot Plan, and the "No action" alternative for each alternative's effects on land use, historic and cultural resources, socioeconomic (including demographics, housing, the local economy, social services, schools, and environmental justice), recreation, transportation, noise, public services and utilities, public health and safety, soils, biological resources and endangered species, water quality, and air quality. This Record Of Decision (ROD) focuses on the impacts that would likely result from implementing the Preferred Alternative.

In the FEIS, Navy used existing land uses as a basis for assessing the impact of the land uses proposed by the Preferred Alternative, the Muckleshoot

Plan, and the "No action" alternative. Navy also considered the compatibility of the proposed land uses with the current uses of property adjacent to Sand Point.

The Preferred Alternative would result in a substantial increase in recreational and educational activity on the Sand Point property and a decrease in administrative and commercial activity as compared with the activities that Navy conducted on the base. These increased recreational and educational uses would not likely have a significant impact on the property or on the surrounding neighborhoods.

While the Preferred Alternative would result in an increase in residential use of the Sand Point property, this land use is similar in nature to the single family and multifamily residential community adjacent to Sand Point. The increase would not likely have an adverse impact on the surrounding area.

Several structures at Sand Point are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Since the Preferred Alternative proposes to use these buildings for purposes similar to Navy's use of the buildings, their historic integrity will be maintained, as will that of the proposed historic district on the base. Although Navy did not discover any surface archeological resources at Sand Point, those resources could be present in undisturbed areas under the surface. If discovered, they will be protected by restrictions incorporated in documents conveying the property.

The Preferred Alternative proposes to consider demolition and modification of certain buildings within the proposed education and community activities area, if renovation and reuse are not feasible within 10 years. Either of these could have an adverse impact on buildings within the historic district. Thus, Navy entered into a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on October 29, 1997, that was accepted by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) on November 20, 1997. This PA would protect the historic district and its constituent elements after conveyance of the Sand Point property. The PA requires the incorporation of restrictive covenants in the conveyance documents to ensure protection of the historic properties and any subsurface archeological resources that may be discovered after conveyance.

Navy's consideration of the socioeconomic impacts of disposal and reuse examined the potential effects on demographics, housing, the local economy, social services, schools, and

environmental justice. The Preferred Alternative would cause an increase in population in the Sand Point area of about 2 percent and an increase in homeless assistance housing units of about 2 percent. It would not have a significant impact on employment or social services in the region.

The Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on the regional economy. Navy's appraisal of its impact on property values, set forth in Appendix G of the FEIS (the Property Value Study), concluded that reuse of the southwestern part of the base along Sand Point Way for transitional multifamily housing should not result in a diminution in the value of nearby properties.

Children living in the transitional housing would continue to attend the same schools that they attended before occupying this housing, using transportation provided by the Seattle School District. Thus, the Preferred Alternative would not have an impact on schools in the Sand Point area.

Navy also analyzed the impacts on low-income and minority populations pursuant to Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, reprinted in 42 U.S.C. 4321 note. There would be no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. The Preferred Alternative would, in fact, benefit minority and low-income populations by providing increased housing, social services and educational opportunities.

The Preferred Alternative would increase the amount of property available for recreational use by 160 percent, from 30 acres to 78 acres. This increase would be reflected in additional indoor and outdoor recreational facilities.

Navy's evaluation of the impacts on transportation considered current traffic conditions and transportation systems, transit routes, high occupancy vehicle routes, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, traffic volumes, traffic safety, and parking. The Preferred Alternative would generate about 9,050 average daily trips, compared with 7,600 such trips when the base was active in 1993. Although not a significant impact, the Preferred Alternative's housing and educational uses would result in an increase in bus ridership. Similarly, because it increases access to the property, this alternative would also result in an increase in the use of existing bicycle and pedestrian routes. In light of the availability of space on

the base, parking and construction-related traffic would not likely cause adverse impacts in the Sand Point area.

The noise associated with the Preferred Alternative would emanate from four sources: (1) Traffic (both on and off site); (2) construction; (3) heating, ventilating, and other mechanical equipment; and (4) other sources (people, activities, and equipment). With the exception of noise generated by outdoor music concerts at the proposed amphitheater, the Preferred Alternative would not cause any significant impact. The noise generated by these concerts, however, could cause a significant impact on the surrounding area.

The Preferred Alternative would not cause any significant impact on public services (*i.e.*, water, wastewater and sanitary sewer, stormwater and solid waste) and utilities. Similarly, it would not have a significant impact on public health and safety (*i.e.*, crime and law enforcement, fire protection, emergency and medical services, and environmental health) in the Sand Point area.

The environmental remediation required by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. 9601, *et seq.* (CERCLA), and Washington's Model Toxics Control Act, RCW 70.105D, WAC 173-340 (MTCA), has been completed. Those areas on the base that still contain contaminants are not likely to cause an impact if left undisturbed. The Washington State Department of Ecology concurs that with proper notification to future users of the property and deed restrictions limiting use of the property, no further action is necessary. However, unless adequately mitigated, the disturbance of asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint during demolition and remodeling could have an impact on human health.

The Preferred Alternative would not cause any significant impact on soils, geology, and topography. This alternative would have only minimal and insignificant impacts on vegetation, wildlife, endangered species, and wetlands. It would increase the amount of wetlands by restoring a wetland habitat at the former Mud Lake.

Bald eagles, which are on the Federal and State lists of threatened species, are present in the vicinity of Lake Washington and Sand Point. Peregrine falcons, which are on the Federal and State lists of endangered species, are also present in this area. The Preferred Alternative would not affect either the bald eagle or the peregrine falcon because it would not affect their critical

habitats or the species upon which they prey.

The Preferred Alternative would result in a decrease of 30 acres in the amount of paved surface on the property. This decrease would occur largely at the southeastern end of the base where the Mud Lake wetlands and grassy recreational areas would be restored. The conversion of impervious surface to wetlands and grassy fields, however, would not have an adverse impact on surface water in Lake Washington and may result in less pollutants draining into the lake.

There would not be any impact on air quality from implementation of the Preferred Alternative. This alternative, however, could result in the temporary and intermittent release of pollutants during demolition and construction activities. The Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (PSAPCA) regulations governing demolition and construction activities (Washington Clean Air Act RCW T. 70 Ch. 94) will ensure consistency with applicable air quality standards. The increases in carbon monoxide that would result from the increased traffic would not exceed applicable regional standards.

Section 176 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7506, as amended, requires Federal agencies to review their activities to ensure that they do not hamper local efforts to control air pollution. This statute prevents Federal agencies from conducting activities that do not conform to an approved implementation plan but recognizes certain categorically exempt activities. The conveyance of real property, regardless of the method, is such a categorically exempt activity. Accordingly, disposal of the Sand Point property does not require Navy to conduct a conformity analysis.

Mitigation

Implementation of the decision to dispose of Sand Point does not require Navy to perform any mitigation measures beyond those discussed here. Navy will include appropriate restrictive covenants in the deeds for any parcels where hazardous substances remain and for the historic properties in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws.

These restrictive covenants will limit the use of certain property and notify future users of the property's condition. In accordance with the Programmatic Agreement that Navy entered into with the SHPO and the Advisory Council, restrictive covenants in the deed conveying the property will protect both historic and archeological resources and establish a process for preserving the

historic district and its constituent elements.

Navy's FEIS identified and discussed those actions that would be necessary to mitigate impacts associated with the reuse and redevelopment of Sand Point. The acquiring entity, under the direction of Federal, State, and local agencies with regulatory authority over protected resources, will be responsible for implementing necessary mitigation measures.

The fact that the Preferred Alternative conforms to the City of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Code, and Physical Development Management Plan provides assurance that the property will be redeveloped in a controlled manner. Additionally, the City of Seattle is developing a Transportation Management Program and a Construction Management Program for Sand Point that will mitigate the effects caused by increased traffic volumes and construction activities. The City's Design Guidelines will be applied to control Sand Point's reuse and preserve the property's unique and historic character.

Comments Received on the FEIS

Navy received comments from a community group and an individual. They expressed concern about the proposed reuse of certain Sand Point facilities by the University of Washington for educational activities. Their comments did not raise any new issues or problems concerning implementation of the Reuse Plan or propose any mitigation measures.

Navy's consideration in the FEIS of the impacts arising out of the City's educational proposal was sufficient to ascertain the impacts of the particular uses advanced by the University of Washington and proposed by the LRA after conclusion of the FEIS. Navy determined that the educational uses advanced by the University of Washington fall within the scope of impacts analyzed in the FEIS and that no further consideration is required.

Regulations Governing the Disposal Decision

Since the proposed action contemplates a disposal action under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (DBCRA), Pub. L. 101-510, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note, selection of the City of Seattle's 1993 Reuse Plan and 1997 Options as the Preferred Alternative was based upon the environmental analysis in the FEIS and application of the standards set forth in 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 90 and 91.

Section 101-47.303-1 of the FPMR requires that the 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 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 DBCRA directs the Secretary of Defense to exercise this authority in accordance with GSA's property disposal regulations, set forth at Sections 101-47.1 through 101-47.8 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 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 DBCRA, may Navy apply

disposal procedures other than the FPMR's prescriptions.

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 closures, 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 Pub. L. 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 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 90.4 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 Local Redevelopment Authority's reuse plan and encourage job creation. As a part of this cooperative approach, the base closure community's interests, *e.g.*, 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 91.7(d)(3) of the DoD Rule provides that the Local Redevelopment Authority'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, 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 committed by law to agency 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 City of Seattle's proposed reuse of the Sand Point property, which consists of the City's 1993 Reuse Plan and its 1997 Options and is embodied in the Preferred Alternative, is consistent with the prescriptions of the FPMR and Section 90.4 of the DoD Rule. The LRA has determined in its Reuse Plan that the property should be used for several purposes, including educational and community facilities, arts and cultural facilities, open space and recreational areas, residential areas, and institutional land uses. 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.

Although the "No action" alternative has less potential for causing adverse environmental impacts, this alternative would not take advantage of the property's location, physical characteristics and infrastructure or the current uses of adjacent property. Additionally, it would not foster local redevelopment of the Sand Point property.

The acquiring entity, under the direction of Federal, State and local agencies with regulatory authority over protected resources, will be responsible for implementing necessary mitigation measures.

Accordingly, Navy will dispose of Naval Station Puget Sound at Sand Point in a manner that is consistent with the City of Seattle's 1993 and 1997 plans for the property.

Dated: December 8, 1997.

William J. Cassidy, Jr.,

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

[FR Doc. 97-32938 Filed 12-16-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Public Hearings for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Development of Facilities to Support Basing U.S. Pacific Fleet F/A-18E/F Aircraft on the West Coast of the United States

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Announcement of public hearings.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy has prepared and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for development of facilities to support basing U.S. Pacific Fleet F/A-18E/F aircraft on the West Coast of the United States. Two public hearings will be held for the purpose to receive oral and written comment on the DEIS. Federal, state and local agencies, and interested individuals are invited to be present or represented at the hearing.

DATES: Hearing dates are as follows:

1. January 7, 1998, 7:00 p.m., Lemoore, CA.
2. January 8, 1998, 7:00 p.m., El Centro, CA.

ADDRESSES: Hearing locations are:

1. Lemoore—Lemoore City Council Chamber, 429 C Street, Lemoore, California.
2. El Centro—Imperial County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 940 West Main Street, El Centro, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Surinder Sikand, (650) 244-3020.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Department of the Navy has prepared and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for development of facilities to support basing U.S. Pacific Fleet F/A-18E/F aircraft on the West Coast of the United States.

A Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the DEIS was published in the **Federal Register** on 7 April 1997 (62 FR 16563). Public scoping meetings for the proposed project were held on Monday, April 28, 1997, at the Lemoore High School Cafeteria, Lemoore, California; on Tuesday, April 29, 1997, at the Imperial County Board of Supervisors Office, El Centro, California; and on Wednesday, April 30, 1997, in the Bougainvillea Room, Orchid Professional Building, Camarillo, California.

The proposed action includes siting 164 F/A-18E/F aircraft, locating associated military personnel and family members, and providing associated training functions at the receiving installation. The two installations considered in detail for the West Coast base are Naval Air Station (NAS) Lemoore and Naval Air Facility (NAF) El Centro. NAS Lemoore is the preferred alternative evaluated in the