

# Eastside Parkway Goals & Objectives

Board Presentation  
*February 9, 2018*

*Jonathan Brinkmann,  
Principal Planner*



- Clarifications
- Process Overview
- TAMC Presentation
- Revised Goals and Objectives
- Recommendation

- Eastside Parkway planned as 2-lane arterial
- Blanco Road is referenced in BRP
- TAMC 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study shows need to complete FORA CIP

- **Freeways:** *High-speed facilities designed to carry large volumes of traffic. Limited-access roadways.* Traffic can only enter and exit at specific locations.
- **Arterial:** Range of roadways that include urban streets and rural highways. *Signalized intersections designed to serve thru traffic.*
- Source: *BRP Vol. 2 p. 283*

- Gigling Road/Inter-garrison Connector:
- This facility is intended to be more attractive to drivers for accessing the southern portion of the reuse area from the east, thus ***reducing the demand on Blanco Road and the 12<sup>th</sup> Street/Imjin Road corridor.***
- Source: *BRP Vol. 2, p. 295*

- **Deficiency Analysis** – a methodology used to determine weaknesses found in a system
- Study analyzed a number of scenarios including:
  - **2035 conditions without FORA CIP (No Build Scenario)** and;
  - **2035 conditions with Alt FORA CIP (Build Alternative CIP)**
- **Results:**
  - No Build Scenario resulted in **7 roadways being deficient**
  - Build Alt CIP resulted in **acceptable levels of service on nearly all roadways** studied

# 2017 TAMC Study Results

Table 10: Level of Service for No-Build– (at horizon year 2035)

Roadway	FORA Project Descriptions	No-Build					
		Direction	AM	PM	Direction	AM	PM
Highway 1	4→6 Lanes (Fremont to Del Monte)	SB	C	E	NB	E	F
Monterey Rd Interchange	New Interchange @ Monterey Rd/Hwy 1	SB Off	N/A	N/A	NB Off	N/A	N/A
		SB On	N/A	N/A	NB On	N/A	N/A
Highway 156	4 Lane Freeway	EB	C	E	WB	E	C
Highway 68	Operational Improvements	EB	B	D	WB	C	C
Davis Road	4 Lanes SR-183→Blanco Rd	SB	E	D	NB	C	F
Davis Road	4 Lanes Blanco Rd→Reservation Rd	NB	B	C	SB	B	B
Reservation Road	4 Lanes East Garrison Gate→Watkins Gate	EB	A	C	WB	B	B
Reservation Road	4 Lanes Watkins Gate→Davis Rd	EB	B	E	WB	E	C
8th Street	2 Lanes 2nd Ave→Intergarrison Rd	EB	B	C	WB	C	B
2nd Avenue	2 Lanes Imjin Parkway→Del Monte Blvd	EB	N/A	N/A	WB	N/A	N/A
Inter-Garrison	4 Lanes Eastside Pkwy→Reservation Rd	WB/SB	E	C	EB/NB	B	E
Gigling Road	4 Lanes General Jim Moore Blvd→Eastside Rd	EB	C	E	WB	E	C
General Jim Moore Blvd	2→4 Lanes Normandy Rd→McClure Way ✓	SB	A	B	NB	B	A
General Jim Moore Blvd	2→4 Lanes McClure Way→Coe Ave ✓	SB	A	B	NB	A	A
General Jim Moore Blvd	2→4 Lanes Coe Ave→S Boundary Rd ✓	SB	B	B	NB	A	B
Eucalyptus Road	2 Lanes General Jim Moore Blvd→Parker Flats ✓	WB	A	A	EB	A	A
Eastside Parkway	2 Lanes Eucalyptus Rd→Schoonover Dr	WB	N/A	N/A	EB	N/A	N/A
South Boundary	2 Lanes General Jim Moore Blvd→York Blvd	EB	B	E	WB	C	E
Imjin Parkway	4 Lane Minor Arterial	WB	F	D	EB	C	F
Del Monte Blvd	4 Lane Principal Arterial	NB	A	A	SB	A	A
Fremont Blvd	4 Lane Minor Arterial	NB	A	A	SB	A	A

Check mark indicates that the project has been constructed.

# 2017 TAMC Study Results

Table 13: Level of Service for Build Alternative CIP – (at horizon year 2035)

Roadway	FORA Project Descriptions	Build Alternative CIP					
		Direction	AM	PM	Direction	AM	PM
Highway 1	4→6 Lanes (Fremont to Del Monte)	SB	C	E	NB	E	F
Monterey Rd Interchange	New Interchange @ Monterey Rd/Hwy 1	SB Off	A	A	NB Off	A	A
		SB On	A	A	NB On	A	A
Highway 156	4 Lane Freeway	EB	B	C	WB	C	B
Highway 68	Operational Improvements	EB	A	C	WB	B	B
Davis Road	4 Lanes SR-183→Blanco Rd	SB	D	C	NB	C	D
Davis Road	4 Lanes Blanco Rd→Reservation Rd	NB	B	C	SB	C	B
Reservation Road	4 Lanes East Garrison Gate→Watkins Gate	EB	B	C	WB	C	B
Reservation Road	4 Lanes Watkins Gate→Davis Rd	EB	B	E	WB	E	C
8th Street	2 Lanes 2nd Ave→Intergarrison Rd	EB	A	A	WB	A	A
2nd Avenue	2 Lanes Imjin Parkway→Del Monte Blvd	EB	C	A	WB	A	A
Inter-Garrison	4 Lanes Eastside Pkwy→Reservation Rd	WB/SB	D	B	EB/NB	B	D
Gigling Road	4 Lanes General Jim Moore Blvd→Eastside Rd	EB	B	B	WB	B	B
General Jim Moore Blvd	2→4 Lanes Normandy Rd→McClure Way ✓	SB	B	B	NB	B	B
General Jim Moore Blvd	2→4 Lanes McClure Way→Coe Ave ✓	SB	A	B	NB	A	B
General Jim Moore Blvd	2→4 Lanes Coe Ave→S Boundary Rd ✓	SB	C	C	NB	B	C
Eucalyptus Road	2 Lanes General Jim Moore Blvd→Parker Flats ✓	WB	B	B	EB	B	B
Eastside Parkway	2 Lanes Eucalyptus Rd→Schoonover Dr	WB	E	C	EB	C	D
South Boundary	2 Lanes General Jim Moore Blvd→York Blvd	EB	C	B	WB	B	C

Check mark indicates that the project has been constructed.

# Process Overview

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Pre-CEQA</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Goals &amp; Objectives - Community Workshop</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Goal describes underlying purpose.</i></li> <li>• <i>Objective describes ways to achieve the goal.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Goals &amp; Objectives – Discuss and consider approval</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>Dec 2017</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Feb 2018</b></p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>CEQA</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Notice of Preparation (NOP): 30-day review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>NOP starts CEQA process</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>EIR Public Scoping Meeting</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Charrette-style format</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Public Review Draft EIR: 45-day review</b></li> <li>• <b>Public Review Draft EIR Public Meeting</b></li> <li>• <b>Final Project Approval &amp; EIR Certification</b></li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: right;"><b>March 2018</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>April 2018</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Dec 2018</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Dec 2018</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>July 2019</b></p>

- Staff Presentation
- Public Comment
- Board of Directors' questions, input, and motion to continue item to **Special Meeting** (canceled), including **TAMC presentation**



- ▶ Q1: What section and pages of the 1997 BRP identifies the Eastside Road as mitigation?
- ▶ R1: The FEIR identified: “[i]mpact: **Increase Travel Demand on Regional Transportation System**” (pg. 4-108). It also identified the following mitigation for this impact: “**A Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP)**...(pg. 4-112).
  - The DRMP states: “**FORA shall fund its “Fair Share” of “on-site,” “off-site,” and “regional” roadway and transit capital improvements** based on the nexus analysis of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) regional transportation model” (BRP Vol.1, pg. 195).
  - The FEIR identified **Eastside Road within the “on-site” network** to connect Imjin Parkway to Gigling Road (FEIR\_pg. 4-104 - 4-106).

- ▶ Q2: Would you please clarify why this contradicts the article in the Monterey County Weekly?
- ▶ R2: The Weekly article does not provide evidence for its statement that the only required traffic mitigations under the BRP are off-site projects. In fact, **establishing the DRMP, which requires FORA to fund its Fair Share of on-site, off-site, and regional projects and transit improvements, is a BRP mitigation.**

- ▶ Q3: Is the 2017 Study the basis for advising the FORA Board that the Eastside Parkway should be the highest priority?
- ▶ R3: No. **The FORA Board prioritized Eastside Parkway funding in the 2009/10 mid-year CIP and maintained this funding priority** in subsequent, annual CIP document approvals.
- ▶ Q4: What are underlying assumptions of 2017 Study “No Build” scenario?
- ▶ R4: Underlying assumptions are that **AMBAG’s projected population growth occurs by year 2035 with no TAMC RTP and no FORA CIP improvements.**

- ▶ Q5: Did you evaluate other roadway improvements vis a vis the “no Build Alternative” to determine optimal \$18 million investment in roads?
- ▶ R5: No. The 2017 Study studied the “**Build FORA CIP**” and “**Build Alternative CIP**” scenario improvements’ effectiveness in providing roadway capacity in 2035 conditions.
- ▶ Q6: If FORA made investment in Eastside Parkway, how many existing roadways would still operate at deficient levels of service?
- ▶ R6: There are **many factors involved** such as **other FORA CIP improvements, TAMC RTP improvements, and population growth.**

- ▶ Q7: Had FORA staff previously asked TAMC for a presentation on the Eastside Parkway and an opinion about its regional benefits?
- ▶ R7: TAMC staff attends FORA Admin. Committee meetings where FORA CIP projects are prioritized for Board consideration. **TAMC has prepared three Fort Ord transportation studies**, in coordination with FORA with Administrative Committee review, including presentations to the Board (1997, 2005, & 2017). These studies have evaluated the effectiveness of the FORA CIP projects, including Eastside Parkway.

- ▶ Q8: Why did staff mischaracterize the overwhelming public opposition to the format of the December Workshops?
- ▶ R8: Staff characterized the Public Meeting comments impartially in the Staff Report. We included a section called **“Criticism of the Process”** in **Exhibit B**.
- ▶ Q9: Why does the staff report exclude quantifying the number of people testifying, letters, and emails in support and opposition?
- ▶ R9: Staff was tasked to obtain Goals and Objectives from the public. That was the primary focus of the staff report and its attachments.

- **Clarifications**
- **Process Overview**
- **January Meeting Summary**
- **TAMC Presentation**
  - Eastside Parkway modeled to provide local (63%) and regional (37%) traffic relief
  - Kimley-Horn preliminary modeling shows:
    - limited Hwy 68 traffic relief
    - improved regional commute
- **Staff Report Questions**

- **Reduce future traffic congestion** along Highway 1, 12th Street (now Imjin Parkway), Blanco Road, and the Del Monte/2nd/General Jim Moore Boulevard corridor.
- **Maintain recreational, cultural, and natural resources**, consistent with the Reuse Plan FEIR and DRMP.

(Full text in Exhibit A to Item 8c)

# Objectives

<b>Mobility</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Acceptable LOS throughout network</li><li>• Reduce travel time and distances</li><li>• Safe and efficient former Fort Ord streets</li><li>• Improve mobility of emergency response</li><li>• Dedicated pedestrian and bicycle facilities</li></ul>	<b>Connectivity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Serve the area south of CSUMB</li><li>• Direct efficient linkages from and to regional roadway system, with best practices (roundabouts etc.)</li><li>• Connect FONM and CCCVC to regional roadway system</li></ul>
<b>BRP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Utilize existing roadways as foundation</li><li>• Comply with BRP</li></ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Maintain existing and proposed trail network</li><li>• MPC/CSU access</li></ul>

## Minimize Disruption

- Minimize disrupting any community's expansion and circulation
- Minimize environmental impacts to all named communities
- De-emphasize Inter-Garrison Road as vehicular route
- Maintain aesthetic character (slopes, views)
- Minimize noise impacts

## Safety

- Consider safety of residents, pedestrians, bicyclists and wildlife
- Improve mobility of emergency system responders

## Environment

- Protect HMAs from edge effects
- Respect and integrate natural resources

- ~~Avoid bisecting CSUMB campus.~~ Minimize disrupting any community, including its expansion and circulation
- Provide direct and efficient linkages from former Fort Ord lands to the regional transportation system
  - Consider best practices in transportation planning, including regional and systemic improvements such as roundabouts and autonomous vehicles
- Improve mobility of emergency system responders, including, but not limited to, firefighter access
- Improve MPC, CSUMB and other educational institutions' access for students, staff, and faculty
- Utilize the existing roadways as the foundation for the future network
- Comply with policies and programs of the Reuse Plan

- **Discuss and consider approval of Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (Exhibit A).**
  - *In its consideration, the Board may approve **Exhibit A** as presented or as modified by Board motion.*