

No Action:

At Alcatraz Island, mobile combustion associated with the operation of the ferry concession would continue to be the largest contributor of Island GHG emissions. However, ferry service is increasingly efficient with supplemental energy from solar and wind power generation on-board. Stationary combustion associated with power generation using diesel generators would be mitigated by onsite generated renewable energy. With the construction of the solar array, 60% of the island's energy will be generated by the sun, and thereby reducing total emission. Total GHG emissions for Alcatraz Island under the no-action alternative would be 1927 MTCO_{2e}

I don't know why this was MTCE, my calculations for this project (from the beginning) were done in MTCO_{2e}. 1927 MTCO_{2e} (original 1675 + 252 MTCO_{2e} for 60% solar emissions and 40% diesel emissions)

Alt 1:

At Alcatraz Island, visitor opportunities would be expanded and access to more areas on the island would result in creased ferry transportation and visitor use. This would result in a slightly increased emissions associated with the ferry concession (mobile combustion) and wastewater treatment. Emissions associated with energy use would also increase due to increases in facility usage and energy demand. Gross emission for Alcatraz Island under Alternative 1 could increase by about 12% to 2,188 MTCO_{2e}.

Alt 2:

At Alcatraz Island, visitor opportunities would be expanded and access to more areas on the island would result in creased ferry transportation and visitor use. This would result in a slightly increased emissions associated with the ferry concession (mobile combustion) and wastewater treatment. Emissions associated with energy use would also increase due to increases in facility usage and energy demand. Gross emission for Alcatraz Island under Alternative 2 could increase by about 6% to 2,050 MTCO_{2e}, the lowest of the three action alternatives for Alcatraz Island.

Alt 3:

At Alcatraz Island, visitor opportunities would be expanded and access to more areas on the island would result in creased ferry transportation and visitor use. This would result in a slightly increased emissions associated with the ferry concession (mobile combustion) and wastewater treatment. Emissions associated with energy use would also increase due to increases in facility usage and energy demand. Gross emission for Alcatraz Island under Alternative 3 could increase by about 7% to 2,062 MTCO_{2e}.

Based on my notes, the total emissions for the combined preferred alternative 1 and 3, the total emissions = 8,979 MTCO_{2e}. My baseline emissions are also greatly different from that in my draft of the GMP, total = 8,779 MTCO_{2e}. That is less than a 3% increase from the baseline to the preferred alternatives.

San Francisco Alt1 =2484 MTCO_{2e}, Marin County Alt1 =2572 MTCO_{2e}, San Mateo Alt1 =48 MTCO_{2e}, Muir Woods Alt 3 =1813 MTCO_{2e}, Alcatraz Alt 3 =2062 MTCO_{2e}

Baseline: San Francisco =2340 MTCO_{2e}, Marin County =2551 MTCO_{2e}, San Mateo =0 MTCO_{2e}, Muir Woods =2058 MTCO_{2e}, Alcatraz =1830 MTCO_{2e}

Alt 1 & 3 Conclusion:

The preferred Alternative 1 for Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo counties and Alternative 3 for Muir woods and Alcatraz Island would result in total emissions of 8,979 MTCO₂e, an increase of 3 % from the 8,779 MTCO₂e baseline.