



FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

SPECIAL MEETING

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY (FORA) BOARD OF DIRECTORS

February 2, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. | 910 2nd Avenue, Marina, CA 93933 (Carpenters Union Hall)

AGENDA

ALL ARE ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT QUESTIONS/CONCERNS BY NOON FEBRUARY 1, 2018.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE *(If able, please stand)*

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND CORRESPONDENCE

4. ROLL CALL

FORA is governed by 13 voting members: (a) 1 member appointed by the City of Carmel; (b) 1 member appointed by the City of Del Rey Oaks; (c) 2 members appointed by the City of Marina; (d) 1 member appointed by Sand City; (e) 1 member appointed by the City of Monterey; (f) 1 member appointed by the City of Pacific Grove; (g) 1 member appointed by the City of Salinas; (h) 2 members appointed by the City of Seaside; and (i) 3 members appointed by Monterey County. The Board also includes 12 ex-officio non-voting members.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

INFORMATION

Members of the public wishing to address the Board on matters within its jurisdiction, but **not on this agenda**, may do so for up to 3 minutes or as otherwise determined by the Chair and will not receive Board action. Whenever possible, written correspondence should be submitted to the Board in advance of the meeting, to provide adequate time for its consideration.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

INFORMATION/ACTION

BUSINESS ITEMS are for Board discussion, debate, direction to staff, and/or action. Comments from the public are **not to exceed 3 minutes** or as otherwise determined by the Chair.

a. Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (Continued from January 12, 2018 Board Meeting)

Recommendation:

- i. Receive an Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Update from January 12, 2018
- ii. Transportation Agency for Monterey County Presentation
- iii. Discuss and Consider Approval of Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (Attachment A) for use in future preparation of an Environmental Impact Report in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Public comment on this item was taken on January 12, 2018. The Board Chair may elect to allow new comments from members of the public that were not in attendance at the January 12, 2018 Board meeting. Comments from the public are **not to exceed 3 minutes**, or as otherwise determined by the Chair.

7. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

INFORMATION

Receive communication from Board members as it pertains to future agenda items.

8. ADJOURNMENT

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: February 9, 2018 at 2:00 P.M.

Persons seeking disability related accommodations should contact FORA 24 hours prior to the meeting. This meeting is recorded by Access Monterey Peninsula and televised Sundays at 9 a.m. and 1 p.m. on Marina/Peninsula Chanel 25. The video and meeting materials are available online at www.fora.org.



FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933

Phone: (831) 883-3672 | Fax: (831) 883-3675 | www.fora.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Board of Directors
FROM: Jonathan Brinkmann, Principal Planner
RE: Item 6a – Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (Continued from January 12, 2108 Board Meeting)
DATE: Special Meeting date – February 2, 2018

The FORA Board continued Item 8d, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (**Exhibit A**), from the January 12, 2018 Board Meeting to a Special Meeting, scheduled Friday, February 2, 2018 at 3:00 pm, directing staff to include added comments that were made on the topic as updates to the January 12, 2018 agenda item Attachment A. **Exhibit B** to this memo displays those contributions as revised Eastside Parkway goals and objectives. Staff has also compiled additional public comments received since the distribution of the January 12 Meeting Packet. These comments are presented as **Exhibit C**. At the January Board meeting, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) Executive Director offered to provide a presentation of additional transportation-related information from her staff. At the Board's request for additional information, the special meeting will include a presentation by TAMC on traffic-related issues associated with goals and objectives.

Staff recommends that the FORA Board consider the following:

- i. Receive an Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Update from January 12, 2018.
- ii. Transportation Agency for Monterey County Presentation
- iii. Discuss and consider approval of Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (**Exhibit B**) for use in future preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT

BUSINESS ITEMS

Subject:	Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives	
Meeting Date:	January 12, 2018	INFORMATION/ACTION
Agenda Number:	8d	

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- i. Receive an Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Report.
- ii. Discuss and consider approval of Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (**Attachment A**) for use in future preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

Completion of FORA's "Fair Share" of transportation improvements, as listed in FORA's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) (<http://fora.org/Reports/CIP/CIPReports/CIP2017-18.pdf>) pg. 18, is a reuse mitigation described in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan (BRP) Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) (http://www.fora.org/Reports/BRP/BRP_v4_FinalEIR_1997.pdf Section 4.7 Traffic and Circulation pg. 4-88 to 4-119).

The FEIR identified the following, "[i]mpact: Increase Travel Demand on Regional Transportation System" (pg. 4-108). It also identified the following mitigation for this impact: "A Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) to establish programs and monitor development at Fort Ord to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities and water supply shall be established by FORA." This reuse mitigation is identified in the BRP FEIR (http://www.fora.org/Reports/BRP/BRP_v4_FinalEIR_1997.pdf pg. 4-112).

The DRMP states: "FORA shall fund its "Fair Share" of "on-site," "off-site," and "regional" roadway and transit capital improvements based on the nexus analysis of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) regional transportation model" (BRP Vol.1, pg. 195).

The FEIR identified Eastside Road within the "on-site" network to connect Imjin Parkway to Gigling Road (FEIR pg. 4-104 - 4-106). TAMC's 1997 Fort Ord Transportation Study presented cost allocations based on Eastside Road preliminary nexus analysis and other transportation improvements (http://fora.org/Reports/1997_Fort_Ord_Transportation_Study.pdf pg. 7-6). According to the study, Fort Ord development was allocated 72% of Eastside Road's cost burden, while other areas outside of Fort Ord were allocated 28% of the cost.

TAMC's 2005 FORA Fee Reallocation Study resulted in an Eastside Road conceptual alignment to address California State University (CSU) Monterey Bay's concerns that the BRP conceptual Eastside Road alignment would impact campus traffic flow (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2005.pdf pg. 12, 13, and 45). The 2005 conceptual Eastside Road alignment is described as a 2-lane arterial roadway from Eucalyptus Road to Schoonover Drive. The 2005 study included two options for allocating FORA's share of transportation improvement costs: Option 1 was a Prorata Based on Fee Approach (nexus based) and Option 2 was a Fund Local First (FORA would fund 100% of on-site transportation

improvements, pg. 31-32). The Prorata Based on Fee Approach attributed 65.5% of the Eastside Road's cost burden to Fort Ord Development, while other areas outside of Fort Ord were allocated 34.5% of the cost. The 2005 study recommended the Fund Local First Approach, which resulted in FORA taking on the regional and local cost share for on-site transportation improvements such as Eastside Road and assuming a smaller cost share for regional transportation improvements. Both boards adopted the 2005 recommendations.

In December 2009, the FORA Board prioritized Eastside Road when it adopted its 2009-10 mid-year CIP. In 2010, County of Monterey staff suggested changing the roadway name from "Eastside Road" to "Eastside Parkway." Under Whitson Engineers' (Whitson) contract amendment #2, in January 2012, FORA's consultant team completed a Draft Preliminary Initial Study Checklist, which included a recommendation to prepare an EIR for Eastside Parkway. In November 2016, the FORA Board approved contract amendment #3 with Whitson to proceed with Eastside Parkway environmental review. Subsequently, Whitson conducted an environmental consulting services selection process. In August 2017, Whitson selected Denise Duffy and Associates (DD&A) to provide these services.

FORA staff and consultants are impartial on the proposed project. In order to minimize issues related to public momentum or bias as to any one project, FORA staff and consultants held a community workshop (meeting) in two sessions on December 6, 2017 from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm and from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm to obtain public input on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. Goals/Objectives are key in the CEQA process, as they are a basis/framework to:

- 1) write the project description and statement of a project's objectives;
- 2) develop a reasonable range of alternatives for the EIR;
- 3) support the evaluation of project alternatives; and
- 4) aid decision-makers in preparing findings.

FORA received written public comments on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives through submitted public comment forms, emails, and letters. Written public comments are included under **Attachment B**. At the December 6, 2017 public meetings, members of the public also offered spoken comments on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. Videos of the December 6, 2017 public meetings are included at the following websites:

1-3 pm video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ncJCAha6ZKk&feature=youtu.be>

6-8 pm video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MZqWUasUD_M&feature=youtu.be

FORA staff summarized these spoken public comments under **Attachment C**. FORA staff provided a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document on Eastside Parkway as materials at the public meetings and has periodically updated this document as additional questions are received. The current FAQ document is under **Attachment D**. As the Board reviews

Attachment A, any added Goals or Objectives will be incorporated.

The next steps include publishing and distributing the NOP with the finalized Goals and Objectives and proposed Project Description for a 30-day public review period. During that public review period, FORA will hold a public scoping meeting for the proposed project, which will include a charrette-style format. This meeting is anticipated for April 2018.

Additional Eastside Parkway information is available at the following FORA webpage: <http://fora.org/EastsideParkway.html>

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller 

Staff time for this item is included in the approved annual budget.

COORDINATION:

Authority Counsel, Whitson, DD&A, Administrative Committee and Executive Committee.

Prepared by  for
Jonathan Brinkmann

Approved by 
Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives

Proposed Project Background/Need:

The 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan identified Eastside Road as a facility within the on-site portion of the Fort Ord transportation network for the mitigation of the reuse of Fort Ord. Since FORA's first CIP (2001-2), Eastside Road has been included as a future "on-site" transportation facility. In 2010, Monterey County staff suggested renaming Eastside Road to Eastside Parkway and plan line studies were prepared to avoid impacts to CSUMB circulation.

The most recent 2017 Fee Reallocation Study prepared by TAMC, in coordination with FORA, included Eastside Parkway as an important part of the FORA CIP, modeled to accommodate 18,586 average daily trips. The Study concluded that the transportation network in the FORA CIP would provide sufficient roadway improvements for the approved reuse of Fort Ord. The Study results for a "No Build" scenario shows that, by 2035, if FORA does not complete the FORA CIP transportation projects, seven of the existing roadways in the current FORA project list will operate at deficient levels of service (LOS) E or F. These results demonstrated that the FORA CIP projects provide measurable improvement to the roadway network to address future development-related transportation deficiencies.

Proposed Project Goals and Objectives:

The purpose of the proposed project is to make improvements to the on-site former Fort Ord transportation system necessary to reduce future traffic congestion along Highway 1, 12th Street (now Imjin Parkway), Blanco Road, and the Del Monte/2nd/General Jim Moore Boulevard corridor while maintaining valued recreational, cultural, and natural resources, consistent with the Reuse Plan FEIR and Development and Resource Management Plan (BRP Vol.1, pg. 119, pgs.194-203, BRP Vol.2 pg. 295 and pg. 298). The primary objectives for implementing the proposed project are:

- Provide a primary southwest-northeast corridor through former Fort Ord, while maintaining an acceptable level of service throughout the FORA CIP roadway network with the implementation of the approved reuse of Fort Ord (BRP Vol.1 pg. 119, BRP Vol.2 pg. 297-298, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Improve and provide efficient regional travel and access to the former Fort Ord, reducing travel time and distances and associated traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution emissions (BRP Vol. 2 pg. 298, Commercial Land Use Objective E and program E-1.1, pg. 261, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 21, 44, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Serve the area immediately south of CSUMB campus (BRP Vol.2 pg. 295).

- Avoid bisecting CSUMB Campus (BRP Vol.2 Institutional Land Use Program A-1.4 on pg. 278, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 76).
- De-emphasize Inter-Garrison Road as a major vehicular route with greater emphasis placed on pedestrian and bicycle traffic (BRP Vol.2 pg. 295).
- Provide direct and efficient linkages from former Fort Ord lands to the regional transportation system (BRP Vol.2 Objective B, pg. 299, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 44, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Provide a safe and efficient street system at the former Fort Ord (BRP Vol.2 Objective C, pg. 299, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 74, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Connect the Fort Ord National Monument and California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery to regional roadways (BRP Vol.2 Objective A, pg. 298 and Recreation Policy A-1, pg. 327, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 7, 44, 53, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Design the project to respect and integrate natural resources by minimizing impacts to coast live oak woodland, special-status species, and wildlife corridors (BRP Vol.2 Recreational/Open Space Objective A, pg. 263, Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, Biological Resources Policy C-2, pg. 383, and Recreation Policy C-1, pg. 328, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 4, 12, 34, 44, 49, 59, 84, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Maintain the aesthetic character of the area by avoiding or minimizing impacts from grading to major topographical features such as drainages, steep slopes, and scenic viewsheds (BRP Vol.2 Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, and Biological Resources Policy C-1, pg. 383, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 59, 70, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Minimize noise impacts adjacent to sensitive receptors (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 77).
- Consider the safety of residents, pedestrians, bicyclists, and wildlife through various project design features by:
 - Providing dedicated pedestrian and bicycle facilities (BRP Vol.2 Commercial Land Use Policy E-2 and program E-2.2, pg.261 and Pedestrian and Bicycles Objectives A and B, pg. 308, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 8, 21, 77, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments);

- Considering Regional Urban Design Guidelines for complete street design features (BRP Vol.1 pg. 61, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 34); and
- Implementing design features to minimize impacts to wildlife movement (BRP Vol.1 pg. 128, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 53, 58, 71, 77, 78, 84, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Protect designated habitat management areas from potential roadway edge effects by applying suitable buffers and project design features (BRP Vol.2 Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, and Biological Resources Policy C-3, pg. 384, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 71, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Minimize environmental impacts on existing communities, including, but not limited to CSUMB campus, City of Seaside, City of Marina, City of Del Rey Oaks, City of Monterey, MPC, and East Garrison (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 4, 24 49, 58, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Accommodate and maintain existing and proposed trail networks, including, but not limited to, the Fort Ord Recreational Trail and Greenway and other regional trails (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments, pgs. 3, 8, 44, 47, 50, 53, 59, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).

Item 8d, Attachment B

**is available for download at the following web
location:**

http://fora.org/Board/2018/Packet/Additional/011218_Item8d-AttachB_ESP_GO_written_comments.pdf

Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments

Background/Purpose

On December 6, 2017, FORA staff and consultants held community workshop in the form of two meetings from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm and from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm to seek public input on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. FORA provided an Eastside Parkway Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document as a handout for the public at the staff table along with Comment Sheets for written comments and speaker cards for spoken comments. After presenting information on Eastside Parkway Background, Roadway Network Overview, and CEQA Goals and Objectives, including examples of Goals and Objectives, FORA staff invited public comment on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives.

The primary purpose of the community workshop was to seek public input on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. The local community who attended expressed criticism of the process, concerns about the conceptual Eastside Parkway improvement, reasons why the improvement is needed, and input for specific Goals and Objectives.

Criticism of the Process

FORA received spoken public comments from 35 people. Many members of the public found fault with the process. Examples of comments included:

- There is no opportunity for questions to be answered at this meeting;
- Not adequate notice/announcements;
- This is not a workshop;
- Prefer a charrette and/or small groups for discussion;
- Workshop does not provide opportunity for public participation or dialogue;
- Email address to send comments not available on website as of 6 pm session;
- I thought I would see a map and have a map to draw on;
- I thought I would see alternatives to Eastside Parkway;
- How can we give Goals and Objectives on a road alignment we haven't seen.

Eastside Parkway - Concerns

Out of the 35 speakers, most of those commenting stated their concerns about Eastside Parkway. Examples of comments included:

- Traffic impacts to roadways adjacent to Eastside Parkway (such as Inter-Garrison Rd and Coe Ave);
- Keep open space accessible for recreation;
- Develop in the already developed areas of the base and upgrade existing roads;
- Maximize infill development first;
- Do not bisect open space areas of Fort Ord;
- Respect Fort Ord Rec. Trail and Greenway (FORTAG);
- Impacts to Fort Ord National Monument (FONM);
- Support future needs of workers and residents;
- Facilitates Monterey Downs/future development;

- Funding and prioritization concerns;
- Consistency with and integration of Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG);
- Monterey Peninsula has reached visitor capacity and ESP might facilitate more growth;
- Impacts to “Happy Trails” area;
- Visual and noise impacts;
- Encourages more traffic;
- No additional encroachment on natural lands;
- Improve existing facilities instead of Eastside Parkway;
- Wildlife and plant impact concerns (e.g., corridor/movement, gray fox, plants, oak tree);
- Integration with Oak Woodland Conservation Plan process and future Seaside East development;
- Increase in dumping of trash;
- Don’t follow outdated Base Reuse Plan – projections are very different now;
- Eastside Parkway is not needed now or in the future;
- Build affordable housing near jobs instead of Eastside Parkway;
- Improve transit and ride sharing instead of Eastside Parkway.

Eastside Parkway - Need

A few speakers stated that Eastside Parkway is a needed improvement. Examples of comments included:

- Need additional route and not attached to any specific alignment;
- Link Salinas to the Peninsula to move commuters back and forth;
- Increase routes North and South;
- Important for future;
- Important for local workers and residents;
- Additional route would shorten commute times and alleviate stress;
- Integrate and provide access with FORTAG;
- Existing congestion is local traffic, not visitors;
- Connect to Veterans Cemetery;
- Locate an alignment with access to BLM trailheads and 8th/Gigling parking area/trailhead.

Goals and Objectives Input

FORA staff reviewed in detail the spoken public comments with the aim of identifying input on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. The following is a list of public input on Goals (open bullet “○”) and Objectives (square “■”):

- Reduce the need for a new roadway by increasing affordable housing in the Peninsula cities;
- Plan for increased traffic on end-point roads;

- Plan ahead for post-FORA Eastside Parkway construction, be transparent as to the next steps;
- Preserve “open areas;”
- Utilize existing facilities;
- Tear down barracks;
- Preserve the clean air;
- Include wildlife migration protection;
- Recognize value of “Happy Trails” recreation and habitat area benefits, which have grown since the BRP (“Happy Trails” extent is North and Northwest of the Fort Ord National Monument, south of Inter-Garrison, east of the Veterans Cemetery and west of Reservation Road);
- Reiterate allowed flexibility of the Reuse Plan for amendment (Volume 1, last paragraph);
- Choose an option with minimal risk of costing too much money and eventually not being constructed;
- Maximize the incentive to build housing near employment;
- Maximize overlap with infill development;
- Defer this project until FORA measures 50-75% residential buildout;
- Consider bussing of workers, work with TAMC;
- Consider light rail instead of parkway;
- Maximize reuse of existing roads by widening;
- Minimize visibility of traffic as seen from recreational and habitat areas;
- Minimize sound of traffic as heard from recreational and habitat areas;
- Make more incentives for people to choose active transportation and mass transit;
- Develop more mass transit;
- Keep open spaces safely accessible as they are currently utilized by children at play on bicycles and on foot;
- Consider carpool lanes and carpool programs, or spread out traffic by encouraging variable work hours;
- Improve General Jim Moore Blvd by added roundabouts in place of stop signs and then study traffic flow;
- Improve traffic patterns on the current roadway network before looking at adding roads;
- Make project consistent with FORTAG and access to trailheads;
- Maintain public access to open space;
- Allow for free and safe West to East crossing, including people in wheelchairs, with strollers, or on horseback, such as underpasses or overpasses;
- Locate a road alignment with access to BLM trailheads and equip the trailheads with facilities;
- Utilize illuminated walkways over or under the roadway;
- Reduce the anticipated and current impact of commuters from the Salinas Valley to the Monterey Peninsula while at the same time reducing impacts on wildlife, open space and open space users (recreational users);
 - Increase the width of Imjin Road to match Imjin Parkway and add roundabouts as a way to carry more people;

- Increase multimodal transportation including safe bike access and frequency of busses;
- Infill center of Hwy 1 with a new vehicle lane that changes direction by time of day;
- Build a north-south route with alignment to the Veterans Cemetery;
- Build tunnels under, or natural bridges over, the roadway to allow wildlife and recreational crossing;
- Include parking for BLM entry;
- Link Salinas to the Peninsula to move commuters back and forth;
- Integrate with FORTAG trails;
- Minimize harm to wildlife and the environment;
- Increase the number of routes north and south but prioritize fixing routes that are now in place first;
- Amend the reuse plan to recognize the value the public has placed on the geography around 8th and Gigling with respect to habitat and recreation;
- No additional bifurcation of the recreational areas of former Fort Ord;
- No additional encroachment of the development footprint (busy roads and buildings) toward the core habitat areas of the former Fort Ord;
- No bifurcation of the remaining oak woodlands on former Fort Ord;
- Consider the impact distance that wildlife species experience, as described in Fred Watson's journal article highlighting gray foxes;
- Use an efficient design to save as much money as possible if the Eastside Parkway is built, since the money will come from Marina;
 - Utilize existing roads to save money on the alignment such as 8th Avenue or General Jim Moore Blvd.;
- Adversely affect open space as little as possible;
 - Utilize existing roads to minimize open space impacts;
- Maximize safety of residents of CSUMB's East Campus housing in commuting to campus;
 - Establish bike and pedestrian routes north or south of, but parallel to Inter-Garrison Road;
- Respect FORTAG and how it respects the natural contours of the land and the public need and desire;
- Leave FORTAG implementable the way it was designed;
- Complete streets, not expressway;
- Look at the topography and allow for future use as bicycle-prominent route;
- Create a buffer/borderland between road and wildlands;
- Incorporate/be consistent with RUDG;
- Avoid encroaching on "edge zone" of the "wilderness";
- Minimize use of traffic signals and stop signs (General Jim Moore Blvd has too many).

Eastside Parkway Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) 01-02-18

1. What is Eastside Parkway and what is it intended to do?

Eastside Parkway is a conceptual Southwest-Northeast arterial roadway within the Fort Ord on-site transportation network. The Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) FY 05-06 thru 17-18 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) documents describe the conceptual roadway as a 2-lane arterial roadway from Eucalyptus Road to Schoonover Drive. Eastside Parkway is expected to accommodate 18,586 average daily trips (ADT) at 2035 (see “2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study” [http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf] for additional information).

2. What will the alignment of Eastside Parkway look like when it’s complete?

The alignment of Eastside Parkway has not yet been determined. As next steps in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process for the roadway, FORA will prepare a statement of the project’s goals and objectives and a project description of the proposed project. The precise alignment of Eastside Parkway will not be determined until the CEQA process is complete.

3. When and how was the public informed of FORA’s plan to build Eastside Parkway?

In 1996, FORA circulated its Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan and accompanying Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which included Eastside Parkway in the Fort Ord Transportation Network, for public review and comment. In 1997, the FORA Board adopted the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and its Final EIR (FEIR). The FEIR identified the following impact: Increase Travel Demand on Regional Transportation System (FEIR, pg. 4-108). It also identified the following mitigation for this impact: A Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) to establish programs and monitor development at Fort Ord to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities and water supply shall be established by FORA (FEIR, pg. 4-112). Section 3.11.5.3 (a) of the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan (a component of the DRMP) states: FORA shall fund its “Fair Share” of “on-site,” “off-site,” and “regional” roadway and transit capital improvements based on the nexus analysis of the TAMC regional transportation model (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume 1, pg. 195).

Eastside Road, renamed Eastside Parkway by County staff in 2010, is an “on-site” road within the Fort Ord Transportation Network identified in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan and its accompanying FEIR, 3 traffic studies in 1997, 2005, and 2017, and in FORA’s annual CIP documents from 2001-02 to present. The FORA Board prioritized Eastside Parkway funding in the 2009/10 mid-year CIP and maintained this funding priority in subsequent, annual CIP document approvals. These documents are available on the FORA website: <http://fora.org/EastsideParkway.html>

4. What Fort Ord developments does Eastside Parkway serve?

Eastside Road was designed as a part of a network that accommodated Fort Ord and regional traffic. Per the 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation study, the conceptual alignment from General Jim Moore Blvd to Inter-Garrison Rd would serve regional traffic and local former Fort Ord traffic areas such as East Garrison, East Campus Housing, California State University Monterey Bay, Defense Manpower and Data Center, California Central Coast Veteran’s Cemetery and Presidio of

Monterey military housing, and future planned developments, such as Campus Town and Seaside East. Future traffic conditions in 2035 modeled in the “2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study” show that Eastside Parkway would provide important roadway capacity, meaning 18,586 ADT would use Eastside Parkway. TAMC modeled the 2035 scenario finding that, with TAMC’s Regional Transportation Plan and the FORA CIP, roadways in the Fort Ord Transportation Network would perform within acceptable levels of service (LOS) D or better.

5. If Fort Ord developments are not built, will Eastside Parkway still be necessary?

Fort Ord developments have been entitled, built, and are being planned consistent with the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan. There is no expectation the recovery program will not be completed. The 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan DRMP (Section 3.11.5) allows development within certain financial and resource constraints, such as 6,600 acre-feet per year of Salinas Valley groundwater (Section 3.11.5.4(b) Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume 1, pg. 197). The FORA Board has not amended the DRMP. Therefore, planning for less development than allowed in the DRMP has not been studied, including performing additional traffic studies under a reduced development scenario.

6. Will there be bike paths on Eastside Parkway?

Yes. The integration of bike path and trail connections with the former Fort Ord roadway network is an important part of the design of each roadway.

7. How will Eastside Parkway be funded?

Eastside Parkway is funded through the FORA CIP. The primary source of funds for the FORA CIP is the FORA Community Facilities District (CFD) Special Tax, which is a one-time special tax on former Fort Ord development. For additional details, you can access the current FORA CIP document on the FORA website: <http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf>

8. Why was Eastside Parkway designed to go through open space and disrupt habitat?

Eastside Parkway is a component of an on-base (“on-site”) network of roads that addresses access issues under the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan identifies nearly 18,000 acres of habitat for permanent conservation and enjoyment by the Monterey Bay community and others, in accordance with the approved 1997 Fort Ord Habitat Management Plan (HMP). The HMP was developed and is being implemented base-wide to mitigate for the potential reuse development impacts to special-status species and sensitive habitats on the former Fort Ord. Access to these habitat management areas, including the Fort Ord National Monument, is a key element in the CIP priority for completing this roadway. As noted above, Eastside Parkway is a conceptual Southwest-Northeast arterial roadway within the Fort Ord on-site transportation network. The impact of the roadway on environmental conditions is yet to be determined and the precise alignment will not be finalized until CEQA is complete. Potential impacts to the habitat management areas under the HMP and other habitat areas have been, and continue to be, considered in planning for reuse of the former Fort Ord, including the location of future roadways.

9. Why is FORA still using the current conceptual alignment for Eastside Parkway?

FORA is not using the current conceptual alignment for Eastside Parkway.

10. What was the lawsuit about, and what was the error by the County and FORA? How was it corrected?

FORA, County of Monterey, and the County of Monterey Redevelopment Agency approved a 5-party memorandum of agreement (MOA) in 2011, agreeing to grant road rights of way (ROW) along the conceptual Eastside Parkway alignment to the County of Monterey. Keep Fort Ord Wild (KFOW) filed a lawsuit arguing that FORA and the County of Monterey should have completed CEQA prior to approval of the 2011 MOA. The Court sided with KFOW, and FORA and County of Monterey subsequently settled with KFOW and rescinded their 2011 MOA approvals.

11. At the two December 6 FORA events on the Eastside Parkway, FORA talked about a "third route." Can you please tell me more about what is meant by a third route?

On December 6th, FORA consultant Andy Hunter with Whitson Engineers presented information about a "3rd Corridor" that would connect the Salinas Valley to the Monterey Peninsula, from Davis Road westerly to Reservation Road to Inter-Garrison Road to Eastside Parkway to the Monterey Peninsula. The other two existing corridors are described as:

- 1) Blanco Road westerly to Reservation Road to Imjin Parkway to Highway 1 South and
- 2) Highway 68 Monterey-Salinas Highway westerly to the Monterey Peninsula.

Three two-directional green arrows show these three corridors' starting points on slides 24-26 of 32 of the December 6, 2017 presentation

(http://fora.org/Presentations/Eastside_Parkway_Workshop_12-06-17.pdf). These slides show modeled changes in ADT from existing conditions to 2035. The source of this information is the TAMC "2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study" (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf).

12. Where do you get on the Parkway at either end?

Although the proposed alignment and associated project description have not been determined, it is generally described as Davis Road westerly to Reservation Road to Inter-Garrison Road to Eastside Parkway to General Jim Moore Blvd to the Monterey Peninsula. FORA's CIP transportation improvements are generally described in the CIP. <http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf>

13. What happens with the extra traffic, as it would bring accidents, go by the middle school on Coe, and via Hilby, with the increase in traffic that building this road would bring?

FORA has not yet completed a project description for Eastside Parkway. FORA is considering options. When FORA prepares the EIR, traffic impacts, including potential safety hazards, will be identified and analyzed under the EIR and provided to the public and decision-makers.

14. Where can I find a map of the proposed project?

See the response to FAQ #12. FORA will present maps at the EIR Scoping Meeting anticipated to be in April 2018.

15. What efforts will you take to ensure the FORA Board does not rubber stamp the same alignment?

CEQA requires FORA to complete a Notice of Preparation (NOP) stating that an EIR will be prepared. The NOP will include a project description and a statement of project goals and objectives. FORA is seeking community input on the project goals and objectives for this reason. In accordance with CEQA, FORA will proceed with an environmental review process that involves public participation, evaluation of a project's environmental impacts, and analysis and consideration of reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project to reduce environmental impacts, including a "no-project" alternative.

16. How is the project prioritized in the CIP without an alignment? How do you know how much it costs if you don't know the alignment?

The FORA Administrative Committee recommends CIP transportation improvements' funding priorities to the FORA Board. The FORA Board establishes CIP priorities. The FORA CIP describes the Eastside Parkway improvement as a 2-lane arterial roadway from Eucalyptus Road to Schoonover Drive. This description and cost estimate comes from TAMC's 2005 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2005.pdf). The cost estimate was developed by professional staff and is generally based on a per mile cost assumption (following industry best practices) for a conceptual 2-lane arterial roadway. The estimated roadway length (identified conceptually in Appendix C of the 2005 study) was multiplied by a cost per mile factor.

17. Why this prioritization?

The FORA Board establishes CIP priorities as set forth in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan (Volume I, DRMP Section 3.11.5.6 on page 202.) They are tasked to complete the FORA CIP. The representatives of this region's leadership serve on the Board to fulfill the vision of reuse and recovery of former Fort Ord. See the response to FAQs #3 and #16 for additional information.

18. Without Goals and Objectives set for this project, how did it rise to the top of the CIP?

Although FORA has not set specific project Goals and Objectives, the Fort Ord Reuse Plan has a Goal in the circulation element which states: *"Create and maintain a balanced transportation system, including pedestrian ways, bikeways, transit, and streets, to provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods to and throughout the former Fort Ord."* (pg. 281) Additionally, the circulation element includes multiple objectives:

Objective A, "an efficient regional network of roadways that provides access to the former Fort Ord."

Objective B, "Provide direct and efficient linkages from former Fort Ord lands to the regional transportation system."

Objective C, "Provide a safe and efficient street system at the former Fort Ord."

For additional information, see the responses to FAQs #16 and #17 above.

19. How can this parkway be deferred to the time when FORA has completed more like 50-75% of the residential buildout?

The FORA Board establishes priority for its CIP transportation improvements, including Eastside Parkway. See responses to FAQs #16 and #17.

20. What aren't circulation improvements being considered, such as 2nd Avenue completion, before trying to complete this rather large parkway?

See response to FAQ #16 regarding transportation improvement prioritization process. Other onsite roads yet to be completed include: Abrams Drive, 8th Street, Gigling Road, Salinas Avenue, and South Boundary Road. Offsite roads yet to be completed include: Del Monte extension (aka 2nd Avenue), Davis Road north of Blanco, Davis Road south of Blanco, Widen Reservation Road to 4 lanes to Watkins Gate, and Crescent Avenue extension to Abrams. Regional improvements include Highway 1 in Seaside and Sand City, Highway 1 Monterey Road Interchange, and Highway 156 freeway upgrade.

21. What forms of alternatives are being considered and evaluated, including other methods of transportation, things other than cars?

Completion of FORA's "Fair Share" of transit improvements, listed in FORA's CIP, is a mitigation described in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan FEIR. CIP Transit improvements include: 1) Transit Vehicle Purchase and Replacement, and 2) Intermodal Centers. See the FY17-18 CIP for more detailed descriptions (<http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf>). Additionally, FORA contributed matching funds to TAMC for a CalTrans planning grant, which resulted in a recommended Marina to Salinas multimodal corridor alignment. For Eastside Parkway, FORA will proceed with an environmental review process with public participation, environmental impact analysis and consideration of reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project to reduce environmental impacts, including a "no-project" alternative, and project evaluation.

22. Can there be bus transportation for staff like what Monterey Bay Aquarium and Google use? (I know this is not FORA but industry leadership question).

FORA supports alternative transportation modes, such as employer-sponsored shuttle routes. FORA urges you to take these ideas to the various entities that can initiate them. See the response to FAQ #21 for information about FORA's contributions to transit improvements in the region.

23. The schedule for completion goes until mid-2019. There may be delays. What happens if FORA sunsets on time? Who will build the road, where will the money come from?

FORA is required to complete a Transition Plan before January 2019. The FORA Transition Plan must address remaining CIP obligations, including Eastside Parkway. If FORA dissolves before Eastside Parkway is completed, another local or regional entity would likely be assigned this obligation.

24. How will the secondary roads from the Parkway be expanded, and who is going to pay for that?

As part of the Eastside Parkway EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including traffic impacts. Measures will be identified to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative.

25. What's going to happen with South Boundary Road, and Highway 218, if you put more people down General Jim Moore Blvd?

As part of the Eastside Parkway EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including traffic impacts. Measures will be created to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative. The public is referred to the 2017 TAMC Fee Reallocation Study for traffic data as referenced in question #13 through #16.

26. What are you going to do, dump all these people onto Canyon del Rey?

As part of the Eastside Parkway EIR, FOR A will assess a number of impacts including traffic impacts. Measures will be created to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative. The public is referred to the 2017 TAMC Fee Reallocation Study for traffic data as referenced in question #13 through #16.

27. How does FORA plan to mitigate the intrusion of Eastside Parkway to the natural animal migration? Wildlife corridor?

As part of the Eastside Parkway EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including potential impacts to native wildlife and wildlife movement. Measures will be identified to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative.

28. Could 68 be made four lanes to alleviate traffic?

To address traffic congestion on Highway 68, TAMC studied Highway 68 capacity improvement alternatives in their State Route 68 Scenic Highway Plan. This plan was completed in August 2017 and is available at the following website: <http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/highway-projects/sr-68-scenic-highway-plan/>

29. There are popular trailheads in the area that the Parkway will cross. What will help people cross West to East from trails, including people with strollers, on horseback, and in wheelchairs?

As part of the Eastside Parkway EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including recreation impacts. Measures will be identified to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about impacts and mitigations would be speculative.

30. How would Eastside Parkway fit in with the Oak Woodlands Conservation Plan, and what have FORA and City of Seaside done around that work?

FORA is considering all reasonable and feasible alignments for Eastside Parkway. Currently, the County of Monterey and City of Seaside are considering various potential oak woodland conservation areas within their former Fort Ord lands to meet Fort Ord Reuse Plan policies and programs. For additional information, please visit the following website: www.oakwoodlands.org. Since FORA will consider a number of potential alignments and alternatives for Eastside Parkway,

there is the potential that one or more alignment options could traverse one of the draft oak woodland conservation areas. At this current draft planning stage, the City of Seaside and County of Monterey's oak woodland conservation planning efforts take into account that potential future road and trail rights of way may reduce the acreage of conserved oak woodland if they overlap. FORA, the City of Seaside, and County of Monterey will continue to coordinate these planning efforts. One effort does not preclude the other.

31. "Seaside East," on roughly 700 acres on the East side of General Jim Moore Blvd., is coming. How will that be developed and does FORA take that development into account in the Eastside Parkway? Or is it just traffic loads ADT today?

The City of Seaside is responsible for Seaside East development, and provides FORA with annual development forecasts for that area. Those forecasts also inform TAMC studies such as the 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf). TAMC's traffic studies utilize the AMBAG regional traffic model to assess 2035 project development (i.e. population and jobs) and the number of trips using the transportation system in 2035. The traffic loads today, measured by ADT, are relevant since they serve as a baseline for future studies. See the response to question #13 for more information about Eastside Parkway traffic impacts and mitigations.

32. How does this solve current traffic issues or resolve current bottlenecks?

Having an additional major route between the Salinas Valley and Monterey Peninsula cities will redistribute vehicle trips among more routes and is likely to result in less congestion during peak hours. TAMC's 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf) examined the levels of service (LOS) for FORA CIP transportation improvements at a base year of 2010 and a future condition of 2035. If the projected population growth in 2035 occurs without FORA's CIP transportation improvements, a number of roadways will have an unacceptable LOS. With FORA's CIP transportation improvements, it is anticipated that the roadways will have an acceptable LOS with future traffic conditions.

33. Do the development and traffic forecasts in the Reuse Plan justify the Parkway now or in the future? If not, what specific projects and traffic forecasts do justify it? And how did it rise to the top of the CIP list?

These questions are similar to question # 16 and question #32. Please see the responses to these questions.

34. How come the Fort Ord BRP adopted in 1997 is still living in '97 concepts? Things have moved on, AMBAG has moved on, has FORA? Growth and economic development changes. How does the BRP reflect new thinking compared to something that was put in writing and tied to property rights and deed restrictions in 1997?

The 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan provides for flexibility in meeting mitigations. For example, DRMP section 3.11.5.3(b) states: "FORA will retain the flexibility to build roadway improvements to the "on-site" and "off-site" network... [and] will participate in reimbursement programs to recover expenses beyond Fort Ord's fair share when alternative programs for financing roadway and transit improvements are established." (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume I, pg. 195) DRMP Section

3.11.5.3(d) outlines how FORA will work with TAMC to monitor current and projected traffic LOS to “prevent development from exceeding FORA’s LOS standards.” (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume I, pg. 195). See the responses to FAQs #3, #5, and #17 for more information on the DRMP as it relates to roadway improvements.

35. Which policies should the alignment defer to, such as “we need to have Oak Woodlands and that we need to have Habitat Management,” that have other objectives?

The 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan and its FEIR do not prioritize one mitigation or one policy or program above another. However, as CIP transportation improvements and other projects proceed, multiple policies and programs are taken into account. For example, Reuse Plan policies and programs require establishment of an oak woodland conservation area. Biological Resources Policy B-2 (County of Monterey) states: “as site specific planning proceeds, for...” [certain former Fort Ord polygons,] “the County shall coordinate with the Cities of Seaside and Marina, California State University, FORA, and other interested entities in the designation of an oak woodland conservation area...” The County of Monterey and City of Seaside are currently engaged in this planning process. At this current draft planning stage, their oak woodland conservation planning assumes road and trail rights of way will reduce total oak woodland to be conserved.

Examples of other policies and programs include: Biological Resources Program C-2.3, Streets and Roads Program B-1.2, Pedestrian and Bicycles Policies A-1 and B-1, Recreation Policy A-1, Recreation Policy F-1, Noise Policy A-1, Noise Policy B-9, and Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Program B-1.4. This is not a definitive list of policies and programs that have other objectives and will be taken into account as part of the Eastside Parkway CEQA process.

36. What specifically are the traffic problems we are trying to solve? Which of those are existing, which are anticipated in the future? For the ones that are in the future, when are they going to be experienced?

According to some members of the public who have spoken at FORA meetings, there are existing traffic problems on local roadways, including Highway 1, Imjin Parkway, and Highway 68. This traffic congestion exists now and is expected to increase as population continues to grow in the Salinas Valley and the former Fort Ord (to meet reuse plan targets of replacing the Army’s population before base closure). While it cannot be predicted exactly when or with what specific scenario a roadway LOS will reach an unacceptable level, it can be predicted through modeling and other types of analyses that if the entirety of FORA’s CIP transportation improvements are not completed between now and 2035, these thresholds will be surpassed for many roadways. For more information, please see TAMC’s 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study: (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf).

37. What are the CEQA mitigations that are required in the plan?

Completion of FORA’s “Fair Share” of transportation improvements, listed in FORA’s CIP (<http://fora.org/Reports/CIP/CIPReports/CIP2017-18.pdf>) pg. 18, is a mitigation described in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan FEIR (4.7 Traffic and Circulation).

The FEIR identified the following impact: Increase Travel Demand on Regional Transportation System (pg. 4-108). It also identified the following mitigation for this impact: “A Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) to establish programs and monitor development at Fort Ord

to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities and water supply shall be established by FORA.” This is identified in the FEIR as a mitigation on page 4-112.

The DRMP states: FORA shall fund its “Fair Share” of “on-site,” “off-site,” and “regional” roadway and transit capital improvements based on the nexus analysis of the TAMC regional transportation model (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume 1, pg. 195).

Other mitigations include Land Use Compatibility, Socioeconomic impacts to population, housing, employment, personal income, social services, military retiree benefits, and schools, Geology and Soils impacts including soil, erosion, soil limitations, and agriculture/horticulture, Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply impacts such as wastewater, solid waste, telephone service, gas and electric service, cable television, storm drainage, water distribution, and water supply, Hydrology and Water Quality impacts such as surface water hydrology, ground water hydrology, surface water quality, groundwater quality, Public Health and Safety impacts such as law enforcement, fire protection, emergency medical services, seismic safety, and hazardous materials, Traffic and Circulation, covered above in part, and including transit service, and pedestrian and bicycles networks, Climate and Air Quality impacts, including the topography and meteorology, existing ambient air quality, and health effects of pollutants, Noise, impacts to Biological Resources, including Biological Communities, special status species, and preserves and significant natural areas, impacts to visual Resources, impacts to Cultural Resources, impacts resulting from development of the University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science, and Technology Center (UC MBEST), and Cumulative Impacts. FORA’s CIP shows the remaining impacts that FORA is funding Water Augmentation, Habitat Management, and Transportation/Transit, as well as obligations that are underway.

38. What are the relevant documents that show that by building the Eastside Parkway, CEQA mitigations are addressed?

Please see these studies:

TAMC’s 1997 Fort Ord Transportation Study
(http://fora.org/Reports/1997_Fort_Ord_Transportation_Study.pdf)

TAMC’s 2005 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2005.pdf)

TAMC’s 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf).

39. What are the CEQA mitigations that when in the BRP was adopted that we’re supposed to be mitigating?

Please see the responses to questions #37 and #38 above.

40. How can I evaluate any alignment that meets those mitigations if I don’t know what they are? Tell me chapter and verse, where are they?

Please see the responses to questions #37 and #38 above.

41. What is the Monterey Peninsula carrying capacity and visitor capacity?

We suggest contacting the Monterey County Convention and Visitors Bureau. The website is <https://www.seemonterey.com>.

42. Is it enough to say, let's just build more housing? (workforce housing)

Historically and currently, morning and evening traffic congestion occurs on roadways connecting the Salinas Valley to cities on Monterey Peninsula. One of the fundamental causes of this is Salinas Valley residents travelling to and from workplaces on the Monterey Peninsula. TAMC monitors regional roadway traffic. (<http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/traffic-counts>). See the Highway 68 Scenic Plan for peak hour congestion information (<http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/highway-projects/sr-68-scenic-highway-plan/>). Building workforce housing near workplaces on the Peninsula could reduce trips and the stress on our transportation system. FORA requires jurisdictions to submit affordable and workforce housing plans for projects on Fort Ord.

43. On the detailed timeline, it is not clear when and by whom the preferred project will be developed? It is not clear if it will include public input.

As noted in FAQ responses above, including #30, 31, & 32, FORA will first engage a robust public outreach program, establish goals and objectives, analyze reasonable alternatives, and assess impacts. Once the preferred project is selected, a description will be included with the Notice of Preparation, which is scheduled for Spring 2018. FORA has been seeking input on Goals and Objectives to help define the Project Description. There will be opportunities for public comment at each step.

44. Does this road open up our community, in the future, for more major developments, like what we just overcame, the horse track?

FORA is contributing to the region's long-term best interest by ensuring that the transportation network will be functional in the future. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan has goals for economic recovery for the area that include development in a subset of the parcels that were or are to be conveyed to landholding jurisdictions. The decision to develop those parcels and how to develop them lies with the jurisdictions. The jurisdictions' developments have Base Reuse Plan level oversight through FORA, in the form of consistency determinations. For more information on the Consistency Determination process, please see the FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 (<http://fora.org/Reports/MasterResolution.pdf>).

45. How many cars ride 68, Imjin, single person? How about carpooling and carpool lanes?

TAMC gathers annual jurisdictions' trip counts on a number of roadway facilities. Those trip counts do not track amount of people transported in a single trip (See FAQ #42). The AMBAG regional transportation model includes statistical assumptions about trips accommodated by ridesharing. TAMC's trip count information is available at the following website: <http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/traffic-counts>

AMBAG maintained a ridesharing program. It has been transferred to TAMC.

46. For the 2035 anticipated roads, what roads become four lane and what stay two lane? And what's the maximum ADT for a four-lane road?

This is a question of efficiency of intersections, traffic speed, and many other factors. Four-lane roadways are expected to include Reservation Road, Gigling Road, Davis Road, and a portion of Inter-Garrison Road east of CSUMB. Del Monte Boulevard Extension in Marina and Eastside Parkway in Monterey County may connect to four-lane facilities, which may require four-lanes for a portion of those facilities.

Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives

Proposed Project Background/Need:

The 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan identified Eastside Road as a facility within the on-site portion of the Fort Ord transportation network for the mitigation of the reuse of Fort Ord. Since FORA's first CIP (2001-2), Eastside Road has been included as a future "on-site" transportation facility. In 2010, Monterey County staff suggested renaming Eastside Road to Eastside Parkway and plan line studies were prepared to avoid impacts to CSUMB circulation.

The most recent 2017 Fee Reallocation Study prepared by TAMC, in coordination with FORA, included Eastside Parkway as an important part of the FORA CIP, modeled to accommodate 18,586 average daily trips. The Study concluded that the transportation network in the FORA CIP would provide sufficient roadway improvements for the approved reuse of Fort Ord. The Study results for a "No Build" scenario shows that, by 2035, if FORA does not complete the FORA CIP transportation projects, seven of the existing roadways in the current FORA project list will operate at deficient levels of service (LOS) E or F. These results demonstrated that the FORA CIP projects provide measurable improvement to the roadway network to address future development-related transportation deficiencies.

Proposed Project Goals and Objectives:

The purpose of the proposed project is to make improvements to the on-site former Fort Ord transportation system necessary to reduce future traffic congestion along Highway 1, 12th Street (now Imjin Parkway), Blanco Road, and the Del Monte/2nd/General Jim Moore Boulevard corridor while maintaining valued recreational, cultural, and natural resources, consistent with the Reuse Plan FEIR and Development and Resource Management Plan (BRP Vol.1, pg. 119, pgs.194-203, BRP Vol.2 pg. 295 and pg. 298). The primary objectives for implementing the proposed project are:

- Provide a primary southwest-northeast corridor through former Fort Ord, while maintaining an acceptable level of service throughout the FORA CIP roadway network with the implementation of the approved reuse of Fort Ord (BRP Vol.1 pg. 119, BRP Vol.2 pg. 297-298, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Improve and provide efficient regional travel and access to the former Fort Ord, reducing travel time and distances and associated traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution emissions (BRP Vol. 2 pg. 298, Commercial Land Use Objective E and program E-1.1, pg. 261, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 21, 44, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- Serve the area immediately south of CSUMB campus (BRP Vol.2 pg. 295).

- ~~— Avoid bisecting CSUMB Campus (BRP Vol.2 Institutional Land Use Program A-1.4 on pg. 278, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 76).~~
- Minimize disrupting any community, including its expansion and circulation (FORA Board Meeting, January 12, 2018, BRP Vol.2 Institutional Land Use Program A-1.4 on pg. 278, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 76).
 - De-emphasize Inter-Garrison Road as a major vehicular route with greater emphasis placed on pedestrian and bicycle traffic (BRP Vol.2 pg. 295).
 - Provide direct and efficient linkages from former Fort Ord lands to the regional transportation system (BRP Vol.2 Objective B, pg. 299, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 44, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
 - Consider best practices in transportation planning, including regional and systemic improvements such as roundabouts and autonomous vehicles (FORA Board Meeting January 12, 2018).
 - Provide a safe and efficient street system at the former Fort Ord (BRP Vol.2 Objective C, pg. 299, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 74, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
 - Connect the Fort Ord National Monument and California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery to regional roadways (BRP Vol.2 Objective A, pg. 298 and Recreation Policy A-1, pg. 327, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 7, 44, 53, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
 - Design the project to respect and integrate natural resources by minimizing impacts to coast live oak woodland, special-status species, and wildlife corridors (BRP Vol.2 Recreational/Open Space Objective A, pg. 263, Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, Biological Resources Policy C-2, pg. 383, and Recreation Policy C-1, pg. 328, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 4, 12, 34, 44, 49, 59, 84, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
 - Maintain the aesthetic character of the area by avoiding or minimizing impacts from grading to major topographical features such as drainages, steep slopes, and scenic viewsheds (BRP Vol.2 Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, and Biological Resources Policy C-1, pg. 383, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 59, 70, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
 - Minimize noise impacts adjacent to sensitive receptors (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 77).
 - Consider the safety of residents, pedestrians, bicyclists, and wildlife through various project design features by:

- Providing dedicated pedestrian and bicycle facilities (BRP Vol.2 Commercial Land Use Policy E-2 and program E-2.2, pg.261 and Pedestrian and Bicycles Objectives A and B, pg. 308, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 8, 21, 77, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments);
 - Considering Regional Urban Design Guidelines for complete street design features (BRP Vol.1 pg. 61, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 34); and
 - Implementing design features to minimize impacts to wildlife movement (BRP Vol.1 pg. 128, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 53, 58, 71, 77, 78, 84, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments, [Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Emails to the Board of Directors Exhibit C pg. 17](#)).
- Protect designated habitat management areas from potential roadway edge effects by applying suitable buffers and project design features (BRP Vol.2 Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, and Biological Resources Policy C-3, pg. 384, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 71, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
 - Minimize environmental impacts on existing communities, including, but not limited to CSUMB campus, City of Seaside, City of Marina, City of Del Rey Oaks, City of Monterey, MPC, and East Garrison (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 4, 24 49, 58, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments, [Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Emails to the Board of Directors Exhibit C pg. 17](#)).
 - Accommodate and maintain existing and proposed trail networks, including, but not limited to, the Fort Ord Recreational Trail and Greenway and other regional trails (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments, pgs. 3, 8, 44, 47, 50, 53, 59, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
 - [Improve mobility of emergency system responders, including, but not limited to, firefighter access \(FORA Board Meeting, January 12, 2018\).](#)
 - [Improve MPC, CSUMB and other educational institutions' access for student, staff, and faculty \(FORA Board Meeting, January 12, 2018\).](#)
 - [Utilize the existing roadways as the foundation for the future network.](#)
 - [Comply with policies and programs of the Reuse Plan.](#)

Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Emails to the Board of Directors

Relating to the Board Meeting Agenda
Item 8d, January 12, 2018

From: Andrew Passell [mailto:ersb64@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 8:29 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: East side parkway is wrong

Please halt all planning for the Eastside Parkway. It will destroy a natural area and promote the wrong kind of development. It will not aid in the redevelopment of areas already developed by the army. It will not address traffic problems.

Andrew Passell

From: Anthony Oropeza [mailto:aeoropeza@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 9:25 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Input Re: Eastside Parkway

Dear Board Members,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the construction of the Eastside Parkway. The integrity of the environment must be maintained and enhanced, as well as natural habitat preserved. The actual need of the proposed parkway has not been sufficiently established or verified. As a resident and taxpayer of Monterey County, our taxpayer dollars would be put to better use by eliminating the blight on the former army base. Thank you for taking my position into consideration.

Respectfully,

Anthony E. Oropeza

aeoropeza@sbcglobal.net

From: Beverly Bean [mailto:beverlygb@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 5:52 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: NO to the Eastside Parkway

To the FORA Board:

The continued placement of the Eastside Parkway as your top priority project is in direct contradiction of the court order by Judge Villareal that your staff entirely re-evaluate this project. The settlement of this case has already cost the taxpayers \$510,000 in attorney's fees, split between FORA and the County.

The December "workshops" did not have any staff interaction with the public who showed up to discuss the Eastside Parkway. Following those sessions, the FORA staff ignored nearly all public input and drafted project goals that once again fail to identify a need for this project. You are wasting money on engineers for a project which is unnecessary, which bisects oak woodlands and which will fail in the next legal battle.

The fantasy that the Eastside Parkway is a required environmental mitigation is belied by your own Base Reuse Plan. Have any of the Board members read the Base Reuse Plan? Your faith in Executive Officer Michael Houlemard is misplaced and increasingly expensive.

What makes you think that continuing to disobey the court is part of your mission? Your spending of public funds on unnecessary projects and litigation is disappointing, to say the least.

Sincerely,

Beverly G. Bean
39 Calera Canyon Rd
Salinas, Ca. 93908

From: john-bonnie [mailto:johnwhisler@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 12:10 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: new road throught Fort Ord

Dear Board

I want you to know that I support LandWatch's goals.

I support improving existing roads.

I oppose a new road through valuable woodlands and recreation area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Whisler

Seaside

From: Dunebug67 [mailto:dunebug67@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 8:42 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: No Eastside Parkway Road

FORA:

The proposed new road is neither needed nor wanted. We realize there's a bigger agenda here (another potential housing development), and we will fight this as well as this new road you've been trying to develop since 1997.

Dalila Epperson

County of Monterey Resident

"The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make his face to shine upon you, and be gracious unto you; the Lord turn his face toward you and give you peace."

From: Daniel Weinstein [mailto:weinstein.daniel.j@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 12:33 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

Dear Chair Rubio, FORA directors, and FORA staff:

There is no demonstrated need for a new “parkway” in Fort Ord. Traffic volumes, regional traffic models, and other traffic data don’t justify it. Moreover, the public strongly opposes significant loss of oak woodlands, as made clear during the Whispering Oaks referenda and the Monterey Downs debacle.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours,

Daniel Weinstein

From: Dawn Poston [mailto:jumperdawn@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 8:05 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: East Side Parkway

Dear FORA members,

Please hold your ground and vote FOR the building of the East Side Parkway. It will bring much needed relief to Highway 68 and Highway 1. Remember that it was called for in the award winning Base Reuse Plan agreed to by all parties almost 20 years ago. Dawn Poston, 11575 McCarthy Road, Carmel Valley, 831 659 3331

From: Gary Courtright [mailto:gary@carmelkitchens.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 4:40 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Cc: 'gacourtright@sbcglobal.net' <gacourtright@sbcglobal.net>; Supervisor Parker <Jane.Parker@co.monterey.ca.us>; Supervisor Adams <district5@co.monterey.ca.us>; Mayor Gunter <salinasmayor@ci.salinas.ca.us>

Subject: East Side Parkway

To whom it may concern,

I am a constituent of Jane Parker's that lives in South Salinas with my business located in Mary Adams district. Being a businessman and a local advocate for open space and recreation areas, I have attended many FORA meetings including the most recent regarding the East Side Parkway as it directly impact my commute, access to trails and open space. I have been commuting from Salinas to Carmel since 2001. While I am not a civil engineer nor an expert on traffic control, I have traveled through and around former Fort Ord well over 10,000 trips over the years and feel my opinion and experience is worth sharing with you regarding the East Side Parkway. My opinion is that it is not needed in the current design nor if the future design infringes upon the access to open space. I feel that my tax dollars would be better applied to improving traffic flow with existing roads. Specifically, widening of Highway 68 and improving Highway 1. The East Side Parkway will only create another bottleneck where it drops onto 218 or Highway 1, it will do so without improving the overall traffic concerns that it is meant to address.

I strongly urge the FORA Board not to move forward with development of the proposed East Side Parkway.

Respectfully,



Gary Courtright, AKBD

Owner

gary@carmelkitchens.com

p: 831.624.4667 | carmelkitchens.com

26386 Carmel Rancho Lane, Suite 104
Carmel, CA 93923

From: Hetty Eddy [mailto:hettyeddy1@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 8:10 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

Where is the need for this project? Stop bringing it up and move on to more pertinent topics.
Hetty Eddy
hettyeddy1@gmail.com

From: James Tarhalla [mailto:jbt@tarhalla.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 5:15 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

Boardmembers;

The proposed Eastside Parkway is a bad idea for all of the reasons stated in the letter you have received from Landwatch Monterey County. You have already wasted taxpayer dollars on one lawsuit. Would you be in favor of this project if you had to pay for the next one out of your own pockets? Unfortunately I will not be able to attend tomorrow's public hearing. If I could be there, I would ask you that question in person.

James B. Tarhalla

Sent from my iPad

From: Joseph Patronik [<mailto:patronikj@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 3:00 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members and Staff:

I am totally opposed to the Eastside Parkway in any way, shape or form. I attended the December 6, 2017 meeting you held regarding this issue. Almost everyone spoke against the project. I believe the only people in favour of it are those whose jobs will benefit.

I ask you to stop this project that is clearly not needed, not supported and has been ruled against. Stop wasting money and do the projects people want and need.

Sincerely,
Joseph Patronik
PO Box 1283
Marina, CA 93933

From: Laura Ferree [mailto:lauragerry@me.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 12:18 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: FORA Plans - Jan. 12 Meeting, public input

Dear Supervisors,

I am writing about the stated objectives - and my objections to omissions, as well as my belief that the need for the East Parkway has not been sufficiently established in this location.

There appears to be no stated formal plans to protect the oak woodlands.
There appears to be no stated formal plans to mitigate / eliminate the impact of 18,000 cars per day on the East Garrison neighborhood.

For both of these reasons, I do NOT support plans for this parkway at this time.

Laura Ferree

Laura and Gerry Ferree
lauragerry@mac.com

From: Linda Bookin Jenkins [mailto:lindabookin@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 3:59 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway Action for meeting January 12

Good Afternoon,

As a resident of East Garrison, I am against any impact on the preserved Oak Woodlands Conservation and the trails as well as the wildlife. Not to mention changing the entire scope of the development we all pay and PAY for the infrastructure via mellow roos taxes. We selected this area knowing we were paying for this but for the development and plans, not for this additional unnecessary parkway.

I feel that the current funded improvements of widening Imjin, adding the roundabouts to both Imjin and General Jim will easily abate any traffic concerns. Focus should be on connecting MST services to reduce traffic on the roads rather than make room for more. The route seems cumbersome as well and is indefinite need to further review and alignment into unpopulated areas-there are plenty. Davis Road could be easily widened to connect out to Reservation and Imjin, where the improvements are already planned.

I strongly urge the Board to do further research and study before continuing forward, including public engagement opportunities.

Thank you for the opportunity,
Linda Jenkins

From: linny@cruzio.com [mailto:linny@cruzio.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 7:16 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

I'm sorry that i cannot attend the meeting on January 12. However, I want to register my deep opposition to the whole idea of this unnecessary project. Please, FORA, get your heads out where you can see and hear what the public is saying to you about the Eastside Parkway and give up your shorsighted obsession with this boondoggle.

Linda Erickson

From: Mark Anicetti [mailto:markanicetti@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 10:25 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: No Eastside Parkway

Staff,

The public has spoken loudly and clearly against putting a freeway across Fort Ord. There is a beautiful virgin parkland that can produce tourism forever. Please widen Highway 68 and Highway 156 as these routes are established and will not increase bottlenecks into Monterey as bad as adding a third freeway would. Leave Fort Ord Wild!

Mark Anicetti

--

Mark Anicetti LUTCF
mark@anicetti.com
831-521-1637
Lic 0C81295

From: Mark Anicetti [mailto:markanicetti@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 1:38 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Prioritize Improving Existing Roads

FORA Staff,

Please improve existing roads like Imjin, and Intergarrison, and General Jim Moore. These should be the transit arterials across Fort Ord. As well, you should widen 68 and 156 rather than bottlenecking the connections near Del Rey Oaks nad Sand City by connecting new roads in that area. Finally, leave the Oak Forest intact in Fort Ord. It is a vital link on the Pacific Flyway. Birds, butterflies and bees migrating in California use the Coast and Sierras. The Fort Ord wilderness is a real tourist attraction for biking, zip lining, hiking and wildlife watching. It should not be developed. We the people want the derelict building developed in Marina, and to leave the Oak Forest alone.

Thank you!

--

Mark Anicetti LUTCF
mark@anicetti.com

831-521-1637
Lic 0C81295

From: Marla Anderson [mailto:manderson831@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 4:16 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>; Landwatch@mclw.org
Subject: Concerns regarding the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members, I would like to express my opposition to the Eastside parkway proposal. This proposal is not consistent with the Monterey County and FORA general plans in the following areas:

- 1). The proposal will open up vast areas of land to development in advance of the availability of resources such as water. Clear evidence exists that the area's aquifers have been in rapid depletion mode for decades.
- 2). Violation of Conservation Element promoting conservation of scenic lands and protection of native vegetation. Native oaks growing on coastal dunes have a unique and biologically significant growth pattern and shape. The number of acres of coastal dune influenced oaks is down to just a few hundred acres. These oak groves are different in shape and habitat from oaks growing on the hills of Monterey, Salinas highway area, and other county locations. To further reduce the area of this unique biome would be a tragedy.
- 3). Opening up this area makes no sense in terms of providing incremental growth. There are still plenty of areas that near existing roads on the former Fort Ord base that are readily developable.

I request with all sincerity that you **DO NOT SUPPORT** the proposal for the parkway in such early phases of Fort Ord's reuse. I believe that the parkway, if developed at all, should be phased towards the end of the Re-use Plan period, not in this still early period.

Thank you hearing my very heart-felt concerns. Sincerely, Catherine Courtney-Anderson. 65 year resident of the Monterey area. Assessor Parcel # 181-161-27

From: Michael Cate [mailto:mcate@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:55 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Re: Proposed parkway

I am adamantly opposed to the idea of constructing an Eastside parkway that we do not need. Open space and natural beauty is what we all must preserve on the Monterey Peninsula. The traffic and tourism has exploded and we do not need to encourage more visitors, they are already here in plenty! California should stop building as there is no more room, water is scarce and we are having too many disasters such as fire, mudslides and grid lock traffic. Keep the developers and development off the Monterey Peninsula and that means no parkway!

Lindy Marrington/Carmel, CA. 93921

From: Michael Do Couto [mailto:spookx12002@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 12:57 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: Regional transportation needs.

FORA Board,

Please identify regional transportation needs.

I support improving existing roads to address those needs but oppose a new road through valuable oak woodlands such as the Eastside Parkway.

This is a waste of taxpayer money and a road to nowhere.

V/R

Michael Do Couto

From: Michael McGirr [<mailto:icl501m@me.com>] **On Behalf Of** mike.mcgirr@icloud.com

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 8:31 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: Not so fast on Eastside Parkway.

Importance: High

FORA Board,

It is mind boggling to me that FOR A is still pushing such a flawed project as the Eastside Parkway. Please take the funds allocated to this boondoggle and reallocate them to preserving the natural lands in Fort Ord.

Please see my message from December 6th below. My opinion and my vote does not support construction of a road that is not needed through a natural lands that are so greatly needed.

Kind Regards,

Mike and Lisa McGirr

1081 San Vincente Ave.

Salinas, CA 93901

321.432.5322

From: Michael McGirr [<mailto:icl501m@me.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 6, 2017 12:59

To: 'Board@FORA.org' <Board@FORA.org>

Cc: Lisa McGirr (LisaMcGirr@comcast.net) <LisaMcGirr@comcast.net>; 'markeyka@co.monterey.ca.us'

<markeyka@co.monterey.ca.us>; 'district4@co.monterey.ca.us' <district4@co.monterey.ca.us>

Subject: Not so fast on Eastside Parkway.

Dear FORA Board,

As a concerned citizen of Monterey County and an avid outdoorsman I believe Supervisor Jane Parker has given a clear and concise summary of why alternatives to the Eastside Parkway are a desirable course of action rather than pursuing a plan with the obvious disruptions and shortcomings of the Eastside Parkway.

I support the suspension of further planning or consideration of the Eastside Parkway. Supervisor Parker gives an excellent summary in her recent Face Book post and I support her efforts for conservation and better planning for use of constrained public funds.

It would be nice to see the County, Seaside and Marina come together to determine a Gateway to the Fort Ord Monument somewhere in the 8th and Giggling area. It could be both a recreational and economic boost to the community.



Jane Parker

3 hrs · 🌐

I'm not convinced that there is a need for a new road (Eastside Parkway) that carves through the middle of a popular recreation area. We need to be clear about the goals we are trying to achieve. I have expressed my opinion that FORA should instead be allocating its share towards improvements on existing regional roads including Highway 1, Highway 68, and Davis Road, before pursuing Eastside Parkway.

I encourage you to learn more and participate in the public process by attending one of the meetings today or sending an email to the FORA Board (board@fora.org).

Some of my concerns I have shared about this project include:

- Is Eastside Parkway needed? There are already existing roads that connect General Jim Moore Boulevard to Reservation Road, and much of the planned development in the upper end of Seaside has not occurred.
- Would Eastside Parkway create third route between Salinas and Monterey? One would have to cut through a series of roads that are currently heavily impacted at rushhour - Fremont Street and Canyon Del Rey. With additional development planned in Del Rey Oaks, this route will become even more difficult.
- There are much more cost effective alternatives to relieving traffic, such as improving existing roads as necessary.
- FORA hasn't yet paid for regional road improvements. FORA committed to helping pay for improvements on Highway 1, Highway 68 and Highway 156. To date, FORA owes \$35 million to TAMC.
- FORA's preferred alignment for Eastside Parkway will destroy a popular recreation area along with 10,000 oak trees.
- The approval of Eastside Parkway would open the door for a project similar to Monterey Downs to be built in the same location at Parker Flats.



DEC Eastside Parkway Environmental Review...

6

Today · 2 Times · Carpenters Union Hall, 910 2nd...
5 people interested

★ Interested

👍 Like ➦ Share

Thank you.

Kind Regards,

Mike and Lisa McGirr
1081 San Vicente Ave.
Salinas, CA 93901
321.432.5322

From: Nancy Selfridge [mailto:self48@icloud.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:26 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: East side Parkway

It is time to stop the unnecessary waste of money on Eastside Parkway. The concept was introduced to help Monterey Downs become a reality. Neither idea was wanted or needed on the Monterey Peninsula. FORA has been judged for bad decisions in the past. It is time for FORA to start listening to the constituents who care about our community.

Nancy Selfridge

Monterey

Sent from my iPhone

From: Nancy Selfridge [mailto:self48@icloud.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 27, 2018 8:05 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Prioritize Improving Existing Roads and Focusing on Needed Projects

The Eastside Parkway was created to help push through Monterey Downs.
Let's forget about this poorly conceived project and use the money to remove blight.
Blight removal would benefit the entire community and leave FORA with a positive reward for the entire region when it sunsets.

Sincerely,
Nancy Selfridge
Sent from my iPhone

From: Paul Whitson [mailto:p.whitson496@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 1:05 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: Opposition to Eastside Parkway

FORA Board Members:

I stand in opposition to the current Eastside Parkway proposal. This project is unnecessary and would destroy up to 10,000 of the beautiful oak trees so emblematic of this area. I urge you to study the true transportation needs of the area and utilize improvements of existing roadways. Imjin Parkway could be continued through the Western border of the airport to connect with Blanco Road, an existing artery.

Cordially,

Paul Whitson

From: Paul Whitson [mailto:p.whitson496@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 2:43 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: I Oppose Eastside Parkway Project

FORA Board Members:

Have you no memory? Do you want to further damage your credibility in the eyes of the public?

"FORA is also proceeding under the pretext that the road is a required environmental mitigation on the former Army base, when FORA's own Base Reuse Plan indicates it is not.

FORA documents repeatedly refer to the road as an obligation – which is not a legally enforceable term – while FORA Executive Officer Michael Houlemard has referred to the Eastside Parkway as a required mitigation, which is legally enforceable. FORA spokesperson Candace Ingram says, "It's not a mitigation."

You are taking a path of continued conflict, litigation and possible removal from your positions.

Sincerely,

Paul Whitson
East Garrison, CA
650-630-0196

From: Hale, Robert (Bob) (CIV) [mailto:hale@nps.edu]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 6:47 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: East Side Parkway Hearing - Jan 12, 2018

Robert Hale
39 Hacienda Carmel
Carmel, CA 93923

FORA Board members:

RE: East Side Parkway Hearing Jan 12,

I oppose the proposed East Parkway planned for crossing former Fort Ord Lands.

This will seriously fragment important oak woodland habitat, greatly impact recreational resources of Fort Ord areas, and does not have a current urgent need.

Improvements to the Imjim Road corridor and Hwy 68 can handle traffic flows. The East Side Parkway would just create more problems by dumping traffic far from Hwy 1 in upper seaside.

Please stop the planning for the East Side Parkway and preserve the oak woodlands of Fort Ord.

thanks for your consideration, Robert Hale

From: shelly wilkinson [mailto:seashelleytoo@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 5:17 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

To FORA:

My husband and I would like to voice our strong opposition to the FORA proposed Eastside Parkway, through Fort Ord. We have an invaluable large piece of native oak woodland, along with its trees and animals, which serves as a wildlife corridor. Animals are free to roam without the risk of being killed on a highway through the middle of their habitat. Citizens of Seaside and Monterey County have already voiced their opinions multiple times, with majority wanting to keep Ford Ord in its present state as a wild/recreational use area. FORA needs to listen the people, and quit trying to ram unneeded and unwanted projects down our throat.

Please count our opinions as a "NO" vote for the Eastside Parkway.

Shelley A. Wilkinson & David Tefelski
Seaside Residents for 18 years

From: Shirl [mailto:labonitashirl@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 3:10 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org> **Subject:**
EASTSIDE PARKWAY ACTION

STOP !! STOP!!

no need to over build... stop

I'm convinced you all just want to over build STOP NO

- “provide a primary southwest-northeast corridor through former Fort Ord”,
- “serve the area immediately south of CSUMB campus”,
- "avoid bisecting CSUMB Campus”,
- “accommodate and maintain existing and proposed trail networks”, and
- “minimize environmental impacts on existing communities”.

I'm a voter in Monterey County..

Shirley A. Graham-Travel Coordinator

labonitashirl@aol.com

1 831 238 1316

From: Susan Thomas [mailto:writeaps@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 8:12 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway proposal

I stand in opposition to the current Eastside Parkway proposal. This project is unnecessary and would destroy up to 10,000 of the beautiful oak trees so emblematic of this area. I urge you to study the true transportation needs of the area and utilize improvements of existing roadways. Imjin Parkway could be continued through the Western border of the airport to connect with Blanco Road, an existing artery. Cordially,
Susan E Thomas

From: Virgil Piper [mailto:pipersvc@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 11:47 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

Chairman of the Board and Board Members,

I am in favor of a freeway pathway through the Fort Ord development area because any decent future planning **requires** thoughtful consideration of future traffic needs which will result from Fort Ord Development.

I feel FORA might achieve more universal support if their proposal included an actual **diagram or drawing** of the route and **cost** of the "Eastside Parkway."

The fact that TAMC and Monterey County have approved roundabout plans for the only two Salinas-to-Monterey arterial routes would seem to favor a "freeway" design for a new Fort Ord Parkway which features on-and-off ramps and overpasses where other roads intersect. Additionally, it might be advisable to offer an alternative to assist the over-flow traffic resulting from the poor planning involved with the two afore-mentioned Salinas/Monterey roadways.

It would seem sensible that any Parkway design should also include a back door access to the Laguna Seca raceway.

ss: *Virgil M. Piper*

Marina, CA.

From: William Silva [mailto:wsilva@woodmandev.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 2:34 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: Supervisor Parker <Jane.Parker@co.monterey.ca.us>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

To Whom it May Concern:

I am a Seaside resident homeowner. At the request of Supervisor Jane Parker, I want to express my opinion about the Eastside Parkway concept to the FORA board. I live just down the street from the intersection of General Jim Moore Blvd. and Coe/Eucalyptus Avenue and I think the Eastside Parkway is a GREAT idea. Much of Eucalyptus is already constructed, but closed off and unused. This is a waste of an existing community asset. Highways 1 and 68 are increasingly impacted with commute traffic, but General Jim Moore has much remaining vehicle capacity. Offering another parallel route between the Peninsula and Salinas will have a great positive impact on the community as a whole, even if it increases traffic on General Jim Moore, which would be less convenient for my family. I do hope that such a plan would include a signal or roundabout at the intersection of General Jim Moore and Coe/Eucalyptus. I appreciate the long term vision of FORA and the proposed solution which is simply good public policy, forward thinking, and good stewardship of community resources.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. SILVA
President

Legacy Real Estate Group
(831) 647-2447

Woodman Development Co. &
Century Construction Group
(831) 647-2440
(831) 647-2450 fax

24571 Silver Cloud Ct., Suite 102
Monterey, CA 93940

Sent from my iPhone

From: Cari-Esta Albert <cea@noonattack.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2018 5:33 PM
To: FORA Board
Subject: Prioritize Improving Existing Roads

Hi, please support LandWatch's goals which prioritize improving existing roads and identifying regional transportation needs, thanks.

Cari Albert

From: Jeffrey Weekley [mailto:jdweekley@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 2:51 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board,

I encourage you to reconsider the impact of the Eastside Parkway on the irreplaceable oak woodlands that would be destroyed if this "road to nowhere" is built.

In 2016, about 7,400 animals were killed or injured on California roads. I have myself seen deer, coyotes, raccoons, skunks, possums, and all manner of bird carcasses on Monterey County Roads. Bisecting sensitive habitat with more roads will only increase the carnage.

Monterey County is prized for its natural beauty and open spaces. We should not be building roads through these places.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey D. Weekley
124 Belle Drive
Marina, CA 93933
831-236-8432

From: Michelle Raine [mailto:mor1951x@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 11:55 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: FORA Meeting 1/12/18 at 2:00 p.m. - Objections to "Eastside Parkway"

OBJECTIONS TO THE EASTSIDE PARKWAY

1. There is no demonstrated need for a new "parkway" in Fort Ord. Traffic volumes, regional traffic models, and other traffic data don't justify it.
2. The public strongly opposes significant loss of oak woodlands, as made clear during the Whispering Oaks referenda and the Monterey Downs debacle. The road is planned through oak woodlands and across at least one ridge line, making it visible for miles.
3. Expenditure of public funds on a road designed for future developments in lieu of improvements to existing roads, which would ameliorate traffic impacts of current development, should not be FORA's priority.
4. Improvements to existing roads, such as Intergarrison to Eighth to Giggling will achieve the same goals and objectives at a significantly reduced expense.
5. Eastside Parkway creates a barrier for recreational users residing on the Peninsula to traverse safely to the National Monument.

This is a boondoggle and a "road to nowhere". It will dump people out in a congested traffic area that cannot deal with the additional traffic.

The FORA Board needs to concentrate on it's mission, which is removal of blight and improvement of existing roads.. They also need to prepare a transition plan as they were supposed to do by this month and then TRANSITION THEMSELVES OUT OF EXISTENCE.

cc: Sen. Bill Monning

From: Michael DeLapa <execdir@landwatch.org>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 5:25 PM
To: Michael Houlemard
Cc: FORA Board
Subject: FORA -- TAMC presentation and ESP goals
Attachments: S100-D4KON218012613480.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Michael,

Would you please clarify FORA staff's timeline and work plan for seeking public input on "goals and objectives" for the Eastside Parkway (ESP). I understood that FORA staff was going to weigh public and Board input from the last FORA meeting and revise the draft goals and objectives prior to the special meeting. Is that true? If so, would you please let me know when revised ESP goals and objectives will be released for public review. I know I'm not the only person who is confused — FORA board members who I've contact have different understandings of the review process.

As currently written, the draft ESP goals and objectives (attached) appear to foreordain a new road through oak woodlands and foreclose the option of improving existing roads. As you know, the court previously rejected an unfair and illegal CEQA process at a public cost in excess of \$1 million. It would be tragic if more public funds were wasted on another flawed process that only allowed for one outcome.

Also, I just learned that the FORA meeting and TAMC ESP presentation is being rescheduled for the 3rd time (Jan. 31 and Feb. 5 being the earlier dates). Why would FORA staff need to change a public meeting three times? Shifting meeting days and times makes it very difficult for the public to provide meaningful input. I urge you to reschedule the special meeting AFTER Feb. 5 so that the public has ample opportunity to review materials and to make plans to attend. Would you also please confirm that public testimony will be heard at the special meeting.

Regards,

Michael

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director
LandWatch Monterey County
execdir@landwatch.org
650.291.4991 m

[Sign-Up](#) | [Get Involved](#) | [Donate](#)

[Like Us on Facebook!](#)

From: Molly Erickson <erickson@stamplaw.us>
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 2:04 PM
To: FORA Board
Subject: KFOW letter to FORA BOD - re Eastside Parkway - for Friday's Board meeting
Attachments: 18.01.09.KFOW.ltr.to.FORA.BOD.to.re.ESP.item.8.d.pdf

Please see attached. Thank you.

Molly Erickson
STAMP | ERICKSON
479 Pacific Street, Suite One
Monterey, CA 93940
tel: 831-373-1214, x14

Michael W. Stamp
Molly Erickson

STAMP | ERICKSON
Attorneys at Law

479 Pacific Street, Suite One
Monterey, California 93940
T: (831) 373-1214
F: (831) 373-0242

January 9, 2018

Via email

Ralph Rubio, Chair
Members of the Board of Directors
Fort Ord Reuse Authority
Marina, CA

Re: Eastside Parkway - Item 8d, January 12, 2017 Board meeting

Dear Chair Rubio and FORA Directors:

Keep Fort Ord Wild objects to approval of the item. KFOR objects to the unreliable, inaccurate, imbalanced, and unfair presentation in the staff report. Some of the factual information is simply wrong. Numerous claims in the staff report are internally inconsistent with other claims in the report and/or inconsistent with adopted FORA documents and land use plans. Many general comments appear to be made from whole cloth by FORA staff or an anonymous source. FORA's secretive approach is inconsistent with good government, transparency, and a healthy public process. FORA staff should label its comments as by staff only, instead of pretending that the comments came from, or were reviewed by, the public.

The staff report has mischaracterized much of what happened at the "workshops":

- When asked for a show of hands, the afternoon workshop audience voted approximately 100 to 1 against a new Eastside Parkway.
- Many attendees said simply FORA should stop, period. FORA should focus on other projects such as implementing required Reuse Plan plans and policies, fostering healthy economic development, removing blight, and protecting oak woodlands.
- The FORA Executive Officer did not present at the "workshop" events. Instead, Mr. Houlemard required his lower level employees and consultants to make the presentations.
- The FORA presenters refused to answer questions from the public. The FORA presenters appeared fearful of public interaction and constructive dialogue on this very important issue of a controversial new roadway.

Chair Rubio and FORA Directors
Re: Eastside Parkway
January 9, 2018
Page 2

FORA Board members Parker, Adams, Morton, and O'Connell attended the events. They saw what happened and felt the unhappy mood of the public attendees.

The proposed Goals and Objectives "in Attachment A" are unreliable and inaccurate.

The FORA Board should not be lulled into thinking that FORA has learned anything from the past KFOR lawsuit.

There are many problems with the current staff analysis of the issues and the current staff report. Many so-called "primary objectives" (Attachment A; FORA Board packet, pp. 159-161) have been made up by whole cloth by anonymous authors, presumably the FORA staff. The staff report Attachment A does not reflect the comments of the public at the workshops. It is entirely staff's ideas of what staff wants; these ideas were not presented to the public at the workshop. Essentially, FORA staff has not included the public's written comments in the packet, and instead relegated those comments to a separate link that requires separate effort by Board members.

There are myriad problems with the FORA actions and documents to date. In this letter, we provide one example of the unreliable claims in the current FORA staff report:

The primary objectives for implementing the proposed project are:

- Connect the Fort Ord National Monument and California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery to regional roadways (BRP Vol.2 Objective A, pg. 298 and Recreation Policy A-1, pg. 327, . . .)

Contrary to the claim in the FORA staff report, the Reuse Plan did not mention the Fort Ord National Monument or the California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery because neither the Monument nor the Cemetery existed when the Reuse Plan was written and approved. Even worse for FORA, the republished Reuse Plan does not say what the FORA Staff report claims it says. Here is the "BRP Vol.2 Objective A, pg. 298" claimed by the FORA report:

Objective A: An efficient regional network of roadways that provides access to the former Fort Ord.

To a large extent, the attractiveness of the former Fort Ord for redevelopment within the national marketplace will depend on the ability of the regional transportation system to provide for efficient intra- and inter-regional travel. Critical facilities include those most proximate to the former Fort Ord (State Highway 1, Reservation Road, Del Monte Boulevard, Fremont Boulevard), those that connect to Salinas (State Highway 68, Blanco Road, Davis Road), and those

to the north that provide connections to Santa Cruz and the Bay Area (State Highway 1, State Highway 156, U.S. 101). As identified previously, a number of these facilities are currently operating at or near deficient levels of service. Regional growth and the redevelopment of the former Fort Ord will result in the worsening of these conditions. Thus, efforts and improvements that address the efficient operation of these facilities are required.

Adding system capacity through roadway improvements represents the most direct means of mitigating the impacts of increased demand. The operating analysis presented above identified those roadway facilities forecast to operate at deficient service levels in 2015 (see Table 4.2-2). This analysis also resulted in the identification of roadway improvements needed to achieve or maintain acceptable service levels. A listing of these improvements was provided with varying levels of relationship to the reuse of the former Fort Ord. In some instances, these improvements address existing system deficiencies or future deficiencies to which the former Fort Ord has an insignificant contribution. A key step in the transportation analysis process was the identification of the former Fort Ord contribution to the volume increases on the regional roadways examined in this study. This analysis, termed a “nexus” test, was used to determine the former Fort Ord’s share for each of the proposed improvements. This information was in turn used to develop a funding mechanism by which Fort Ord development would pay for its share of the impact on the regional transportation system. Because funding for the non-Fort Ord share may not always be available, the option exists for the use of Fort Ord-generated funding to cover the entire cost of selected improvements to facilitate their implementation. In this situation, the total Fort Ord contribution to all improvements would remain the same as that determined by the nexus test.

(Underlining added.)

Why this FORA claim is wrong: The Reuse Plan objective A addresses offsite regional transportation. The Eastside Parkway would not be a regional offsite road. The Reuse Plan stated no onsite (on-base) traffic mitigations were required.

Here is the second support claimed by FORA staff for the “objective”, “BRP Vol.2 . . . Recreation Policy A-1, pg. 327”:

Recreation Policy A-1: Monterey County shall provide for adequate access to BLM recreation area.

Chair Rubio and FORA Directors
Re: Eastside Parkway
January 9, 2018
Page 4

Why this FORA claim is wrong: The Reuse Plan Recreation Policy A-1 implements Recreation Objective A, which is this: *Objective A: Integrate the former Fort Ord's open spaces into the larger regional open space system, making them accessible as a regional resource for the entire Monterey Peninsula.* In other words, the Policy A-1 is to increase access to the larger regional open space system. Such access already exists, with trail heads at Highway 68, 8th and Gigling, Jerry Smith Trailhead at Intergarrison Road, and the Creekside Terrace trailhead off Reservation Road. Thus, the Monument is already accessible to "the entire Monterey Peninsula" as the Objective A requires. A new Eastside Road would harm the regional open space resources, including Parker Flats and oak woodlands. The Reuse Plan Recreation Policy A-1 addresses all "Fort Ord's open spaces." FORA should not prioritize one open space over another, as this FORA staff report has done here.

Beware of proposals that Board prematurely reject feasible alternative and Reuse Plan.

There is a new effort to abandon the Intergarrison Road alternative to the Eastside Parkway. This alternative alignment is feasible as stated by FORA documents. The alignment should be included as an alternative in the EIR. Rejecting it at this premature stage would not be consistent with CEQA and regional governance.

The Reuse Plan proposed that the Eastside Road go through CSUMB. However, there is a new effort by staff not to follow the Reuse Plan. The staff report Attachment A proposes that the Eastside Parkway "avoid" going through the CSUMB campus. The Board should not approve Attachment A for this and many other reasons.

Conclusion.

The FORA staff report and the FORA process to date is riddled with holes and flaws in every way: from a public policy standpoint, from a public process standpoint, and from a CEQA standpoint. FORA is headed down a path of legal violations similar to FORA's past actions regarding the Eastside Parkway.

FORA should start over and FORA should do it right.

Very truly yours,

STAMP | ERICKSON

/s/ Molly Erickson

Molly Erickson