

## Rosalyn Charles

---

**From:** PJ <toocrows@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 08, 2016 2:56 PM  
**To:** FORA Board; Pat Duran; Sydney Blankenship; Carrie Carr; Robin Musitelli  
**Subject:** parking and access from 8th & Giggling

I am a prior BETA volunteer for Ft. Ord. I hike, ride my road bike and my horse in the area. I am a member of Santa Cruz County Horsemen's Assoc. and Monterey Bay Equestrians and have been the trail advocate for both organizations for 5 + years. A scathing letter was sent to SCCHA from Mr. Gordon Smith of Keep Ft. Ord Wild regarding parking and access for equestrians at 8th & Giggling, the dirt parking area next to the open gate on 8th. He states the 400 acres, (Happy Trails) is officially closed to horses.

Over the past several months I have seen the Federal Posted signs come down and have seen the parking and access become more popular with all users. I am interested in finding out the actual status of this area after reading Mr. Gordon's letter.

I logged on to the FORA website and was interested to see the Agenda for the 1-8-2016 board packet has item #3, closed session regarding existing litigation Keep Ft Ord Wild vs FORA. Case #M114961.

I attended the public input and planning symposiums held in 2015. The focus regarding trails seems to be with walking, hiking and cycling. There is a very important group of equestrians who live in the bay area and come to Ft Ord to ride for the day. There are also many who keep their horses at MEC and ride into Ft. Ord. I live in Santa Cruz and have an associate membership at MEC for that reason. Many of us buy gas and stop for food in Moss Landing. Horse people spend quite a bit of money in your county because of Ft. Ord. Mr. Smith states there is adequate parking for horse trailers on Inter-garrison. This is not a safe area to unload a horse or to back in a horse trailer since the road was open to the new housing development. Some of the safety issues were addressed with the speed limit, speed bumps and the markings on the road for an equestrian crossing. Horse riders are appreciative.

I understand Josh Metz was hired as the Economic Development Coordinator. One of his responsibilities stated in his job description is planning collaboration, convening relevant stakeholders with the goal of resolving inter-jurisdictional planning challenges.

There have been 4 user groups who each seem to feel this land belongs only to them and not the use, stewardship and enjoyment for all. Some want it to be a cycle park, some an equestrian facility, some for walking and hiking only and even a few that would like to let it revert to a wilderness area with minimal human impact. The challenge will be to negotiate in a reasonable way without litigation so all can use it.

I just received your notice regarding a community input meeting set for Jan. 20th. Very timely.

**Rosalyn Charles**

---

**From:** Pure Water Monterey <info@mailva.evite.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 21, 2016 10:33 AM  
**To:** FORA Board  
**Subject:** Pure Water Monterey Grand Opening

You're invited!

---

# Pure Water Monterey Grand Opening



**Pure Water Monterey** sent you an invitation.

## Rosalyn Charles

---

**From:** Office <Office@mscbctc.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2016 12:37 AM  
**To:** Michael Houlemard; Robert Norris; FORA Board; Stan Cook; Peter Said  
**Cc:** Andy Hartmann; John Papa; Manuel Pinheiro; Steve MacArthur; Sharon Seidenstein; Jolene E. Kramer  
**Subject:** Lost Vision, A Time for Action

Michael Houlemard - Exec. Officer  
FORA  
Jan. 29th, 2016

Mr. Houlemard, we present this letter in the hopes that FORA can bring back the Vision.

### **The Vision -**

We have been involved with the Ft Ord issue since the announcement of an upcoming BRAC round by then Congressman Panetta in 1990. With the announcement of the closing (actually extreme downsizing) of Ft Ord we worked within the community and construction industry to address a simple goal put forth by Pres. Clinton expressed in his explanation of his 5 Point Plan for Base Closures. That was, to ensure that local economies would benefit from the re-development of closed military bases. From these efforts we presented to FORA language to its first ordinance for action in 1995 which was implemented into what was then the Procurement Code. Many of the elements within the Procurement Code were the results of local businesses and workers coming together to assist FORA in meeting President Clinton's and their wishes. The communities, its leaders, and FORA recognized the benefit of promoting and working "locally". FORA's vision and its intention was to utilize local business and workers to the greatest extent possible. All realized that it couldn't be a 100% effort but wanted the effort to be realistic and practical. Opportunities provided by re-development would provide opportunities throughout the construction industry and other businesses. Development meant work for local professionals and companies, provided jobs, which provided fair wages, benefits, and training, which provides a great economic base for both businesses and workers to thrive. This would transfer throughout the greater community as the money earned would be spent in the communities. The multiplier affect of that money working its way through the communities would have even a greater benefit. We were on our way.

### **The Reality -**

We believe it is not necessary to rehash the history of re- development as we all know that it did not take place as envisioned, projected, or desired. Once things did get going it was short lived as the greatest economic downturn in our lifetime put a halt to most progress. What was the vision has become blurred. Elected officials, administrations, and staffs of the jurisdictions within FORA have changed. Elections and turnovers in staffs and Admin. have created a macular degenerative situation which is robbing FORA and our communities of what was their Vision. There is some concern within the communities of FORA expressing the vision has changed but it seems to vary per community. We believe the majority shares the original vision. We find it most interesting that in one such community (Marina) many fight to stop or limit re-development throughout FORA but Marina is building like there is no tomorrow. The leadership complains that Marina is the only one paying the freight within FORA but they have beat all to the punch and are paying as outlined and approved at FORA. When the others start to develop and pay their share will Marina feel sorry for those jurisdictions?

Because of the time gap in getting development started and the need of some to get the jump on the others, problems with what was hoped for have arisen. Hasty self serving agreements and bureaucrats who didn't know any better and quite frankly in some instances don't care have ignored the vision or given it little credence.

Because the Vision is blurred the Developers have taken advantage as their interest lies in the almighty dollar. As for the elected officials, some are too far removed by time as to what the Vision was. Some we believe genuinely don't care. Some are from jurisdictions with no vested interest in what takes place and it is a crap shoot as to if FORA winds up with a competent representative or one who has nothing better to do on the 2nd Friday afternoon of the month. Some are playing politics. And, some care, understand, and may be waiting for the tide to turn or want to help to turn the tide. We could probably come up with other scenarios but this is good for now because the landscape changes with elections, appointments, and the realization of what is really taking place and the need or desire to change it.

What has and is taking place? In too many instances local companies are being ignored and not given an opportunity to engage in the development process (design, engineering, contracting, supply) These companies hire local people and they miss out. Local workers who can work independently of a company aren't being recruited. Too many workers are being cheated, robbed, and defrauded regardless of where they are from. Businesses who run honest businesses cannot operate in this type of environment. Our businesses, workers, and communities lose. Skilled professions are losing opportunities to train individuals for the future which in turn diminishes the local workforce and creates a burden on businesses. It is a vicious circle and there has been little concern on behalf of the local governments who have projects in progress. They have turned their heads as they are getting what they want without getting what their communities wanted. They have been blinded by governmental greed and lost the Vision.

#### **What can be done? -**

We all know people are in business to make money, this is no secret. The re-development of Ft Ord was not only to benefit the local governments but their communities, their businesses, their people. Development is big business. There are big risks and big rewards. If the reward of Ft Ord wasn't substantial the developers wouldn't be here. We don't see why any jurisdiction should overlook the needs of their community to ensure the reward for those who only seek to benefit from that community. There must be something in it for those besides the local government itself. A government who does not take care of the needs of its community should not exist. The Vision is not being realized and those from out of our communities are reaping the rewards. **It is time for FORA to look into what is taking place. It is time for a survey and analysis of what is happening regarding local participation and abuse. A report should be issued to the Board, a recommendation should be made by staff, and FORA should act to get us back on track.** We believe this is the right approach as some jurisdictions have shown no interest in accepting their own responsibilities. FORA was formed in part; **to ensure that local economies would benefit from the re-development of closed military bases.** To do anything less is to reject the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of the Vision that was created and regarding local participation should still exist. There are many examples of responsible, caring communities setting policy and binding developers to ensure local participation of its businesses and workers. It is time and we will assist if called upon.

**Thank you, Ron Chesshire-** CEO on behalf of the affiliated trades of the Monterey/Santa Cruz Counties Building and Construction Trades Council

Past member of the community based Tri County Building Industry Alliance,  
authors of parts of Chapter 3 of the Master Resolution Procurement Code  
60 year resident of the Monterey Bay area and son of Douglas (Capt. US Army  
retired) and Mary Chesshire. Married, wife Ida, father of 3,  
and grandfather of 8. All who are living are local residents. I didn't get  
here yesterday and am vested in our community.

Below is a section of Chapter 3 of the MR. This is one instance of where FORA ensured local participation. Some say it is no longer relevant. I believe it is still in effect as it was voted into the MR in 1997 or 98 and should be good as long as the MR is (good) in effect. At one time it was also referenced in 3.03.100 which was

the original language requiring prevailing wages. WE have missed out on a good share of local businesses and workers on our local projects. This is but a small example of a local provision. RC

### 3.03.040. LOCAL PREFERENCE.

(a) Each Contractor performing construction funded in whole or in part by Authority funds, or funds which, in accordance with a federal grant or otherwise, the Authority expends or administers, and to which the Authority is a signatory to the construction contract, will be eligible for a local preference as provided in the subsection, if such Contractor meets each of the following minimum requirements:

- (1) The Contractor must be licensed by the State of California and be a business, employer, or resident doing business in the Area for the past five years.
- (2) The Contractor must be a business, employer, or resident who has been adversely affected by the closure of the Fort Ord military base.
- (3) Eighty percent (80%) of the work force of the Contractor must be residents of the Area and fifty

35 percent (50%) of the Subcontractors must be residents of the Area.

(b) Each Contractor who is within five percent of the lowest responsible bid and who is eligible for a local preference under this subsection will be provided the opportunity to reduce the Contractor's bid to an amount equal to the amount of the lowest responsible bid. The opportunity to reduce bid amounts will be provided first to the lowest eligible bidder and, if not accepted by such bidder within five business days of the opening of bids, then to each successive eligible bidder in ascending order of the amount of the bids. In the event an eligible Contractor reduces the bid to the amount of the lowest responsible bid, the eligible Contractor will be deemed to have provided the lowest responsible bid and will be awarded the contract.

(c) In the event there is no available and qualified resident of the Area who can fill a specified position, vacancy, or job classification sought to be filled by the Contractor, or by a Subcontractor of the Contractor, the Contractor may request an exemption for the worker hours performed by a person who fills such position, vacancy, or job classification in computing the percentage of total worker hours performed by residents of the Area for the purpose of determining whether the Contractor has met the minimum requirements specified in this subsection. A Contractor seeking such an exemption must file a written application therefore with the Executive Officer on a form provided by the Executive Officer no later than ten days after the position, vacancy, or job classification for which the exemption is sought is filled by a nonresident of the Area. Such application must include a detailed written statement under oath describing the efforts and action taken by the Contractor, or the Contractor's Subcontractor, in attempting to hire a resident of the Area for the position, vacancy, or job classification for which the exemption is sought, and such further and additional information as may be requested by the Executive Officer.

(d) The provisions of this subsection will expire and will no longer be in force or effect on December 31, 1999, unless otherwise extended by the Board prior to such date.

## Rosalyn Charles

---

**From:** Matt Grigsby <matt@280systems.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 04, 2016 12:45 PM  
**To:** FORA Board  
**Subject:** Vehicle Testing @ Fort Ord

Hi,

I'm looking to do some vehicle testing at in the very near future an likely have an on-going relationship if possible. I'm curious if you can allow this and what would be the:

1. Cost for rental, if any?
2. Is a permit required, if any? How long would approval take?
3. Where exactly will we be allowed to operate?

Regarding us, we want to do some off public road testing with a semi truck using some specialized equipment and a few runs back and forth with some turning involved. We should not need more than half a day (and probably less in fact) and a parking lot area the size of a football field.

Let me know if you can assist and what the next steps are... I'm happy to explain details over the phone.

Thanks,

Matt

408-464-9581