

From: [Paul Whitson](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: I Oppose Eastside Parkway Project
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 2:42:44 PM

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: [Joseph Patronik](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 3:00:35 PM

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: [James Tarhalla](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 5:15:00 PM

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: [shelley wilkinson](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 5:16:53 PM

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: [Beverly Bean](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: NO to the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 5:52:33 PM

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: [Hale, Robert \(Bob\) \(CIV\)](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: East Side Parkway Hearing - Jan 12, 2018
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 6:47:07 PM

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: linny@cruzio.com
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 7:15:24 PM

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: [Hetty Eddy](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 8:10:49 PM

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

From: [Nancy Selfridge](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: East side Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:26:38 PM

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: [Michael Cate](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Re: Proposed parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:55:21 PM

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: [Mark Anicetti](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: No Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2018 10:25:31 PM

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: [Dunebug67](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: No Eastside Parkway Road
Date: Friday, January 12, 2018 8:42:00 AM

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: [Anthony Oropeza](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Input Re: Eastside Parkway
Date: Friday, January 12, 2018 9:25:51 AM

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: [Molly Erickson](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Item 8d on today's FORA Board agenda
Date: Friday, January 12, 2018 10:33:49 AM
Attachments: [18.01.12.KFOW.ltr.to.FORA.BOD.re.ESP.goals.objs.pdf](#)

Please see attached letter on behalf of Keep Fort Ord Wild. 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 12, 2018

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 the FORA process. FORA staff is trying to get the Board to approve "Attachment A," which is a list of goals and objectives designed to result in the discredited 2011 road alignment or one similar. FORA is trying to hide the complete public comments related to this Eastside Parkway issue.

The Board should not approve the Attachment A document, because approval would give further illegal momentum toward the discredited 2011 alignment and away from feasible alternative projects and the no-project alternative.

FORA told the Court "FORA is proceeding with an environmental review process that involves meaningful public participation, . . . and analysis and consideration of reasonable and feasible alternatives" (*ibid.*, emph. added). But the FORA "workshops" were not meaningful and not in the public interest.

FORA is trying to sucker-punch the public and the Court.

- FORA promised the Court and the public that FORA would seek "community input on the project goals and objectives necessary to inform the project definition and to develop a range of potential alternatives to the project." (FORA pleading filed with Superior Court, Dec. 13, 2017.)
 - FORA then betrayed that promise and ignored the public's feedback. FORA did not use the public input that FORA told the Court was "necessary" to define the project and the project alternatives.
 - Instead, FORA staff has presented a self-serving document that does not reflect the public comments. It is a confusing, muddled and inconsistent staff report. FORA has not disclosed the private communications on which the FORA based the staff report and Attachment A.
 - Board approval of Attachment A would improperly narrow the project to the discredited alignment and alignments very similar to it. Board approval of Attachment A also would mean the EIR would not consider a

From: [Michelle Raine](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: FORA Meeting 1/12/18 at 2:00 p.m. - Objections to "Eastside Parkway"
Date: Friday, January 12, 2018 11:55:20 AM

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

Chair Rubio and FORA Directors
Re: Eastside Parkway
January 12, 2018
Page 2

reasonable range of feasible alternatives and would prematurely reject feasible and more cost effective alternatives.

- The public comments included in the FORA Board packet do not include several material and substantial comments submitted by the public by the FORA deadline. FORA represented to the Court it would consider all public comments on Eastside Parkway. FORA has not kept its promise to the Court and to the public. KFORW questions what else FORA has hidden from the Board and omitted from the Eastside Parkway analysis at this critical stage.
- To make matters even worse, FORA is not providing fair and equal treatment to the public comments it has received and included in the Board packet. For example, FORA placed almost verbatim in Attachment A language requested in one comment letter from one organization. At the same time FORA rejected without comment dozens of comments from individuals and public interest groups, and FORA refused to incorporate their public interest requests in the “Goals and Objectives” in Attachment A.
- FORA’s prejudicial, unfair, and selective treatment of favored commenters and out-of-hand rejection of other comments is contrary to the public interest and responsible regional governance.

What is certain: The FORA process is improper. FORA’s momentum toward the discredited 2011 alignment has continued unabated. FORA is going down the same path as before, inviting further litigation from public interest organizations.

Request: continue the hearing and the decision.

The FORA Board does not have a complete and relevant information set the Board should have for the Board to make this important Eastside Parkway decision. The FORA Board should not vote on Item 8d and should not approve the Attachment A to the staff report.

The Board should continue the item and direct FORA staff to (1) provide **all** public comments to the Board and (2) explain why FORA has adopted selected comments and rejected others.

Very truly yours,

STAMP | ERICKSON

/s/ Molly Erickson

Molly Erickson

From: [Daniel Weinstein](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway
Date: Friday, January 12, 2018 12:33:30 PM

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: [Michael Do Couto](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Regional transportation needs.
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2018 12:57:06 PM

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: [Paul Whitson](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Opposition to Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2018 1:06:20 PM

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: [Mark Anicetti](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Prioritize Improving Existing Roads
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2018 1:38:32 PM

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](#)
To: FORA Board; Landwatch@mclw.org
Subject: Concerns regarding the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, January 25, 2018 4:15:49 PM

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: [Susan Thomas](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway proposal
Date: Friday, January 26, 2018 8:12:25 AM

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: [Michael DeLapa](#)
To: [Michael Houlemard](#)
Cc: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: FORA -- TAMC presentation and ESP goals
Date: Friday, January 26, 2018 5:24:48 PM
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!](#)

Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives

Proposed Project Background/Need:

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

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

Proposed Project Goals and Objectives:

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

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

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

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

From: [Nancy Selfridge](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Prioritize Improving Existing Roads and Focusing on Needed Projects
Date: Saturday, January 27, 2018 8:04:47 AM

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: [Cari-Esta Albert](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Prioritize Improving Existing Roads
Date: Sunday, January 28, 2018 5:33:26 PM

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

Cari Albert

From: [john-bonnie](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: new road through Fort Ord
Date: Monday, January 29, 2018 12:10:29 PM

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: [Michael Houlemard](#)
To: [Michael DeLapa](#)
Cc: [FORA Board](#); [Dominique Jones](#); [FORA Staff](#)
Subject: RE: RESENT: FORA -- TAMC presentation and ESP goals [originally sent 1/26/18]
Date: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 10:20:06 AM

Michael,

My apologies for not responding to your original email of last week. Our server software protections screened it into junk mail. I have asked our technical staff to clear that problem.

- 1) I do not have a record of the Special Meeting continuance of the Goals and Objectives Item from the January meeting being set three times. We did send out a meeting maker that originally asked for availability on three (1/25, 1/31, 2/5) separate dates. After receiving responses from Board members to determine if we could achieve maximum participation (and hearing that the appropriate TAMC staff could attend) we selected February 5, 2018 after checking with the chair. However, after setting that date we were informed that it conflicted with a TAMC subcommittee meeting – which would limit or eliminate participation by certain Board members. Therefore, we again polled the members for another potential date and 2/2 @ 3:00 P.M. was the final date that enable maximum participation at a reasonable time for public participation and provided for TAMC presentation. Rather than rely on Board member contact, I suggest you check the FORA web page as we always post our meetings in accordance with the Brown Act.
- 2) The Goals and Objectives seek a solution to completing the transportation network that was reviewed under the Base Reuse Plan and its accompanying documents. Please re-read the Board report from the January meeting, even though it appears you have already made up your mind about what it describes.
- 3) Since this item is continued from the January 12 meeting the public comments on the Goals and Objectives have been heard. However, the chair may decide to take comment from those who did not have an opportunity to comment during the first time this was heard. As well, we do anticipate additional Board comments (only some Board members had opportunity to comment) that were also deferred from the January meeting.
- 4) In following the Board's direction, we have made adjustments to the Goals and Objectives and will be sending those out later today with the agenda and Board packet.

The Board has asked us to continue to pursue a public process and to follow State Law in assuring public review. We will continue to do exactly that while keeping with the direction to conduct a robust community engagement process. Thank you for your constructive criticisms on ways to improve and sustain that commitment, even though we may not always agree on every point.

Peace,

Michael

Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.
Executive Officer
Fort Ord Reuse Authority
920 2nd Avenue

From: [Michael DeLapa](#)
To: [Michael Houlemard](#)
Cc: [FORA Board](#); [Dominique Jones](#); [FORA Staff](#)
Subject: Re: RESENT: FORA -- TAMC presentation and ESP goals [originally sent 1/26/18]
Date: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 10:35:56 AM

Michael,

Thank you for your reply. Would you please let me know how and when the Board chair will decide whether to allow public testimony from people who didn't comment in January. What criteria will he use to make his decision? It's important to let people know prior to the meeting whether their voices will be heard, and if they're not being allowed to speak why.

Also, at the last meeting I had been apprised there would be 3 minutes of public testimony but the board chair changed that to 2 minutes immediately prior to testimony beginning, which significantly impacted my and others' presentations. Being clear about testimony duration prior to the meeting respects the public process.

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!](#)

On Jan 30, 2018, at 10:19 AM, Michael Houlemard <Michael@fora.org> wrote:

Michael,

My apologies for not responding to your original email of last week. Our server software protections screened it into junk mail. I have asked our technical staff to clear that problem.

- 1) I do not have a record of the Special Meeting continuance of the Goals and Objectives Item from the January meeting being set three times. We did send out a meeting maker that originally asked for availability on three (1/25, 1/31, 2/5) separate dates. After receiving responses from Board members to determine if we could achieve maximum participation (and hearing that the appropriate TAMC staff could attend) we selected February 5, 2018 after checking with the chair. However, after setting that

date we were informed that it conflicted with a TAMC subcommittee meeting – which would limit or eliminate participation by certain Board members. Therefore, we again polled the members for another potential date and 2/2 @ 3:00 P.M. was the final date that enable maximum participation at a reasonable time for public participation and provided for TAMC presentation. Rather than rely on Board member contact, I suggest you check the FORA web page as we always post our meetings in accordance with the Brown Act.

- 2) The Goals and Objectives seek a solution to completing the transportation network that was reviewed under the Base Reuse Plan and its accompanying documents. Please re-read the Board report from the January meeting, even though it appears you have already made up your mind about what it describes.
- 3) Since this item is continued from the January 12 meeting the public comments on the Goals and Objectives have been heard. However, the chair may decide to take comment from those who did not have an opportunity to comment during the first time this was heard. As well, we do anticipate additional Board comments (only some Board members had opportunity to comment) that were also deferred from the January meeting.
- 4) In following the Board's direction, we have made adjustments to the Goals and Objectives and will be sending those out later today with the agenda and Board packet.

The Board has asked us to continue to pursue a public process and to follow State Law in assuring public review. We will continue to do exactly that while keeping with the direction to conduct a robust community engagement process. Thank you for your constructive criticisms on ways to improve and sustain that commitment, even though we may not always agree on every point.

Peace,

Michael

Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.
Executive Officer
Fort Ord Reuse Authority
920 2nd Avenue
Marina, CA 93933
831.883.3672

From: Michael DeLapa [<mailto:execdir@landwatch.org>]

Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 4:20 PM

To: Michael Houlemard <Michael@fora.org>

Cc: FORA Board <board@fora.org>; Dominique Jones <Dominique@fora.org>; FORA Staff <Staff@fora.org>

Subject: RESENT: FORA -- TAMC presentation and ESP goals [originally sent 1/26/18]

1/26/18

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!](#)

Marina, CA 93933
831.883.3672

From: Michael DeLapa [mailto:execdir@landwatch.org]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 4:20 PM
To: Michael Houlemard <Michael@fora.org>
Cc: FORA Board <board@fora.org>; Dominique Jones <Dominique@fora.org>; FORA Staff <Staff@fora.org>
Subject: RESENT: FORA -- TAMC presentation and ESP goals [originally sent 1/26/18]

1/26/18

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](#)

From: [Michael Wellborn](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:06:02 AM

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: [Mark Anicetti](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Landwatch Monterey County Land Watch](#)
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:07:50 AM

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: [Joseph Patronik](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:08:14 AM

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: [Robert Stephens](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:18:58 AM

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: [Steve Zmak](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:23:37 AM

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: [Michael Do Couto](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Regional transportation needs
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:42:12 AM

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: [Andrew Konik](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 10:09:03 AM

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: pmcneill64@gmail.com on behalf of [Pat McNeill](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 11:09:09 AM

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: [Dawn H](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [LandWatch Monterey County](#)
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 12:42:12 PM

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: [Katherine Biala](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 12:47:53 PM

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: [Hale, Robert \(Bob\) \(CIV\)](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: Oppose the Eastside Parkway Plan
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 2:16:10 PM

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: [Juli Hofmann](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 2:55:06 PM

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: [DALE & CHRIS MCCAULEY](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: No "PARK" WAY Don't try again
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 3:14:36 PM

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: [Sheila](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 4:15:13 PM

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: [Nick Madronio](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 4:53:39 PM

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: [Karl Ogden](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:16:25 PM

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: [Maria Ogden](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I strongly oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 9:04:36 PM

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: [Jim Tarhalla](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 6:33:41 AM

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: [Michael Cate](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 7:40:21 AM

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: [JB](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:20:20 AM

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: [John Manning](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:28:47 AM

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: senebdesign@gmail.com on behalf of [Steve Benes](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway Opposition
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:37:08 AM

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: [dorothy.cole](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:50:17 AM

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: [John Sexton Photography](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 11:30:42 AM

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: [Anne Larsen](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 11:31:02 AM

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: [Bertrand Deprez](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 11:48:36 AM

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: JaneHaines80@gmail.com
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: The Eastside Parkway is NOT a Necessary Mitigation for Traffic Levels of Service (LOS)
Date: Thursday, February 01, 2018 11:59:42 AM

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