



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 2
290 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10007-1866

MAR 11 2008

Linda Neal, Superintendent
Governors Island National Monument
National Park Service
Battery Maritime Building, Slip 7
10 South Street
New York, New York 10004

Dear Ms. Neal:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the General Management Plan for the Governors Island National Monument (CEQ # 20080008) on Governors Island in New York Harbor. This review was conducted in accordance with Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7609, and Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C).

The DEIS presents the analysis of four alternative management plans for the Governors Island National Monument. Governors Island has played a vital role in the defense and development of New York City, and was long used by the U.S. Army and the U.S. Coast Guard. In 2001, approximately 22 acres of the 175 acre island were established as the Governors Island National Monument by Presidential Proclamation 7420. The Monument includes Castle Williams and Fort Jay, which are fine examples of defensive structures from the First and Second American Systems of Fortifications; the glaxis (or grassy area) surrounding Fort Jay; the National Park Service (NPS) dock; and Building 140. The purpose of the General Management Plan is to define and describe the vision or central management philosophy for this unit within the National Park System.

The preferred alternative, designated as "Harbor Partnership," would develop the National Monument as a Harbor Center – a hub of activity for visitors wanting to explore Governors Island, New York Harbor and other harbor attractions. Fort Jay, Castle Williams, and the cultural landscape would accommodate the exhibits, activities and programming for the Harbor Center. Fort Jay would be rehabilitated to showcase and accommodate exhibits, harbor research and programs, administrative offices, and in-residence programs for NPS staff. Castle Williams would be rehabilitated to become the island's main interpretive center with a variety of exhibits, programs and installations.

While the proposed project does not present significant environmental concerns, we would like to take this opportunity to alert you to energy savings opportunities that may be considered in the implementation of the preferred alternative. A variety of energy efficient lighting products, appliances, fans, heating and cooling equipment that have received the **EnergyStar** label are now commercially available; these products can provide lower utility bills and help reduce green house gas emissions. More information about **EnergyStar** products and locations where they can be purchased can be found at: www.energystar.gov. Additionally, EPA Region 2 has established a multi-disciplinary team (or Green Team) that is well-versed in environmentally preferable design, construction and operations practices that could be implemented for projects such as the Governors Island National Monument. We would be happy to arrange for the Green Team to meet with you to discuss potential options for the project.

Based on our review, we do not anticipate that implementation of the preferred alternative will result in significant adverse impacts to the environment. Accordingly, consistent with EPA policy, we have rated this DEIS as LO, indicating that we lack objections to the project's implementation.

If you have any questions or should you like to meet with our Green Team, please call Lingard Knutson of my staff at (212) 637-3747.

Sincerely yours,



John Filippelli, Chief
Strategic Planning Multi-Media Programs Branch

SUMMARY OF RATING DEFINITIONS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTION
Environmental Impact of the Action

LO-Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC-Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. **EPA would** like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO-Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU-Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory **from** the standpoint of environmental quality, public health or welfare. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. **If** the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommend for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1-Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental **impact(s)** of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2-Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain **sufficient** information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the **final** EIS.

Category 3-Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analysis, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have **full** public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is **adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should** be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From: EPA Manual 1640, "Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment."