

**Table ES-1: Comparison of Environmental Impacts from Alternatives**

Option Study Area	No Action Alternative		Reuse Option 1 Adaptive Reuse		Reuse Option 2 Low-Density Zoning		Reuse Option 3 High-Density Zoning		Reuse Option 4 Conservation or Preservation		Comments
	PI	OP	PI	OP	PI	OP	PI	OP	PI	OP	
Land Use and Visual Resources	0	0	-1	-1	-2 to -3	-1	-3	-3	+1	0	Visual resources could be impaired by increased development of Plum Island
Infrastructure and Utilities	-2	-1	-1	-1	-2	-1	-2	-2	-3	-3	Increased development would require upgrades to utility and infrastructure connections to Plum Island
Air Quality	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1	+1	0	-2	+1	+1	Development would likely reduce emissions from Plum Island and increase emissions from transportation to Plum Island at Orient Point
Noise	+1	+1	-1	-1	-2	-2	-2	-2	+1	+1	Development would likely result in noise levels typical of a suburban environment
Geology and Soils	0	0	0	0	-1	0	-1	-1	0	0	Development would likely impact recognized geologic resources such as surficial groundwater
Water Resources	0	0	0	0	-2 to -3	0	-3	-1	+1	+1	Development could increase impacts to water resources
Biological Resources	+1	0	0	0	-2 to -3	0	-3	0	+1	+1	Development would likely increase impacts by habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, and increased human activities
Cultural Resources	0	0	0	0	-2	0	-2	0	0	0	Development could impact areas of high probability for potential prehistoric resources
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	-2	-1	0	0	-1	-1	+1	+1	-2	-2	Development would likely increase state and local tax revenue and affect employment and income through business and residential development
Traffic and Transportation	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	-2	-2	0	0	Development would likely increase transportation needs, but would remain within acceptable limits (LOS)
Existing Hazards, Toxic, or Radiological Waste Contamination	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Development would not adversely impact or significantly improve existing contamination
Waste Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+1	+1	Waste generated by increased development could be handled by existing structures and procedures
Legend:											
PI - Plum Island	0 - No Impact		-2 - Minor Impact		+1 - Beneficial Impact						
OP - Orient Point	-1 - Negligible Impact		-3 - Moderate Impact								

The terms of environmental impacts used in the Environmental Impact Statement are defined as follows:

**No Impact:** No impact is anticipated.

**Negligible Impact:** Slight adverse or beneficial impacts would not likely be detectable.

**Minor Impact:** Adverse or beneficial impacts would be measurable but well within historic or regulated limits.

**Moderate or Major Impact:** Adverse or beneficial impacts would be readily apparent – adverse impacts outside historic baseline or regulated limits would require offsetting mitigation measures.

**Beneficial Impact:** Impacts recognized as being an improvement to the study area being evaluated.

## **PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

The Environmental Impact Statement considers a *No Action Alternative* and an *Action Alternative*.

### **No Action Alternative**

The *No Action Alternative* is based on the premise that the Property would not be sold after PIADC is relocated and accordingly, the Property would remain in federal ownership. Although GSA is directed by law to sell the Property at public sale, NEPA requires consideration and analysis of a *No Action Alternative*, as described in Section 1502.14(d) of the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The *No Action Alternative* is based on the premise that the Property would not be sold after PIADC is relocated and accordingly, the Property would remain in federal ownership.

### **Action Alternative**

The *Action Alternative* is the sale of the Property by public sale, which is the outcome directed by law. The EIS examines the *Action Alternative* through an analysis of four practicable reuse options.

*Reuse Option 1:* Under the adaptive reuse option, the existing buildings, infrastructure, and transportation assets would be adapted for other purposes and continue to function at current or similar levels.

*Reuse Option 2:* The low-density zoning option is based upon a land use and zoning scheme similar to that of neighboring Fishers Island, New York. This option would accommodate approximately 90 residential units including the required support infrastructure.

*Reuse Option 3:* The high-density zoning option is based upon the highest density permitted by the Town's zoning regulations. This option would accommodate approximately 750 residential units and supporting infrastructure.

*Reuse Option 4:* The primary function of the conservation/preservation option would be to protect, manage, and enhance the natural and cultural resources on the Property should the Property be purchased for conservation or preservation purposes.