

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 through 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

From: Andrew Konik [mailto:akonik@rta-inc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 10:09 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Andrew Konik
Seaside, CA

From: Anne Larsen [mailto:anne@annelarsen.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 11:31 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Anne Larsen

Sent from my iPhone

From: Barbara Cole [mailto:barbaracole2000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 12:23 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

We need every tree!!!

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands.

Adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

Encourage alternative transportation.

Sincerely,

From: Bertrand Deprez [mailto:bertrand@redshift.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 11:49 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Bertrand Deprez
2025 Cross Street
Seaside, CA 93955

From: bljteach [mailto:bljteach@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 9:08 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Brenda Lewis

From: Tom Graves [mailto:tgraves@ci.carmel.ca.us]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 2:48 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: Mayor Dallas <dallasforcarmel@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Eastside Parkway - public comments 1-31-2018

Dear Board Members,

Mayor Dallas asked me to forward this to you. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Tom Graves, MMC
City Clerk
831-620-2016 - o
408-201-3760 - c



----- Forwarded message -----

From: Chris Mack <gelffmack@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Feb 1, 2018 at 8:40 AM
Subject: Fwd: Eastside Parkway - public comments 1-31-2018
To: cityclerk@ci.carmel.ca.us
Cc: Christopher Mack <gelffmack@gmail.com>

Please forward this to all city council members

chris mack

Re: Eastside Parkway (ESP)
31,2018

Jan.

Dear FORA Board Member

Although I respect FORA for bringing a project to the Board, The Eastside Parkway is not a solution to our "traffic congestion problems (FORA statement)". FORA has not demonstrated that there is, or how there is a need for this road, FORA has not presented any data that shows this road will correct any problem inside or outside of the Fort Ord lands.

The money and the time that will be spent on planning and building this project does not have merit. The money allocated for this project will be better spent elsewhere by improving existing roads.

This road project needs to be shelved. Please **Vote NO** to send this project to the bottom of the CIP priority list.

IF all of these below comments are not attended to, then **Vote NO** on approval of Goals and Objectives.

The goals and objectives show a bias to building a route in the open spaces/ oak woodland. "serve the area immediately south of CSUMB". The area immediately south of CSUMB is open space. Open space does not need a road built through it to continue being a successful open space. For the Goals to be fair and unbiased to all route possibilities the same wording needs to be applied to all goals. Remove this statement Or add serve the area south of 8th ST. Extension or Intergarrison.

In the Goals and Objectives it states the purpose of the ESP is to "reduce future traffic congestion on Highway 1, 12th Street (now Imjin Parkway), Blanco Road, and the Del Monte/2nd/General Jim Moore Boulevard." This statement is false, over reaching and needs to be changed because many of these roads are far from capacity or aren't tied together at all. Also there is no data to support the claim of "reduce future traffic" FORA has not presented any data to support the "traffic congestion" claim, or that this road will accomplish what it's claimed purpose is.

--- 2nd/General Jim Moore Boulevard were FORA recent up graded roads and should have incorporated into their vehicle design these future vehicle loads. They are not being utilized to their capacity. General Jim Moore is a 4 lane road, what is the VPD before it gets over loaded? This statement claims these roads were poorly designed from the start.

----. Hwy 1, Blanco Rd. are roads that have vehicles traveling to multiple destinations, The ESP would not contribute to traffic decongestion on these roads because The ESP is located in a remote section of the ex-base relative to Hwy1 and Blanco.

--- The statement "Design the project to respect and integrate natural resources by minimizing impacts to coast live oak woodland " can't be achieved if the route were to be placed in the oak woodland. Is removing up to 10,000 trees a minimal amount? what is the definition of "minimize"? This must be defined before the board can decide if they agree with the statement of "minimize and the word respect".

--- "Improve mobility of emergency system responders, including, but not limited to, firefighter access " No data has been presented to show that there is deficiency and impairment to emergency systems before adding this statement. Remove this statement.

---- The statement De-emphasize Inter-garrison needs be stricken from this document. This road will become more important and used when the 8th St. Extension is completed as a connection between East Garrison and The Dunes shopping area. This road will never be able to be de-emphasize.

— The goals do not state the ESP will have any on-site benefit. Any new road should have benefits for the Fort Ord community.

— "Minimize disrupting any community, including it's expansion and circulation"- This statement is direct towards and is protective of CSUMB's maybe possible future expansion into their Open Space as defined y their 2017 Draft Master plan. While the goal "avoid bisecting CAUMB campus..." was removed, this was added. It is referenced to Public comments pg.76 (CSUMB). CSUMB has no plans for building on their OpenSpace. Remove "including it's expansion and circulation"

— If the above goal can be removed, then add this- "Design the project to respect and integrate into any community"

— "Minimize noise impacts adjacent to sensitive receptors" Add "" Along the entire length of the road" Will there be sensitive receptors placed in the openspace or only in CSUMB?

— FORA still owes TAMC \$35million(CIP 2017), FORA needs to pay TAMC this money. This money will help build TAMC's planned traffic reducing improvements to the regional road system. It is an obligation from 1997. Get this off the books now instead of spending TAMC's money on the ESP.

— The role of FORA is to mitigate development on the base, not regional roads. This is TAMC's role.

There is not a development planned in the Parker Flats area, so this road does not offer anything in inter-base benefits. Regional traffic will not be improved with this road , and any vehicles using the ex-base

for cross county travel will be accommodated by the existing road system, especially after all the other planned road improvements by FORA and TAMC are completed.

This road will not reimburse the community for the loss of quality of life that the open spaces/ oak woodland provides for our citizens.

Development is progressing rapidly in Marina and East Garrison and soon in Seaside Surplus II, therefore the 8th St. Extension, Gigling Rd and Imgin Pky. improvements are more current projects that need to be attended to now.

thank you
chris mack

From: Carole Erickson [mailto:cje8270@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 3:50 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

To:
FORA Board Members:

This message is to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs. That this board continues to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands, makes no sense at all.

As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public and your critics.

Sincerely,

Carole January
Carmel, 93923

From: Catherine Crockett [mailto:cm_crockett@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 12:59 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: Opposing Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to add my voice to the growing number of concerned citizens who oppose the goals and objectives of the proposed Eastside Parkway. Justification for the Parkway proposal is based on outdated claims of: (1) jobs and housing levels that have not materialized, (2) interconnection to a proposed State Highway 68 freeway which does not exist, and (3) proximity to what was in 1997 deemed to be a primary redevelopment area, a claim that is inaccurate after the 2002 swap in exchange for development at East Garrison. The Eastside Parkway project has already exhausted an enormous amount of public funds. The projected \$18 million to complete the project can be better spent on alternative improvements to the Fort Ord transportation network, such as widening existing roads and constructing roundabouts.

Sincerely,

Catherine Crockett
1739 Havana St.,
Seaside, CA

From: Cathy Wooten [mailto:cathywooten@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 1:15 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Cathy Wooten
Pacific Grove

Sent from my iPad

From: Chris Mack [mailto:gelffmack@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 8:35 AM
Cc: Christopher Mack <gelffmack@gmail.com>
Subject: Eastside Parkway - public comments 1-31-2018

Re: Eastside Parkway (ESP)
31,2018

Jan.

Dear FORA Board Member

Although I respect FORA for bringing a project to the Board, The Eastside Parkway is not a solution to our "traffic congestion problems (FORA statement)". FORA has not demonstrated that there is, or how there is a need for this road, FORA has not presented any data that shows this road will correct any problem inside or outside of the Fort Ord lands.

The money and the time that will be spent on planning and building this project does not have merit. The money allocated for this project will be better spent else where by improving existing roads.

This road project needs to be shelved. Please **Vote NO** to send this project to the bottom of the CIP priority list.

IF all of these below comments are not attended to , then **Vote NO** on approval of Goals and Objectives.

The goals and objectives show a bias to building a route in the open spaces/ oak woodland. “serve the area immediately south of CSUMB”. The area immediately south of CSUMB is open space. Open space does not need a road built through it to continue being a successful open space. For the Goals to be fair and unbiased to all route possibilities the same wording needs to be applied to all goals. Remove this statement Or add serve the area south of 8th ST. Extension or Intergarrison.

In the Goals and Objectives it states the purpose of the ESP is to "reduce future traffic congestion on Highway 1, 12th Street (now Imjin Parkway), Blanco Road, and the Del Monte/2nd/General Jim Moore Boulevard." This statement is false, over reaching and needs to be changed because many of these roads are far from capacity or aren't tied together at all. Also there is no data to support the claim of "reduce future traffic" FORA has not presented any data to support the "traffic congestion" claim, or that this road will accomplish what it's claimed purpose is.

--- 2nd/General Jim Moore Boulevard were FORA recent up graded roads and should have incorporated into their vehicle design these future vehicle loads. They are not being utilized to their capacity. General Jim Moore is a 4 lane road, what is the VPD before it gets over loaded? This statement claims these roads were poorly designed from the start.

----. Hwy 1, Blanco Rd. are roads that have vehicles traveling to multiple destinations, The ESP would not contribute to traffic de-congestion on these roads because The ESP is located in a remote section of the ex-base relative to Hwy1 and Blanco.

--- The statement "Design the project to respect and integrate natural resources by minimizing impacts to coast live oak woodland " can't be achieved if the route were to be placed in the oak woodland. Is removing up to 10,000 trees a minimal amount? what is the definition of "minimize"? This must be defined before the board can decide if they agree with the statement of "minimize and the word respect".

--- "Improve mobility of emergency system responders, including, but not limited to, firefighter access " No data has been presented to show that there is deficiency and impairment to emergency systems before adding this statement. Remove this statement.

---- The statement De-emphasize Inter-garrison needs be stricken from this document. This road will become more important and used when the 8th St. Extension is completed as a connection between East Garrison and The Dunes shopping area. This road will never be able to be de-emphasize.

—— The goals do not state the ESP will have any on-site benefit. Any new road should have benefits for the Fort Ord community.

—— "Minimize disrupting any community, including it's expansion and circulation"- This statement is direct towards and is protective of CSUMB's maybe possible future expansion into their Open Space as defined y their 2017 Draft Master plan. While the goal "avoid bisecting CAUMB campus..." was removed, this was added. It is referenced to Public comments pg.76 (CSUMB). CSUMB has no plans for building on their OpenSpace. Remove "including it's expansion and circulation"

—— If the above goal can be removed, then add this- “Design the project to respect and integrate into any community”

—— “Minimize noise impacts adjacent to sensitive receptors” Add “” Along the entire length of the road” Will there be sensitive receptors placed in the openspace or only in CSUMB?

—— FORA still owes TAMC \$35million(CIP 2017), FORA needs to pay TAMC this money. This money will help build TAMC's planned traffic reducing improvements to the regional road system. It is an obligation from 1997. Get this off the books now instead of spending TAMC's money on the ESP.

—— The role of FORA is to mitigate development on the base, not regional roads. This is TAMC's role.

There is not a development planned in the Parker Flats area, so this road does not offer anything in inter-base benefits. Regional traffic will not be improved with this road, and any vehicles using the ex-base for cross county travel will be accommodated by the existing road system, especially after all the other planned road improvements by FORA and TAMC are completed.

This road will not reimburse the community for the loss of quality of life that the open spaces/ oak woodland provides for our citizens.

Development is progressing rapidly in Marina and East Garrison and soon in Seaside Surplus II, therefore the 8th St. Extension, Gigling Rd and Imgin Pky. improvements are more current projects that need to be attended to now.

thank you
chris mack

From: DALE & CHRIS MCCAULEY [mailto:chris_dale@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 3:14 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: No "PARK" WAY Don't try again

Dear FORA Board Members:

I believe you are making this more complicated than it needs to be. You should be focusing on fixing the bottlenecks and improving the existing roads and connected highways into and exiting Ft. Ord.

Please don't waste any more time and resources, I am disappointed with your board, you can do better.

Respectfully,

Dale McCauley

270 El Caminito Rd.

Carmel Valley, CA 93924

From: Dawn H [mailto:dhartsock@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 12:42 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: LandWatch Monterey County <subscriptions@landwatch.org>
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Dawn Hartsock

From: Denyse Frischmuth [mailto:denyse.f@att.net]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 12:44 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

Dear Board members

You will find attached the statement I will read this afternoon at the meeting. I wanted my comments to be received in writing as well.

Thanks

See you later this afternoon.

Denyse Frischmuth

My name is D.F. I am a resident of Pacific Grove. I am concerned about this proposed Eastside Parkway and I urge you to vote NO on the Goals and Objectives of this ill-advised project.

My reading of the background information on the subject, has led me to conclude that the East Side Parkway project is an ill-advised plan for resolving our regional traffic problems. Even minimal impact on the oak forest, which is in the Parkway's path, is not acceptable when we can spend our tax money on better alternatives, one of which is the improvement of already existing roads. Minimal impact still means wildlife corridors interrupted, habitat loss, emissions released from the destruction of thousands of carbon storing trees.

Twice, in recent history, the public has expressed its disapproval of projects that threatened our unique, beautiful and irreplaceable environment. Think Whispering Oaks and Monterey Downs.

Additionally, the East Side Parkway is a 1997 proposal predicated on conditions that have changed drastically or never materialized, e.g. Monterey Downs . The East Side Parkway has no place in Monterey County's set of solutions for regional traffic problems.

Is this ill-advised project what we want to leave as our legacy to our children and grand children?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

My name is D.F. I am a resident of Pacific Grove. I am concerned about this proposed Eastside Parkway and I urge you to vote NO on the Goals and Objectives of this ill-advised project.

My reading of the background information on the subject, has led me to conclude that the East Side Parkway project is an ill-advised plan for resolving our regional traffic problems. Even minimal impact on the oak forest, which is in the Parkway's path, is not acceptable when we can spend our tax money on better alternatives, one of which is the improvement of already existing roads. Minimal impact still means wildlife corridors interrupted, habitat loss, emissions released from the destruction of thousands of carbon storing trees.

Twice, in recent history, the public has expressed its disapproval of projects that threatened our unique, beautiful and irreplaceable environment. Think Whispering Oaks and Monterey Downs.

Additionally, the East Side Parkway is a 1997 proposal predicated on conditions that have changed drastically or never materialized, e.g. Monterey Downs . The East Side Parkway has no place in Monterey County's set of solutions for regional traffic problems.

Is this ill-advised project what we want to leave as our legacy to our children and grand children?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

From: Donna Penwell [mailto:dcpenwell@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 3:23 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org

Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Donna Penwell
1884 Nadina Street
Seaside, CA 93955

From: dorothy cole [mailto:eaglesorhi@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:50 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Dorothy Cole

Sent from my iPhone

From: elena falkovskaia [mailto:efalkov@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 5:21 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members: I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs. FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Elena Falkovskaia

From: Gary Karnes [mailto:gary.karnes@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 5:21 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Gary Karnes
Pacific Grove voter

From: George Riley [mailto:georgeriley@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 8:54 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org; George Riley <georgeriley@gmail.com>
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the proposed Eastside Parkway . No regional study supports it. Please do not prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

George Riley

From: Gordy [mailto:gordykfrog@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 12:31 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I know this is a prewritten response, but it says everything that needs to be said on this matter. Please take it to heart.

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Gordon Kauhanen, Monterey, CA

From: Jim Tarhalla [mailto:jbt@tarhalla.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 6:34 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

James B. Tarhalla

From: JaneHaines80@gmail.com [mailto:janehaines80@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 12:00 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: The Eastside Parkway is NOT a Necessary Mitigation for Traffic Levels of Service (LOS)

Dear FORA Board members;

This letter addresses the fact the FORA Board was given no option other than construction of the Eastside Parkway, rather than an additional option to upgrade existing roadways. It explains why the Eastside Parkway is NOT necessary for achieving acceptable traffic levels of service (LOS).

Don't Be Misled

Attachment A to the 2/2/18 staff report (page 159) implies the Eastside Parkway is required in order to mitigate traffic to acceptable levels of service by 2035. I refer to the second paragraph on page 159 of Attachment A in your 2/2/18 staff report. It states:

*"The [2017 Fee Reallocation 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 improvements to the roadway network to address future development-related transportation deficiencies."* (Emphasis added.)

That statement omits mentioning that the 2017 Fee Allocation Study actually analyzed **nine** roadways. The Eastside Parkway plus one other roadway comprised the eighth and ninth roadways analyzed. The study found that failure to construct those two roadways would not necessarily cause an unacceptable decline in level of service by 2035. You can confirm this by the second paragraph on page 1 in the 2017 Fee Allocation Study at http://www.fora.org/Board/2017/Packet/Additional/051217-Item8c-Attach_B.pdf It states:

*"The Build 2015 CIP and Build Alternative CIP analysis shows two roadways (Reservation Road between Davis and Watkins Gate Roads, and **Eastside Parkway**) would operate at a LOS D/E by 2035 (however these two LOS D/E roadways are within the margin of error for the acceptable LOS D."* (Emphasis added.)

In other words, nine roadways were studied but only seven of the nine proved necessary to mitigate 2035 traffic levels of service, and Eastside Parkway was not among those seven. Thus, the Eastside Parkway is NOT a necessary mitigation.

Upgrading Existing Roads May Be a Superior Traffic LOS Mitigation

For this and other reasons, I respectfully request your Board to reject the staff report's recommendation for approval of Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives for use in preparation of an EIR for Eastside Parkway (referenced recommendation is in Memorandum for 2/2/18 staff report, bottom of page 1). I request you please to direct staff to evaluate the potentially superior mitigation-effect from upgrading existing roadways.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Haines
Pacific Grove resident

From: JB [mailto:jbmail@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:20 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Jeff Hawkins [mailto:jeff.hawkins@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 1:13 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org

Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I've lived on the Monterey Peninsula for 25 years and wish you would focus your attention on urgent items other than the Eastside Parkway!!

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs. FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Jeff Hawkins

From: Joseph Patronik [mailto:patronikj@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:06 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I spoke at the December meeting. **I am totally against the Eastside Parkway.** It is quite clear that almost 100% of the people in our area see it as not needed, and environmental disaster and would have terrible long term consequences for the greater community of Monterey County.

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Joseph Patronik
PO Box 1283
Marina, CA 93933

From: joseph russell [mailto:jprussell@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 2:08 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members: I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs. FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public. Sincerely,
JOE RUSSELL
Former FORA Board President
Former Mayor of Del Rey Oaks

From: John Sexton Photography [mailto:info@johnsexton.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 11:31 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

John Sexton

Sent from my iPhone

From: Joyce Vandevere [mailto:jvandevere@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 2:46 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

Please pay attention to the unique beauty of the land over which you have authority and respect the wishes of the public to keep much of those lands in their natural state into perpetuity. We do not need the Eastside Parkway. We do need the woodlands both for recreation and for the contribution of the trees to air quality. To build a freeway we don't need while despoiling one of the attractions that may bring visitors to drop coins in our coffers is not in our interest.

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Joyce Vandevere
Monterey

From: Juli Hofmann [mailto:jhofmann@redshift.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 2:55 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I attended 2 FORA board meetings in 2017 to make comments on non-Eastside Parkway issues. I was really astounded at the open hostility and eye-rolling attitude exhibited by some members of the board regarding public input.

Having followed the Eastside Parkway decision making and subsequent litigation in the media recently, I am now writing to express my opposition to the current FORA goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway. There is an obvious bias that is hampering objective analysis of regional transportation needs and continues to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, which has been exposed to be a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. Why not utilize public input which asks for focus on regional transportation needs and prioritize to improve existing roads to address those needs? It might cost a lot less and actually be useful to the people.

It is time to stop the money waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Juli Hofmann
Marina, California

From: Karl Ogden [mailto:karlogden@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:16 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Karl Ogden
967 Jefferson St
Monterey CA 93940

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kathey Felt [mailto:katheyaf@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 12:42 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Kathey Felt

Sent from my iPhone

From: Katherine Biala [mailto:kybiala@icloud.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 12:47 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Kathy Biala

Kathy Biala
Cell: 831-242-0023
Other: 831-920-2762
Fax: 831-241-6370
Email: kybiala@icloud.com

From: Laura Yasu Murphy-Kuroda [mailto:laura.yasu@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 3:28 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Laura Murphy

Seaside, CA

From: Leonard Laub [mailto:pythonca84@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 6:39 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Leonard Laub
City of Monterey Resident

From: Lisa Ciani [mailto:lisa.ciani@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 1:43 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing in concert with LandWatch to express my opposition to the proposed goals and objectives related to the Eastside Parkway. Those goals were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands.

The 18 "primary objectives" released this week for Eastside Parkway include "minimiz[ing] impacts" to natural resources (pristine oak woodland habitat, special status species—but not other native species—and wildlife corridors), and to the aesthetic character of the area. Minimizing impacts has come to mean "doing the minimum" to protect resources. Fort Ord is a national and regional treasure, and the natural and aesthetic resource protections need to be maximized! The last number I read for the number of coast live oaks that would be removed for the Eastside Parkway was 11,000 (Monterey County Weekly, January 13, 2017). Is that the minimized number? Or, how many thousands would be a minimized number?

As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I URGE YOU TO ADOPT THE GOALS PROPOSED BY LANDWATCH, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to IMPROVE EXISTING ROADS to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the "freeway to nowhere". After a very expensive lawsuit that FORA and the County lost to Keep Fort Ord Wild, the plans for Eastside Parkway continue. It is time to STOP THE WASTE AND LISTEN TO THE PUBLIC. Please reject the staff's proposed goals and vote for improving existing roads.

Sincerely,

Lisa Ciani
220 Walnut Street
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

From: Lynham [mailto:lynham@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 2:19 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Fwd: Eastside parkway

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lynham <lynham@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Feb 1 2018
To: planning@fora.org
Subject: Eastside parkway

Dear FORA Board members,

I continue to oppose the Eastside Parkway.

I am very concerned that any addition to roadways on Fort Ord wild lands will further disrupt wildlife habitat and animal migration routes. Any further loss of oak woodland will also harm ecotourism and nearby real estate values.

There is a stretch of Imjin Parkway, from Reservation to Imjin Rd., that is about 1.5 miles long. This is where the real bottleneck is on Imjin. A widening of this short stretch would greatly improve traffic movement along Imjin. This, along with round-abouts to be built on highway 68, TAMC's multi-modal plan, and other TAMC proposals, will greatly improve traffic speed, without damaging the rare maritime oak woodland that will draw increasing ecotourism, especially after the new campground is completed at Fort Ord Dunes State Park. Let's not "kill the goose that lays the golden egg"!

Thank you,
Lynn Hamilton

Sent from my iPad

From: Maria Ogden [mailto:mariaogden@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:04 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I strongly oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Maria Ogden
967 Jefferson Street
Monterey, Ca

From: Mark Anicetti [mailto:markanicetti@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:07 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: Landwatch Monterey County Land Watch <subscriptions@landwatch.org>
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

From: Mark Chaffey [mailto:chma@mbari.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 3:07 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: There is no reason to build the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I am writing because I strongly oppose your plans to build the east side parkway. Why do you insist on providing overly built non-needed expensive infrastructure for development plans that are unlikely to ever be built? Freeway to nowhere is an appropriate slogan indeed!

By paving more and more oak woodlands and insisting on poorly planned development schemes you are in danger of killing the potential that Ft Ord offers for sustainable and appropriate development.

What happened to "University Villages"? Shopping Mall 1.0.

Sincerely,

Mark Chaffey
Electrical Engineer
hallchaffey@mac.com
(831) 775-1708

From: Michael Cate [mailto:mcate@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 7:40 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Michael Cate
Carmel

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

Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:42 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: Regional transportation needs

FORA,

NO to the Eastside Parkway!

Please support LandWatch's goals to identify regional transportation needs and improve existing roads to address those needs;
and,

Oppose building a new road through valuable oak woodlands.3

V/R

Michael Do Couto

From: Michael McGirr [mailto:icl501m@me.com] **On Behalf Of** mike.mcgirr@icloud.com
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 2:28 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org; Mayor Gunter <salinasmayor@ci.salinas.ca.us>
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

Can you help me understand how traffic gets to either of the stated terminus points of Schoonover Road or Eucalyptus Road? How do 18,586 vehicles get to either point and where do they go from there? We support a road system that will enhance commerce and traffic flow in the Salinas – Monterey – Seaside – Marina quad area but the proposed Eastside Parkway is destined to eradicate natural spaces and not solve the problem at hand.

The comments in the 02/02/18 meeting agenda for the so called Eastside Parkway “– Need” are not specific to a new road, but to traffic needs in general which would not be satisfied by the ill-conceived Eastside parkway. The traffic concerns would be better served through a comprehensive traffic re-alignment considering all existing roads and the improvements needed to handle the traffic projections.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Michael and Lisa McGirr, Salinas, CA

From: Michael Wellborn [mailto:wellborn.michael@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:05 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org

Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands.

As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, that focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere.

It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Michael Wellborn

FRIENDS OF FORT ORD OPEN SPACE SOLUTIONS

9840 La Amapola

Fountain Valley, CA 92708

From: Michaelia M [mailto:msmichaelia@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 3:03 PM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org

Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members: I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs. FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Michaelia Morgan

Keep Ft Ord Wild!!

--

Life is so hard; how can we be anything but kind?

...Jack Kornfield

From: Nancy Selfridge [mailto:self48@icloud.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 2:57 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Nancy Selfridge

Sent from my iPhone

From: Nick Madronio [mailto:ncmffd@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 4:53 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Nick Madronio

Sent from my iPhone

From: Nicky Swanson [mailto:jeepergirl17@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 7:18 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Nicky Swanson
22641 Murietta Rd
Salinas, CA 93908

From: perryfamily hotmail.com [mailto:perryfamily@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 7:59 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Noel Perry
Former member of the Monterey County Civil Grand Jury

Sent from my iPad

From: pmcneill64@gmail.com [mailto:pmcneill64@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Pat McNeill

Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 11:09 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org

Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

1. Reject staff's proposed goals and objectives for the Eastside Parkway;
2. Support improving existing roads to address transportation needs; and,
3. Oppose building a new road through valuable oak woodlands.

Sincerely,
Pat McNeill

From: pmcneill64@gmail.com on behalf of Pat McNeill <pmcneill@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 2:07 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: Eastside Parkway

The now-antiquated route of an Eastside parkway is un-supportable. It would fragment valuable open space at great expense and shave mere seconds off a commute utilizing a streamlined intergarrison-8th ave connection to a Parker Flats-Eucalyptus. A portion of the savings can upgrade an all-weather, non-motorized corridor serving campus housing. Eastside parkway is redundant to significant segments of TAMC's multi-modal corridor.

By the way, my map suggests any route in the area should be more appropriately termed a 'northside' parkway connecting the east and west sides of the former Ft Ord.

Thank you,
Pat McNeill

From: pmcneill64@gmail.com [mailto:pmcneill64@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Pat McNeill
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 11:09 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

1. Reject staff's proposed goals and objectives for the Eastside Parkway;
2. Support improving existing roads to address transportation needs; and,
3. Oppose building a new road through valuable oak woodlands.

Sincerely,
Pat McNeill

From: Pierre Rolin [mailto:pikadache@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 10:38 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
P.Y. and Karen Rolin

From: Rebecca Lee [mailto:rlee311@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 11:43 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs. FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

It greatly saddens me that we have the opportunity to learn from the past and not repeat mistakes and yet that is what the Eastside Parkway does: it divides land, cutting off contiguous land for wildlife passage; it cuts through undeveloped land rather than creating a plan that uses existing roads: in short, it follows the old paradigm that nature is for destroying and exploiting and that progress is paved. This is not what is revealed when people are asked: where do you go to heal, to find respite? The answer is either forest, beach or mountains. Never by a roadside. Thus, the forest must be preserved to preserve sanity in society and existing roads used and widened whenever possible. This is a whenever possible situation. Please recognize this and do the right thing, not the easy to map out thing. Thank you, my fate, our fate is in your hands.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lee
713 2nd Street
Pacific Grove

From: richardwb1 . [mailto:richardwb99@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2018 8:46 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org

Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Richard Brinton

Salinas, Calif.

richardwb99@gmail.com

From: Hale, Robert (Bob) (CIV) [mailto:hale@nps.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 2:15 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: Oppose the Eastside Parkway Plan

Robert Hale
39 Hacienda Carmel
Carmel, CA 93923
31 January 2018

Dear FORA Board Members:

I am opposed the Eastside Parkway through the oak woodlands of the former Fort Ord. This wild area should not greatly fragmented and impacted by the presence of a freeway. Existing road infrastructure should be improved. I support LandWatch's analysis of the lack of need for the Eastside parkway.

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Thank you for your consideration, Robert Hale

From: Robert Stephens [mailto:awranch@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:19 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

Please don't build a new road through oak woodlands.

I'm writing to also express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Robert Stephens

From: John Manning [mailto:ruthandrick@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:29 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Ruth Carter, hiker

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sheila Baldrige [mailto:baldrige@redshift.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 3:43 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Sheila Baldrige
1132 Seaview Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

From: Sheila [mailto:saclark63@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 4:16 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Sheila Clark

From: senebdesign@gmail.com [mailto:senebdesign@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Steve Benes

Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:37 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Subject: Eastside Parkway Opposition

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the unnecessary Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

I believe FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway. Please listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Steve Benes & Family

From: Steve Zmak [mailto:steve@stevezmak.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:13 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs. Replacing the stop signs along Gen. Jim Moore would go along way to improving traffic through the Former Fort Ord.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public and abandon Eastside Parkway!

Sincerely,

Steve Zmak
Zmak Creative
Photographer—SteveZmak.com
Graphic Artist—ZmakCreative.com
TV Host, West Coast Focus—
SteveZmak.com/west-coast-focus-tv/
FAA Remote Pilot Certificate #4018318
3200 Crescent Ave.
Marina, CA 93933
831-883-4459

From: Susan Morse [mailto:smorse21st@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 9:40 AM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

Note: this is the 21st Century, we are moving from more roads, to fewer cars, more public transportation, more bike paths, more efficient, clearer roads (including roundabouts). Please, think ahead and oppose the Eastside Parkway!

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Susan Morse,
569 Aguajito Rd.
Carmel 93923
831 646-8480

From: Susan Pierszalowski [mailto:heronmoon@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 7:41 AM

To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>

Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org

Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members: I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs. FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Susan Pierszalowski
1257 Shell Avenue,
Pacific Grove, CA
93950

This Friday, February 2, the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) will make a decision either to adopt Goals and Objectives for construction of the Eastside Parkway, or reject Goals and Objectives in favor of alternative improvements to the Fort Ord transportation network. The decision is likely to affect everyone who travels near or within the former Fort Ord.

The Eastside Parkway was proposed in 1997 in the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan (BRP) and has been part of the FORA Capital Improvement Plan since 2002. It is intended to be a Southwest-Northeast arterial whose conceptual alignment is from General Jim Moore Boulevard to Inter-Garrison Road. It is currently projected to cost \$18 million.

However, it is strongly opposed. On December 6, thirty-five people spoke at FORA workshops about Eastside Parkway. Thirty-two strongly opposed it and three favored it. On January 12, the FORA Board spent two hours discussing Goals and Objectives for the Parkway, came to no decision, and continued the discussion to February 2.

Arguments opposing its construction include: [1] No post-1997 studies show that the Parkway would alleviate traffic congestion as effectively as using the \$18 million to improve existing roads by widening, roundabouts and other roadway improvements. [2] The Parkway would traverse the same sensitive oak woodland habitat area that ignited fury against the Monterey Downs racetrack proposal. [3] Construction of Eastside Parkway is not specifically required, either by the 1997 BRP or the California Environmental Quality Act; thus FORA could lawfully substitute other on-site transportation projects. [4] FORA's 2017 Fee Reallocation Study acknowledges that Eastside Parkway is one of two planned Ft. Ord roadways whose construction is not necessarily required for avoiding unacceptable levels of service by 2035.

Opponents also point to outdated claims in the 1997 BRP about the Eastside Parkway to show why the Parkway proposal needs reexamination. These include the following:

BRP Vol. One, pg. 111 states the Eastside Road will serve as a new interchange with "the proposed State Highway 68 freeway," However, there is no "proposed State Highway 68 freeway."

BRP Vol. Two, pg. 297 states the Eastside Road would run between Imjin and Gigling along the "eastern portion of the primary redevelopment area" in the former Fort Ord. However, the referenced "primary redevelopment area" was relocated in 2002 when development originally planned for Parker Flats was swapped in exchange for development allowed at East Garrison.

BRP Vol. Three, Appendix B, pg. IV-4 states that in 2015, there will be 13,366 dwelling units and 18,342 jobs at the former Fort Ord. However, it's now 2018 and there are less than a quarter that many dwelling units and jobs.

From: Timothy Smith [mailto:tarchin@icloud.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 1:58 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

From: Cameron Binkley [mailto:cabinkley@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 5:07 PM
To: FORA Board <board@fora.org>
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Cameron Binkley
213 Sicily Road
Seaside, CA 93955

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: Tama Olver <tamaolver@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 4:17 PM
To: FORA Board
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPad

From: Patty Kennedy <pkennedy1950@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 7:57 AM
To: FORA Board
Subject: Eastside Parkway

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Patty Kennedy
Seaside resident of 33+ years