

CHAPTER 8.

LAND AND SUBMERGED LAND USE

8.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes land and submerged lands ownership and use in and around Naval Base Guam, which is the site for the proposed new aircraft carrier wharf. The two wharf alternatives are located in proximity to each other on either side of the entrance channel to Inner Apra Harbor, but the land uses and utility infrastructure are different at the sites. One alternative requires an adjustment to an existing private lease and the other would have no potential impact on land ownership. Submerged lands are areas in coastal waters extending from the Guam coastline into the ocean 3 nautical miles (nm) (5.6 kilometers [km]). As points of reference, primary land use constraints are mentioned (e.g., Explosive Safety Quantity Distance [ESQD] arcs), but details are provided in other resource chapters of this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

A description of the affected environment for Naval Base Guam is presented in Volume 2. For example, the land use issues associated with upland placement of dredged material are addressed in Volume 2. The impacts to land and submerged lands use are identified in this chapter by alternatives and components, and the chapter concludes with identification and discussion of proposed mitigation measures that apply to significant impacts.

The region of influence for the Volume 4 land use discussion is land and submerged lands in and around Naval Base Guam within 3 nm (5.6 km) offshore, which is the limit of state or territorial jurisdiction.

8.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

8.2.1 Approach to Analysis

The affected environment section for Land and Submerged Lands Use is organized under two categories: 1) land/submerged lands ownership and management; and 2) land/submerged lands use. There are different criteria for assessing potential impacts under the two categories. Short-term impacts would be related to facility construction activities that would be located within the project footprint or on previously disturbed lands. No construction staging area has been designated away from the project site. These construction activities would have minimal and localized impacts on land use. All impacts related to land ownership and use are assumed to occur during the long-term operational phase of the proposed action as the changed conditions would alter the development and use of the current site and its vicinity.

The potential indirect impacts that would be due to changes in land ownership and use are addressed under other specific resource categories such as traffic, noise, natural resources and recreation. Incompatibility with adjacent land uses to the extent that public health and safety is impacted is addressed under public health and safety and noise resource sections. Federal actions on federal lands are not subject to local zoning or land management regulations; however, consistency with surrounding non-federal land uses is an important consideration in land use planning. A Coastal Zone Management Act consistency determination assessment was prepared for all Guam proposed actions and the correspondence is included in Volume 9, Appendix H.

8.2.1.1 Land Ownership/Management

The impact assessment for land/submerged lands ownership and management was not based on regulatory authority or permit requirements. There is flexibility in the methodology and assumptions were made. The basic premise was that a release of federal lands/submerged lands to GovGuam or individuals would have beneficial impacts on the new landowners. Conversely, the acquisition of land by the federal government may be considered a beneficial or an adverse impact depending on the perspective of the individual landowner. Owners who are interested in selling to the federal government would presumably perceive the federal acquisition as a beneficial impact, whereas owners who are not interested in selling would presumably perceive the federal acquisition as an adverse impact. “Taking” of property in the context of this discussion refers to a legal involuntary acquisition of a property interest by a government authority. Owners who do not want to sell their property (or relocate) are likely to consider an involuntary acquisition or relocation as an adverse impact even though they are properly compensated. Until the land acquisition negotiations are concluded, the impact analysis assumes a significant adverse impact on an individual landowner. There are exceptions to this rule, such as in the case of acquisition of non-possessory affirmative easements for utilities or other rights-of-way.

The Navy is required to comply with federal land acquisition law and regulations, which includes the requirement to offer just compensation to the owner, to provide relocation assistance services and benefits to eligible displaced persons, to treat all owners in a fair and consistent manner, and to attempt first, in all instances, acquisition through negotiated purchase. A more detailed discussion of the land acquisition process is described in Volume 9, Appendix F, Socioeconomic Impact Assessment Study, Section 5.2.6.

The change in land ownership may result in a change in public access policies that may result in an adverse land ownership impact.

The aircraft carrier berthing alternatives are located within the Naval Base Guam on Navy submerged lands; therefore, land and submerged lands ownership is not a factor in the impact analysis.

8.2.1.2 Land Use

There are two criteria that are applied for assessing impacts on land/submerged lands use:

- Consistency with current or documented planned land/submerged lands use
- Restrictions on access due to changes in land use on federally controlled property

Land Use Criterion 1: Consistency with Current or Documented Planned Land/Submerged Lands Use

Land use plans are intended to guide future development. The Department of Defense (DoD) and non-DoD land use plans and constraint figures were presented in Volume 2, Chapter 8. Potential adverse land use impacts would result from a proposed land use that is inconsistent with the existing land use, planned land use, or if vacant land and open space would be developed. Potential adverse impacts would also result if there are incompatible changes in use within submerged lands.

The test for adverse impact significance is less rigorous for existing DoD land and submerged lands, where the limited land availability may force less than ideal land use changes. Federal actions on federal lands/submerged lands are subject to base command approval, but are not required to conform to state/territory land use plans or policies. The proposed waterfront improvements are water dependent activities that would be consistent with the Guam Coastal Zone Management Act policies. The proposed action alternatives of this EIS have been developed in consultation with base command planners and approved by base commands. As a result, there would be no anticipated significant adverse impact to land use within DoD parcel boundaries. Land use changes on existing DoD land could be the basis for

significant adverse impacts to other resource categories (such as aesthetics, noise, traffic, recreation, cultural, and natural resources) within and beyond DoD land boundaries. Impacts to these resources and others are addressed elsewhere in this EIS.

Proposed land uses on newly acquired lands may have an adverse impact if they are not consistent with the existing or proposed land use at that site. Similarly, a change in use within non-DoD submerged lands could have an adverse impact. The test for significance is the degree of incompatibility and is qualitative. For example, proposed military housing would be consistent with existing or planned civilian residential communities and there would be no adverse impact to land use. A proposed industrial facility in an area that is designated for a public park may result in a significant adverse impact, while the same facility in an area proposed for heavy commercial would likely have no significant adverse impact.

While the proposed land use under the action alternatives may be consistent with the existing land use, there is potential for adverse impacts due to changes in land use intensity. For example, a training range that is used once per month would likely have no adverse impact, while daily use may result in an adverse impact. Potential adverse impacts associated with changes in land use intensity such as increases in marine traffic (Chapter 14), noise (Chapter 6), and unexploded ordnance (Chapter 18) are addressed under other resource area discussions of this EIS. No significance criterion is established for land use intensity impacts.

Land Use Criterion 2: Access Restrictions

Additional restrictions on public access would be a potential adverse impact. For example, an increase in the setback distance from Navy ships for security purposes may restrict access to a recreational swimming or SCUBA diving site. The test for significance is subjective and based on geographic area affected, the schedule or timing of the access restrictions (permanent or occasional), and the population affected.

Physical access restrictions can also result if land acquisition by the federal government results in a pocket or island of non-federal land. This would be an adverse impact on the landowner(s) of the land to which access has been restricted. The significance of the impact is based on the extent to which access to the non-federal land is restricted. Significant adverse impacts result when the property is surrounded by military property (even when access to property is provided). Similarly, such pockets of non-DoD land within a DoD installation would be a potential adverse impact on military land use.

The pockets of land use and public access restrictions have potential indirect impacts on other resources that are discussed elsewhere in this EIS.

Farmland Protection Policy Act

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) (Public Law 97-98, 7 United States Code [USC] 4201 and 7 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 658) is intended for federal agencies to: 1) identify and take into account the potential adverse effects of federal programs on the preservation of farmland land; and 2) consider alternative actions, as appropriate, that could lessen such adverse effects; and assure that such federal programs, to the extent practicable, are compatible with state, unit of local government, and private programs and policies to protect farmland. The FPPA addresses prime and important farmlands. Consistency with FPPA was a land use significance criterion in the Draft EIS, but was removed for the Final EIS. In the interval between the two EISs, the Navy determined that the Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Military Relocation is exempt from FPPA regulations because the action is undertaken by a federal agency for national defense purposes (section 1547[b] of the Act, 7 USC. 4208[b]). Although consistency with FPPA is not a criterion for analysis, impacts to agricultural use are assessed in this EIS in conjunction with impacts to other land uses, such as residential or urban.

8.2.1.3 Issues Identified During Public Scoping Process

Many of the scoping issues regarding land use overlap with other resource areas such as noise and recreation and are discussed under those sections. The following are public, including regulatory stakeholders, concerns:

- No increase in federal land ownership (although there were some land owners interested to sell).
- No re-acquisition of lands that have been or are in the process of being released by the federal government.
- Current public rights-of-way should be retained.
- No further restrictions on recreational use of submerged lands. Current restrictions have interfered with boat races and competitions in Outer Apra Harbor.

8.2.2 Alternative 1 Polaris Point (Preferred Alternative)

8.2.2.1 Onshore

The proposed aircraft carrier wharf location at Alternative 1 Polaris Point (referred to as Alternative 1) and the proposed upland placement sites are proposed entirely on federal land within Naval Base Guam. No land acquisition is proposed. The project site does not border non-federal lands and would have no adverse impact on neighboring civilian communities.

Construction

There is adequate previously disturbed land at the proposed wharf areas for construction staging at the project site. The underground utilities would be within existing utility corridors, except for the local Polaris Point connections to the wharf structure.

As described in Volume 2, dredged material may be reused, placed in upland placement facilities and/or disposed of in an ocean dredged material disposal site (ODMDS). The EIS assumes five scenarios: 100% ODMDS disposal, 100% upland placement, 100% beneficial reuse, 50% beneficial reuse/50% ODMDS disposal, and 20-25% beneficial reuse/75-80% ODMDS disposal. No land use impacts are anticipated from use of the ODMDS site and its selection would avoid any use or impact on land use. The Navy is in the process of developing a detailed dredged material management plan that will incorporate the disposal options, specific plans for beneficial reuse to the extent possible, and include specific monitoring efforts required for each disposal option. Recent preliminary information from the upland placement study supplemental review has indicated that there may be substantially less upland capacity available on the five confined disposal facilities on Navy lands. Due to land use changes, Field 4, the PWC Compound, and the Polaris Point confined upland placement site may not be available for upland placement. Capacity may be reduced in Field 5 due to cell construction to separate different types of materials. Field 3 remains a suitable option for upland placement.

The potential land use impacts of the upland placement site options are as described in Volume 2, Chapter 8, Land Use. The only difference is the aircraft carrier volume of dredged material is greater than that proposed in Volume 2 for Sierra Wharf dredging. No adverse impact to land use near the site would result from the use of any of the remaining candidate upland disposal sites. There is a potentially adverse land use impact associated with the existing upland placement sites if there are other more productive uses of the land than stockpiling dry dredged material. Reuse of dredged material, described further in Volume 2 and Volume 4, Chapter 2, would provide other beneficial land use opportunities if the upland placement site is no longer needed, thus, creating a beneficial impact to land use.

Operation

The proposed new aircraft carrier wharf would be compatible with adjacent submarine compound operational facilities. The proposed wharf and associated facilities would be within and consistent with the Operation land use area of the land use plan (refer to Volume 2, Figure 8.1-12) and consistent with the nearby submarine compound land use. There would be negligible impacts on existing Polaris Point radiological response and emergency repair operations at the submarine compound. There would be sufficient capacity and staff to support the aircraft carrier (COMPACFLT 2009).

The development of a new wharf is consistent with historical use of the proposed project area for ship berthing. These facilities and the wharf would develop an area that is currently vacant and provides open space. The adjacent Fleet/Community Support land use designation is consistent with the planned Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) facilities. The impact on land use is minor and would be less than significant.

The proposed MWR area lies within and is consistent with the designated Fleet/Community Support land use area on base land use maps. MWR facilities are often provided close to the waterfront to support transient personnel. There may be interruptions to current MWR activities at Griffin Beach or nearby ballfields when the aircraft carrier is in port, but this would not be an adverse impact as there are alternative recreational areas on base. The proposed MWR area would be open space when the aircraft carrier is not in port and available for suitable MWR facilities and uses. When the aircraft carrier is in port, there would be temporary MWR facilities. These MWR activities would be consistent with the adjacent MWR uses that include ballfields and Griffin Beach. No adverse impacts were identified on existing land uses or future land use plan, including a fenced perimeter and manned gates.

No changes to existing public access policy are proposed. Land access to Polaris Point would continue to be limited to authorized personnel, including a fenced perimeter and manned gate. There would be additional security restrictions at the aircraft carrier wharf area when the aircraft carrier is in port. These restrictions would be comparable to those used at the existing submarine compound.

Minor structures (e.g., guard tower) at the project site would be removed or relocated. The proposed shoreside facilities operations are typical of other Navy waterfront development (i.e., wharf, utilities, storage facility, access roads, and paving). Volume 2, Section 2.4 summarizes the utility requirements. New construction and significant upgrades are proposed to meet the utility requirements. The buildings proposed at the wharf would include: Bilge and Oily Wastewater Treatment System (BOWTS), Bilge and Oily Wastewater (BOW) pump station, boiler house with fuel storage, air compressor building, water treatment building, Port Operations Support Building, watch towers, and electrical substation. Improvements to Piti Power Plant, with no change to footprint, and the proposed underground lines along existing utility corridors would have no impact on land use. Upgrades to the existing sewage pump station nine on Polaris Point and the proposed underground gravity sewer lines to the wharf that are necessary would have no impact on land use. Water and communication upgrades would require extensions to the underground lines from the Alpha/Bravo Wharves' area to the aircraft carrier wharf and, again, no impact to land use is anticipated. Minor roads would be added and modified in the aircraft carrier project area, with no adverse impact on land use.

8.2.2.2 Offshore

The navigational channel, turning basin, and wharf structure are all proposed within federal submerged lands. No change in submerged lands ownership is proposed. Multiple uses of Apra Harbor would

continue, and existing restrictions including existing setback distances from Navy assets would remain, with no changes to public access policies.

Construction

Dredging and wharf construction is typical of an active harbor and would be consistent with the industrial activities of Apra Harbor. Maintenance dredging occurs periodically, as does construction dredging. The equipment and barges may temporarily block access to Inner Apra Harbor Channel resulting in minor impacts to access.

There would be no direct submerged lands use impacts during use of the ODMDS. There would be temporary impacts to navigation in the shipping lane due to scows carrying dredged material. These impacts would be managed through communication between the dredging contractor and other vessel operators. There would be ample room in the outer harbor for smaller vessels to go around dredging equipment and, where larger commercial vessels are involved, coordination between the dredging equipment and vessel operators would minimize any scheduling delays for either operation.

Operation

All in-water operational activities associated with berthing an aircraft carrier at a new Polaris Point wharf would be the same as those occurring at a typical Navy harbor. The widening of the ship navigation channel would not have an adverse impact on the use of the channel by other ship or boat operators. Channel markers would be relocated as needed. The navigation route in the vicinity of the new wharf would be dredged deeper, which would have no impact on submerged lands use. Use of the project area turning basin and submerged lands fronting the wharf would be restricted and subject to Navy Port Operations approval, as is current practice. Commercial ship traffic does not use the turning basin area and would not be impacted by security barriers at the wharf.

During typical aircraft carrier visits, there would be a disruption to normal ship traffic patterns because of force protection restrictions during aircraft carrier arrival and departure. Normal arrivals and departures would result in disruption of harbor traffic for periods not to exceed four hours (average two). Under the proposed action, there would be a cumulative total of up to 63 in-port days per year, with actual arrivals and departures being determined by operational requirements. Ship schedules have fluctuated over the past 10 years as noted in Section 1.1 of this EIS. For further discussion of navigation impacts refer to Chapter 14, Transportation.

Once the aircraft carrier is docked, there would be no impact on commercial or recreational ship traffic in the northern part of Outer Apra Harbor. No additional submerged lands use restrictions are anticipated while the aircraft carrier is in port. In-water security barriers surrounding the aircraft carrier in port would have to be moved to allow military vessels to enter and exit Inner Apra Harbor. This is considered a minor impact on harbor operations as it only affects military operations.

8.2.2.3 Summary of Alternative 1 Impacts

Table 8.2-1 summarizes the potential impacts of Alternative 1.

Table 8.2-1. Summary of Alternative 1 Impacts

<i>Area</i>	<i>Project Activities</i>	<i>Project Specific Impacts</i>
Onshore	Construction	Activity and staging on DoD-owned compatible lands Disturbance of previously disturbed lands Loss of other potential uses for land designated as upland dredged material placement sites
	Operation	Temporary interruptions to current MWR activities Compatible with surrounding land uses Efficient use of non-DoD land
Offshore	Construction	Dredging activities would be consistent with existing land use Intermittent (1 to 2 ships per day) impact to harbor traffic Interruptions in access to Inner Apra Harbor Channel
	Operation	Temporary impacts to submerged lands use Temporary impact on harbor operations when security barriers are moved Restricted access to Outer Apra Harbor during the infrequent transient aircraft carrier movements

8.2.2.4 Alternative 1 Proposed Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to land/submerged lands ownership, management, or use were identified under Alternative 1; therefore, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

8.2.3 Alternative 2 Former Ship Repair Facility (SRF)

8.2.3.1 Onshore

The proposed site is within the current private shipyard leasehold area at Former Ship Repair Facility (SRF). The current lease term expires in 2012. Future use of the SRF lands beyond 2012 is currently being reviewed by the Navy. No decision has been made at the present time in connection with the future reuse of the Former SRF lands, which may include a new lease for commercial ship repair facility purposes beyond the current 2012 lease term expiration date. The proposed project construction would occur after the existing lease term expires in 2012. Consequently, there would be no effect on the current lease. The Former SRF lease area could be reduced and the proposed project area could be excluded from any new lease. The new aircraft carrier wharf would require reduction of the existing Guam Shipyard leased area but because of the timing of the expiration of the lease, would be considered a less than significant adverse impact on the lessee. This is a conservative assessment and assumes the lessee would prefer not to reduce the lease area during the present lease. The construction of the shoreside infrastructure would not commence until a new land use plan is implemented. Any impact would not be significant because any reduction in the current leasehold footprint would be done on a negotiated basis with the lessee; and if ship repair operations were to continue, they would be done with a more consolidated operation through a more efficient configuration of the physical plant with no reduction in capacity or service capability. No additional land acquisition is proposed. There would be no change to existing public access policy. Land access to the Former SRF would continue to be limited to authorized personnel only. Any new leased area would continue to be surrounded by DoD land, with no change in access policy.

Construction

Potential land use impacts during construction would be similar to those described for Alternative 1. However, Alternative 2 may result in a new real estate arrangement where construction activities may be adjacent to a private commercial leasehold interest.

Operation

Development of a Navy general purpose wharf at the Former SRF is consistent with the Navy's existing land use plan that designates the project area as Operations and Industrial Support (refer to Volume 2, Figure 8.1-12). The new wharf would remove the finger piers, which are not used anyway. The area is underutilized and no relocation of occupied facilities would be required. One abandoned building would be demolished. The proposed shoreside facility (i.e., wharf, utilities, storage facility, and paving) would be operated in a manner typical of other Navy waterfront facilities. MWR facilities are often provided close to the waterfront, within operational areas, to support transient personnel. The proposed MWR area would be open space when the aircraft carrier is not in port. When the aircraft carrier is in port, there would be temporary MWR facilities. No adverse impacts were identified on existing land uses or future land use plans.

Volume 2, Section 2.4 summarizes the utility requirements for a new aircraft carrier wharf. New construction and significant upgrades are proposed to meet the utility requirements. The buildings proposed at the wharf would include: BOWTS, BOW pump station, boiler house with fuel storage, air compressor building, water treatment building, Port Operations Support Building, watch towers, and electrical substation. Improvements to Piti Power Plant and Orote Substation would not change the footprint of the facilities. The underground lines would be within existing utility corridors. The three new submersible pump stations and underground pipelines would be on the existing utility corridor, except in the Former SRF area. Water and communication upgrades would require extensions of the underground lines from the existing Former SRF waterline and Building 3169 (near Victor Wharf) communications hub to the aircraft carrier wharf. No impact to land use is anticipated due to utility improvements.

Potential land use impacts for operations would be similar to those described for Alternative 1. However, Alternative 2 may result in a new real estate arrangement where aircraft carrier wharf operations may be adjacent to a private commercial leasehold interest. Any new lease area would continue to be surrounded by DoD land/submerged lands, continuing a pocket of non-DoD land.

Antiterrorism/force protection is a standard consideration for siting military facilities. Even with a commercial leasehold adjacent to the military property there is sufficient land area at the Former SRF site to accommodate the stand-off distances. Minor roads would be added and modified in the aircraft carrier project area, with no adverse impact on land use.

8.2.3.2 Offshore

Construction

The potential in-water impacts would be as described for Alternative 1, with one additional potential impact. The current design allows for adequate space to access the private shipyard floating dry-dock facility when the wharf is not in use. However, force protection standoff distances restrict ingress and egress to the floating dry dock when the wharf is in use. This limitation would restrict the scheduling of docking and undocking ships at the commercial shipyard. Though the impact would be short in duration, any impact to the private shipyard would be mitigated through scheduling of ship repairs. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts to land use.

Operation

The potential in-water impacts would be as described for Alternative 1, with one additional potential impact. The current design allows for adequate space to access the private shipyard floating dry-dock facility when the wharf is not in use. However, force protection standoff distances restrict ingress and egress to the floating dry dock when the wharf is in use. This limitation would restrict the scheduling of docking and undocking of ships at the commercial shipyard during periods when CSG support vessels may require docking capability.

8.2.3.3 Summary of Alternative 2 Impacts

Table 8.2-2 summarizes the potential impacts of Alternative 2.

Table 8.2-2. Summary of Alternative 2 Impacts

<i>Area</i>	<i>Project Activities</i>	<i>Project Specific Impacts</i>
Onshore	Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity and staging on DoD-owned compatible lands • Disturbance of previously disturbed lands • Loss of other potential uses for land designated as dredged material placement sites
	Operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary interruptions to current MWR activities • Compatibility with surrounding land uses • Efficient use of non-DoD land • Reduction in the Guam Shipyard Lease area would be an impact if lease renegotiated prior to its current 2012 end
Offshore	Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dredging activities would be consistent with existing land use • Intermittent (1-2 ships per day) impact to harbor traffic movement • Interruptions in access to Inner Apra Harbor Channel
	Operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temporary impacts to submerged lands use • Temporary impact on harbor operations when security barriers are moved • Temporary restricted access to Outer Apra Harbor during the infrequent transient aircraft carrier movements • Potential delays in private dry dock operations

8.2.3.4 Alternative 2 Proposed Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to land/submerged lands ownership, management, or use were identified under Alternative 2 that would not be mitigated to less than significant. One proposed mitigation measure to reduce impacts to operations that could be employed is to negotiate long-term leases instead of purchase of non-federally-controlled land.

8.2.4 No-Action Alternative

No change to land ownership would occur at Apra Harbor. Under the no-action alternative, the lease area at the Former SRF would likely continue in its current or similar industrial use, resulting in the same less than significant impact identified under Alternative 2. The Former SRF area would continue to be underutilized and the existence of deteriorating buildings would continue. The Polaris Point site would not be fully utilized, but could potentially be used for submarine compound or MWR facility expansion. The area proposed for MWR could be developed as permanent MWR facilities. There would be no impact to submerged lands use. Except for the potential for negotiated modifications to the lease, no adverse land use impacts are anticipated under the no-action alternative.

8.2.5 Summary of Impacts

Table 8.2-3 summarizes the potential operation impacts of each action alternative and the no-action alternative. A text summary is provided below. The land use analysis assumes that all impacts would be long-term and direct, with the exception of upland placement of dredged material that is considered a temporary land use. The land use analysis assumes that all construction staging would be within the project footprint on land planned for development. In the case of upland placement of dredged material, the construction impact would be within the upland placement sites construction area. No adverse land use impacts associated with construction are anticipated. This assumption applies to all alternatives.

Table 8.2-3. Summary of Impacts

<i>Alternative 1</i>	<i>Alternative 2</i>	<i>No-Action Alternative</i>
Land Ownership/Management		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land: NI • Submerged Lands: NI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land: LSI • Submerged Lands: NI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land: LSI • Submerged Lands: NI
Consistency with Existing or Proposed Land Use		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoD Land: NI • DoD submerged lands: NI • Non-DoD land: NI • Non-DoD submerged lands: NI • Access/pocket of non-DoD land: NI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoD Land: LSI • DoD submerged lands: NI • Non-DoD land (shipyard): LSI • Non-DoD submerged lands: NI • Access/pocket of non-DoD land: LSI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DoD Land: LSI • DoD submerged lands: NI • Non-DoD land: NI • Non-DoD submerged lands: NI • Access/pocket of non-DoD land: LSI

Legend: LSI = Less than significant impact, NI = No impact

From a land/submerged lands ownership and use perspective, there is little difference between the two action alternatives. However, Alternative 2 and the no-action alternative could both result in a change to the Guam Shipyard Lease area that maintains a pocket of non-DoD land surrounded by DoD land and represents a decrease in non-DoD land use, which is an adverse impact. This is a conservative assessment and assumes the lessee would prefer not to reduce the lease area, but does not evaluate the expiration of the lease prior to construction nor the increase in efficiency that may result from consolidation of shipyard activities within a new leased area. The impact would be a less than significant adverse impact because: 1) the Navy is entitled to change the terms of the lease at lease expiration; 2) the sublessee would be more efficient and continue ship repair operations with no reduction in capacity or service capability; and 3) existing access policies would be retained. A beneficial impact of the reduced footprint would be the increased land use efficiency in the area.

The proposed waterfront land and submerged lands use at either site is consistent with existing and planned waterfront uses. Upland placement of stockpiled dredged material would be an adverse impact because it would not represent the best use of the land; however, the upland placement sites being considered were selected to minimize impacts on land use.

8.2.6 Summary of Proposed Mitigation Measures

Table 8.2-4 summarizes the proposed mitigation measures.

Table 8.2-4. Summary of Proposed Mitigation Measures

<i>Alternative 1</i>	<i>Alternative 2</i>
Construction	
• Not warranted	• Not warranted
Operation	
• Not warranted	• Not warranted

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.