

From: [Greg](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Councilmember Morton](#); [Councilmember O'Connell](#)
Subject: FORA TRANSITION PLAN
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2017 10:11:54 PM

Dear FORA Board Members

I'm writing to oppose extending time for FORA to deliver a detailed transition plan in order to extend their authority beyond the current 2020 termination date. The role of FORA has has been completed and I think my city, Marina, Monterey county, Seaside and other agencies such as the Coastal Commission can manage any remaining FORA obligations.

FORA has not been particularly effective that I can tell on delivering solutions to repurposing Ford Ord lands and cleaning up the mess. Why do we still have extensive blighted homes still across Fort Ord with no plan to address that in sight? FORA has done its job, its time to end it's tenure and not create a brand new authority.

Thanks,

Greg Simmons, Marina Resident.

From: [PAULA PELOT](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Frank O'Connell](#); [Councilmember Morton](#); [Layne Long](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 8(c) - Transition Task Force
Date: Friday, October 13, 2017 12:46:09 AM

I strongly urge the FORA Board to address the legislative mandates as well as the public's expectation for a thorough examination of transition options for the 2020 sunset of FORA.

Instead of producing a transition plan, wherein FORA hands over its' remaining responsibilities to the appropriate and capable agencies such as TAMC, MCWD, LAFCO and land use jurisdictions as was mandated by AB1614, staff is indicating that they cannot produce a transition plan because they need direction. Evidently, they've failed to comprehend what was written into law when the State Legislature provided them a six-year extension beyond 2014.

AB1614 had the very specific direction to create a transition plan for the 2020 sunset that would (1) assign assets and liabilities, (2) designate responsible successor agencies and (3) provide a schedule of remaining obligations. That is the direction. Where is the plan?

What staff is proposing is not a transition plan; it is a transformation plan wherein FORA is reconstituted as another Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that would shuffle along for another decade or even longer. Transformation is not transition.

FORA costs millions in salary and CalPERS liability and yet they would have us believe they do not have the collective knowledge, skills and abilities to create the legislatively mandated transition plan. Worse yet, a new JPA or extended FORA would continue to collect tax increment funds that are derived from local property taxes. Those funds should not be devoured by a redundant bureaucracy; they should be flowing to cities, the County and to K-14 education.

If FORA staff is incapable of writing the required transition plan, consultants and legal professionals could be hired to develop options for consideration by the Board and the public. One can only conclude that there is no incapacity to develop a transition plan, only an unwillingness to do so - like a child who refuses to go to bed.

Thus far, FORA staff has been stubbornly unresponsive to meeting its' AB1614 legislative mandates and so there can be no justification for FORA's continuation.

Sincerely,

Paula F.Pelot

From: [Grace Silva-Santella](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Councilmember Morton](#); [Gail Morton](#); [Layne Long](#); [Supervisor Parker](#); [Jane Parker](#); [Councilmember O'Connell](#); [Frank O'Connell](#)
Subject: NO to extending FORA beyond 2020
Date: Friday, October 13, 2017 6:30:34 AM

Dear Board Members FORA,

This letter is to express my desire that there be no extension of your time period beyond 2020.

It is time for FORA agency to disband and allow the local jurisdictions to retain all fees and tax revenue from the former Fort Ord property. Distribution of those funds would then be monitored and distributed per the direction of each Jurisdiction's elected and appointed officials.

I am a 28 year resident of Marina. I served on the Marina Planning Commission at the time of our City's' General Plan Update for 2020. Many years ago I was instrumental in organizing a joint day long workshop of all the neighboring cities Planning Commissions for a walk through of Fort Ord before the first bulldozer came through.

Much has occurred on the former military base. A few mishaps and a crushing economic downturn.

It is now time to disband your agency and allow each local jurisdiction to manage all fees from the former Fort Ord land.

Respectfully,

Grace Silva-Santella
3230 Susan Ave.,
Marina, CA
ssgardens2@gmail.com

From: [Michele Neuhaus](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Plan
Date: Friday, October 13, 2017 9:47:22 AM

I am asking to see the plan otherwise please disband this committee. Thank you.

Michele Neuhaus
831.236.6955

From: [Jasona Prowse](#)
To: [Dominique Jones](#); [Jen Simon](#)
Subject: Resident Concerns
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2017 10:34:09 PM
Attachments: [Fora.docx](#)

Thank you for opening.

Sincerely,

Jason and Jasona Prowse

October 10, 2017

Dear FORA Board,

Please urge the FORA Board to address legislation mandates as well as public expectations for a thoughtful and thorough examination of transition options, including FORA's sunset on June 20, 2020.

Assembly Bill No. 1614, Chapter 743 signed into law in 2012, required FORA to approve and submit a transition plan that:

1. Shall assign assets and liabilities,
2. Designate responsible successor agencies, and
3. Provide a schedule of remaining obligations

No such plan has been created for the public to review. Instead, FORA has SELECTED to ignore AB 1614, and SEEK an extension of FOR A either as it currently exists, or in a modified form as a single entity successor, joint powers authority. Their new joint powers authority is an extension of FORA, not a transition that distributes FORA's responsibilities to other entities.

While FORA may seek an extension, it is still mandated to produce a detailed transition plan in the event the Legislature does not extend FORA. So I ask, WHERE IS THE PLAN?

Sincerely,

Jason and Jasona Clayton
135 Cypress Grove Ct.
Marina CA 93933
Resident

From: [Howard Fosler](#)
To: [Dominique Jones](#); [FORA Board](#)
Cc: dawnalva@comcast.net
Subject: FORA - End of an Era
Date: Saturday, October 21, 2017 3:38:17 PM

Mayor Ralph Rubio, Board of Directors, Michael Houlemard, All Executives,

It is time to wrap it up and close shop. Please vacate by 2020 at the latest. Now, we must move on. Your services are appreciated. Good luck in the future.

Howard Fosler

720 Terry Street
Monterey

From: [Carmen Lombardino](#)
To: senator.monning@senate.ca.gov; Assemblymember.stone@assembly.ca.gov; [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Phillip Lombardino Sr](#)
Subject: FORA
Date: Sunday, October 22, 2017 8:55:21 AM

Greetings,

Thank you for your service. While another citizen took the time to compose this email below, I completely agree with this and would urge you as our representatives to support this request. Thank you.

I urge the FORA Board to address legislation mandates as well as public expectations for a thoughtful and thorough examination of transition options, including FORA's sunset on June 20, 2020. Assembly Bill No. 1614, Chapter 743 signed into law in 2012, required FORA to approve and submit a transition plan that: - Shall assign assets and liabilities, - Designate responsible successor agencies, and - Provide a schedule of remaining obligations No such plan has been created for the public to review. Instead, FORA has SELECTED to ignore AB 1614, and SEEK an extension of FORA either as it currently exists, or in a modified form as a single entity successor, joint powers authority. A new joint powers authority is an extension of FORA, not a transition that distributes FORA's responsibilities to other entities. While FORA may seek an extension, it is still mandated to produce a detailed transition plan in the event the Legislature does not extend FORA. **I as a resident of Monterey County wish to have FORA sunset/dissolve and want to see the transition plan to make this happen.** Sincerely, Carmen and Phillip Lombardino Marina, CA

From: [PAULA PELOT](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Bill Monning](#); [Layne Long](#); [Bruce Delgado](#); [Dominique Jones](#)
Subject: October 26, 2017 FORA Board Special Meeting Item 5 (a)- Need for Independent Analysis of Transition Plan
Date: Monday, October 23, 2017 10:09:17 PM

Dear FORA Board Members,

I strongly urge the FORA Board to address the unmet legislative mandates as well as the public's expectation for a thorough examination of transition options for the 2020 sunset of FORA.

Instead of producing a transition plan, wherein FORA hands over its' remaining responsibilities to the appropriate and capable agencies such as TAMC, MCWD, LAFCO and land use jurisdictions as was mandated by AB1614, staff indicated that they could not produce a transition plan because they require direction. AB1614 however, provided the very specific direction to create a transition plan for the 2020 sunset that would (1) *assign assets and liabilities*, (2) *designate responsible successor agencies* and (3) *provide a schedule of remaining obligations*. That is the direction.

Unless and until FORA can meet its' legislative obligation as per the AB1614, there can be no justification for FORA's continuation. Addressing the legislative obligation is not difficult, it simply takes a commitment from the Board to honor its' obligation made when FORA received its' last six year extension.

In order to do this, the FORA Board should direct that there be **an independent third party review to develop a transition plan that includes all alternatives**: extension, Joint Powers Authority, Sunset 2020, Cities/County acting independently while still coordinating on impact fees, Habitat Conservation Plan, etc. Any such analysis would also **look carefully at all financial and CEQA obligations, as well as all financing mechanisms available.**

The consultant must report **directly and independently to the Board** as reporting to staff has an inherent conflict of interest relative to oversight - most specifically in the area of pension obligation analyses.

There are a number of very capable consulting firms , i.e. Willdan Financial & Economic Consulting, Keyser Marston, etc. who the Board should consider engaging for this purpose. And yes, it will require expending funds and the Transition Task Force will need to prepare the parameters of such analyses.

Once this analysis and Transition plan is complete and reported to the Board/Public, with all the options fully examined, the Board will have begun to meet its obligation and can then move toward a consensus.

Thank you,

Paula F. Pelot

728 Landrum Court
Marina, CA 93933

From: [Virgil Piper](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Re: FORA extension
Date: Monday, October 23, 2017 2:01:18 PM

Virgil M. Piper
3010 Eddy St., Marina, CA. 93933
(831) 384-9595 (fax 384-6059)
pipersvc@sbcglobal.net

October 23, 2017

FORA Board of Directors
920 2nd Avenue
Marina, CA. 934933
Board@fora.org

TO: Members of the FORA Board of Directors.

This Board should postpone any discussion concerning an extension of the Fort Ord Reuse Authority until such time as FORA has met its obligation to provide a transition plan in accordance to provisions of Assembly Bill 1614.

Personally, I see no reason to extend FORA and was opposed to it being extended beyond 2014 because the annual \$3-million plus administrative costs are but another burden to be shared by taxpayers – some of which are your friends and neighbors. Moreover, FORA is just another level of bureaucracy which potential developers have to deal with in a time when many are pushing for “affordable” housing in our area.

There are other existing agencies which can properly handle residual problems left undone by the termination of FORA; in fact, LAFCO is currently involved in resolving certain problems related to the water and sewer issues on Fort Ord. TAMC is another “Special District” agency charged with the responsibility to handle road and traffic problems.

According to Mr. Houlemard **“You don’t know what you don’t know. . .”** but I do know this: *FORA contracted a \$100-million munitions cleanup fund to ARCADIS US, Inc. to handle unexploded ordinance.* Monterey County is fully able to implement the terms of this contract without FORA.

This Board should require that full disclosure of the required **“Transition Plan”** be made public, published in the paper for everyone to see, **BEFORE** any discussion is scheduled for yet another extension!

Sincerely,

ss: *Virgil M. Piper*

Marina, CA.

From: [Michael DeLapa](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Nicole Charles](#); assemblymember.stone@assembly.ca.gov; senator.cannella@senate.ca.gov; assemblymember.caballero@assembly.ca.gov
Subject: FORA Conflict of Interest
Date: Tuesday, October 24, 2017 7:03:21 AM
Attachments: [FORA Conflict of Interest_LandWatch.pdf](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)
[LandWatch FORA transition plan.pdf](#)
[ATT00002.htm](#)

LandWatch letter regarding FORA staff's conflict of interest, below as text and attached as PDF.

October 24, 2017

Mayor Ralph Rubio, Chair
Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Board of Directors
920 2nd Avenue, Suite A
Marina, CA 93933

Dear Chair Rubio and Board of Directors:

LandWatch understands that the FORA Board of Directors has scheduled a workshop Thursday, October 26 to consider preparation of a transition plan. FORA staff face an inherent conflict of interest in developing this plan, as made clear by the woefully inadequate transition planning that has so far taken place. Whether FORA is extended or not, staff will be economically impacted by the transition. Salaries, pensions, and other benefits are all at stake. Staff has a very significant incentive to pursue an extension to the exclusion of fair consideration of other alternatives that might better serve the public interest.

As evidence of this problem, LandWatch received no reply to our October 3, 2017 letter (attached), nor any indication that staff is seriously evaluating the eleven critical public policy issues we raised. As further evidence, FORA staff released this week [Realizing the Vision - 20 years of Fort Ord Reuse Progress](#), a slick promotional video—presumably paid with public funds—that aims to present its case for extension, highlighting in a shallow, public relations fashion FORA's ostensible successes with no mention of its shortcomings. It's hard to imagine another public agency using public funds to toot its own horn at a more inappropriate time and in a more inappropriate manner.

Staff's conflict of interest is further spotlighted by its recommendation for a five-year extension in the January 27, 2016 memorandum, written by Assistant Executive Director Officer Steve Endsley, and the 2016 and 2017 Transition Task Force Committees' conclusionary recommendations to the board to extend FORA. Staff guided all three recommendations, which were made prior to the development and consideration of a transition plan.

Because of the staff's conflict of interest, the FORA Board of Directors must retain as quickly as possible an objective third-party consultant who can develop transition options for the Board's consideration. At a minimum, such options must include the termination of FORA

consistent with current state law; the identification of responsibilities that require no further action; and the potential assignments of unfulfilled responsibilities to other jurisdictions and agencies.

Any extension of FORA must be premised upon supported findings of a true need for the Authority to continue, *if such need exists*. Neither the FORA Board nor the state legislature should consider any extension of the Authority Act, contemplated to sunset in 2014 and already extended to 2020, without a full and impartial analysis of alternatives, as Assembly Bill No. 1614, Chapter 743 requires.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

<!--[if !vml]--> <!--[endif]-->

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director