Attachment

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) FOR THE PROPOSED COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC FREMONT, CALIFORNIA

### Introduction

The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) has prepared a Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) to construct a Community Based Outpatient Clinic (CBOC) on approximately 7.9 acres in Fremont, California, within Alameda County. The SEA was prepared because the original EA—*Final Environmental Assessment, Proposed Community Based Outpatient Clinic in Southern Alameda County, California, June 2011* (hereinafter referred to as the 2011 EA)—is more than five years old; therefore, VA considered whether information gathered since the 2011 EA was prepared—and the 2011 Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) signed—would pose new circumstances or generate environmental concerns different from what was understood at that time. Since 2011, VA has prepared an additional detailed Transportation Impact Analysis, so the results of that analysis were considered in the SEA. The size of the proposed CBOC also decreased from 80,000 square feet to 35,000 square feet. No other substantial project changes from the 2011 EA were proposed in the SEA.

The SEA was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 United States Code [U.S.C.] 4321 et seq.), the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508), Environmental Effects of the Department of Veterans Affairs Actions (38 CFR Part 26), and the VA's NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects.

### Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to replace the interim CBOC (10,000 square feet) located at 39199 Liberty Street, Fremont, which only offers basic primary care and mental health services. This project is needed as a component of VA's plan to improve services and facilities in the East Bay, Central Valley, and Palo Alto areas in preparation for the eventual closure of the Livermore VA Medical Center.

### **Proposed Action**

The Proposed Action is to construct a CBOC on an approximate 7.9-acre lot in Fremont, California, within Alameda County. Construction of the proposed Fremont CBOC is anticipated to begin in 2021 and last for approximately three years. The new CBOC would replace the existing Fremont CBOC, a leased property that is approximately three miles northwest of the project site.

The CBOC would be a one- or two-story structure that provides primary, specialty, and ancillary medical care services to Veterans. Services and facilities would include primary care and mental health services, basic blood and urine laboratory, and basic pharmacy. The CBOC would also include a small vending area for use by employees and visitors. An emergency generator to serve the CBOC would be located on-site. Parking would be provided on-site for employees and visitors. Sidewalks would be constructed along the CBOC's frontage. The CBOC would employ medical and administrative staff. On-site security services would be provided by VA Police.

### **Alternatives Considered**

The SEA examined two alternatives—the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative—defined as follows:

- **Proposed Action:** VA's Proposed Action is to construct a CBOC and associated site infrastructure at the project site selected in the 2011 FONSI for the 2011 EA, located at 4100–4149 Technology Drive, Fremont, California.
- No Action Alternative: Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not be implemented, and the Fremont CBOC would not be constructed at the Alameda County project site. The current, leased Fremont CBOC (at 39199 Liberty Street, Fremont, California) would continue serving Veterans at existing levels until at least 2022, which is when the lease expires. The VA would continue to operate the Livermore VAMC, and resources would be used to maintain its aging infrastructure. Veterans would continue to travel within the region to access specialized services, as needed, which requires some patients to travel to the Palo Alto hospital. Finally, as the owner of the property at 4100–4149 Technology Drive, Fremont, VA would continue to mow and maintain the project site, as needed.

### **Potential Environmental Effects**

The SEA evaluated the potential effects on the physical, environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic aspects of implementing the Proposed Action. In keeping with CEQ regulations that encourage agencies to streamline environmental analyses in their EAs by focusing on significant issues and discussing insignificant issues only briefly, VA assessed possible changes in the affected environment since the 2011 EA and consequently determined that the analyses in the 2011 EA for aesthetics, cultural resources (including National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Office and Native American Tribes), geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use, floodplains, wetlands, coastal zone management, socioeconomics, community services, solid waste and hazardous materials, utilities, and environmental justice were sufficient to encompass the impacts of the changes in the Proposed Action since that time. The above-mentioned resource areas were found to result in no significant adverse direct, indirect, or cumulative effects in the 2011 EA. This SEA updated the analyses to again conclude that the Proposed Action would result in no significant adverse direct, or the Proposed Action would result in no significant adverse direct, or cumulative effects on the following resource areas: transportation and parking, air quality, noise, and wildlife and habitat.

Implementation of standard environmental best management practices (BMPs) and management measures, as identified in the SEA and listed in Attachment A, will ensure that any potential impacts would be less than significant. Minimization measures and BMPs identified in the 2011 EA/FONSI would also be implemented, with some minor updates based on the analyses in the SEA (provided for reference in Attachment B).

The potential environmental effects associated with implementing the Proposed Action as analyzed in the SEA are summarized in the following sections.

**Transportation and Parking.** Impacts on transportation and parking would not be significant. A Transportation Impact Analysis prepared for the project estimated that the proposed CBOC would generate an average of 1,218 trips per day, including 97 trips during the morning peak hour (between 7:00 and 9:00 AM) and 121 trips during the afternoon peak hour (between 4:00 and 6:00 PM). The addition of the Project Driveway at Technology Drive and Technology Court/ Technology Place (Intersection No. 7) would deteriorate level of service and result in delays at that intersection, but vehicular volume at that intersection would not be considered significant. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) reviewed the Draft SEA and Transportation Impact Analysis and had no comments on the project.

*Air Quality.* Impacts on air quality would not be significant. Short-term criteria pollutant emissions and fugitive dust during construction and long-term criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles accessing the site would be expected. Increases in services at the new Fremont CBOC would regionally offset some mobile source emissions occurring from patients that are currently accessing the Livermore or Palo Alto facilities within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Construction and operational emissions would be well below federal *de minimis* thresholds; a Conformity Determination is not required.

**Noise.** Impacts on the noise environment would not be significant. Short-term noise from construction equipment and vehicles and long-term noise from vehicles accessing the site would be expected. The closest noise-sensitive receptor is a preschool 100 feet east across Technology Drive from the project site; noise levels could be 83 decibels (A-weighted) during construction. Long-term increases in noise from vehicles would be expected; however, populations would barely perceive these increases.

*Wildlife and Habitat.* Impacts on wildlife and habitat would not be significant. Short-term, minor impacts and long-term, negligible impacts are expected from the conversion of a partially grassy, undeveloped site of marginal habitat quality to a developed, landscaped site. There is no suitable habitat for listed species. VA determined that the proposed project would have no effect on federally listed species as a result of no suitable habitat onsite; therefore, consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is not required.

*Cumulative Effects.* Cumulative impacts would not be significant. Warm Springs/South Fremont (which includes the project site) is a rapidly developing area within the city of Fremont, resulting in increased traffic. Several intersections near the project site are expected to experience unacceptable LOS due to baseline growth unrelated to the Proposed Action. The proposed CBOC would contribute to increase traffic, as described under Transportation and Parking, but the traffic at these intersections is projected to be unacceptable regardless of the proposed CBOC.

**Potential for Generating Substantial Public Controversy.** Possible concerns regarding traffic were brought up during the public review period of the 2011 EA, which are addressed under the Transportation and Parking section. No other potential for substantial public controversy was identified.

### Agency and Public Comment

The Draft SEA was made available for a 30-day public comment period, beginning October 9, 2020. A notice of availability for the Draft SEA was published in Fremont's *East Bay Times* from October 9 through October 11, 2020. Copies of the Draft SEA, along with the 2011 EA as a companion reference document, were available for public review on a VA website (www.cfm.va.gov/environmental/). No public comments were received.

VA notified the stakeholders from the 2011 EA and one federally recognized tribe of the public review period for the Draft SEA. Caltrans provided a letter stating they had no comments on the Draft SEA or the Transportation Impact Analysis. No other agency or tribal comments were received.

## Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the impacts analyses in the SEA, which is summarized and incorporated by reference herein, it is the conclusion of VA that the implementation of the Proposed Action would not generate significant public controversy nor have a significant adverse impact on the quality of the natural or human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2c) of NEPA. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Glenn M. Elliott 689970

Digitally signed by Glenn M. Elliott 689970 Date: 2020.12.14 15:58:24 -05'00'

Glenn Elliott Director of Environmental Programs VA Construction and Facilities Management Office

Thomas J. Fitzgerald III, CHESP Director VA Palo Alto Health Care System

# Attachment A. Minimization and Management Measures Incorporated into the Proposed Action in this SEA

Technical Resource Area	Minimization or Management Measure (including Best Management Practices)
Transportation and Parking	<ul> <li>Prepare and implement a Traffic Management and Safety Plan adhering to Alameda County and Caltrans requirements, including the following elements:</li> <li>Schedule project-generated construction truck trips on Auto Mall Parkway and Technology Drive outside the peak commute hours to reduce potential traffic congestion during peak morning and evening commute periods.</li> <li>Comply with transportation permit requirements of Caltrans and California Highway Patrol when scheduling construction truck trips carrying oversized loads. In addition, provide pre-notification to local-police, fire, and emergency service providers of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities that could affect the movement of emergency vehicles on area roadways.</li> <li>Place signs along appropriate roads to notify drivers of construction traffic throughout the duration of the construction period. Advance warning signs (e.g., "ROAD WORK AHEAD," "SLOW TRUCKS," and/or "TRUCKS TURNING AHEAD"), flaggers, and speed control (including signs informing drivers of state-legislated double fines for speed infractions in a construction zone) shall be provided to achieve required speed reductions for safe traffic flow through the work zone.</li> </ul>
Air Quality	All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered as needed to control project site fugitive dirt and dust emissions, but at a minimum two times per day.
	All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
	All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day.
	All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.
	All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
	Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
	All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All site equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic, determined to be running in proper condition (maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers specifications) and regularly documented within project site documentation (in agreement with the VA Construction documentation requirements for air compliance), prior to operation (and throughout the contract).
	Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Technical Resource Area	Minimization or Management Measure (including Best Management Practices)
Noise	Implement noise control as outlined in VA Document PG-18-1, <i>Master Construction Specifications</i> , No. 01-57-19, "Temporary Environmental Controls."
	Designate a noise disturbance coordinator during construction.
	Perform noise-producing work during less-sensitive hours of the day or week.
Wildlife and Habitat	Implement environmental controls as outlined in VA Document PG-18-1, <i>Master Construction Specifications</i> , No. 01-57-19, "Temporary Environmental Controls."

# Attachment B (for reference). Minimization and Management Measures Incorporated into the Proposed Action as Identified in the 2011 EA/FONSI, with 2020 Amendments Noted

Technical Resource Area	Minimization or Management Measure (including Best Management Practices)
Cultural Resources	If cultural resources are encountered at the project site during ground-disturbing activities, all activity in the vicinity of the find shall cease until it can be evaluated by a professional archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the appropriate specialty. If the archaeologist determines that the resources may be significant, the VA and the City of Fremont shall be notified and will jointly develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The VA shall consult with the Native American representatives identified by the NAHC in determining appropriate treatment for unearthed cultural resources if the materials are associated with Ohlone or earlier cultural traditions. In considering any suggested measures proposed by the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) will be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while treatment plans for cultural resources are being developed and implemented.
	If human remains are uncovered at the project site during ground-disturbing activities, work in the vicinity of the find will immediately halt. An appropriate VA project representative will contact the Alameda County coroner to evaluate the remains. If the County coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the VA representative will contact the NAHC, in accordance with Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, subdivision (c), and Public Resources Code 5097.98 (as amended by AB 2641). The NAHC will provide the name of one or more individuals determined to be the Most Likely Descendant for Native American human remains in the project site. Per Public Resources Code 5097.98, the VA shall ensure that the immediate vicinity of the find is not damaged or disturbed by further development activities until the landowner has discussed and conferred with the Most Likely Descendant regarding their recommendations, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains.
Hydrology and Water Quality	<ul> <li>Draft and implement a site-specific drainage plan that specifies control and treatment measures to manage stormwater pollutant runoff as part of the overall site design.</li> <li>Permanent and operational BMPs would include the following:</li> <li>Grass strips, high infiltration substrates, and grassy swales shall be used where feasible throughout the development to reduce runoff and provide initial storm water treatment.</li> <li>Detention basins shall be installed beneath large parking areas to provide initial filtration prior to discharge into the storm drains.</li> <li>Roof drains shall discharge to natural surfaces or swales where possible to avoid excessive concentration and channelization of storm water.</li> <li>Permanent energy dissipaters shall be included for drainage outlets.</li> <li>Water quality detention basins shall be designed to provide effective water quality control measures to maximize detention time for settling of fine particles; establish maintenance schedules for periodic removal of sedimentation, excessive vegetation, and debris that may clog basin inlets and outlets; and maximize the detention basin elevation to allow the highest amount of infiltration and settling prior to discharge.</li> </ul>

Technical Resource Area	Minimization or Management Measure (including Best Management Practices)
Wildlife and Habitat	Updated December 2020: The minimization and management measures identified in the 2011 EA were not carried forward. Table 17 of the SEA summarizes all federal- and state-listed species that may occur, as determined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) system and the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) online tool. There is no suitable habitat for any listed species, and so the measures from the 2011 EA are not applicable.
Wetlands	Updated December 2020: There are no wetlands mapped by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory on the project site.
Transportation and Parking	Updated December 2020: Since the 2011 EA was released, a Transportation Impact Analysis Report was completed for the Proposed Action. As a result, minimization and management measures have been updated and are included in Attachment A.

## Attachment Z

## FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROPOSED COMMUNITY BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC IN SOUTHERN ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

June 17, 2011

#### **Prepared for:**

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs 810 Vermont Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20420

#### Under contract to:

Carpenter Robbins Commercial Real Estate, Inc. 3160 Crow Canyon Road, Suite 200 San Ramon, California 94593

#### Prepared by:

Environmental Science Associates (ESA) 225 Bush Street, Suite 1700 San Francisco, California 94104

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## Alameda County VA Outpatient Clinic Final Environmental Assessment

		Page
	Executive Summary	ES-1
1.0	Introduction 1.1 Purpose and Need 1.2 Proposed Action	<b>1-1</b> 1-1 1-2
2.0	<ul><li>Alternatives</li><li>2.1 Development of Alternatives</li><li>2.2 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Analysis</li></ul>	<b>2-1</b> 2-1 2-3
3.0	Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences 3.1 Aesthetics 3.2 Air Quality 3.3 Cultural Resources 3.4 Geology and Soils 3.5 Hydrology and Water Quality 3.6 Wildlife and Habitat 3.7 Noise 3.8 Land Use 3.9 Floodplains, Wetlands, and Coastal Zone Management 3.10 Socioeconomics 3.11 Community Services 3.12 Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials 3.13 Transportation and Parking 3.14 Utilities 3.15 Environmental Justice 3.16 Cumulative Impacts 3.17 Potential for Generating Substantial Controversy	3-1 3-11 3-14 3-19 3-30 3-35 3-48 3-52 3-57 3-64 3-67 3-70 3-74 3-78 3-86 3-89 3-90
4.0	Public Involvement	4-1
5.0	Mitigation / Management Measures5.15.1Alternative 1: Technology Court Site5.2Alternative 2: South Grimmer Boulevard Site	<b>5-1</b> 5-1 5-5
6.0	Conclusions	6-1
7.0	List of Preparers	7-1

		Page	
8.0 I	References Cited	8-1	
9.0 l	∟ist of Acronyms and Abbreviations	9-1	
10.0 F	Responses to Comments	10-1	
Apper	ndices (provided on CD)		
	Agency Consultation	B-1	
	Jtilities Connections Applications	C-1 D-1	
	Phase 1 Survey Reports Public Notices	E-1	
<u> </u>		L .	
List of	Figures		
2-1	Proposed Site Locations	2-4	
2-2 3.1-1	Aerial Photograph Site Photographs – Technology Court Site North-South	2-5 3-2	
3.1-1	Site Photographs – Technology Court Site Rotti-South	3-3	
3.1-3	Site Photographs – South Grimmer Boulevard Site North-South	3-5	
3.1-4	Site Photographs – South Grimmer Boulevard Site East – West	3-6	
3.1-5	Conceptual Site Layout – Technology Court Site	3-8	
3.1-6	Conceptual Site Layout – South Grimmer Boulevard Site	3-10	
3.4-1 3.4-2	Soils Map Bringing Active Foults in the San Francisco Boy Area	3-20 3-22	
3.4-2 3.6-1	Principal Active Faults in the San Francisco Bay Area Special-Status Species	3-44	
3.7-1	Noise Measurement Location, Technology Court Site	3-49	
3.7-2	Noise Measurement Location, South Grimmer Boulevard Site	3-51	
3.9-1	Floodplain Map	3-58	
3.9-2	Wetlands Map	3-60	
List of	Tables		
3.2-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards and Bay Area Attainment Status	3-12	
3.4-1	Soil Types Identified within the Proposed Sites Construction Disturbance	3-21	
3.4-2	Areas Active Faults in the Vicinity of the Proposed Sites	3-24	
3.4-2	Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale	3-25	
3.6-1	Special-Status Species Considered for the Proposed Sites	3-37	
3.7-1	Existing Noise Environment at the Technology Court Site and Vicinity	3-48	
3.7-2	Existing Noise Environment at the South Grimmer Boulevard Site and Vicinity	3-50	
3.10-1	Population Changes for Fremont, Alameda County, California and the United States, 1990-2009	3-64	
3 10-2	Individual Poverty Status, Labor Force, and Employment for the City of	0-04	
00 2	Fremont, Alameda County, California, and the United States	3-65	
	Summary of Income for Alameda County, Fremont, Census Tract 4415.03	3-66	
	Projected Enrollment for Fremont Unified School District through 2015-2106	3-68	
3.15-1	Racial Composition and Hispanic Ethnicity of Alameda County, Fremont, Census Tract 4415.03	3-87	
3-15-2	Poverty Status of Census Tract 4415.03, City of Fremont, and Alameda County	3-88	

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared to address the construction and operation of a new state-of-the-art Community Based Outpatient Clinic (CBOC) to serve the approximately 10,000 veterans in Southern Alameda County, California. The project is proposed by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). This EA was conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500-1508) and VA Regulations (38 CFR Section 26.4(a)).

The veterans in Southern Alameda County currently are required to travel to the Livermore VA Medical Center (VAMC) for care. The Livermore facility was built in the 1940's and its aging infrastructure requires constant care and maintenance which uses VA financial resources that could otherwise be used to provide better quality care for veterans.

The VA considered the option of continuing operations at the Livermore VAMC (the No Action alternative). However, because this option would not provide improved quality care for veterans and would require veterans in Southern Alameda County to travel quite a distance for services, this option was the least preferred alternative.

After consideration of several other alternatives such as leasing space, renovating existing facilities, and contracting out services, the VA determined that the best option was the purchase of property and construction of a new CBOC. The VA has identified two possible locations for the proposed CBOC. Both sites are located in the City of Fremont within about one mile of each other.

The CBOC would be a roughly 84,000 square-foot, two-story facility. This CBOC would provide primary care and mental health services, and would include medical/surgical sub-specialty clinics, audiology and speech pathology facilities, an eye clinic, basic blood laboratory, basic pharmacy, physical medicine and rehabilitation facilities, prosthetics services, and radiology (general X-ray) services. The CBOC would not include an emergency room, urgent care, or outpatient surgery services. Parking for up to 420 vehicles would be provided on site for employees and visitors. The CBOC would employ approximately 100 medical and administrative staff. On-site security services would be provided by VA Police.

The CBOC would be LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Silver Certified in accordance with the April 2010 Sustainable Design and Energy Reduction Guide. Construction is

tentatively anticipated to begin in 2013 and would take approximately two years. Operation of the CBOC would begin in late 2015 or early 2016.

The VA has requested concurrence with this report's finding of no significant effect on endangered and threatened species or critical habitat from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and has received concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer that this project would not adversely affect historic resources pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

As discussed in this EA, the proposed action would have short term adverse effects during construction. However, with the best management practices identified in Chapter 5, these adverse effects would not be significant. Ground disturbing activities during construction also have the potential to result in the discovery of human remains or to damage archaeological resources. As part of these best management practices, if cultural artifacts or human remains are uncovered, all activity in the vicinity of the find would be stopped until the proper protocol and process are observed. No significant adverse long term effects from operation of the proposed CBOC were identified at either site location.

In conclusion, this EA has determined that the proposed action of construction and operation of a CBOC on either site would not result in significant adverse effects on the human environment or natural resources. The proposed action would provide a positive long term effect by providing new jobs, while achieving the objectives of the VA to provide quality care to veterans closer to their places of residence.

Attachment 4

	FILE COPY
	an annan an a
File No.	the matter and a subject to a subject the set of the

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

## U. S. Department of Veterans Affairs

Community-Based Outpatient Clinic in Southern Alameda County, California

July 28, 2011

#### Background

The veterans in Southern Alameda County currently are required to travel to the Livermore VA Medical Center (VAMC) for care. The Livermore campus was originally constructed in the 1920's and its aging infrastructure requires constant care and maintenance which uses VA financial resources that could otherwise be used to provide better quality care for veterans.

After consideration of several other alternatives of how to provide care for Veterans, such as continuing operations at the Livermore VAMC, leasing space, renovating existing facilities, and contracting out services, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) determined that the best option was the purchase of property and construction of a new Community Based Outpatient Clinic (CBOC). Through a competitive market survey process, the VA identified two possible locations for the proposed CBOC: the Technology Court site and the South Grimmer Boulevard site. Both sites are located in the City of Fremont within about one mile of each other.

An Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500-1508) and VA Regulations (38 CFR Section 26.4(a)). The VA assessed the potential impacts of the short-term construction and long-term operation of the proposed CBOC to serve the veterans in Southern Alameda County.

#### Summary of the Proposed Action

The CBOC would be a approximately 84,000 square-feet. This CBOC would provide primary care and mental health services, and would include medical/surgical sub-specialty clinics, audiology and speech pathology facilities, an eye clinic, basic blood laboratory, basic pharmacy, physical medicine and rehabilitation facilities, prosthetics services, and radiology (general X-ray) services. The CBOC would not include an emergency room, urgent care, or outpatient surgery services. Parking for approximately 420 vehicles would be provided on site for Veterans, visitors and employees. The CBOC would employ approximately 100 medical and administrative staff.

The CBOC would be LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Silver Certified in accordance with the April 2010 Sustainable Design and Energy Reduction Guide. Construction of the new facility is dependent upon receiving additional major construction funding. Construction is tentatively anticipated to begin in 2014/2015 and would take approximately three years. Operation of the CBOC is anticipated to begin in late 2017or 2018.

#### **Consideration of Alternatives**

The VA considered the following five alternative scenarios:

- No Action
- Leasing Space
- Renovation
- Contracting Out
- New Construction

The No Action alternative was determined to potentially expose veterans to reduced quality of care and an inefficient use of VA resources. This alternative was the least preferred alternative.

Based on a cost effectiveness analysis the Leasing Space alternative was determined not to be feasible because it would be more expensive over a 20-year full service lease than new construction. In addition, the likelihood was low of finding space that suited the needs of the VA in the geographic area best situated to serve the veterans in the Southern Alameda County area.

The Renovation alternative was not considered feasible because using the existing facility would not provide a CBOC in proximity to where veterans live, and temporary facilities would have to be found while areas of the existing facility were renovated.

The contracting out alternative was determined to be cost prohibitive because according to the VA's workload projections approximately 30,000 outpatient visits would be contracted to community providers annually.

The new construction alternative was determined to be the preferred alternative because it would replace outdated facilities with state-of-the-art facilities and locate the ambulatory care services closer to where veterans reside. The new facilities would also attract a highly qualified and innovative workforce who would provide better quality care for veterans.

To implement this alternative, the VA looked at two alternative site locations for the proposed CBOC to serve veterans in Southern Alameda County:

- Alternative 1—Technology Court Site: located at 4100-4149 Technology Drive, Fremont
- Alternative 2—South Grimmer Boulevard Site: located at the intersection of Grimmer Boulevard
   and Old Warm Springs Boulevard, Fremont

#### **Summary of Environmental Consequences**

An Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to evaluate the two alternative site locations. The EA analysis indicates that the two sites have equal merit. The proposed action at either of the proposed site locations would not result in short-term, long-term, or cumulative impacts related to the following topics: land use, floodplains, socioeconomics, community services, utilities, and environmental justice.

Ground disturbing activities during construction also have the potential to result in the discovery of human remains or to damage archaeological resources. As outlined in Chapter 5, Mitigation / Management Measures, of the EA, if cultural artifacts are uncovered, all activity in the vicinity of the find would be stopped until a qualified archaeologist determines the significance of the find. If human remains are uncovered, all activity in the vicinity of the find would be stopped and the Alameda County coroner would evaluate the remains and follow the appropriate procedures and protocols.

Construction activities also have the potential to disturb nesting birds and roosting bats. As outlined in Chapter 5 of the EA, by scheduling construction around the bird nesting period and avoiding the removal of trees, these potentially adverse effects would be avoided.

The South Grimmer Boulevard site would require soil sampling and sealing of unused groundwater wells at the site. With implementation of the management measures outlined in Chapter 5 of the EA, these potential adverse effects would not be significant. No significant adverse long term effects from operation of the proposed CBOC were identified at either of the proposed sites.

In conclusion, the proposed action at either site would not result in significant adverse effects on the human environment or natural resources executed at either of the proposed sites. The proposed action would provide a positive long term effect by providing new jobs, while achieving the objectives of the VA to provide quality care to veterans in closer proximity to their places of residence.

#### **Public Review**

The Draft EA was circulated for a 30-day public comment period extending from February 24, 2011 to March 25, 2011. A notice of availability for the Draft EA was published in the *Fremont Argus* on Monday and Tuesday, February 21 and 22, 2011, and Sunday, February 27, 2011. Copies of the Draft EA were mailed to the State Clearinghouse for distribution to State agencies. Copies were made available at the Fremont Main library and the Niles Library.

The Draft EA comment period was extended an additional two weeks through April 8, 2011. Notice of the extension was published in the *Fremont Argus* on Monday and Tuesday, March 31 and April 1, 2011, and Sunday, April 3, 2011.

All comments were responded to in Chapter 10, Responses to Comments, in the Final EA, and where appropriate, the Final EA was revised to address the comments. The Final EA was completed on June 17, 2011 and is attached to this FONSI.

#### Decision

As a result of the analysis of impacts of the proposed action contained in the EA, it is the VA's conclusion that, with the implementation of best management practices, compliance with regulatory requirements, and implementation of the management measures outlined in the EA, the proposed action would not have a significant environmental impact, therefore, an environmental impact statement would not be prepared. VA has determined that selection of the Technology Court site would best serve the veterans in Southern Alameda County, California.

Elizabeth Joyce Freeman Director, VA Palo Alto Health Care System U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

#### Attachment:

Final Environmental Assessment, Proposed Community Based Outpatient Clinic in Southern Alameda County, California