

Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) 9-1-18

1. Where did the name “Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector” come from? Why was the project renamed in April 2018?

From FORA Board discussions on the upcoming planning process for a proposed roadway project identified as Eastside Road in the FORA Base Reuse Plan (BRP). Eastside Road is a required element described in both the BRP and FORA Capital Improvement Program (CIP). During March 2018 Board discussions, members of the public and several FORA Board members suggested that the name given by Monterey County to this part of the BRP's transportation network several years ago is dated and possibly has a negative connotation. Instead of inventing a name before the public participation process of the proposed project got underway, FORA staff and consultants are using the description of the roadway as a placeholder. Once a roadway location is determined, after the planning process and Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a final name will be designated.

2. What happens at a Scoping Meeting?

A Scoping Meeting is a formal step in the planning process for proposed project development by public entities in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). During the 30-day comment period on a Notice of Preparation for an EIR, at least one open public meeting is held to solicit comments from the public about the proposed scope and content of the environmental analysis. CEQA expertise is not required to attend. The Notice of Preparation contains the proposed project description, location, and potential identified environmental effects and can be accessed online: <http://www.fora.org/connector>. The public is invited to comment on the scope and content of the environmental analysis at the scoping meeting. You can comment at the Scoping Meeting on the information provided or what you think should be considered in the review process for this proposed project. Comment forms will be provided and collected at the Scoping Meetings. Also, you may submit your comments to the mailing address or email address below by September 25, 2018.

Jonathan Brinkmann, Principal Planner, FORA
920 2nd Avenue, Suite A
Marina, California 93933
or
connector@fora.org

3. Why were these dates chosen for the Scoping Meeting?

CEQA law requires that at least one Scoping meeting be held to receive comments within a certain time frame. FORA is holding two meetings. The times and locations were selected based on availability of facilities and scheduling of persons responsible for preparation of the EIR. These are not the only way to provide comments on the scope and content of the Environmental analysis. Comments may be submitted in writing or via email (see FAQ #2 response for details), and, as the EIR process moves forward, there will be more opportunities for public participation in the environmental review process.

4. Why do some people say the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) study doesn't show a need for this roadway?

This question surfaced as a follow on to a TAMC February 9th presentation (http://www.fora.org/Board/2018/Presentations/02/2018_TAMC-FORA-Eastside-Parkway_020918.pdf) that summarized current and future traffic flow. The presentation concluded that the NE-SW corridor would still be an important link in the local and regional roadway network. The presentation shows that, without the roadway, Highway 1, Imjin Parkway, and Inter-garrison road would have more trips, but little correlation to Highway 68 traffic. The presentation answered specific questions that had been raised, such as “is this new road needed without Monterey Downs?” The numbers of trips on the Northeast-Southwest Connector was forecasted to be very high without that development project in place. It is important to note that the 2017 TAMC traffic study that informs FORA for the need for this project did not pull out specific projects. The study showed “no build” and “build” with all the planned projects in the former Fort Ord in place. Without the Northeast-Southwest Connector, many of the key roadways fail at Level of Service (LOS). Finally, the TAMC presentation does not show the “no build” impact on other roadways. The goal of this project does not include relief of congestion on Highway 68. Highway 68 is already at capacity, so new growth that increases traffic on roadways in the network will be taken up by other roadways.

5. What is Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector and what is it intended to do?

Northeast-Southwest Connector is a conceptual Northeast-to-Southwest arterial roadway within the Fort Ord on-site transportation network. The FORA CIP documents (2006-2018) describe the conceptual roadway as a 2-lane arterial roadway from Eucalyptus Road to Schoonover Drive. Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector is expected to accommodate 18,586 average daily trips (ADT) at 2035 (see “2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study” (where it is labeled “Eastside Parkway”) (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf) for additional information. What will the alignment of Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector look like when it's complete?

The alignment of Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector has not yet been determined. In the current steps in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process for the proposed roadway, FORA prepared a statement of the project's goals and objectives and a project description of the proposed project. The precise alignment of Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector will not be determined until the CEQA process is complete.

6. When and how was the public informed of FORA's plan to build Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector?

In 1996, FORA circulated its Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan and accompanying Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which included a Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector (identified as Eastside Road) in the Fort Ord Transportation Network, for public review and comment. In 1997, the FORA Board adopted the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and its Final EIR (FEIR). The FEIR identified the following impact: Increase Travel Demand on Regional Transportation System (FEIR, pg. 4-108). It also identified the following mitigation for this impact: A Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) to establish programs and monitor development at Fort Ord to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities and water supply shall be established by FORA (FEIR, pg. 4-112). Section 3.11.5.3 (a) of the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan (a component of 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 TAMC regional transportation model (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume 1, pg. 195).

Eastside Road is an “on-site” road within the Fort Ord Transportation Network identified in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan and its accompanying FEIR, three traffic studies in 1997, 2005, and 2017, and in FORA’s annual CIP documents from 2001-02 to present. The FORA Board prioritized Eastside Road funding in the 2009/10 mid-year CIP and maintained this funding priority in subsequent, annual CIP document approvals. These documents are available on the FORA website: <http://fora.org/connector.html>.

7. What Fort Ord developments does Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector serve?

Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector was designed as a part of a network that accommodated Fort Ord and regional traffic. Per the 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation study, the conceptual alignment from General Jim Moore Blvd to Inter-Garrison Rd would serve regional traffic and local former Fort Ord traffic areas such as East Garrison, East Campus Housing, California State University Monterey Bay, Defense Manpower and Data Center, California Central Coast Veteran’s Cemetery and Presidio of Monterey military housing, and future planned developments, such as Campus Town and Seaside East. Future traffic conditions in 2035 modeled in the “2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study” show that Northeast-Southwest Connector would provide important roadway capacity, meaning 18,586 Average Daily Trips (ADT) would use Northeast-Southwest Connector (labelled Eastside Parkway in the report). TAMC modeled the 2035 scenario finding that, with TAMC’s Regional Transportation Plan and the FORA CIP, roadways in the Fort Ord Transportation Network would perform within acceptable levels of service (LOS) D or better.

8. If Fort Ord developments are not built, will Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector still be necessary?

Fort Ord developments have been entitled, built, and are being planned consistent with the 1997 BRP. There is no expectation the recovery program will not be completed. The 1997 BRP DRMP (Section 3.11.5) allows development within certain financial and resource constraints, such as 6,600 acre-feet per year of Salinas Valley groundwater (Section 3.11.5.4(b) BRP Volume 1, pg. 197). The FORA Board has not amended the DRMP. Therefore, planning for less development than allowed in the DRMP has not been studied, including performing additional traffic studies under a reduced development scenario.

9. Will there be bike paths on Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector?

Yes. The integration of bike path and trail connections within the former Fort Ord roadway network is an important part of roadway design.

10. How will Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector be funded?

Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector is funded through the FORA CIP. The primary source of funds for the FORA CIP is the FORA Community Facilities District (CFD) Special Tax, which is a

one-time special tax on former Fort Ord development. For additional details, you can access the current FORA CIP document on the FORA website: <http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf>.

11. Why was Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector designed to go through open space and disrupt habitat?

Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector is a component of an on-base (“on-site”) network of roads that addresses access issues under the 1997 BRP. The BRP identifies nearly 18,000 acres of habitat for permanent conservation and enjoyment by the Monterey Bay community and others, in accordance with the approved 1997 Fort Ord Habitat Management Plan (HMP). The HMP was developed and is being implemented base-wide to mitigate for the potential reuse development impacts to special-status species and sensitive habitats on the former Fort Ord. Access to these habitat management areas, including the Fort Ord National Monument, is a key element in the CIP priority for completing this roadway. As noted above, Northeast-Southwest Connector is a conceptual Northeast-to-Southwest arterial roadway within the Fort Ord on-site transportation network. The impact of the roadway on environmental conditions is yet to be determined and the precise alignment will not be finalized until CEQA is complete. Potential impacts to the habitat management areas under the HMP and other habitat areas have been, and continue to be, considered in planning for reuse of the former Fort Ord, including the location of future roadways.

12. Why is FORA still using the 2010 conceptual alignment for Eastside Parkway?

FORA is not using the 2010 conceptual alignment for Eastside Parkway. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) includes the current conceptual alignment for the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector.

It serves the same underlying purpose, but the alignment is new and relates to the current Goals and Objectives for the project.

13. At the two December 6 FORA events on the Eastside Parkway, FORA talked about a "third route." Can you please tell me more about what is meant by a third route?

On December 6th, FORA consultant Andy Hunter with Whitson Engineers presented information about a “3rd Corridor” that would connect the Salinas Valley to the Monterey Peninsula, from Davis Road westerly to Reservation Road to Inter-Garrison Road to Northeast-Southwest Connector to the Monterey Peninsula. The other two existing corridors are described as:

- 1) Blanco Road westerly to Reservation Road to Imjin Parkway to Highway 1 South and
- 2) Highway 68 Monterey-Salinas Highway westerly to the Monterey Peninsula.

Three two-directional green arrows show these three corridors’ starting points on slides 24-26 of 32 of the December 6, 2017 presentation:

http://fora.org/Presentations/Eastside_Parkway_Workshop_12-06-17.pdf. These slides show modeled changes in ADT from existing conditions to 2035. The source of this information is the TAMC “2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study”:
http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf.

14. Where do you get on the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector at either end?

The alignment is generally described as Davis Road westerly to Reservation Road to Watkins Gate Road to Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector to Eucalyptus Road to General Jim Moore Blvd to the Monterey Peninsula. Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector (proposed project) is generally described in the Notice of Preparation (NOP):

http://fora.org/Reports/NOP/NOP_NE-SW_Arterial_Connector_Project_8-23-18.pdf

15. What happens with the extra traffic, as it would bring accidents, go by the middle school on Coe, and via Hilby, with the increase in traffic that building this road would bring?

FORA considered the options of connections from the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector onto the rest of the transportation network as the project description for Northeast-Southwest Connector was being developed. As is shown in the NOP project conceptual alignment, several intersection improvements are proposed. When FORA prepares the EIR for Northeast-Southwest Connector, traffic impacts, including potential safety hazards, will be identified and analyzed under the EIR and provided to the public and decision-makers.

16. Where can I find a map of the proposed project?

The proposed project conceptual alignment is shown in the NOP (see http://www.fora.org/Reports/NOP/NOP_NE-SW_Arterial_Connector_Project_8-23-18.pdf). The NOP is posted at the FORA office and at the proposed project site (intersection of West Camp and Watkins Gate Roads and intersection of Parker Flats Cut-off and Eucalyptus Road), as well. FORA will also present maps at the EIR Scoping Meetings on September 5 and 6, 2018, which will be held at the locations listed below.

Date: September 5, 2018
Time: 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm
Location: Monterey Room
168 West Alisal Street, 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Date: September 6, 2018
Time: 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm
Location: Community Center at Soper Field
220 Coe Avenue
Seaside, CA 93955

17. What efforts will you take to ensure the FORA Board does not rubber stamp the same alignment?

First, the 2010 alignment is not being presented as the proposed project. Also, CEQA requires FORA to complete a Notice of Preparation (NOP) stating that an EIR will be prepared. The NOP includes a project description, location, and potential environmental analysis. FORA sought community and Board input on the project goals and objectives in order to avoid a “rubber-stamp” scenario. With the feedback from the Board and the public on the project goals and objectives, FORA completed the NOP, which presents a different proposed project alignment. In accordance

with CEQA, FORA will proceed with an environmental review process that involves public participation, evaluation of a project's environmental impacts, and analysis and consideration of reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project to reduce environmental impacts, including a "no-project" alternative. FORA prepared a Community Engagement Plan (CEP) as a guide for this environmental review process. It is available online:

http://fora.org/Reports/NOP/CEP_NE-SW_Arterial_Connector_Project_August%202018.pdf.

18. How was the project prioritized in the CIP without an alignment? How do you know how much it costs if you don't know the alignment?

The FORA Administrative Committee recommends CIP transportation improvements' funding priorities to the FORA Board. The FORA Board establishes CIP priorities. The FORA CIP describes the Northeast-Southwest Connector improvement as a 2-lane arterial roadway from Eucalyptus Road to Schoonover Drive. This description and the estimate of cost come from TAMC's 2005 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2005.pdf). The cost estimate was developed by professional staff and is generally based on a per mile cost assumption (following industry best practices) for a conceptual 2-lane arterial roadway. The estimated roadway length (identified conceptually in Appendix C of the 2005 study) was multiplied by a cost per mile factor.

19. Why this prioritization?

The FORA Board establishes CIP priorities as set forth in the BRP (Volume I, DRMP Section 3.11.5.6 on page 202.) They are tasked to complete the FORA CIP. The representatives of this region's leadership serve on the Board to fulfill the vision of reuse and recovery of former Fort Ord. See the response to FAQs #6 and #8 for additional information.

20. Without Goals and Objectives set for this project, how did it rise to the top of the CIP?

The FORA Board passed a motion approving Goals and Objectives for the proposed roadway on March 9, 2018. The approved Goals and Objectives are included in the March 9, 2018 FORA Board packet under Attachment A to Item 8a. The link to this FORA Board Packet is: <http://fora.org/Board/2018/Packet/030918BrdPacket.pdf>. For additional information on prioritization, see the responses to FAQs #18 and #19 above, as well as FAQ #6.

21. How can this parkway be deferred to the time when FORA has completed more like 50-75% of the residential buildout?

The FORA Board establishes priority for its CIP transportation improvements, including Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector. See response to FAQ #6 and #19.

22. What aren't circulation improvements being considered, such as 2nd Avenue completion, before trying to complete this rather large parkway?

See response to FAQ #19 regarding transportation improvement prioritization process. Other onsite roads yet to be completed include: Abrams Drive, 8th Street, Gigling Road, Salinas Avenue, and South Boundary Road. Offsite roads yet to be completed include: Del Monte extension (aka 2nd Avenue), Davis Road north of Blanco, Davis Road south of Blanco, and Widen Reservation Road to 4 lanes to Watkins Gate. Regional improvements include Highway 1 in Seaside and Sand City, Highway 1 Monterey Road Interchange, and Highway 156 freeway upgrade.

23. What forms of alternatives are being considered and evaluated, including other methods of transportation, things other than cars?

Completion of FORA's "Fair Share" of transit improvements, listed in FORA's CIP, is a mitigation described in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan FEIR. CIP Transit improvements include: 1) Transit Vehicle Purchase and Replacement, and 2) Intermodal Centers. See the FY18-19 CIP for more detailed descriptions (<http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf>). Additionally, FORA contributed matching funds to TAMC for a CalTrans planning grant, which resulted in a recommended Marina to Salinas multimodal corridor alignment. For Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector, FORA will proceed with an environmental review process with public participation, environmental impact analysis and consideration of reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project to reduce environmental impacts, including a "no-project" alternative, and project evaluation.

24. Can there be bus transportation for staff like what Monterey Bay Aquarium and Google use? (I know this is not FORA but industry leadership question).

FORA supports alternative transportation modes, such as employer-sponsored shuttle routes. FORA urges you to take these ideas to the various entities that can initiate them, such as Monterey-Salinas Transit. See the response to FAQ #23 for information about FORA's contributions to transit improvements in the region.

25. The schedule for completion goes until mid-2019. There may be delays. What happens if FORA sunsets on time? Who will build the road, where will the money come from?

FORA is required to complete a Transition Plan before January 2019. The FORA Transition Plan must address remaining CIP obligations, including Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector. If FORA dissolves before Northeast-Southwest Connector is completed, another local or regional entity would likely be assigned this obligation.

26. How will the secondary roads from the Parkway be expanded, and who is going to pay for that?

As part of the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including traffic impacts. Measures will be identified to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing the EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative.

27. What's going to happen with South Boundary Road, and Highway 218, if you put more people down General Jim Moore Blvd?

As part of the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including traffic impacts. Measures will be created to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative. The public is referred to the 2017 TAMC Fee Reallocation Study for traffic data as referenced in FAQ #5.

28. What are you going to do, dump all these people onto Canyon del Rey?

As part of the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including traffic impacts. Measures will be created to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative. The public is referred to the 2017 TAMC Fee Reallocation Study for traffic data as referenced in FAQ #5.

29. How does FORA plan to mitigate the intrusion of Northeast-Southwest Connector to the natural animal migration? Wildlife corridor?

As part of the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including potential impacts to native wildlife and wildlife movement. Measures will be identified to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing the EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative.

30. Could Highway 68 be made four lanes to alleviate traffic?

To address traffic congestion on Highway 68, TAMC studied Highway 68 capacity improvement alternatives in their State Route 68 Scenic Highway Plan. This plan was completed in August 2017 and is available at the following website: <http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/highway-projects/sr-68-scenic-highway-plan/>. Their report concludes that it is infeasible to convert Highway 68 to a 4-lane highway.

31. There are popular trailheads in the area that the "Parkway" will cross. What will help people cross West to East from trails, including people with strollers, on horseback, and in wheelchairs?

As part of the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including recreation impacts. Measures will be identified to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing the EIR, any assumptions about impacts and mitigations would be speculative.

32. How would Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector fit in with the Oak Woodlands Conservation Plan, and what have FORA and City of Seaside done around that work?

FORA is considering all reasonable and feasible alignments for Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector. Currently, the County of Monterey and City of Seaside are considering various potential oak woodland conservation areas within their former Fort Ord lands to meet Fort Ord Reuse Plan policies and programs. For additional information, please visit the following website: www.oakwoodlands.org. Since FORA will consider a number of potential alignments and alternatives for Northeast-Southwest Connector, there is the potential that one or more alignment options could traverse one of the draft oak woodland conservation areas. At this current draft planning stage, the City of Seaside and County of Monterey's oak woodland conservation planning efforts take into account that potential future road and trail rights of way may reduce the acreage of conserved oak woodland if they overlap. FORA, the City of Seaside, and County of Monterey will continue to coordinate these planning efforts. One effort does not preclude the other.

33. "Seaside East," on roughly 700 acres on the East side of General Jim Moore Blvd., is coming. How will that be developed and does FORA take that development into account in the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector? Or is it just traffic loads ADT today?

The City of Seaside is responsible for Seaside East development, and provides FORA with annual development forecasts for that area. Those forecasts also inform TAMC studies such as the 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf). TAMC's traffic studies utilize the AMBAG regional traffic model to assess 2035 project development (i.e. population and jobs) and the number of trips using the transportation system in 2035. The traffic loads today, measured by ADT, are relevant since they serve as a baseline for future studies. See the response to FAQ #5 for more information about Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector traffic impacts and mitigations.

34. How does this solve current traffic issues or resolve current bottlenecks?

Having an additional major route between the Salinas Valley and Monterey Peninsula cities will redistribute vehicle trips among more routes and is likely to result in less congestion during peak hours. TAMC's 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf) examined the levels of service (LOS) for FORA CIP transportation improvements at a base year of 2010 and a future condition of 2035. If the projected population growth in 2035 occurs without FORA's CIP transportation improvements, a number of roadways will have an unacceptable LOS. With FORA's CIP transportation improvements, it is anticipated that the roadways will have an acceptable LOS with future traffic conditions.

35. Do the development and traffic forecasts in the Reuse Plan justify the "Parkway" now or in the future? If not, what specific projects and traffic forecasts do justify it? And how did it rise to the top of the CIP list?

These questions are similar to FAQ #19. Please see the response to this question.

36. How come the Fort Ord BRP adopted in 1997 is still living in '97 concepts? Things have moved on, AMBAG has moved on, has FORA? Growth and economic development

changes. How does the BRP reflect new thinking compared to something that was put in writing and tied to property rights and deed restrictions in 1997?

The 1997 BRP provides for flexibility in meeting mitigations. For example, DRMP section 3.11.5.3(b) states: “FORA will retain the flexibility to build roadway improvements to the “on-site” and “off-site” network... [and] will participate in reimbursement programs to recover expenses beyond Fort Ord’s fair share when alternative programs for financing roadway and transit improvements are established.” (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume I, pg. 195) DRMP Section 3.11.5.3(d) outlines how FORA will work with TAMC to monitor current and projected traffic LOS to “prevent development from exceeding FORA’s LOS standards.” (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume I, pg. 195). See the responses to FAQs #5 and #6 for more information on the DRMP as it relates to roadway improvements.

37. Which policies should the alignment defer to, such as “we need to have Oak Woodlands and that we need to have Habitat Management,” that have other objectives?

The 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan and its FEIR do not prioritize one mitigation or one policy or program above another. However, as CIP transportation improvements and other projects proceed, multiple policies and programs are taken into account. For example, Reuse Plan policies and programs require establishment of an oak woodland conservation area. Biological Resources Policy B-2 (County of Monterey) states: “as site specific planning proceeds, for...” [certain former Fort Ord polygons,] “the County shall coordinate with the Cities of Seaside and Marina, California State University, FORA, and other interested entities in the designation of an oak woodland conservation area...” The County of Monterey and City of Seaside are currently engaged in this planning process. At this current draft planning stage, their oak woodland conservation planning assumes road and trail rights of way will reduce total oak woodland to be conserved.

Examples of other policies and programs include: Biological Resources Program C-2.3, Streets and Roads Program B-1.2, Pedestrian and Bicycles Policies A-1 and B-1, Recreation Policy A-1, Recreation Policy F-1, Noise Policy A-1, Noise Policy B-9, and Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Program B-1.4. This is not a definitive list of policies and programs that have other objectives and will be taken in to account as part of the Northeast-Southwest Connector CEQA process.

38. What specifically are the traffic problems we are trying to solve? Which of those are existing, which are anticipated in the future? For the ones that are in the future, when are they going to be experienced?

According to some members of the public who have spoken at FORA meetings, there are existing traffic problems on local roadways, including Highway 1, Imjin Parkway, and Highway 68. This traffic congestion exists now and is expected to increase as population continues to grow in the Salinas Valley and the former Fort Ord (to meet reuse plan targets of replacing the Army’s population before base closure). While it cannot be predicted exactly when or with what specific scenario a roadway Level of Service (LOS) will reach an unacceptable level, it can be predicted through modeling and other types of analyses that if the entirety of FORA’s CIP transportation improvements is not completed between now and 2035, these thresholds will be surpassed for many roadways. For more information, please see TAMC’s 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study: (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf).

39. What are the CEQA mitigations that are required in the plan?

Completion of FORA's "Fair Share" of transportation improvements, listed in FORA's CIP (<http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf> pg. 19), is a mitigation described in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan FEIR (4.7 Traffic and Circulation).

The FEIR identified the following impact: 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) to establish programs and monitor development at Fort Ord to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities and water supply shall be established by FORA." This is identified in the FEIR as a mitigation on page 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 TAMC regional transportation model (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume 1, pg. 195).

Other mitigations include Land Use Compatibility, Socioeconomic impacts to population, housing, employment, personal income, social services, military retiree benefits, and schools, Geology and Soils impacts including soil, erosion, soil limitations, and agriculture/horticulture, Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply impacts such as wastewater, solid waste, telephone service, gas and electric service, cable television, storm drainage, water distribution, and water supply, Hydrology and Water Quality impacts such as surface water hydrology, ground water hydrology, surface water quality, groundwater quality, Public Health and Safety impacts such as law enforcement, fire protection, emergency medical services, seismic safety, and hazardous materials, Traffic and Circulation, covered above in part, and including transit service, and pedestrian and bicycles networks, Climate and Air Quality impacts, including the topography and meteorology, existing ambient air quality, and health effects of pollutants, Noise, impacts to Biological Resources, including Biological Communities, special status species, and preserves and significant natural areas, impacts to visual Resources, impacts to Cultural Resources, impacts resulting from development of the University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science, and Technology Center (UC MBEST), and Cumulative Impacts. FORA's CIP shows the remaining impacts that FORA is funding Water Augmentation, Habitat Management, and Transportation/Transit, as well as obligations that are underway.

40. What are the relevant documents that show that by building the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector, CEQA mitigations are addressed?

Please see these studies:

TAMC's 1997 Fort Ord Transportation Study
(http://fora.org/Reports/1997_Fort_Ord_Transportation_Study.pdf)

TAMC's 2005 FORA Fee Reallocation Study
(http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2005.pdf)

TAMC's 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study
(http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf)

41. What are the CEQA mitigations that when in the BRP was adopted that we're supposed to be mitigating?

Please see the responses to FAQ #36 and #37 above.

42. How can I evaluate any alignment that meets those mitigations if I don't know what they are? Tell me chapter and verse, where are they?

Please see the responses to FAQ #26, #36 and #37 above.

43. What is the Monterey Peninsula carrying capacity and visitor capacity?

We suggest contacting the Monterey County Convention and Visitors Bureau. The website is <https://www.seemonterey.com>.

44. Is it enough to say, let's just build more housing? (workforce housing)

Historically and currently, morning and evening traffic congestion occurs on roadways connecting the Salinas Valley to cities on Monterey Peninsula. One of the fundamental causes of this is Salinas Valley residents travelling to and from workplaces on the Monterey Peninsula. TAMC monitors regional roadway traffic. (<http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/traffic-counts>). See the Highway 68 Scenic Plan for peak hour congestion information (<http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/highway-projects/sr-68-scenic-highway-plan/>). Building workforce housing near workplaces on the Peninsula could reduce trips and the stress on our transportation system. FORA requires jurisdictions to submit affordable and workforce housing plans for projects on Fort Ord.

45. On the detailed timeline, it is not clear when and by whom the preferred project will be developed? It is not clear if it will include public input.

As noted in FAQ responses above, FORA will first engage a robust public outreach program, establish goals and objectives, analyze reasonable alternatives, and assess impacts. The project description is included with the NOP. There will be opportunities for public comment during the CEQA process.

46. Does this road open up our community, in the future, for more major developments, like what we just overcame, the horse track?

FORA is contributing to the region's long-term best interest by ensuring that the transportation network will be functional in the future. The BRP has goals for economic recovery for the area that include development in a subset of the parcels that were or are to be conveyed to landholding jurisdictions. The decision to develop those parcels and how to develop them lies with the jurisdictions. The jurisdictions' developments have BRP level oversight through FORA, in the form of consistency determinations. For more information on the Consistency Determination process, please see the FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8 (<http://fora.org/Reports/MasterResolution.pdf>).

47. How many cars ride Highway 68 and Imjin Parkway in single person occupancy vehicles? How about carpooling and carpool lanes?

TAMC gathers annual jurisdictions' trip counts on a number of roadway facilities. Those trip counts do not track amount of people transported in a single trip (See FAQ #33). The AMBAG regional transportation model includes statistical assumptions about trips accommodated by ridesharing.

TAMC's trip count information is available at the following website:

<http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/traffic-counts>

AMBAG maintained a ridesharing program. It has been transferred to TAMC.

48. For the 2035 anticipated roads, what roads become four lane and what stay two lane? And what's the maximum ADT for a four-lane road?

This is a question of efficiency of intersections, traffic speed, and many other factors. Four-lane roadways are expected to include Reservation Road, Gigling Road, Davis Road, and a portion of Inter-Garrison Road east of CSUMB. Del Monte Boulevard Extension in Marina and Northeast-Southwest Connector in Monterey County may connect to four-lane facilities, which may require four-lanes for a portion of those facilities.

47. What section and pages of the 1997 BRP identifies the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector as mitigation?

The BRP 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 (now Northeast-Southwest Connector) within the "on-site" network to connect Imjin Parkway to Gigling Road (FEIR pg. 4-104 -4-106).

48. Would you please clarify why this contradicts the article in the Monterey County Weekly?

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.

49. Is the 2017 Study the basis for advising the FORA Board that the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector should be the highest priority?

No. The FORA Board prioritized Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector funding in the 2009/10 mid-year CIP and maintained this funding priority in subsequent, annual CIP document approvals.

50. What are underlying assumptions of 2017 Study “No Build” scenario?

Underlying assumptions are that AMBAG’s projected population growth occurs by year 2035 with no TAMC Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and no FORA CIP improvements.

51. Did you evaluate other roadway improvements vis a vis the “no Build Alternative” to determine optimal \$18 million investment in roads?

No. The 2017 Study studied the “Build FORA CIP” and “Build Alternative CIP” scenario improvements’ effectiveness in providing roadway capacity in 2035 conditions.

52. If FORA made investment in Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector, how many existing roadways would still operate at deficient levels of service?

There are many factors involved such as other FORA CIP improvements, TAMC RTP improvements, and population growth.

53. Had FORA staff previously asked TAMC for a presentation on the Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector and an opinion about its regional benefits?

TAMC staff attends FORA Administrative 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 Northeast-Southwest Arterial Connector.

54. Why did staff mischaracterize the overwhelming public opposition to the format of the December Workshops?

Staff characterized the Public Meeting comments impartially in the Staff Report. We included a section called “Criticism of the Process” in **Exhibit B**.

55. Why does the staff report exclude quantifying the number of people testifying, letters, and emails in support and opposition?

Staff was tasked to obtain Goals and Objectives from the public. That was the primary focus of the staff report and its attachments.

56. Do the goals and objectives (as presented at the 2nd Vote at the FORA Board Meeting on March 9, 2018) support first responders getting into the further reaches of former Fort Ord, like we’ve seen was important during the fires of Santa Rosa?

Yes. One of the added objectives is: “Improve mobility of emergency system responders, including, but not limited to, firefighter access.”

