


FORT ORD REUSE PLAN

Fort Ord Reuse Authority



March 1997

FINAL

PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

VOLUME II - RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

EMC Planning Group, Inc.

Table of Contents

VOLUME 1

1.0	Introduction to Volume 1	1
1.1	Background and Purpose of the Final Program EIR	1
1.1.1	Introduction	1
1.1.2	Background to the Project	2
1.1.3	Background and Purpose of the Final Program EIR.....	2
1.1.4	Indexing the Army Documents.....	3
1.1.5	Baseline Determination	3
1.1.6	Intended Uses of the Program-Level Final EIR	3
1.2	Organization of the Final PEIR	5
1.2.1	Volume I	5
	Assumptions Used To Create the Chronological List of Comments	5
	How to Find a Particular Comment Letter	6
1.2.2	Volume II.....	7
	How to Find a Particular Response to Comment	7

Appendices

Appendix A	List of Commenters in Numerical Order
Appendix B.....	List of Commenters in Alphabetical Order

VOLUME 2

1.0	Introduction to Volume II	1
1.1	Organization of the Final EIR.....	1
1.1.1	Volume I	1
	How to Find a Particular Comment Letter	1
1.1.2	Volume II.....	1
	How to Find a Particular Response to Comment	2
2.0	Responses to Comments	3

3.0 References 433
3.1 Bibliography 433
3.2 Persons Contacted 434
3.3 Report Preparers 434

Appendices

Appendix C..... Table of Comments
**Appendix D Assessment of Planning Baseline and
Market Data Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan**
Appendix EFort Ord Regional Transportation Study
Appendix FThe Land Use - Air Quality Linkage

1.0 Introduction to Volume II

1.1 Organization of the Final Program EIR

1.1.1 Volume I

The Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final PEIR) consists of the following documents: Fort Ord Reuse Plan Final Program EIR (Volume I and Volume II) and the Draft Program EIR (incorporated herein by reference) and the comments.

Volume I of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Final Program EIR contains the written comments received on the draft program Fort Ord Reuse Plan and EIR, written and oral comments submitted at public hearings held by the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) and member agencies. Volume II of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Final Program EIR contains the responses to the comments.

The comments received have been arranged in chronological order by the date of transmittal referenced on the letter or by the date of the public hearing the comment was made. This organizational approach reflects the FORA's desire to treat each comment received in an equal manner. The response to comments contained in Volume II also reflects this order. An index listing the comments received in chronological and alphabetical order is also included in Volume I to assist the reader in making it easier to find a comment (Appendix A and B, respectively).

How to Find a Particular Comment Letter

To make a search for a particular comment located in Volume I easier for the reader, an alphabetized index of all comments is included in Appendix B of Volume I. This index is organized alphabetically based on the names of organizations, agencies and individuals who submitted oral or written comments. To find where in Volume I a particular comment is located, look up the comment number assigned to the commenter from the alphabetical list in Appendix B of Volume I and then look for this number in Volume I.

1.1.2 Volume II

Volume II contains the response to comments and changes to the Reuse Plan and the EIR, as well as new policy considerations for the FORA Board to consider. The policy considerations may or may not be decided by the FORA Board prior to adoption of the Reuse Plan. Volume II also contains the following appendices: Table of Comments; Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan; Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study; and the Land Use - Air Quality Linkage.

How to Find a Particular Response to Comment

To make a search for a particular response to comment in Volume II easier the reader should obtain the comment number from the alphabetized index (contained in Appendix B of Volume I) and then refer to the response corresponding to the comment in Volume II.

2.0 Response to Comments

CEQA Guidelines section 15200 indicates that the purposes of the public review process include sharing expertise, disclosing agency analyses, checking for accuracy, detecting omissions, discovering public concerns, and soliciting counter proposals.

CEQA Guidelines section 15132(b) requires that the final environmental impact report contain a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies who have commented on the draft environmental impact report. These comments are located in Volume I of the Final PEIR. In addition, CEQA Guidelines section 15132(d) requires that the final environmental impact report contain the response to comments. These are contained in Volume II of the Final PEIR. Where required, revisions have been made to the text of the Draft EIR based on the responses to comments, which are contained in Volume II (CEQA Guidelines 15132(a)). Any revisions are located immediately following the response. Deletions to the EIR text are shown with ~~strike-through~~ type. Additions to the EIR text are shown with underlined type. Changes to the Reuse Plan as a result of public and agency comments received are similarly made.

Because there are approximately 2,000 comments, a Table of Comments has been constructed to expedite review of the Final Program EIR document. Accompanying this volume is Appendix C which contains the "Table of Comments". The Table of Comments contains three columns of information. The first column represents the comment number. The second column indicates the gist of the comment. The third column represents the comment "subject". The Table of Comments is organized alphabetical by "subject" so the reader will have quick access to all comments of a similar nature. For the benefit of the reader, some comments are assigned multiple subjects (e.g., TRANSPORTATION / CEQA) to imply that there is more than one important issue conveyed by the commenter.

Objectivity

This Final Program EIR is a factual, objective public disclosure document that takes no position on the merits of the project, but instead provides information on which decisions about the project can be based. Thus, the findings of this EIR do not advocate a position "for" or "against" development. The EIR has been prepared according to the professional standards and practices of the EIR participant's individual disciplines and in conformance with the legal requirements and informational expectations of CEQA and its implementing guidelines. The preparers of this EIR are independent professionals under contract to the Fort Ord Reuse Authority.

Response to Letter 1

1-1. The commenter questions whether the description of the “vision” for Fort Ord described in Chapter 1 of the Context and Framework gives the impression that the CSUMB campus will be a focal point from which all other development will spread. The commenter refers to descriptions of the CSUMB campus as the “Town Center” with Fort Ord emerging as a “separate city” that does not fit in “seamlessly” into the existing community structure.

The CSUMB campus has been identified as one of several major existing assets and public commitments that underlie the “community-building strategies” in the plan. These are explicitly listed on page 3-151 and include: “1) provide a community that supports the emerging CSUMB campus; 2) build on the activity that is emerging at the new Marina Municipal Airport; 3) support the inherent opportunities at the UCMBEST Center to attract new technology-driven and research-based employers; 4) fully integrate the communities with the former Fort Ord with the regional recreation and open space resources managed by the State Parks and BLM; 5) take advantage of the proximity to State Highway 1 to create a gateway to the former Fort Ord; 6) utilize the two existing golf courses in Seaside; 7) integrate the existing housing stock into the surrounding communities; and 8) build on the continuing commitments by the DOD represented by the Defense Facility Accounting System (DFAS), and POM Annex and other elements of the military enclave.” The commenter has identified a central role for the CSUMB campus implicit throughout the plan but certainly not an exclusive role for the CSUMB campus. The vision described in the Plan Framework is built on the potential role of several educational institutions (principle 1), the landscape setting (principle 2), mixed-use villages (principle 3), neighborhoods (principle 4), and sustainability (principle 5).

Planning Areas and Districts are established in the Reuse Plan to facilitate the management of various spatial components of the plan. The “Town Center Planning Area” is a designated planning area within the City of Marina that is adjacent to the CSUMB Planning Area and includes the Del Monte Mixed Use District, the University Office Park/R & D District, the Marina Village District, and the Mixed Use Corporate Center District. The CSUMB campus is not within Marina’s Town Center Planning Area.

There are many aspects of the Reuse Plan that contribute to eliminating the historic boundaries of the military reservation and the adjacent Cities of Marina and Seaside. These strategies will promote the “seamless integration” of the reuse of Fort Ord into the surrounding communities. The strategies include: 1) interconnecting roadways such as California Street in Marina or Broadway in Seaside; 2) orienting residential neighborhoods such as the Seaside “Planned Residential Extension Districts” to the adjacent neighborhoods west of North-South Road; and 3) providing an integrated and continuous bicycle and trail network that connects the

open space resources of the former base with the existing surrounding neighborhoods.

1-2. The commenter questions whether the CSUMB campus will create a level of economic activity approximating that of the military departing the area since the students are only around for approximately 9 months (or 180 academic days).

The Campus enterprise is much larger than just the student population. The CSUMB campus will employ 3,000 when fully developed, with an estimated annual budget of approximately \$200 million (Vol. 1, Page 2-6). The campus includes a substantial housing resource for (1,253 existing units) for faculty, staff and upper-division and graduate students. It is anticipated that this housing could be occupied year-round. In addition, the campus plans to incorporate housing on the central campus area for students and has identified a goal of achieving a very high percentage of students living on the campus.

The estimate of average off-campus expenditure of \$1,000 annually per student (Volume I, Page 2-32) refers only to "convenience goods and entertainment" and does not reflect the total contribution of the local economy of the campus population.

1-3. The commenter would prefer to see the ethnicity breakdown for all cities on the peninsula rather than for just Marina, Seaside and Sand City.

The purpose of the socio-economic setting in the Framework Plan is to paint a broad brush picture of several characteristics and refers to background documents that can provide the information the commenter is looking for.

1-4 and 1-5. The commenter asks for clarification of whether the AMBAG population forecasts include student, POM Annex, and the rehabilitation of existing residential neighborhoods on the base.

The reader is referred to the revised language under changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I, Context and Framework, Section 2.2.4 Demographic Forecasts.

Page 2-15: Amend the first full paragraph to read as follows:

Table 2.2-3 reflects AMBAG's forecasts for population growth in Monterey County ~~and does not include CSUMB students.~~

Page 2-15 to 2-16: Amend the last sentence in the last paragraph to read as follows:

During this period, an average of nearly 3,300 persons are expected to be added annually to the Peninsula's population. Approximately 84% of this growth is anticipated to be accommodated in Marina and Seaside, reflecting the redevelopment and reuse of the former Fort Ord property, including the student, faculty and staff forecasts for the new CSUMB campus at Fort Ord.

1-6. The commenter states that page 2-6 of the Reuse Plan is incorrect as it pertains to soldiers spending in the local community. See Response to comment 1-2.

1-7. The commenter asks where the "Town Center" is envisioned to be.

The "Marina Town Center" is a descriptive term used in the Reuse Plan to refer to a particular Planning Area on the north side of the CSUMB Campus. Because of the size and development capacity of this planning area, and because of the mixed use development permitted in the plan, this planning area has the potential to become larger in extent and developed to a greater intensity than other "village centers" identified in the Reuse Plan. Hence the descriptive term, "Marina Town Center."

1-8. The commenter asks how many village centers are in the plan and would like to know if there is an artist's depiction.

The location of the mixed use villages is diagrammatically illustrated in Volume I, Page 3-5, next to the description of Principle 3.

1-9. The commenter asks whether compact, identifiable development patterns (consistent with Peninsula Prototypes) with definable edges, entries and structure is incompatible with the objective of linking the development seamlessly into the existing communities.

The vision for the Reuse Plan reflects the strong edges created by the Habitat Management Plan and topographic or improvement features that have given rise to the planning area structure used to define and manage the development process. Design Principle 2 illustrates how gateways and scenic corridors can both identify different components of development at Fort Ord as well as provide those links that promote a seamless integration with the existing communities.

The Peninsula community prototypes that are characterized by mixed use development and reflect village-scale life are described in the discussion of urbanism of the Monterey Peninsula (Vol. 1, Pages 3-28 to 3-31).

1-10. The commenter asks for clarification on how the Highway 1 Scenic Corridor is defined.

Design Principle 6 introduces the Highway 1 Scenic Corridor as one of several areas of “regional urban design significance”. The Reuse Plan requires that FORA adopt design guidelines for the following areas: 1) Highway One Scenic Corridor, 2) the freeway entrances to the former Fort Ord area from Highway One (12th Street Gate and the Main Gate areas) and from the east, 3) areas bordering the publicly accessible habitat conservation areas, 4) Major through roadways such as Reservation Road and Blanco Road, and 5) Other areas to be determined by FORA. Standards are to be established for road design, setbacks, building height, landscaping, signs, and other matters of visual importance (Vol. 1, Page 3-8). The design guidelines will be developed prior to the start of new development at Fort Ord.

General Development Character and Design Objectives are provided for each Planning Area in the Reuse Plan Context and Framework beginning on Page 3-97.

Between the 12th Street Gate and the Main Gate, the Scenic Highway One Corridor is typically 100 feet wide measured from the CalTrans ROW. (Vol. 1, Page 3-110. Page 3-122). For the New Golf Course Community District in Seaside, the development character and design objectives are identified but no specific corridor dimension is provided. (Vol. 1, Page 3-126)

Reuse Plan Volume II, Reuse Plan Elements, provide specific programs to implement the regional design objectives. These programs are found in the Recreational/Open Space Land Use Objectives for each of the three jurisdictions. Note: the reference to 500 feet could not be found in the document, nor could the reference to Program D-13.

1-11. The commenter would like to have Bostrom Park to be specifically mentioned as one of the existing residential neighborhoods throughout the Reuse Plan.

The Reuse Plan provides for the redevelopment of the Bostrom Park area and includes Bostrom Park in the New Golf Course Community Planning District that surrounds the two existing golf courses in Seaside.

1-12. The commenter requests clarification regarding how the Reuse Plan identifies the development areas for the City of Del Rey Oaks.

The Reuse Plan identifies Planning Areas within the County that are consistent with the proposed annexations for Del Rey Oaks and the City of Monterey. The South Gate Planning Area corresponds to the Del Rey Oaks proposed annexation area. The York Road Planning Area corresponds to the City of Monterey proposed annexation area (Vol. 1, Figure 3.10-1, and Table 3.10-1).

1-13. The commenter would like additional information on “edge”. Refer to response to comments 1-7 through 1-10.

- 1-14. The commenter states that the South Gate Planning Area should be identified as Del Rey Oaks. Refer to response to comment 1-12
- 1-15. The commenter states that the reference to “seamless’ appears to contradict other references in the Reuse Plan regarding “discernible and urban edges”. Refer to response to comments 1-7, through 1-10.
- 1-16. The commenter would like a reference to housing stock relative to the Sun Bay Apartments and Bostrom Park. Refer to response to comment 1-11
- 1-17. The commenter refers to text in the Administrative draft that has been subsequently changed in the draft Reuse Plan (Vol. 2, Page 4-35).
- 1-18. The commenter refers to text in the Administrative draft that has been subsequently changed in the draft Reuse Plan (Vol. 2, Page 4-94).
- 1-19. The commenter provides additional descriptive material regarding existing bicycle access to the Pacific Coast Bikeway. No response necessary.

Response to Letter 2

2-1. The commenter requests changes in the Reuse Plan to reflect the requests for conveyances for lands to serve the Monterey Salinas Transit (MST) facilities and a change in the text description in the Plan to designate the proposed Intermodal Center.

The Reuse Plan Land Use Concept depicts the combined MST Operations and Maintenance Facility and adjacent Park and Ride Facility with a “Public Facility” designation based on a footprint that has been subsequently refined. As public benefit conveyances are completed, FORA’s maps may be refined again to reflect completed surveys.

The proposed Multimodal Corridor is diagrammatically indicated on Figure 3.5-2 in the Reuse Plan and includes a letter “P” to indicate the general locations for Park and Ride Facilities to illustrate the functional relationships of the transit corridor rather than a specific land parcel. Figure 3.5-2 also designates “potential transit stations” that, though not presently included in MST’s conveyance requests, represent diagrammatically opportunities to provide increased levels of service in the long run. Transit services are also described in section 4.2.3 of the Reuse Plan and the multimodal corridor is illustrated diagrammatically in Figure 4.2-5.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-111: Amend the following sentences to read:

Based on further evaluation from the land use plan, a ~~more specific~~ alternative site has been recommended for further consideration at 8th Street.

This site would effectively support the mixed-use area as well as recreational travel to Fort Ord Dunes State Park.

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date.

Response to Letter 3

3-1. The commenter expresses concern that the Public Service Plan in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan may overstate the revenues to the City of Marina.

The Public Service Plan reflects the estimate of revenue to the City prepared by the public financing consultant that is based on response from each fiscal entity included in the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 4

4-1. The commenter has submitted the same comments in comment letter 1 above.

Response to Letter 5

5-1. The commenter addresses an issue pertaining to the 45-day public review period originally established by FORA, which commenced on June 1, 1996 and ended on July 15, 1996. Based on the number of comments received regarding the public review period FORA responded by extending the review period to October 11, 1996. The total public review period was 133 days.

During the public review period three public hearings on the EIR were held. These hearings occurred on July 1, August 22 and October 7, 1996. The FORA Board also held monthly meetings which were advertised in a local newspaper with wide distribution. These meetings were open to the public and were available as a public forum for discourse pertaining to the Reuse Plan and EIR. FORA member cities also held public hearings on the Reuse Plan and the EIR. No "workshops" were conducted by FORA or FORA member cities.

Response to Letter 6

6-1. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics and text reference "Fort Ord Dunes State Beach". This is incorrect and should read "Fort Ord Dunes State Park".

Changes to the EIR

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

Page 4-10: Amend the second sentence in the last paragraph to read as follows:

In the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Planning Area, the *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan* proposes a 59-acre multi-use area, a 23-acre future desalination plant and 803 919 acres reserved for park and open space.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I and 2. Replace all references to "Fort Ord Dunes State Beach" with "Fort Ord Dunes State Park".

6-2. The commenter states the EIR reference to the State Park being 1001 acres shall be amended to read 885 acres instead. The reader is referred to the revised language under the Reuse Plan sections below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

As it pertains to the Reuse Plan text, the following changes are proposed:

Volume I. Page 3-37:

Amend the first sentence in the last paragraph on page 3-37 to read as follows: Approximately ~~1000~~ 885 acres of the coastal zone land unit are pending public conveyance to the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation...

Volume I. Page 3-42:

Amend the acreage for Fort Ord Dunes State Park in Monterey County from 977 acres to 850 acres and adjust the total acreages accordingly.

Volume I. Page 3-85:

Amend the title "Fort Ord Dunes State Beach" to "Fort Ord Dunes State Park".

Amend the second sentence in the last paragraph on page 3-85 to read as follows: Approximately 885 acres, including 48 acres of sandy beach, 305 acres of coastal dunes, and 532 acres of disturbed habitat, 1,000 acres of land, will be affected.

Volume I, Page 3-129, Section 3.10.1 Fort Ord Dunes State Park Planning Area, Projected Land Uses:

Amend Open Space Land use as follows: 919 803 acres are reserved for park and open space which will be managed for habitat restoration and limited visitor-serving activities.

Volume I, Table 3.10.1, Monterey County Land Development Intensity Summary Table:

Amend Fort Ord Dunes State Park and open space from 919 acres to 803 acres and adjust the total acreages accordingly.

6-3. The commenter requests that the lead agency responsible for future construction of a sewage treatment plant work with the Department of Parks and Recreation. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

6-4. The commenter suggests an alternative location for the multi-agency visitor center and requests that affected jurisdictions pertaining to the center will work cooperatively with the Department of Parks and Recreation. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

6-5. The commenter states that a coastal road on the west side of Highway 1 is not proposed in the State Park plan for the beach area. The Reuse Plan and EIR does not indicate there being a coastal road. Changes to the Reuse Plan and PEIR are not necessary.

Response to Letter 7

7-1. The commenter addresses annexation procedures. The reference to Del Rey Oaks and Monterey having future jurisdiction on Fort Ord lands is included

in the Reuse Plan (page 4-17; Figure 4.1-4) and the EIR (page 3-10). Further discussion of annexation procedures currently underway between the County and local jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR is not necessary. The issue of excluding these two jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan at the level of detail requested in this comment was a decision by the FORA staff based on input from the County of Monterey.

7-2. The commenter refers to page IV-18 that is claimed to have a dramatic impact on the role and financial future of FORA. The revision and correction to the Draft Business Plan are incorporated into this response to comments document.

Numerous changes have been made in text portion of the Comprehensive Business Plan to be consistent with the final runs of the financial performance model.

Changes to The Reuse Plan

Business and Operations Plan. Page II-7 (Exhibit 3): For purposes of clarification, the following notes have been added to Exhibit 3, explaining why some of the numbers in that exhibit, which was produced as a part of the original market analysis, do not precisely conform to the numbers in the later land use plan:

“At the time that the market study was conducted, it was assumed that 1,522 existing units could be reused; subsequently, the Army determined that some units require demolition due to environmental concerns, for a net total of 1,300 units.”

“The above figures reflect the conclusions of the SKMG market study. In the development of a land use plan, the real estate development projected to be captured from this demand potential differs slightly to take advantage of characteristics of probable development sites and for strategic reasons.”

Page II-18: Replace second paragraph under “Implications for Marketability” with the following revised text:

“Secondly, certain key job generating uses would not be marketable if a pure ‘nexus’ approach to burden was utilized. For example, the infrastructure cost burden projected in the preliminary cost screens (PFIP p. 2-23) for light industry, business park and office/R&D uses is so high as to preclude early development.”

Page II-20: Delete Exhibit 5.

Page III-6: Insert the following text as a new paragraph just after the current last paragraph:

“It should be noted that, as the market forecasts indicated in Exhibit 3 were applied to the realities of the land plan, projected demand does not precisely correspond with development projections on specific sites.”

Page III-17: Delete next to last sentence in third paragraph:

~~It is SKMG's understanding that the Army intends to maintain ownership of the golf courses to provide preferred use by the Army, as a support function to the Presidio of Monterey Annex.~~

Page IV-17: Add the following language before the last sentence of the second paragraph under Introduction:

"Two sets of factors were used in the PFIP to allocate the cost of public improvements to land use categories. The factors in Section 2 of the PFIP were based strictly on the demand placed on facilities by each land use (i.e., they met the strict test of 'rational nexus'). However, as noted in CBP Section II, this pure nexus approach would likely preclude certain job-generating uses. Therefore, if these factors were adjusted to reduce the burden on commercial and industrial land uses, to encourage economic development. The cost allocation factors defined in Section 5 are the factors that will define the responsibility of private parties to pay a special tax that will finance public improvements."

Page IV-18: Change the estimated cash flow in the third line of the first paragraph from \$69.0 to \$70.4 million.

Page IV-18: In the second paragraph under 2. Summary Financial Results - Basewide Pro Forma, change \$249.2 to \$240.9, and add a new footnote to that figure as follows:

"The \$240.9 million consist of \$189.3 million basewide infrastructure (PFIP Table 1-10); \$16.0 million to complete Highway 156 (CBP recommendation); \$22.6 million for Parks/Recreation (PFIP Table 1-10); \$13.0 million for local facilities (PFIP, page 4-3)."

Page IV-18: In first paragraph under 3, Summary Financial Results - FORA Operations, change to \$18.9.

Page IV-18: Replace last two sentences in first paragraph under 3. Summary Financial Results - FORA Operations, with the following:

"FORA's primary anticipated sources of funding are \$10.1 million in member dues and federal grants and \$46.7 in net proceeds from land sales. The \$46.7 represents FORA's 50 percent share (per its legislation) and was calculated as follows:

	\$260.7 million Projected Land Sales
Less	\$120.0 for demolition
Less	\$ 30.0 for Facilities Management
Less	\$ 1.3 Marketing Incentives
Less	\$ 16.0 to complete Highway 156
Equals	\$ 93.4 x 50 percent
Equals	\$ 46.7 million

Page IV-18: Replace the second paragraph under 3. Summary Financial Results - FORA Operations, with the following:

“The total cost of FORA operations over the 20-year period is estimated at \$29.4 million (see Table 14 for detailed summary of first five years). This excludes the cost of Habitat Management, since the final responsibility has not yet been assigned. As a result, FORA is projected to generate a net surplus of approximately \$18.9 million over the 20-year period.”

Pages IV-19-22: Replace with revised versions of Exhibits 9 and 10 (attached). Note that the revised Exhibit 9 summarized land sales proceeds by land use type, and that Exhibit 10 subtotals FORA Operations as a discrete item.

Page IV-23: Change next to last sentence in third paragraph to read:

“See Exhibits 11A and 11B for absorption by phase.”

Page IV-24: Replace Exhibit 11 with Exhibits 11A and 11B (attached).

Page IV-2: Replace Exhibit 12 with revised Exhibit 12 (attached), which is now titled Net Land Value Assumptions, and which now contains a fifth note explaining how these number are derived for Exhibit 6.

Page IV-27: Revise Exhibit 13 (attached).

Page V-1: In the last sentence of the first paragraph under 1. Long-term Plan Viability, change \$49 million to \$50 million.

Page V-5: Revise Table 14 (attached).

Page V-6: In order to conform with the new Table 14, make the following changes to Estimated Budgets for Reuse Plan: Adoption Maintenance and Update:

Change \$175,000 to \$325,500; and
Change \$136,500 to \$286,500.

Page V-8: Delete first bullet at top of page, referring to Habitat Management, and delete the words “staff or contractual” in the Organizational/Staffing paragraph.

Page V-8: In order to conform with the new Table 14, change the estimated budget for CPI Conformance and Update from \$241,000 to \$390,500.

7-3. The commenter would like the information in various tables to include Del Rey Oaks. Del Rey Oaks is separately identified as South Gate Planning Area in the Reuse Plan tables.

7-4. The commenter requests a modification to figures in the Reuse Plan, and PEIR. There are no inconsistencies between the two figures identified by the commenter. The Reuse Plan maps including Figure 4.1-4 reflect refinements in the South Gate Planning and York Road Planning Areas in the County that correspond to the intended boundary between the HMP and the developed areas. The roadway alignment was adjusted to fit the new digitized aerial survey maps and reflect a consensus alignment to protect habitat resources and achieve roadway engineering standards. Figure 6.2-1 reflects a land use alternative prepared for the EIS by Jones & Stokes using an earlier base map. The polygon boundaries have been adjusted to reflect the physical boundaries utilized in the initial base reuse planning but adjusted to the new digitized base map.

7-5. The commenter states that maps he has submitted reflect only the currently proposed future Del Rey Oaks city boundary lines. The City reserves the right to request different boundaries in the future. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

Response to Letter 8

8-1. The commenter believes that the Army should be responsible for removal of lead paint from existing structures. The Reuse Plan has projected a cost of approximately \$120 million for the demolition and removal of structures containing lead paint and/or asbestos materials (Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group 1996). This cost projection is based on the engineering estimates of removal of structures prepared by Reimer and Associates in 1996 drawing on detailed building characterization supplied by the U.S. Army. Also, refer to response to comment 139-6 for additional information on lead and asbestos tainted structures.

8-2. The commenter implies that developers will not be able to absorb the cost of infrastructure plus demolition and disposing of toxic buildings. The cost has been factored into the reuse plan costs and are integral to the Business and Operations Plan.

**EXHIBIT 3
FORT ORD DEVELOPMENT AND ABSORPTION POTENTIAL
1996 - 2015**

Land Use	FAR/ DU/AC	1996 - 2000		2001 - 2005		2006 - 2010		2011 - 2015		Total 1996 - 2015	
		Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres
Light Industrial/R&D/Office											
Light Industrial/Business Park	0.25 FAR	206,250	24	250,000	29	306,250	35	375,000	43	1,137,500	131
Office/R&D	0.25 FAR	300,000	28	382,000	35	488,000	45	624,000	57	1,794,000	165
Induced demand	0.25 FAR	0	0	250,000	23	300,000	29	375,000	34	925,000	86
Subtotal (Sq. Ft.)		506,250	52	882,000	87	1,094,250	109	1,374,000	134	3,856,500	382
Residential											
Reuse of Existing Units (1)		1,522	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1,522	---
Reuse of Existing CSU Units		1,253	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1,253	---
Detached											
Low Density	4 DU/AC	50	13	100	25	150	38	200	50	500	125
Medium Density	6 DU/AC	600	100	800	133	800	133	900	150	3,100	517
High Density	8 DU/AC	350	44	600	75	600	75	600	75	2,150	269
Attached											
Low Density	10 DU/AC	0	0	0	0	100	10	100	10	200	20
High Density	20 DU/AC	0	0	0	0	100	5	200	10	300	15
Subtotal (Units)		3,775	156	1,500	233	1,750	261	2,000	295	9,025	945
Retail											
Neighborhood/Community	.25 FAR	191,000	18	99,000	9	114,000	10	131,000	12	535,000	49
Regional/Outlet	.25 FAR	0	0	0	0	0	25	250,000	25	250,000	50
Subtotal (Sq. Ft.)		191,000	18	99,000	9	114,000	35	381,000	37	785,000	99
Lodging											
Conference Center	.25 FAR	0	0	200	15	0	0	0	0	200	15
Resort/Hotel (Golf-Oriented)	.50 FAR	300	10	0	0	300	10	200	8	800	28
Subtotal		300	10	200	15	300	10	200	8	1,000	43
Recreation											
Equestrian Center		0	0	---	15	0	0	0	0	---	3
Golf Course		0	0	0	0	---	160	---	160	---	

(1 At the time that the market study was conducted, it was assumed that 1,522 existing units could be reused; subsequently, the Army determined that some units require demolition due to environmental concerns, for a net total of 1,300 units.

NOTE: The above figures reflect the conclusions of the SKMG market study. In the development of a land use plan, the real estate development projected to be captured from this demand potential differs slightly to take advantage of characteristics of probable development sites and for strategic reasons.

Sources: Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
C:\WPDOCS\PROJECTS\29694\EXHIB3CB.WK4 / A [jde]

12:16 PM
24-Jul-96

SKMIG

**EXHIBIT 9
BASE-WIDE PRO FORMA SUMMARY**

BASE-WIDE PRO FORMA SUMMARY	20Yr TOTAL	FY96/97	FY97/98	FY98/99	FY99/00	FY00/01	FY01/02	FY02/03	FY03/04	FY04/05	FY05/06
SOURCES OF FUNDS (000's)											
Land Sales @ 100%											
Industrial/Office/R&D	\$7,243	\$0	\$0	\$398	\$398	\$398	\$298	\$298	\$298	\$298	\$298
Retail	4,308	0	0	224	224	224	135	135	135	135	135
Lodging Rooms	16,371	0	0	0	0	3,367	0	0	0	0	5,384
Existing Units	9,693	0	1,261	1,261	1,261	1,261	910	910	910	910	910
Residential											
4 DU/AC Units	31,145	0	747	747	747	747	1,246	1,246	1,246	1,246	1,246
6 DU/AC Units	123,558	0	5,979	5,979	5,979	5,979	6,377	6,377	6,377	6,377	6,377
8 DU/AC Units	63,253	0	2,578	2,578	2,578	2,578	3,515	3,515	3,515	3,515	3,515
10 DU/AC Units	3,746	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20 DU/AC Units	1,451	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal Land Sales	\$260,667	\$0	\$10,565	\$11,187	\$11,187	\$14,554	\$12,482	\$12,482	\$12,482	\$12,482	\$17,866
Special Tax & Development Fees											
CSUMB	20,503	0	0	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139
MBEST											
Base-Wide	7,409	0	0	0	200	200	200	382	382	382	382
Local	1,411	0	0	0	38	38	38	73	73	73	73
FORA											
Base-Wide	117,356	0	3,919	6,128	6,128	8,054	5,314	5,314	5,314	5,314	7,240
Local	34,179	0	1,838	1,935	1,935	1,986	1,811	1,811	1,811	1,811	1,862
Property Tax Increment @ 0.000%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal & State Grants/Members Dues	10,132	5,735	365	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224
Water & Sewer Reserves/Bond Financing	48,830	0	612	2,488	2,358	2,462	1,685	1,685	1,188	1,188	1,188
Total Cash Sources	\$500,487	5,735	17,299	23,101	23,208	28,666	22,893	23,109	22,612	22,612	29,973
USES OF FUNDS (000's)											
Infrastructure (Base-wide & Local)											
EDA Infrastructure	\$240,893	\$560	\$2,595	\$17,128	\$9,884	\$16,507	\$10,745	\$10,745	\$11,178	\$11,178	\$5,823
Demolition Costs	5,230	5,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FORA Operating Costs	120,000	0	0	24,000	0	0	24,000	0	0	24,000	0
Facilities Management/Maintenance	29,400	1,486	1,536	1,497	1,447	1,447	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466
Habitat Management Costs	30,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Marketing Incentives	3,260	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
	1,334	0	0	220	220	894	0	0	0	0	0
Total Cash Uses	\$430,117	8,939	5,794	44,508	13,214	20,510	37,874	13,874	14,306	38,306	8,951
Net Cash Flow	\$70,370	(3,204)	11,505	(21,407)	9,995	8,146	(14,981)	9,236	8,306	(15,694)	21,021
Cumulative Cash Flow		(3,204)	8,301	(13,106)	(3,111)	5,035	(9,946)	(711)	7,595	(8,099)	12,922
KEY FINANCIAL DATA (000's)											
Cumulative Private Investment		\$0	\$10,565	\$66,777	\$131,633	\$199,856	\$307,194	\$372,841	\$438,489	\$504,136	\$575,167
Debt Balances		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



EXHIBIT 9
BASE-WIDE PRO FORMA SUMMARY

BASE-WIDE PRO FORMA SUMMARY	20Yr TOTAL	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16
SOURCES OF FUNDS (000's)											
Land Sales @ 100%											
Industrial/Office/R&D	\$7,243	\$386	\$386	\$386	\$386	\$386	\$525	\$525	\$525	\$525	\$525
Retail	4,308	90	90	90	90	90	503	503	503	503	503
Lodging Rooms	16,371	0	0	0	0	5,377	0	0	0	2,243	0
Existing Units	9,593	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Residential											
4 DU/AC Units	31,145	1,894	1,894	1,894	1,894	1,894	2,492	2,492	2,492	2,492	2,492
6 DU/AC Units	123,558	6,377	6,377	6,377	6,377	6,377	7,174	7,174	7,174	7,174	7,174
8 DU/AC Units	63,253	3,514	3,514	3,514	3,514	3,514	3,559	3,559	3,559	3,559	3,559
10 DU/AC Units	3,746	375	375	375	375	375	375	375	375	375	375
20 DU/AC Units	1,451	145	145	145	145	145	145	145	145	145	145
Subtotal Land Sales	\$260,667	\$12,780	\$12,780	\$12,780	\$12,780	\$18,157	\$14,772	\$14,772	\$14,772	\$17,016	\$14,772
Special Tax & Development Fees											
CSUMB	20,503	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139
MBEST											
Base-Wide	7,409	382	480	480	480	480	480	769	578	578	578
Local	1,411	73	91	91	91	91	91	147	110	110	110
FORA											
Base-Wide	117,356	4,818	4,818	4,818	4,818	6,102	7,595	7,595	7,595	8,878	7,595
Local	34,179	1,645	1,645	1,645	1,645	1,679	1,817	1,817	1,817	1,851	1,817
Property Tax Increment @ 0.000%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal & State Grants/Members Dues	10,132	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224
Water & Sewer Reserves/Bond Financing	48,830	1,188	1,393	1,393	1,393	1,393	5,444	5,444	5,444	5,444	5,444
Total Cash Sources	\$500,487	22,248	22,570	22,570	22,570	29,264	31,562	31,907	31,679	35,240	31,679
USES OF FUNDS (000's)											
Infrastructure (Base-wide & Local)	\$240,893	\$3,638	\$18,961	\$18,961	\$18,961	\$18,961	\$13,014	\$13,014	\$13,014	\$13,014	\$13,014
EDA Infrastructure	5,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Demolition Costs	120,000	0	24,000	0	0	24,000	0	0	0	0	0
FORA Operating Costs	29,400	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466
Facilities Management/Maintenance	30,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Habitat Management Costs	3,260	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
Marketing Incentives	1,334	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Cash Uses	\$430,117	6,766	46,090	22,090	22,090	46,090	16,143	16,143	16,143	16,143	16,143
Net Cash Flow	\$70,370	15,482	(23,520)	480	480	(16,826)	15,419	15,764	15,536	19,097	15,536
Cumulative Cash Flow	28,404	4,884	5,364	5,844	(10,982)	4,437	20,201	35,737	54,834	70,370	70,370
KEY FINANCIAL DATA (000's)											
Cumulative Private Investment	\$683,595	\$749,965	\$816,335	\$882,706	\$954,453	\$1,055,595	\$1,138,961	\$1,221,456	\$1,306,194	\$1,408,688	\$1,408,688
Debt Balances	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SKMG

EXHIBIT 10
FORA OPERATIONS PRO FORMA SUMMARY

FORA PRO FORMA SUMMARY	20Yr TOTAL	FY06/07	FY07/08	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16
SOURCES OF FUNDS (000's)											
Land Sales @ 50% 1/	\$46,667	\$812	\$812	\$812	\$812	\$3,501	\$1,808	\$1,808	\$7,386	\$8,508	\$7,386
Property Tax Increment @ 0.000%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal & State Grants/Members Dues	10,132	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224
Total Cash Sources	\$56,798	1,036	1,036	1,036	1,036	3,725	2,032	2,032	7,610	8,732	7,610
USES OF FUNDS (000's)											
EDA Infrastructure	5,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FORA Operating Costs											
Plan Monitor/Update	5,833	287	287	287	287	287	287	287	287	287	287
CIP Planning/Programming	7,870	395	395	395	395	395	395	395	395	395	395
Marketing	7,760	385	385	385	385	385	385	385	385	385	385
Agency Mgmt/Gov't Liaison	6,227	314	314	314	314	314	314	314	314	314	314
Overhead	1,720	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86
Subtotal FORA Operating Costs	29,400	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466
Habitat Management Costs	3,260	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
Total Cash Uses	\$37,890	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629
Net Cash Flow	\$18,908	(593)	(593)	(593)	(593)	2,096	404	404	5,981	7,103	5,981
Cumulative Cash Flow		(1,282)	(1,875)	(2,468)	(3,060)	(965)	(561)	(158)	5,824	12,927	18,908

1/ Net of Base-wide demolition, Highway 156 reserve costs, property management and marketing incentives, the total of which is amortized at \$11 million per year from FY98/99 - FY2012/2013.



**EXHIBIT 10
FORA OPERATIONS PRO FORMA SUMMARY**

FORA PRO FORMA SUMMARY	20Yr TOTAL	FY96/97	FY97/98	FY98/99	FY99/00	FY00/01	FY01/02	FY02/03	FY03/04	FY04/05	FY05/06
SOURCES OF FUNDS (000's)											
Land Sales @ 50% 1/	\$46,667	\$0	\$5,282	\$16	\$16	\$1,699	\$663	\$663	\$663	\$663	\$3,355
Property Tax Increment @ 0.000%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal & State Grants/Members Dues	10,132	5,735	365	224	224	224	224	224	224	224	224
Total Cash Sources	\$56,798	5,735	5,647	240	240	1,923	887	887	887	887	3,579
USES OF FUNDS (000's)											
EDA Infrastructure	6,230	5,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FORA Operating Costs											
Plan Monitor/Update	5,833	326	326	287	287	287	292	292	292	292	292
CIP Planning/Programming	7,870	391	391	391	391	391	395	395	395	395	395
Marketing	7,760	375	425	425	375	375	385	385	385	385	385
Agency Mgmt/Gov't Liaison	6,227	309	309	309	309	309	309	309	309	309	309
Overhead	1,720	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86	86
Subtotal FORA Operating Costs	29,400	1,486	1,536	1,497	1,447	1,447	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466	1,466
Habitat Management Costs	3,260	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163	163
Total Cash Uses	\$37,890	6,879	1,699	1,660	1,610	1,610	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629	1,629
Net Cash Flow	\$18,908	(1,144)	3,948	(1,420)	(1,370)	313	(742)	(742)	(742)	(742)	1,950
Cumulative Cash Flow		(1,144)	2,804	1,384	14	327	(415)	(1,157)	(1,898)	(2,640)	(690)

1/ Net of Base-wide demolition, Highway 156 reserve costs, property management and marketing incentives, the total of which, is amortized at \$11 million per year from FY98/99 - FY2012/2013.

**EXHIBIT 11A
ABSORPTION BY PHASE
(In Various Units)**

	1996-2000	2001-2005	2006-2010	2011-2015	Total
Industrial/Business Park (sq.ft.)	206,000	249,200	306,000	375,700	1,136,900
R&D/Office (sq.ft.)	297,000	636,800	787,200	1,002,700	2,722,800
Retail - Neighborhood/Convenience (sq.ft.)	149,800	149,800	119,800	141,600	561,000
Retail - Regional/Outlet (sq.ft.)	0	0	0	500,000	500,000
Hotels (rooms)	300	300	200	200	1,000
Residential - Existing (units)	800	500	0	0	1,300
Residential - 4 DU/acre (units)	50	100	150	200	500
Residential - 6 DU/acre (units)	600	800	800	900	3,100
Residential - 8 DU/acre (units)	352	600	600	608	2,160
Residential - 10 DU/acre (units)	0	0	100	100	200
Residential - 20 DU/acre (units)	0	0	100	100	200

**EXHIBIT 11B
ABSORPTION BY PHASE
(In Acres)**

	1996-2000	2001-2005	2006-2010	2011-2015	Total
Industrial/Business Park	29	34	44	60	166
R&D/Office	24	54	68	86	233
Retail - Neighborhood/ Convenience	15	15	10	12	52
Retail - Regional/Outlet	0	0	0	46	46
Hotels	9	15	15	6	45
Residential - Existing	254	159	0	0	413
Residential - 4 DU/acre	12	25	38	50	125
Residential - 6 DU/acre	100	133	134	150	517
Residential - 8 DU/acre	44	75	75	76	270
Residential - 10 DU/acre	0	0	10	10	20
Residential - 20 DU/acre	0	0	5	5	10

EXHIBIT 12 NET LAND VALUE ASSUMPTIONS FORT ORD						
Area By Use	Retail Land Value (\$/Acre)	Retail Value per Sq. Ft. (2)	On-Site Cost per Acre (3)	Base-Wide & Local Facilities Fees (\$/Acre) (4)	Wholesale Land Value per Acre	Net Realizable Value per Sq. Ft. (5)
<i>Residential (1)</i>						
Existing DU (2)	\$35,000	n.a.	n.a.	\$11,773	\$23,227	n.a.
4 DU / AC	300,000	\$6.89	\$0	50,932	249,068	\$5.72
6 DU / AC	315,000	7.23	0	75,696	239,304	5.49
8 DU / AC	335,000	7.69	0	100,464	234,536	5.38
10 DU / AC	295,000	6.77	0	107,600	187,400	4.30
20 DU / AC	295,000	6.77	0	149,820	145,180	3.33
<i>Retail</i>						
Convenience	348,480	8.00	75,000	227,770	45,710	1.05
Neighborhood	348,480	8.00	75,000	227,770	45,710	1.05
Regional / Outlet	348,480	8.00	76,500	227,770	44,210	1.01
Average			75,704	227,770	45,006	1.03
<i>LI / BP & Office / R&D</i>						
LI / BP	130,680	3.00	61,500	44,760	24,420	0.56
Office / R&D	163,350	3.75	70,500	62,938	29,912	0.69
Average			67,895	57,676	28,322	0.65
MBEST (3)	163,350	3.75	69,000	64,897	29,453	0.68
<i>Lodging</i>						
Hotel	631,620	14.50	75,000	197,670	358,950	8.24
Notes:						
(1) Land values indicated are for unfinished lots, net of on-site costs.						
(2) Existing dwelling units are valued on a per unit basis.						
(3) Reimer Associates estimates of developer required on-site improvement costs, 1/10/96.						
(4) Allocation of base-wide capital costs per Reimer Associates estimates, and local facilities fees per Angus McDonald & Associates.						
(5) Figures consistent with those in Section III Exhibit 6, less on-site and base-wide and local facilities fees.						
Sources: Angus McDonald & Associates; Reimer Associates; Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.						
N:\WPDOCS\PROJECTS\29694\EXHIB12.WK4\DJR						07/17/96

EXHIBIT 13 PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL SUMMARY - FORT ORD REUSE PLAN 1996 - 2015	
Items	Sources of Funds (millions)
Land Sales (based on all cash sales)	\$260.7
One Time Mello Roos Special Tax	\$145.2
Local Development Fees	\$35.6
Water and Sewer Fees & Reserves	\$48.8
EDA Grant and Annual Dues	\$10.2
Total Sources:	\$500.5
	Uses of Funds (millions)
Basewide and Local Infrastructure (1)	\$240.9
EDA Projects	\$5.2
Demolition	\$120.0
FORA Operations	\$29.4
Facilities Management/Maintenance	\$30.0
Funding of Shortfall for Local Services	\$20.0
Miscellaneous, Other	\$4.6
Total Uses:	\$450.1
	Net Total Funds (millions)
Total Sources Minus Uses (millions):	\$50.4
Less: 10% Land Sales Contingency	(\$26.1)
Net Total Funds:	\$24.3
Notes:	
Sources: Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.	
D:\FTORD\OVERHED4.WK4\IVJM	

(1) In addition to Basewide infrastructure costs of \$189.3 million, this includes: an extra \$16 million for Hwy 156, \$22.6 million for Parks/Recreation, and \$13 million for local facilities (police, fire, library, general).

**Table 14
FORA OPERATING BUDGET**

	20 YR. TOTAL	FY 96/97	FY 97/98	FY 98/99	FY 99/00	FY 00/01
PROGRAMS						
PLAN MONITOR/UPDATE		\$325,500	\$325,500	\$286,500	\$286,500	\$286,500
CIP PLANNING/PROGRAMMING		\$390,500	\$390,500	\$390,500	\$390,500	\$390,500
MARKETING		\$375,000	\$425,000	\$425,000	\$375,000	\$375,000
AGENCY MGT/GOV'T LIAISON		\$308,850	\$308,850	\$308,850	\$308,850	\$308,850
Subtotal	\$27,680,000	\$1,399,850	\$1,449,850	\$1,410,850	\$1,360,850	\$1,360,850
OVERHEAD						
OFFICE		\$36,000	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$36,000
SUPPLIES		\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
OTHER		\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Subtotal	\$1,720,000	\$86,000	\$86,000	\$86,000	\$86,000	\$86,000
TOTAL	\$29,400,000	\$1,485,850	\$1,535,850	\$1,496,850	\$1,446,850	\$1,446,850

8-3. The commenter states that FORA should negotiate with the Army to get the Army to clean up the toxic buildings. Refer to response to comment 8-1.

8-4. The commenter states that the pilot program to determine if toxic buildings can be recycled is preposterous. The commenter submits an opinion. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

8-5. The commenter is concerned with issues pertaining to water. The following discussion is provided to augment the existing discussion in the EIR.

Agreement No. A-06404/Resolution No. 93-387

By reasons of an Army agreement with the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA)(Agreement No. A-06404/Resolution No. 93-387), a potable water supply of 6,600 acre feet per year (afy) is assured from the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin for the period up to 2015. The source of this water is projected to be a combination of water derived from Fort Ord wells that tap into the 180-foot, 400-foot and 900-foot aquifers of Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin or other sources from within the MCWRA. Army's position under the agreement with MCWRA is expected to be assigned to FORA. The anticipated population for the year 2015 that will coincide with the 6,600 afy (5,610 afy with conservation efforts) is 37,370. Annual water use at Fort Ord was 5,634 acre feet in 1992, 3,971 acre feet in 1993, and 3,235 acre feet in 1994 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1996).

The fundamental tenet of this contractual agreement is that the Fort Ord wells are part of the seawater intrusion problem and are also threatened by seawater intrusion. This situation necessitates future Fort Ord development obtaining water at a safe yield level from a combination of Fort Ord wells and potentially from MCWRA's inland wells. The 6,600 afy is the amount available through the Army/MCWRA agreement and is based on the peak water use that occurred at Fort Ord in 1984 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1993). With a projected overall water conservation effort at Fort Ord of 15 percent implemented through the Reuse Plan, the total potable water requirement for the year 2015 would be anticipated to be 5,610 afy (Reimer 1996). Therefore, the 6,600 afy reflects an historical peak only, not the actual projected water use, which is based on an aggressive conservation effort promulgated by implementation of Monterey County's water conservation regulations (Ordinance number 3539).

The Fort Ord service areas have been officially included in Zones 2 and 2a of the MCWRA by previous agreement between MCWRA and the Army (Agreement No. A-06404; Resolution No. 93-387). Under that agreement, a total of 6,600 afy of potable water is made available for consumption within the Fort Ord boundary. This amount of water comes from wells which take water from the Salinas Groundwater Basin or from any imported water source delivered by the MCWRA to a point within the Fort Ord boundary. The MCWRA/Army agreement also stipulates that a maximum of 5,200 afy can be pumped from the 180 and/or 400 foot

aquifers while the additional 1,400 afy is to be obtained from the deeper 900 foot aquifer. An agreement between the City of Marina, MCWD and MCWRA makes available to Fort Ord lands the 1,400 afy from the 900 foot aquifer (Malcolm Crawford, public statement, October 7, 1996). The 5,200 afy threshold corresponds to the average water withdrawal from 1988 to 1992 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1993) [note: the Supplemental Fort Ord Disposal and Reuse EIR (June 1996) states that the annual average water use between 1986 and 1989 was 5,100 afy]. The 6,600 afy excludes the water pumped from the Seaside Basin for the two existing golf courses (400 afy average). The

The surety of the 6,600 afy is based on the following: first, 5,200 afy water supply from current wells which must be augmented by a deeper well source from which an additional 1,400 afy can then be pumped under the existing agreement. The surety of the 1,400 afy appears to be absolute since Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) has wells into the deep aquifer proximate to the Fort Ord boundary which already exhibit yield sufficient to produce an additional 1,400 afy without resulting in saltwater intrusion. Consequently, either a new well, which is authorized by the MCWRA agreement, or a delivery agreement with MCWD can be expected to provide for water supplies up to the 6,600 afy agreed upon.

Second, there has been ongoing concern as to whether or not the State Water Resources Control Board will "adjudicate" the Salinas Groundwater Basin so as to limit well pumping in order to combat salt water intrusion. In this scenario, it is uncertain what amount of water Fort Ord would get vis-a-vis Agreement No. A-06404.

The first phase of the Castroville Agricultural water replacement program now under construction represents a local response to the seawater intrusion problem and the state's adjudication threat. If, or when, the additional step of limiting pumping from existing wells is mandated, then a percentage reduction in pumping rights is expected to be applied to all wells in the MCWRA jurisdiction.

Furthermore, the water supply issues between Fort Ord and the more southerly Monterey Peninsula are separate and distinct. The Peninsula's water supply program is the prerogative of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management district (and, of course, the voters of the District). Fort Ord depends upon the supply agreement with MCWRA as discussed in response to comment 8-5. The sources of water supply are geographically separated and independently controlled.

Safe Yield Water Supply

A safe yield (discussed in the Army's Final EIS, Volume I, Page 4-57) is that amount of water that can be pumped annually on a long-term basis without causing undesirable effects, the greatest of which in the Fort Ord area are excessive drawdown which precipitates seawater intrusion. A drawdown associated with well pumping creates a downhill gradient vis-a-vis the seawater. The seawater will then flow (through capillary action) inland and down gradient toward the wells. It

is such a situation that occurred over a period of years which precipitated the U.S. Army to relocate its wells further inland in 1986.

As stated in the Final EIS, the safe yield of potable water for future Fort Ord development may be less than the present total pumpage of 4,700 afy ("present" means 1991 average water use). A specific amount of water extraction below 4,700 afy that would result in there being no seawater intrusion or at least a stable level of seawater intrusion is not known at this time, due to the lack of current empirical data.

Safe yield, as it pertains to seawater intrusion, is subject to a variety of environmental factors, such as well water pumping rates, "cones of depression", drought, precipitation, rate of recharge, and other factors. Therefore, safe yield should not be construed as something that is static. A safe yield supply of water during a drought year would be expected to be a less than a safe yield during a year with heavy precipitation (assuming the groundwater basin is recharged relatively quickly). This is because during a drought year it would be expected that more water would be used. Furthermore, a safe yield water supply from Fort Ord wells may be different in 1991 than it would be in 1997. This is because the population at Fort Ord has dropped significantly since 1991, which has resulted in a significant reduction of water pumped from Fort Ord wells, and because there have been at least two years of heavy precipitation since 1991. At base closure, water use was approximately 4,700 afy. The current water use is approximately 1,700 afy from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin (based on 1.5 mgd water use)(Jim Bowles, pers. com. February 3, 1997). The implication is that the chloride (salt water) contour line between seawater and groundwater in the area of Fort Ord and Marina is potentially dynamic and may have moved further west since 1991. However, there is no empirical evidence that the contour line has moved in any direction. The most current chloride contour lines applicable to the Fort Ord and Marina area are based on 1983 data (Kathy Thomasburg, pers. com., January 6, 1997).

Limiting future development to a safe yield water supply without any regional approach to ameliorate seawater intrusion would require a significant reduction in well pumping along the entire Monterey County coastal area. This would result in massive economic impacts to farmers and would be expected to significantly reduce Fort Ord development opportunities and options. Of course, to not limit use of water to a safe yield level will also result in a similar outcome.

To address the seawater intrusion problem, the MCWRA is currently completing the construction phase of the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP), which would result in reclaimed water being transferred to the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin via a number of recharge wells. This should start in 1997. In addition, the MCWRA is currently preparing an environmental document and basin management plan which addresses future water demand in the County and provide recharge water in the Castroville area to augment the effort to stop seawater intrusion. The MCWRA is considering water storage facilities and additional water lines to convey water to the seawater intrusion area. This includes the proposed surface storage reservoir for

reclaimed water at Armstrong Ranch or an Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) Project that both the MCWRA and the Bureau of Reclamation are currently investigating. The Armstrong Ranch reservoir is projected to hold 3,000 acre-feet.

Future development on Fort Ord reflects the need to withdraw only an amount of water through Fort Ord wells which would result in a safe yield extraction from the Basin. For the purposes of this EIR, a "safe yield" water supply pertaining to Fort Ord is water extracted from the aquifers (180-foot, 400-foot and 900-foot) which will result in the 1997 chloride contour lines (not yet determined) remaining stable and not moving further inland relative to the 1997 conditions. To achieve this goal a Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) has been developed which requires monitoring of seawater in the Marina/Fort Ord area with monitoring wells.

Since the effectiveness of the CSIP has yet to be demonstrated, the observed rates of seawater intrusion were used to predict the life expectancy of the existing producing wells on Fort Ord. The FORIS report presents conclusions on the 180- and 400-foot aquifers based upon the Harding Lawson Associates studies which were conducted as part of the environmental assessment activity on the base in the early 1990's. The FORIS report states that for the 180-foot aquifer in the Fort Ord area the distance between the last observed location of seawater intrusion and the well field is approximately 6,500 feet. Assuming that the maintenance of the observed gradient rate of flow of the intrusion front is approximately 230 feet per year, the travel time for the seawater intrusion to the existing well field is about 30 years. This estimate of well life expectancy is based upon previously conducted studies. No more exact location of seawater intrusion in the 180 foot aquifer has been reported.

The FORIS report also states the groundwater flow direction in the 400-foot aquifer in the area of the Main Garrison, where seawater was last detected, is currently toward the northeast. Under predicted conditions, the seawater intrusion front within the 400-foot aquifer will not advance significantly toward the existing well field.

FORA would be required to participate in a Development and Resource Management Plan that relies on the MCWRA to restrict water use from the 180-, 400- and 900-foot aquifer through a monitoring program to assure that a hydrogeologically stable relationship between seawater and groundwater. For a discussion of the Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) as it pertains to an assured safe yield water supply, refer to response to comment public hearing comment 21-1.

Long-term Water Supply

Long term water supply for Fort Ord buildout above and beyond the 6,600 afy discussed above and in the EIR is projected to come to Fort Ord as either one of or a combination of the following: imported water, and/or desalination water and/or on- or off-site water storage.

The EIR erroneously states that the future water use requirement at buildout is 18,262 afy. This amount represents water requirements of the December 1994 Interim Reuse plan (Reimer 1996). The current Reuse Plan has been significantly reduced as to the amount of development and, as the result, the predicted water use at buildout is 13,500 afy, not 18,262. Of the 13,500 afy, 10,500 afy will be consumed as potable water while 3,000 afy is anticipated to be used for irrigation/industrial process purposes and is to be supplied from reuse water sources such as reclaimed water from the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD).

The revised build out water use figure prompted a second look at the anticipated Fort Ord buildout wastewater flows. The wastewater flows projected in the EIR for full buildout at Fort Ord has been verified and determined to be correct and a maximum flow assuming that all 13,500 afy is processed at the MRWPCA wastewater treatment plant. However, as noted above, only 10,500 afy would be used as potable water that would end up as flow into the treatment plant. The remaining water use (3,000 afy) is reclaimed water for use on golf courses, other turf, landscaping and industrial processes. Therefore, the actual amount of wastewater flow is projected to be less than the amount discussed in the EIR (9.8 mgd). The 9.8 mgd wastewater treatment plant capacity requirement projected for full buildout of Fort Ord represents approximately 80 percent of 13,500 afy.

Associated with the source of water for buildout of Fort Ord will be environmental impacts. The projected environmental impacts of these potential future water sources are discussed below.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-42. Amend reference to "18,262 afy" in first sentence of second paragraph to read "13,500 afy".

Page 5-5. Amend reference to "18,262 afy" in first line on page to read "13,500 afy".

Page 4-42. Amend title at top of page to read as follows: Impact: Need for New Local Water Supplies (2015)

Page 4-44. Add the following discussion.

3. Impact: Need for new Local Water Supplies (Buildout)

A. Imported Water From Outside Monterey County

San Felipe Project

Description of Water Source

There is the potential that the San Felipe Project water could be obtained and piped to Monterey County from an existing 96-inch San Felipe Project water

line in San Benito County. This line would traverse agricultural land in San Benito County, and potentially traverse wetlands habitat in San Benito County and northern Monterey County. This source of water is discussed in concept only. It is not a project.

Environmental Considerations

If water were imported from the San Felipe Project, it is presumed that this would result in temporary construction related impacts to agricultural land and potentially to sensitive/endangered/threatened plant species that occur in wetlands habitat and other environments. The installation of pipelines would be the primary impact activity. Mitigation of this sort of activity would require re-establishing the agricultural operations and revegetation of disturbed areas. In some cases it may be required that a more extensive mitigation program be implemented in the case of impacts to endangered/threatened species (e.g., habitat replacement on a ratio prescribed by a federal or state agency). Also, because San Felipe Project water is used for agricultural purposes only, there would be an amount of agricultural land that would become fallow somewhere in the central California area that is currently served by San Felipe Project water. The acreage of agricultural land lost is unknown because it cannot be determined how much water could potentially be taken from this source. There is also the potential for growth inducement if the agricultural land taken out of cultivation is near an urban area. Another potential environmental impact requiring consideration includes potential impacts to archaeological resources.

B. Imported Water From the Salinas Valley

Groundwater

Description of water source

The discussion of the impacts of imported water require a general discussion of the potential impacts of water withdrawal and water conveyance. This analysis is relevant to the potential importation of water through new pipes between future MCWRA sources of water and Fort Ord. The discussion that ensues is derived from the Hydrogeology and Water Supply of Salinas Valley, A White Paper Prepared by the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin Hydrology Conference on behalf of the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, June 1995.

Future Water Withdrawal From the Salinas Valley

Future water withdrawal from MCWRA sources is projected to impact the Salinas Valley ground water basin. The Salinas Valley is a 120 mile long.

broad, flat bottomed drainage that flows northwest towards Monterey Bay in central coastal California. The valley is filled with river alluvium up to several hundred feet thick.

This basin is commonly divided into four subareas for purposes of analysis: Pressure (includes part of Fort Ord and the area near the coast), East Side (includes the north half of the Salinas Valley between the coast and the Forebay subarea), Forebay and the Upper Valley (area farthest upstream). The alluvial deposits underlying the riverbed are deepest in the Forebay subarea and relatively shallow along the coast and at the southern end of the valley. The Upper Valley and Forebay subareas are unconfined and in direct hydraulic connection with the Salinas River. There are no barriers to the horizontal flow between these subareas, although aquifer characteristics decrease the rate of ground water flow in certain parts of the basin.

Ground water in the East Side consists of 74,000 acres and is primarily of unconfined aquifers that are recharged by runoff from the western slope of the Gabilan Range east of the project area, from groundwater underflow originating in the adjoining Forebay and Pressure areas, and to a lesser degree, percolation of rainfall and irrigation water. Water wells in the Salinas Valley range in depth from a few hundred feet to as much as 1,000 feet. Production rates in the range of 1,500 to 2,500 gallons per minute (GPM) are common.

The pressure area is composed primarily of confined and semi-confined aquifers separated by clay layers (aquitards) that limit the amount of vertical recharge. The Pressure area covers an approximately 91,000 acres between Gonzales and Monterey Bay. These deposits include at least three separate fresh water aquifers labeled the "180-foot", "400-foot" and "Deep Zone". Extensive groundwater pumping for agricultural, municipal and industrial uses has affected the groundwater supplies of the basin in terms of both quantity and quality. Annual pumping in excess of recharge has caused a gradual lowering of water tables and pressure heads. This "overdraft" condition is the primary cause of salt water intrusion into the Pressure subarea. Both the 180-foot and 400-foot aquifers are in contact with the salt water of Monterey Bay which has intruded inland causing agricultural and domestic water supply wells along the coast in the Pressure subarea to be abandoned.

The exact nature of the connection between the Deep zone and the ocean is unknown. Seawater intrusion has not been detected in Deep Zone wells, but there is no evidence indicating that the Deep Zone is not connected to the ocean. Lacking this evidence, it must be assumed that the Deep Zone, like the 180-foot and 400-foot aquifers above it, is connected to the ocean and vulnerable to seawater intrusion if ground water levels fall below sea level. Similarly, the aquitards between the 400-foot and the Deep Zone are subject

to leakage of degraded water downward to the Deep Zone as the water level is lowered.

The Upper Valley and Forebay areas are unconfined and in direct hydraulic connection with the Salinas River. The Upper Valley area covers an area of approximately 92,000 acres near the south end of Salinas Valley from Greenfield to Bradley. Primary ground water recharge to the Upper Valley area occurs from percolation in the channel of Salinas River.

The Forebay area from Gonzales to Greenfield consists of approximately 87,000 acres (including Arroyo Seco Cone) of unconsolidated alluvium. Principal recharge to the Forebay area is from percolation of water from Salinas River and Arroyo Seco Cone, and ground water outflow from the Upper Valley.

The Arroyo Seco Cone is located on the west side of southern Salinas Valley and is a part of the Forebay area. Arroyo Seco Cone receives recharge from percolation in channels of Arroyo Seco Cone may provide some opportunity for additional recharge.

Sources of Recharge in the Salinas Valley

Ground water recharge in the Salinas Valley is principally from infiltration from Salinas River, Arroyo Seco Cone, and, to a much lesser extent, from deep percolation of rainfall. Minor amounts are derived from infiltration from small streams and inflow from bedrock areas adjoining the basin. Deep percolation of applied irrigation water is the second largest component of the ground water budget, but because it represents recirculation of existing ground water rather than an inflow of "new" water, it is not considered a source of recharge for this discussion. Seawater intrusion is another source of inflow of the basin, but because it is not usable fresh water it is also excluded as a source of recharge.

Infiltration from the Salinas River and deep percolation of rainfall would occur under natural conditions, but both are increased by present water use patterns in the Valley. Ground water extraction increases the amount of infiltration from the river upstream of Salinas. Irrigation increases the amount of rainfall that percolates past the root zone by increasing antecedent soil moisture at the beginning of the rainy season. The low permeability of the Salinas Valley aquitard in the Pressure Area decreases but does not altogether eliminate deep percolation of rainfall and irrigation return flow directly to the 180-foot aquifer in the Pressure Area. Average annual amount of recharge in the entire Salinas Valley during 1970 to 1992 (most current information available) derived from various sources is 514,000.

Seawater Intrusion in the Salinas Valley

Analysis of water samples from wells in the Pressure Area has indicated that seawater has been intruding the aquifers for the last 60 years or so. The intrusion is in the 180- and 400-foot aquifers and has moved 6 miles inland in the 180-foot aquifer and 2 miles inland in the 400-foot aquifer, rendering wells in the intruded area unusable and decreasing usable basin storage. The Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project addresses, in part, the sea water intrusion problem. Additionally, measures must be taken, primarily the delivery of water from inland locations to the mouth of the Salinas Valley, in order to further hinder the encroachment of seawater up the Salinas Valley.

Seawater is another source of inflow into the basin. However, the chloride content of seawater makes it unusable. The average seawater intrusion totals about 17,000 afy. Combined with the average annual groundwater extraction, which is 20,000 afy more than total fresh water inflow, the valley wide water budget shows an average fresh water deficit of 37,000 afy.

Environmental Considerations

There are two potential environmental impacts associated with Salinas Valley water as a long-term water source option for Fort Ord. The projected environmental impacts are associated with the withdrawal of water from the Salinas Valley (surface or groundwater) and the impact of conveying the water to the users. Pertaining to impacts associated with conveyance are potential biological impacts, the loss of agricultural land, impacts to archaeological resources and growth inducement.

As it pertains to the long-term water source for Fort Ord development, it is assumed in this scenario that 10,500 afy would be taken from the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin, either through existing Fort Ord wells or from wells located elsewhere in the Salinas Valley, and conveyed to Fort Ord via water pipes.

Withdrawal of 10,500 afy from an aquifer that is currently being pumped at a rate of 535,000 afy appears insignificant. However, the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin is in deficit condition in the amount of 37,000 (20,000 afy from overdraft and 17,000 afy from seawater intrusion), with the greatest impact occurring in the Pressure and East Side Area of the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin. The overdraft has precipitated a sea water intrusion condition that has been known since 1946 when the California Department of Water Resources conducted a study of the basin and provided recommendations to stave off seawater intrusion and reduce overdraft. A recent "White Paper" prepared for the MCWRA by a number of hydrologists reiterates the 1946 study and draws the same conclusions, which is that to solve the Salinas Valley seawater intrusion problem there must be redistribution of water from the inland areas to the mouth of the Salinas Valley where there is seawater intrusion.

The second impact pertains to conveying the water from the source to the users. It cannot be determined what the path of a water line would be so it cannot be determined exactly what the potential environmental impacts associated with construction activities will be. However, it should be assumed that there are potentially significant temporary adverse impacts to plant and wildlife species as a result of construction activities. Implementation of federally and state mandated plant and wildlife mitigations would adequately mitigate the potential impacts associated with pipeline construction activities off Fort Ord. Implementation of the HMP for construction activities on Fort Ord would adequately mitigate the potential impacts. Short term construction related impacts to agricultural land is not considered to be significant.

Archaeological impacts would need analysis as well as growth inducement. An increased water supply would both address seawater intrusion and future development.

The HMP describes a cooperative federal, state, and local program of conservation for plant and animal species and habitat of concern known to occur at Fort Ord. The HMP establishes a long-term program for the protection, enhancement and management of all HMP resources with a goal of no net loss of HMP populations while acknowledging and defining an allowable loss of such resources through the land development process. The HMP establishes the conditions under which the disposal of Fort Ord lands to public and private entities for reuse and development may be accomplished in a manner that is compatible with adequate preservation of HMP resources to assure their sustainability in perpetuity. Therefore, the HMP establishes performance standards for all future developments to implement and are assured to be implemented by local agencies and jurisdictions.

Off-site Storage in the Salinas Valley

Description of water source

Another source of new water that could be used to both hinder seawater intrusion and provide for future development in the County and at Fort Ord is the construction of water storage facilities in the Salinas Valley. Currently the MCWRA is investigating in greater detail two potential future water storage facilities, the Merritt Lake site and the Espinosa Lake site. A number of sites have been identified besides these two and are identified in a Technical Memorandum dated June 1996 prepared by Montgomery Watson for the MCWRA. A program EIR on the construction of these two storage facilities is currently being prepared and is anticipated to be available for public review by the end of 1977. At this time, the information provided in the discussion below is the only data available on the Merritt Lake and the Espinosa Lake sites.

Based on the Montgomery Watson report, the most feasible water storage facility appears to be the Merritt Lake site. Merritt Lake is approximately 1.5 miles southeast of Castroville and in the area bound by state Highway 101 to the east, State Highway 156 to the north and State Highway 1 to the west. The potential size of the Merritt Lake site would be up to 40,000 acre-feet.

The next most feasible water storage facility is the Espinosa Lake site. Espinosa Lake is approximately 2.5 miles southeast of Castroville. The existing lake is formed by a small man made dike which impounds a shallow pond which currently results in a wetland habitat. The potential size of the Espinosa Lake site would be approximately 20,000 acre-feet.

Environmental Considerations

Merritt Lake: The topographic, geologic and construction material situation appears to be favorable for construction of a dam and reservoir of the size and type needed. It appears that reservoir seepage would not be an issue at the Merritt Lake site. In addition to geo/hydro-technical issues, the loss of agricultural land will be an important issue (Montgomery Watson 1996).

Espinosa Lake: Issues associated with this project would include temporary loss of wetlands habitat, potential inundation of residences if the storage facility is larger than 10,000 acre-feet and geo/hydro-technical issues (ibid.).

Associated with either of these scenarios will be potential impacts associated with archaeological resources, wetlands, plant and wildlife resources and growth inducement impacts associated with increased water supply.

C. Desalination

Description of water source

Another source of water is desalination of seawater from the Monterey Bay. This water source would require a desalination plant in the dunes area where existing industrial structures are located or on the east side of Highway 1. These facilities would take sea water through intake pipes, process the sea water to extract potable non-salty water, and then dispose of brine through a separate set of pipes back to the Monterey Bay. There is an existing document titled Near-Term Desalination Project Final EIR (EIP 1992), prepared for the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, which discusses the potential environmental impacts associated with a 3 MGD desalination plant at a Sand City site. This document is incorporated by reference. Refer to this document for a general discussion of the characteristics of a desalination plant. [Note: any future desalination plant on Fort Ord would require a separate environmental analysis, but some of the Sand City project information could be used].

Environmental Considerations

Impacts pertinent to desalination projects include impacts to aquatic plants and animals, terrestrial vegetation and wildlife, air quality, and others issues. In the Near-Term Desalination Project Final EIR, prepared for the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (December 1992), for a proposed 3,000 afy desalination project, all impacts that were identified as potentially significant were reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of prescribed mitigations, except one, noise impacts. The short-term construction impacts would generate a level of noise that could not be reduced to a less than significant level. Growth inducement impacts associated with the increased water supply would also occur.

D. On-site Storage at Fort Ord

Description of Water Source

In the Technical Memorandum dated June 1996 prepared by Montgomery Watson for the MCWRA one Fort Ord water storage site is identified.

Environmental Considerations

This Fort Ord site considered in the technical memorandum has been eliminated from further consideration because, though the costs of a water storage facility in Barloy Canyon appears to be slightly lower than for the Merritt and Espinosa Lake sites (currently favored by the MCWRA), the foundation and embankment stability problems could not be overcome during seismic loading. Exacerbating this issue is the fact that Barloy Canyon is located within the Fort Ord Habitat Management Area, which would present significant environmental constraints. Though earlier considered a viable location for a large water storage facility, Fort Ord's geologic and environmental constraints make it one of the least desirable. Consequently, pending environmental analysis by the MCWRA for viable water storage projects precludes Fort Ord as an option (except in terms of alternatives analysis).

However, small cisterns could be incorporated in future developments that would be used to offset potable water use for landscaping. These cisterns would be located throughout the community and constructed simultaneous with new and/or remodeled structures. The impacts of this type of water storage would not be expected to present any significant environmental impact. However, it would reduce the need for groundwater resources used for landscaping, car washes, etc., thus would reduce seawater intrusion a small incremental amount. Potential recharge of groundwater resources through cisterns or small ponds is negligible and is not counted in net water use for Fort Ord.

Archeological resources would also have to be investigated associated with a Barloy Canyon project. The proposed project would not be expected to be growth inducing outside of the context of the water supply providing service to the project (i.e., Fort Ord reuse). Water would not be available for other off-base users.

Because a number of reasonable long-term water supply options exist and are discussed herein, including the siting of an on-site desalination plant assuming adoption of the policies, programs, and mitigations identified on page 4-43 of the Draft EIR, the increased demand for water would be considered a less than significant impact at the project level.

Response to Letter 9

9-1. The commenter notes that there is a multiplicity of agendas within FORA. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

9-2. The commenter asks for clarification of the demographic and employment overview summarized in the Comprehensive Business Plan and specifically requests background information for the employment projections. The discussion is summarized in Exhibit 2 distinguishing the Peninsula from Monterey County projected employment. The commenter is referred to the "Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan," (SKMG 1995) for discussion of the information. This document is included in Appendix D.

9-3. The commenter asks for clarification of the absorption of the existing residential stock at Fort Ord. The Commenter is referred to response to comment 7-1 which provides a revised Exhibit 3 with additional footnotes that address the reuse of 1,522 existing units (only 1300 estimated to be remaining after demolition that addresses environmental concerns). Exhibit 3 is a aggregate of projected absorption. The Sun-Bay apartments (291) have been included in the Reuse Plan but they are presently occupied and do not represent an absorption potential for new growth. Bostrom Park units are assumed to be demolished because of the their uneconomic reuse potential. Replacement housing in the Bostrom Park location would come out of the overall absorption potential indicated in Exhibit 3.

The commenter asks why the 2015 scenario for housing does not total the absorption potential illustrated in Exhibit 3. The 2015 scenario distinguishes between non-market generated housing (supported by institutional activities) and market-generated housing. A closer look at the market-generated housing identified in the 2015 scenario illustrates some the Reuse Plans response to the absorption potential. The existing units in Marina have been reduced from 1522 (from exhibit 3) to 1,300 based on better information on the rehabilitation potential of these units. The 1,253 CSU units shown in exhibit 3 are not included in the 7,460 total. And the total number of units in the 2015 scenario is less than the market potential because the

scenario reserves water supplies for industrial/commercial development, based on planning policies.

The commenter suggests an alternative way to display the housing unit market projections and planning totals. No response necessary.

9-4. The commenter suggests funding for Hwy 156 shouldn't be the sole responsibility of FORA and a funding source should be identified for all transportation needs. The suggestion that Hwy 156 is not the full responsibility of FORA is born out in the nexus analysis (FORA's trip contribution is 11.7 %, but the link fails to meet the nexus criteria because of the large share of trips that cannot be captured by a development-related financing mechanism). The Comprehensive Business Plan assumes a nexus based contribution to transportation funding and suggests an internal financing mechanism by which FORA could contribute its fair share to the regional network. This is defined as the "Optimistic Financing" Scenario in the Circulation Element of the Reuse Plan and in the DEIR. Alternative financing arrangements are possible and FORA will not be adopting a particular financing approach when it adopts the Reuse Plan and certifies the EIR. The Comprehensive Business Plan lays out a "benchmark" analysis that indicates FORA can finance its fair share of improvements. The commenter is correct in identifying the need to finance the region's roadway requirements. TAMC is addressing the issue and has summarized its most recent nexus analysis and funding priorities in the "Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study" (JHK 1997).

9-5. The commenter disagrees on the marketing approach advanced by the real estate economist. Comment noted.

9-6. Commenter asks if the 500 foot wide strip designated as a "special design district" will affect the initial 12 acres of land projected for low-density single-family detached units in Seaside. The special design district is an overlay relating to the visual issues along the Highway One corridor. The overlay extends over a much larger area than the 12 acres identified in the "Early Marketing Action Plan."

9-7. Commenter refers to the numerous PBC requests for properties in the planning area identified as the University Village in Seaside. The Public Benefit Conveyances represent a wide range of land uses that are consistent with the mixed use designation for the University Village. The Reuse Plan illustrates one approach to creating accommodating a wide range of facilities and activities. See the Reuse Plan, Volume I, Page 3-15.

The commenter asks what the "financial impacts for services" (fiscal burden on the communities) will be if the majority of "Excess II" buildings and lands do eventually end up in the hands of the tax-exempt entities. The 2015 scenario allocates water and assumes the traffic generation from the public facilities identified in Tables 3.8-1, 3.9-1, and 3.10-1, Volume I of the Reuse Plan. The 2015 scenario utilizes the private market development to generate land sales and development fees sufficient to carry the cumulative burden of required capital costs and fiscal deficits.

9-8. The commenter asks how the 500 foot “special design district” (scenic corridor) will affect the regional retail opportunity site at the Main Gate along Highway One. The Reuse Plan identifies the regional interest in the visual impacts in this corridor and provides for FORA to adopt Design guidelines. The “Development Character and Design Guidelines” are located in Volume I, Page 3-122 of the Reuse Plan.

9-9. The commenter requests clarification of the ownership of the golf courses. The commenter is referred to response to comment 7-1.

9-10. The commenter refers to the screening process that will happen in the Seaside University Planning Area. The commenter is referred changes to the Comprehensive Business Plan text and tables identifies in response to comment 9-7.

9-11. The commenter requests clarification of the location of the “Planned Residential Extension Districts.” The commenter is referred to Figure 3.9-1 in Volume I of the Reuse Plan.

9-12. The commenter expresses concern about the designation of a “special design district” (referred in the Reuse Plan as the Highway One Scenic Corridor) vis-a-vis future economic . The General Development Character and Design Objectives for each jurisdiction are necessary to mitigate potential visual impacts (regional and on-site). The General Development Character and Design Objectives requirements are not expected to negatively impact the development opportunities provided for in the Reuse Plan. The approach used in the Reuse Plan for mitigating visual impacts includes the following:

1. Adopting the Design Principles and Objectives for Reuse (Volume 1, Page 3-1 to 3-20);
2. Describing the “Development Character and Design Guidelines” for the individual planning areas (Section 3.7 Planning Areas and Districts, beginning on page 3-97); and
3. Subsequent to the adoption of the Reuse Plan, preparing Regional Urban Design Guidelines for the areas identified in Design Principal 6 as areas of regional importance for maintaining the scenic qualities of the Peninsula (e.g., the Highway One Corridor).

9-13. The commenter recommends that the financial information in the Comprehensive Business Plan be reviewed to substantiate the development model, projections and assumptions. The Comprehensive Business Plan was prepared to assist FORA in devising a viable and equitable financial plan for reuse and is based on many assumptions for which information is continuously improved. The Comprehensive Business Plan is not meant to be adopted as a financing limitation. In fact the Plan recommends strongly that other approaches, such as the use of redevelopment be explored. The Comprehensive Business Plan serves as a guide to indicate how FORA could establish fees, and finance the identified capital costs,

while respecting real estate marketing projections. The recommendations of the Comprehensive Business Plan will be under continuous review and refinement by FORA throughout the Reuse process. To clarify the role of the Comprehensive Business Plan and the Financing recommendations included in the Public Facilities Improvement Plan, the Reuse Plan will be amended.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-16, Summary, Business and Operations Plan Development Strategies, amend to add the following additional paragraph, as follows:

The Business and Operations Plan has been prepared for a twenty-year planning horizon (to the year 2015) which attempts to optimize financial performance in order to see whether, under optimal conditions, the identified program can be feasibly constructed in the market place.

The Comprehensive Business Plan (CBP) was prepared to assist FORA in devising a viable and equitable financing plan for reuse and is based on many assumptions for which information is continuously improved. The CBP serves as a guide to indicate how FORA could establish fees, and finance the identified capital costs, while respecting real estate market projections. The recommendations of the CMP and the financing tools recommended in the Public Facilities Improvement Plan (PFIP) is under review and refinement by FORA. Adoption of a financing plan and development fees will be separate actions taken by FORA subsequent to certification of the Final PEIR and adoption of the Reuse Plan.

The Business and Operations Plan is built from the following development strategies:

Volume I. Page 3-150, Add the following discussion after the first paragraph under the section titled - What Are The Development Strategies for the Business and Operations Plan?

The Comprehensive Business Plan (CBP) was prepared to assist FORA in devising a viable and equitable financing plan for reuse and is based on many assumptions for which information is continuously improved. The CBP serves as a guide to indicate how FORA could establish fees, and finance the identified capital costs, while respecting real estate market projections. The recommendations of the CMP and the financing tools recommended in the Public Facilities Improvement Plan (PFIP) is under review and refinement by FORA. Adoption of a financing plan and development fees will be separate actions taken by FORA subsequent to certification of the Final PEIR and adoption of the Reuse Plan.

The Business and Operations Plan is built from the following development strategies:

Appendix B. FORA Comprehensive Business Plan (CBP), page I-1, amend to add the following paragraph beneath the Title and before 1. Introduction and Statement of Purpose:

The Comprehensive Business Plan (CBP) was prepared to assist FORA in devising a viable and equitable financing plan for reuse and is based on many assumptions for which information is continuously improved. The CBP serves as a guide to indicate how FORA could establish fees, and finance the identified capital costs, while respecting real estate market projections. The recommendations of the CMP and the financing tools recommended in the Public Facilities Improvement Plan (PFIP) is under review and refinement by FORA. Adoption of a financing plan and development fees will be separate actions taken by FORA subsequent to certification of the Final PEIR and adoption of the Reuse Plan.

9-14. The commenter repeats the concern over the financing of Highway 156. The commenter is referred to response to comment 9-4.

9-15. The commenter requests that the residential development represented in the various portions of the Reuse Plan be consistent. The commenter confuses the Reuse Plan capacity limitations (which are a general plan land use designation), with the real estate market projections (which are a demand side picture through 2015), and the 2015 development scenario (which is a particular development program to simulate market responses, capital improvement requirements, and development policies in the Reuse Plan).

9-16. The commenter would like to know why will municipalities not be entitled to either payments in lieu of property taxes or franchise fees from system earnings. Since Proposition 218 passed in 1996, local jurisdictions cannot charge a fee unless it strictly reflects the cost associated with the fee.

9-17. The commenter states the burden of financing non-profit housing by the City of Marina needs to be addressed. The commenter addresses a political issue that cannot be resolved in the context of the Reuse Plan and the EIR. The issue pertaining to cities providing services to non-profits is a serious problem pertinent to the local jurisdictions affected and the non-profit organizations or public agencies involved. However, it is not an EIR or reuse plan issue.

9-18. Commenter notes explanations of impact fees, special taxes, cash flows, LOS, land value analyses, debt service, and capital costs, etc., are presented without embellishment. No response required.

9-19. Commenter compliments the diagram illustrating the breakdown of property tax distribution. No response required.

Response to Letter 10

10-1. Commenter reflects on the lack of meetings to accommodate public input. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

10-2. The commenter is concerned with the limited number of copies of the Reuse Plan and EIR available at public places. FORA provided one set of documents to each of the libraries on the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas for a period of 133 days. Considering the period of time for review, the single set at each library is considered to be adequate. For the Final PEIR, FORA will provide five sets at each library that it used as a repository for the Reuse Plan and Draft EIR.

10-3. The commenter is concerned about the York Road connection to the Highway 68 bypass. The connection to York Road at a future Highway 68 alternative route is intended to provide the mid-valley residents along the existing Highway 68 corridor an alternative route. A York Avenue connection to the by-pass will also reduce the number of vehicles that travel the full length of Highway 68.

10-4. The commenter discusses "real" jobs and Fort Ord becoming an "Orange County" or another "San Jose". The commenter does not address the content of the EIR. No response is necessary.

10-5. Comment refers to the public not being aware of the proposed project. The public was adequately notified of the Reuse Plan process and intent. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

Response to Letter 11

11-1. The commenter indicates that a rifle range is preferable at the East Garrison. The East Garrison's final configuration may include a rifle range, but this will be for the FORA Board to consider.

Policy Consideration

The Board should consider including a gun range in the East Garrison area.

Response to Letter 12

12-1. Comment states that the level of analysis required is extensive and requires more than a 45-day public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

Response to Letter 13

13-1. Commenter discusses mosquito and/or vector control. CEQA mandates that significant environmental impacts be discussed. There is no indication from the comment that mosquito and vector control is a significant environmental issue. Therefore, no additional discussion is warranted.

[Start July 1, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 14

Comments 14 through 26 are from the July 1, 1996 Draft EIR public hearing and are herein referenced as "Response to Comment" instead of "Response to Letter".

14-1. Commenter requests an extended public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

14-2. Commenter requests an extended public review period and workshops. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

14-3. Commenter suggests lower a lower density for residential units in Seaside. Refer to response to comment 28.

14-4. Commenter "lost his trailer home". The commenter does not address the content of the EIR. No response is necessary.

14-5. The commenter included a comment letter at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 30.

14-6. The commenter included a comment letter at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 31.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 15

15-1. Commenter is concerned with the water issue and how it will support development at Fort Ord. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 16

16-1. Commenter discusses public hearings. Refer to response to comment 5-1. No public workshops were conducted in Salinas during the public review period.

16-2. Commenter requests a safe yield alternative be discussed in the EIR. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

16-3. Commenter questions the program level EIR approach. FORA prepared a Program EIR under CEQA Guidelines section 15168. A Program EIR can be prepared on a series of actions which can be characterized as one large project and are related geographically or as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions. The use of a Program EIR under the circumstances is relevant to the preparation of the Reuse Plan because the Reuse Plan is a general development document. A Program EIR is more general in nature and typically covers a plan area and focuses on the environmental impacts of carrying out the policies and/or programs of the plan. It is inherently more general in its evaluation of environmental impacts because it reflects the general nature of a "plan". On the other hand, a Project EIR is prepared on a specific development project containing actions like a tentative subdivision map or a use permit.

A Staged EIR was not prepared because a Staged EIR is best suited to large capital projects that will require a number of discretionary approvals from government agencies and one of the approvals will occur several years before construction will begin. This type of EIR is appropriate for a specific project and not general plans. In this situation, the EIR is staged or phased over a number of years.

By using the program EIR the public as well as the FORA Board will be assured that adequate environmental review has been performed. Future environmental review will be subject to tiering relative to the EIR. Where information in the EIR is inadequate to adequately address a particular future project's impact, additional environmental analysis may be required. This determination will be made at the local jurisdiction level as required by CEQA Sections 15060 through 15065 and 15070 through 15075, as well as 150151, 15152 and 15153. In conclusion, additional environmental studies may be completed and subject to public scrutiny before development consistent with the reuse plan can occur at Fort Ord. Also, refer to the discussion in the EIR on future environmental review (section 1.3, page 1-3).

16-4. The commenter included a comment letter at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 32.

16-5. Comment regarding public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1. Also, refer to Response to comment 33.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 17

17-1. Comment regarding public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

17-2. The commenter requests that an "executive summary" be prepared. CEQA does not require the preparation of an "executive summary" in an EIR per se, however, a summary is required. Such a summary is included in the Draft EIR. As it pertains to a program EIR versus a staged EIR, Refer to response to comment 16-3.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 18

8-1. The commenter requests additional information on water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 19

19-1. Commenter wants to know what Fort Ord will be. The former military base will be sold and distributed to various federal, state and local entities for reuse. Portions will be in the jurisdictions that currently exist, which include Monterey County, Marina, Seaside, UC, CSUMB and the Presidio of Monterey Annex, etc. As established by Senate Bill (SB) 899, FORA is a governing body, formed to accomplish the transfer of the former military base. The basis of FORA's existence is discussed in the Draft EIR (page 1-1). FORA has a mandated life span of 20-years to the year 20014, or until 80 percent of redevelopment has occurred, which ever is first. As it pertains to allowing a vote of all the people regarding future use at Fort Ord, this would be a decision for the FORA Board to make.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 20

20-1. Comment regarding vacancy rate percentage used in the Comprehensive Business Plan. The vacancy rate referred to applies to the multiple family supply which reflects the short-run constraints in the market. The market projections for all housing types that could be captured at Fort Ord is 9,025 units, including reuse of 1,522 existing units and occupancy by CSUMB of another 1,253 units. The Reuse Plan therefore anticipates market support for 6,250 new units in that period. Refer to Exhibit 3 on page II-7 in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 21

21-1. Comment refers to phasing of future development at Fort Ord as it pertains to transportation and water issues.

The Final PEIR identifies an additional mitigation measure to address the phasing of future development at Fort Ord to mitigate potential environmental impacts associated with: 1) traffic and circulation (section 4.7) addressing roadway capacity and capital resources to fund required improvements; 2) hydrology and water quality (section 4.5) including available water supply and seawater intrusion into the aquifer; and capital resources to fund required improvements. The additional mitigation measure is 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. The

components of the DRMP include: 1) Management of transportation improvements, 2) Management of available water supply, 3) Provision of adequate public services, and 4) Capital Planning. The DRMP requires an annual report on the Development, Resource and Service Levels.

The Reuse plan will be amended to include the additional mitigation measures to provide a DRMP to implement the growth management approach and principles and incorporate the levels of service standards of the Draft Reuse Plan.

Volume I of the Reuse Plan will include a new section 3.11.5 titled FORA's DRMP.

Volume II of the Reuse Plan will include for the individual land use jurisdictions, additional programs for: Section 4.4 - "Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply," and for Section 4.7 - "Traffic and Circulation."

Changes to the EIR

Amend Section 4.4 - Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply

Page 4-43. Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.1. Amend this program to read as follows:

"The City/County, with assistance input from FORA, and the MCWRA MPWMD, shall identify potential reservoir and water impoundment sites on the former Fort Ord and zone those areas for watershed use which would preclude urban development."

Page 4-43. Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.2. Amend this program to read as follows:

"The City/County shall work with FORA and the MCWRA appropriate agencies to determine the feasibility of developing additional water supply sources for the former Fort Ord, such as water importation ..."

Page 4-43. Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.3. Amend this policy to read as follows:

"The City/County, in conjunction with FORA, shall adopt and enforce ..."

Page 4-43. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1. Add the following new program:

"Program B-1.4: The City/County shall continue to actively participate in and support the development of "reclaimed" water supply sources by the water purveyor and the MRWPCA to insure adequate water supplies for the former Fort Ord."

Page 4-43. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1. Add the following new program:

“Program B-1.5: The City/County shall promote the use of on-site water collection, incorporating measures such as cisterns or other appropriate improvements to collect surface water for in-tract irrigation and other non-potable use.”

Page 4-43. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1. Add the following new program:

“Program B-1.6: The City/County shall work with FORA to assure the long-range water supply for the needs and plans for reuse of the former Fort Ord.”

Page 4-43. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1. Add the following new program:

“Program B-1.7: The City/County, in order to promote FORA’s DRMP, shall provide FORA with an annual summary of the following: 1) the number of new residential units, based on building permits and approved residential projects, within its former Fort Ord boundaries and estimate, on the basis of the unit count, the current and projected population. The report shall distinguish units served by water from FORA’s allocation and water from other available sources; 2) estimate of existing and projected jobs within its Fort Ord boundaries based on development projects that are on-going, completed, and approved; and, 3) approved projects to assist FORA’s monitoring of water supply, use, quality, and yield.”

Page 4-43. Add the following new mitigation:

“Mitigation: 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.”

Page 4-84. Add the following new mitigation:

“Mitigation: 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.”

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Context and Framework. Section 3.11.4. Insert the following new section 3.11.5 and sequentially renumber existing section 3.11.5 to 3.11.6 and section 3.11.6 to 3.11.7:

3.11.5 FORA’s Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP)

3.11.5.1. Objectives of the DRMP

Reuse of the former Fort Ord will utilize the DRMP to restrain development to available resources and service constraints. The DRMP objectives are:

- Development on former Fort Ord lands will be limited by the availability of services;
- Service availability is measured by compliance with Level of Service standards;
- Services are limited by resource and financial constraints. Resource limitations describe holding capacity limitations. Financial limitations are expressed in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and its periodic updates, for Base Reuse; and
- Services will be extended to development on a first come first served basis, up to the financial and resource limitations.

3.11.5.2 Components of the DRMP

To adequately implement the approach and principles described in sections 3.11.1 through 3.11.4, FORA will establish programs and monitor the following components of the DRMP:

- Management of Transportation Improvements,
- Management of Water Supply;
- Provision of Public Services; and
- Capital Planning.

FORA shall provide an annual report on the Development, Resource and Service Levels.

3.11.5.3 Management of Transportation Improvements

The development of transportation improvements is more a financial constraint than a resource constraint. However, the funding of an adequate transportation system must be paired with measurement of current and future traffic congestion to insure compliance with Level of Service standards. Programs to implement this component of the DRMP include:

3.11.5.3 (a) Fair Share Financing Program. 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. The nexus is described in the Public Facilities Improvement Plan, Volume 3 of the Reuse Plan, as amended from time to time. The nexus has been updated to reflect TAMC's

re-prioritizing of improvements in the network and is reported in the "Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study," prepared by TAMC, January 6, 1997.

3.11.5.3 (b) Reimbursement Programs for On-site and Off-site Improvements.

FORA will retain the flexibility to build roadway improvements to the "on-site" and "off-site" network, as described in the Reuse Plan to serve development activities at the former Fort Ord. FORA 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.

3.11.5.3 (c) Regional Improvements Program. FORA intends to participate in a regional transportation financing mechanism if adopted by TAMC, as provided in 3.11.5.3 (a). If not, FORA will collect and contribute Fort Ord's "Fair Share" to construction of a roadway arterial network in and around the former Fort Ord. FORA's participation in the regional improvements program constitutes mitigation of FORA's share of cumulative impacts.

3.11.5.3 (d) Monitoring Transportation Improvements. Monitoring of transportation improvements will prevent development from exceeding FORA's Level-of-Service Standards.

LAND USE JURISDICTION RESPONSIBILITY. Each Land Use Jurisdiction shall annually provide information to TAMC and FORA on approved projects and building permits with their jurisdiction (both on the former Fort Ord and outside the former base), including traffic model runs, traffic reports, and environmental documents.

FORA RESPONSIBILITY. FORA shall work with TAMC to monitor current and projected traffic service levels on links identified as "on-site" and "off-site" segments in the Reuse Plan.

TAMC RESPONSIBILITY. TAMC shall monitor current and projected traffic service levels on links identified as "on-site," "off-site," and "regional" segments in northern Monterey County that affect the Reuse of the former Fort Ord.

3.11.5.4 Management of Water Supply

Water supply is a central resource constraint for development of Fort Ord. Insuring that development does not exceed the available water supply and safe yield is a major component of the DRMP. The following measures ensure that development is managed within this resource constraint.

3.11.5.4 (a) Water Allocation Program. FORA has adopted a program for allocation of the existing potable water supply by jurisdiction. The allocation is summarized in Table 3.11-2. The allocation will provide the member agencies the necessary certainty of water supplies to responsibly manage development within each individual land use jurisdiction.

1) Implementation Procedures and Annual Report. FORA shall enter into an allocation agreement or agreements with the member agencies to implement the allocation program and define procedures to address:

- (a) the exchanges of water allocations among member jurisdictions;
- (b) an annual allocation of the strategic reserve;
- (c) mechanisms to assure the jurisdictions remain within their allocation; and
- (d) changes to the allocation resulting from changes in the availability of the total existing water supply to the former Fort Ord.

2) 5-Year Review. FORA and the member agencies shall review and, if necessary, revise the water allocation program at least every five years. This review process will be established in FORA's allocation agreement(s) with the member agencies.

3) Water Allocation Monitoring. The water allocation will be monitored at the time of project reviews.

LAND USE JURISDICTION RESPONSIBILITY. Development projects approved by each land use jurisdiction will require a finding by that land use jurisdiction that the project can be served with their jurisdictional water allocation or by water imported to the former Fort Ord from another available water source.

FORA RESPONSIBILITY. If projects approved by the land use jurisdictions cannot be served by water supplied by the FORA water purveyor from the jurisdiction's allocation or by water imported to the former Fort Ord from another available water source, the FORA Board will be required to determine that the project is Not Consistent with the Reuse Plan.

3.11.5.4 (b) Residential Development Program. To prevent using up scarce resource availability, overall residential development limitations must be put in place to save capacity for industrial/commercial land uses and to prevent residential development from outstripping the existing 6600 afy of potable water supply at the former Fort Ord. The land use jurisdictions shall manage and determine the use for their full water allocation. The Residential Development Program limits total residential development that is served by the FORA existing potable water supply, based on the planning projections detailed in Table 3.11-3:

1) Residential Population Limit. Based on the existing potable water supply of 6,600 afy, the total resident population limit at the former Fort Ord is estimated to be 37,370.

2) New Residential Unit Limit. Based on the existing potable water supply of 6,600 afy, the total new residential units within the former Fort Ord shall not exceed 6,160 so that when combined with replacement or occupancy of the 1,813

existing units the total residential units shall not exceed 7,973 (excluding CSUMB and POM Annex housing). FORA's DRMP does not attempt to allocate residential units to the land use jurisdictions.

3) Residential Unit and Population Monitoring. Residential units and population will be monitored to prevent residential development from exceeding available water supplies.

LAND USE JURISDICTION RESPONSIBILITY. Each land use jurisdiction shall annually report to FORA the number of new residential units, based on building permits and approved residential projects, within its former Fort Ord boundaries and estimate, on the basis of the unit count, the current and projected population. The report shall distinguish units served by water from FORA's allocation and water from other available sources.

FORA RESPONSIBILITY. FORA shall incorporate the report on the residential population and units in its annual report.

TABLE 3.11-2
Allocation of Existing Potable Water Supply
By Jurisdiction
 (Based on FORA's April 12, 1996 Resolution)

<u>JURISDICTION</u>	<u>TOTAL WATER ALLOCATION (AFY)</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<u>City of Seaside</u>	<u>710</u>	
<u>County/City of Del Rey Oaks</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>Plus reclaimed water for golf course</u>
<u>County/City of Monterey</u>	<u>65</u>	
<u>City of Marina</u>	<u>1,185</u>	
<u>Monterey County</u>	<u>545</u>	
<u>ARMY</u>	<u>1,410</u>	
<u>CSUMB</u>	<u>1,035</u>	<u>Plus reclaimed water for irrigation</u>
<u>UCMBEST</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>Plus reclaimed water for irrigation</u>
<u>County/State Parks and Recreation</u>	<u>45</u>	
<u>County/Marina Sphere Polygon 8a</u>	<u>50</u>	
<u>SUBTOTAL</u>	<u>5,285 AFY</u>	
<u>Line Loss (10%)</u>	<u>530</u>	
<u>FORA Strategic Reserve</u>		
<u>Encumbered Reserve:</u>		
<u>Army - 160 AFY¹</u>		
<u>CSUMB - 125 AFY¹</u>		
<u>Seaside - 230 AFY²</u>		
<u>Unencumbered - 270 AFY</u>	<u>785</u>	
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>6,600 AFY</u>	

ENCUMBRANCES TO FORA'S STRATEGIC RESERVE:

¹ 160 AFY at the POM Annex and 125 AFY at CSUMB polygon 10 are available upon metering of existing dwelling units.

² 230 AFY loaned to Seaside is available to Seaside for golf course irrigation until reclaimed replacement water is provided.

TABLE 3.11-3
Projected Residential Development Through 2015
 (Based on the Existing 6,600 AFY of Potable Water)

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>UNITS</u>	<u>OCCUPANCY</u>	<u>POPULATION</u>
<u>POM Annex</u>	<u>1,590</u>	<u>2.6/unit</u>	<u>4,134</u>
<u>CSUMB Housing¹</u>	<u>1,253</u>	<u>2.0/unit</u>	<u>2,506</u>
<u>New Housing²</u>	<u>6,160</u>	<u>2.6/unit</u>	<u>16,016</u>
<u>Existing Housing</u>	<u>1,813</u>	<u>2.6/unit</u>	<u>4,714</u>
<u>CSUMB on campus students³</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>10,000</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>10,816</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>37,370</u>

¹ Assumes that no students live in this housing. If students occupy this housing then the estimate for students living on campus would be reduced to avoid double counting.

² Single Room Occupancy Units (SRO's) shall be counted as .38 units based on a comparable water demand.

³ Assumes 80% of 2015 projections of 12,500 FTE.

3.11.5.4 (c) Industrial and Commercial Job Creation Programs. The replacement of the 18,000 jobs lost as a result of the closure of Fort Ord is a major goal of the Reuse Plan. Market studies for the Reuse Plan show that the market for industrial and commercial job creation is weak and will, in fact, be the principal limitation on non-residential development. When the estimated jobs within the former Fort Ord boundaries reaches 18,000, the Residential Development Program (3.11.5.4(b)) shall be eliminated. The following measures are designed to implement this DRMP component.

1) Priority Infrastructure Funding. The CIP shall provide priority funding for infrastructure to serve industrial and commercial development.

2) Development Tax Fee Burdens. The financial program shall implement tax and fee burdens that promote industrial and commercial uses. FORA will initiate appropriate proceedings for the implementation of development tax burdens to transfer some infrastructure costs from job-generating uses to residential development.

3) Job Creation Monitoring. Job creation monitoring will provide FORA with information necessary to monitor the effectiveness of the Residential Population and New Unit Limits.

LAND USE JURISDICTION RESPONSIBILITY. Each Land Use Jurisdiction shall prepare an annual estimate of existing and projected jobs within its Fort Ord boundaries based on development projects that are on-going, completed, and approved.

FORA RESPONSIBILITY. FORA shall incorporate the job creation reports into its annual report.

TABLE 3.11-4
Job Creation Projected Through 2015
(Based on 6,600 afy Water Supply)

<u>LAND USE CATEGORY</u>	<u>PERCENT BUILDOUT</u>	<u>EMPLOYEES</u>
<u>CSUMB</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>1,600</u>
<u>POM Annex</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>310</u>
<u>Industrial/Office/R&D</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>11,350</u>
<u>Retail</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>2,372</u>
<u>Hotel (Includes golf and other visitor-serving)</u>	<u>56%</u>	<u>1,155</u>
<u>Parks and Open Space (State Park, etc.)</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>90</u>
<u>Public Facilities (Schools, MPC, including military)</u>	<u>99%</u>	<u>1,450</u>
<u>Habitat Management</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>		<u>18,342</u>

3.11.5.4 (d) Water Supply Management and Augmentation Programs. The management of existing groundwater supplies, water conservation, and providing alternative sources of water supply are all necessary water management measures required to implement the objectives of the Reuse Plan. Development beyond the limits defined in the DRMP will be allowed only upon the augmentation of existing water supplies.

1) Protection of Yield and Quality of Water Supplies. Pumping from the on-site well-water supply for FORA has been shown to effect the extent of seawater intrusion into the shallow aquifers. FORA shall:

(a) participate in on-going water basin management planning;

(b) actively manage the water supply allocation so as to remain within the water resources available to the former Fort Ord under the auspices of the Responsible Regional Agency, the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA);

(c) through the water purveyor, monitor chloride levels in the wells supplying the former Fort Ord in order to provide warning of salt water intrusion. If a detected upward trend in chloride levels results in exceeding potable water standards over a five year period, the FORA Board will be notified by the water purveyor in order to take corrective action.

(d) take measures to eliminate extraction of the former Fort Ord's water supply from the 180-foot shallow aquifer by encasing those wells through the shallow aquifer zone.

2) Water Use Efficiency Program. FORA shall establish water efficiency and on-site reuse policies governing development to achieve conservation objectives.

3) Reclaimed Water Source and Funding. FORA shall continue to actively participate in and support the development of reclaimed water supply sources by the water purveyor and the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) to insure adequate water supplies for the former Fort Ord. The CIP shall fund a reclaimed water program adequate for the full development of industrial and commercial land uses and golf course development.

4) On-Site Water Collection Program. FORA shall promote the use of on-site water collection, incorporating measures such as cisterns or other appropriate improvements to collect surface water for in-tract irrigation and other non-potable use.

5) Additional Potable Water Supplies Program. FORA may investigate and provide appropriate augmentation of the potable water supplies to:

(a) assure the long-range water supplies for the needs and plans for the planned uses at the former Fort Ord;

(b) assure the economic viability of the reuse financing measures; and

(c) promote the goals established for FORA in SB-899.

6) Monitoring of Water Supply, Use, Quality, and Yield. Water supply, use, quality, and yield shall be monitored to meet the DRMP objectives.

LAND USE JURISDICTION RESPONSIBILITY. Each land use jurisdiction shall provide FORA with an annual summary of approved projects.

FORA RESPONSIBILITY. FORA shall monitor the availability of potable and non-potable water and compare it with existing use. This monitoring is undertaken to insure that the water consumption at the former Fort Ord will not exceed the contracted, owned, or allocated water supply of FORA or its member agencies for use within the former Fort Ord boundaries.

FORA shall pursue partnerships with MRWPCA and other appropriate agencies to develop sources of reclaimed water available to the former Fort Ord.

WATER PURVEYOR RESPONSIBILITY. The water purveyor shall annually report to FORA on:

(a) the use of water by on-going and existing projects;

(b) consumption rates for potable and non-potable water for typical users; and

(c) chloride levels of the water withdrawn from the former Fort Ord's wells and, if necessary, recommended corrective actions.

MCWRA RESPONSIBILITY. MCWRA shall continue to manage the Salinas River Valley ground water aquifers on a basin-wide basis to ensure an available water supply to FORA.

3.11.5.5 Other Public Services

FORA has adopted service levels in the Reuse Plan for wastewater, habitat management and fire protection. FORA shall work with the land use jurisdictions and service providers to assure that development has sufficient public services to meet the adopted service levels.

1) Monitoring of Public Services. The availability of public services will be monitored at the time of project review.

LAND USE JURISDICTION RESPONSIBILITY. Development projects approved by each land use jurisdiction will require a finding by that land use jurisdiction that the project can be served with adequate public services for wastewater, habitat management, and fire protection consistent with FORA's Level-of-Service Standards.

FORA RESPONSIBILITY. If a project approved by a land use jurisdiction does not meet FORA's Level-of-Service Standards, the FORA Board will be required to determine that the project is Not Consistent with the Reuse Plan.

3.11.5.6 Capital Planning to Assure Financial Integrity

FORA's CIP is the principal mechanism for insuring adequate service levels within resource constraints.

1) Preparation of Annual Update. FORA shall annually update the CIP to reflect the proposed capital projects. The extension of infrastructure shall be made on a first-come-first-served basis consistent with funding capabilities and best engineering practices.

2) Monitoring of CIP Conformance.

LAND USE JURISDICTION RESPONSIBILITY. Each development approval by a land use jurisdiction for a project that will utilize infrastructure included in FORA's CIP will require a finding by that land use jurisdiction that the project is consistent with FORA's CIP or can be served by infrastructure provided to the project from outside the former Fort Ord boundaries.

FORA RESPONSIBILITY. If a project approved by a land use jurisdiction cannot be served by adequate infrastructure, the FORA Board will be required to determine that the project is Not Consistent with the Reuse Plan.

3.11.5.7 Annual Development, Resource and Service Level Report

Annual monitoring and reporting is a fundamental contributor to the effectiveness and public support for the DRMP. The report shall project demand for services from projected growth and recommend actions that FORA may take to remain within resource capacity or service level standards.

FORA RESPONSIBILITY. FORA shall prepare an annual report on the programs included in the DRMP on the following topics:

Transportation

Available Water Supply

- **Water Allocation by Jurisdiction**
- **Residential Units and Population**
- **Industrial and Commercial Job Creation.**
- **Water Supply, Use, Quality, and Yield.**

Other Public Services.

CIP.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Section 4.2.2 - Streets and Roads. 4.2.2.5 - Policies and Programs

Page 4-104. Amend Streets and Roads Policy A-1 to read as follows:

“FORA and each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall coordinate with and assist TAMC in providing funding for an efficient regional transportation network to access former Fort Ord and implement FORA’s Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP).”

Page 4-104. Amend Streets and Roads Program A-1.1 to read as follows:

“Each jurisdiction, through FORA’s DRMP, shall fund its “fair share” of “on-site,” “off-site,” and “regional” roadway improvements based on the nexus analysis of the TAMC regional transportation model. The nexus is described in the Public Facilities Improvement Plan, Volume 3 of the Reuse Plan, as amended from time to time. The nexus has been updated to reflect TAMC’s re-prioritizing of improvements in the network and is reported in the “Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study,” prepared by TAMC, January 6, 1997. FORA and each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall provide a funding mechanism to pay for former Fort Ord’s share of impact on the regional transportation system. ”

Page 4-104. Amend Streets and Roads Program A-1.2 to read as follows:

“FORA will retain the flexibility to build roadway improvements to the “on-site” and “off-site” network, as described in the Reuse Plan to serve development activities at the former Fort Ord. FORA 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.”

~~FORA and each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall identify specific transportation issues that affect former Fort Ord and support and participate in regional and state planning efforts and funding programs to provide an efficient regional transportation effort to access former Fort Ord.~~

Page 4-104. Amend Streets and Roads Program A-1.3 to read as follows:

“Each jurisdiction, through FORA’s DRMP, shall participate in a regional transportation financing mechanism if adopted by TAMC, as provided in 3.11.5.3 (a) the DRMP. If not, FORA will collect and contribute Fort Ord’s “fair share” to construction of a roadway arterial network in and around the former Fort Ord. FORA’s participation in the regional improvements program constitutes mitigation of FORA’s share of cumulative impacts.

Page 4-104. Amend Streets and Roads Program A-1.4 to read as follows:

"In order for FORA to monitor the transportation improvements and to prevent development from exceeding FORA's level of service standards, each jurisdiction shall annually provide information to TAMC and FORA on approved projects and building permits with their jurisdiction (both on the former Fort Ord and outside the former base), including traffic model runs, traffic reports, and environmental documents."

Volume II. Section 4.4.2 - Hydrology and Water Quality. 4.4.2.3 - Policies and Programs

City of Marina

Page 4-162. Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.1. Amend this program to read as follows:

"The City/County, with assistance input from FORA, and the MCWRA MPWMD, shall identify potential reservoir and water impoundment sites on the former Fort Ord and zone those areas for watershed use which would preclude urban development."

Page 4-162. Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.2. Amend this program to read as follows:

"The City/County shall work with FORA and the MCWRA appropriate agencies to determine the feasibility of developing additional water supply sources for the former Fort Ord, such as water importation ..."

Page 4-162. Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.3. Amend this policy to read as follows:

"The City/County, in conjunction with FORA, shall adopt and enforce ..."

Page 4-162. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1. Add the following new program:

"Program B-1.4: The City/County shall continue to actively participate in and support the development of "reclaimed" water supply sources by the water purveyor and the MRWPCA to insure adequate water supplies for the former Fort Ord."

Page 4-162. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1. Add the following new program:

"Program B-1.5: The City/County shall promote the use of on-site water collection, incorporating measures such as cisterns or other appropriate improvements to collect surface water for in-tract irrigation and other non-potable use."

Page 4-162. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1. Add the following new program:

“Program B-1.6: The City/County shall work with FORA to assure the long-range water supply for the needs and plans for reuse of the former Fort Ord.”

Page 4-162. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1. Add the following new program:

“Program B-1.7: The City/County, in order to promote FORA’s DRMP, shall provide FORA with an annual summary of the following: 1) the number of new residential units, based on building permits and approved residential projects, within its former Fort Ord boundaries and estimate, on the basis of the unit count, the current and projected population. The report shall distinguish units served by water from FORA’s allocation and water from other available sources; 2) estimate of existing and projected jobs within its Fort Ord boundaries based on development projects that are on-going, completed, and approved; and, 3) approved projects to assist FORA’s monitoring of water supply, use, quality, and yield.”

Volume II. Section 4.4.2 - Hydrology and Water Quality. 4.4.2.3 - Policies and Programs

City of Seaside

Program B-1.1: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-1.2: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-2.3: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-2.4: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-2.5: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-2.6: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-2.7: See description of this program under Marina above.

Volume II. Section 4.4.2 - Hydrology and Water Quality. 4.4.2.3 - Policies and Programs

Monterey County

Program B-1.1: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-1.2: See description of this program under Marina above.

Page 4-162. Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.3. Amend this policy to read as follows:

“The County, in conjunction with FORA, shall enforce its existing water conservation ordinance”

Program B-2.4: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-2.5: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-2.6: See description of this program under Marina above.

Program B-2.7: See description of this program under Marina above.

21-2. Commenter would like to know what population numbers should be used. Refer to Response to comment 1-4 and 1-5.

21-3. The commenter included a comment letter at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 34

21-4. The commenter included a comment letter at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 35

21-5. The commenter comments on the need for study sessions, an executive summary, additional copies in the local libraries, the EIR being too general, and taxpayers to be affected by costs of development. As it pertains to an “executive summary”, refer to response to comment 17-2. As it pertains to additional copies at the libraries, FORA will provide five sets of the Final PEIR at each library that was used as a repository for the Reuse Plan and Draft EIR. As it pertains to the DEIR being too general in its discussion on transportation and water solutions, the comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response. However, it is felt that FORA has adequately responded to the transportation and water issues in the Final EIR. As it pertains to taxpayers and how they are affected by future development costs, new development on Fort Ord will pay a fair share amount which reflects future Fort Ord impacts on transportation, water, sewer and drainage infrastructure. Existing residents outside of Fort Ord are not assessed any fees for redevelopment.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 22

22-1. The commenter is concerned with transportation infrastructure costs and sources of water. As it pertains to water issues, the reader is referred to response to comment 8-5.

As it pertains to transportation issues, FORA has developed a funding mechanism as a part of the Reuse Plan implementation to fund roadway improvements on a “fair share” basis that are impacted by Fort Ord development.

The Public Facilities Implementation Plan and the Comprehensive Business Plan discussed the funding of a number of regional roadways by Fort Ord development beyond Fort Ord's fair share. Subsequent to preparation and circulation of these reports in early 1996, TAMC prepared a revised regional transportation study (JHK 1997), which included a revised list of the regional transportation project and their phasing. The costs applicable to Fort Ord reuse impacts to on- and off-base roadways is approximately \$116.6 million of the total regional transportation costs of \$856.6 million. The fair share nexus is based on a revised nexus analysis contained in the Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study (JHK 1997).

This "fair share" basis is reflected in a fair share financing program for three categories of roadways contained in the Reuse Plan, the Draft EIR and the 1997 Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study. The Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) provides the financing programs. The categories of improvements to be financed include "on-site", "off-site" and "regional" roadways and transit capital improvements.

"On-site" roadways are those on Fort Ord. "Off-site" roadways are roadways in the immediate area of Fort Ord (e.g., Reservation Road, Blanco Road, etc. The PFIP contains the full list of "off-site" as well as "regional" roadways)(Note: Highway 218 has been transferred from an "off-site" category to a "regional" category). "Regional" roads are all state highways. Transit improvements consist of transit vehicle purchase and replacement and intermodal centers within Fort Ord. The DRMP discusses these roadways and transit improvements and how they are funded and implemented simultaneous to development.

The DRMP provides three programs for financing transportation improvements. These programs provide flexibility for FORA in mitigating transportation impacts in response to alternative financing approaches pursued by TAMC to address the north county long-range transportation requirements.

3.11.5.3 (a) Fair Share Financing Program. 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. The nexus is described in the Public Facilities Improvement Plan, Volume 3 of the Reuse Plan, as amended from time to time. The nexus has been updated to reflect TAMC's re-prioritizing of improvements in the network and is reported in the "Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study," prepared by TAMC, January 6, 1997.

3.11.5.3 (b) Reimbursement Programs for On-site and Off-site Improvements. FORA will retain the flexibility to build roadway improvements to the "on-site," "off-site," and "regional" network, as described in the Reuse Plan to serve development activities at the former Fort Ord. FORA 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.

3.11.5.3 (c) Regional Improvements Program. FORA intends to participate in a regional transportation financing mechanism if adopted by TAMC, as provided in 3.11.5.3 (a) and (b). Until such a mechanism is established, FORA will collect and, at its discretion, may use Fort Ord's "Fair Share" for construction of a roadway arterial network in and around the former Fort Ord. FORA's participation in the regional improvements program constitutes mitigation of FORA's share of cumulative impacts.

Table 7-3 from the January 1997 Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study entitled 2015 Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study Preliminary Nexus Analysis Results, and included in response to comment 22-1, indicates the funding amount that future development at Fort Ord is responsible for. The reader is also referred to response to comment 21-1 for discussion of implementation, management and monitoring of transportation improvements through the DRMP. Also, refer to 154-2 for a discussion of the significant unavoidable impacts associated with transit O&M.

22-2. The commenter included a comment letter at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 37.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 23

23-1. The commenter states he is not in favor of hotel and golf development in Del Rey Oaks and intends to oppose this. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or the PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 24

24-1. Commenter is concerned with democratic participation, workshops and an executive summary. Public workshops were not provided for each issue and models were not developed for the Reuse Plan. As it pertains to public participation, the reader is referred to response to comment 5-1. A Summary is included in the Draft EIR.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 25

25-1. The commenter wants the FORA board to "think about the face of the community and leave it alone". The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or the PEIR. No response is necessary.

Table 7-3
2016 FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY
PRELIMINARY NEXUS ANALYSIS RESULTS

FACILITY	ESTIMATED COST	DEDICATED/EXPECTED FUNDING (1)		UNFUNDED COST ALLOCATION(2)		
		Amount	Source	Fort Ord Development	Impact Study Area Development	PUBLIC(3)
Regional Highway Projects						
Highway 1 - Hixon Canyon	\$36,000,000	\$36,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	\$0
Highway 1 - North of Castanville	\$60,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$60,000,000
Highway 1 - Seaside/Sand City	\$20,000,000	\$0		\$8,400,000	\$13,600,000	\$0
U.S. 101 - Prunedale By-Pass	\$236,000,000	\$107,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	\$129,000,000
U.S. 101 Interchanges	\$63,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$63,000,000
Highway 68 - Bypass Freeway	\$177,000,000	\$0		\$18,054,000	\$138,788,000	\$20,178,000
Highway 158 Widening	\$50,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$50,000,000
Highway 183 Widening	\$59,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$58,050,000	\$2,950,000
Highway 218 - North-South to Hwy 68	\$3,590,000	\$0		\$1,629,860	\$1,960,140	\$0
Expected STIP County Minimum Funds (4)	\$0	\$56,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	(\$56,000,000)
SUBTOTAL	\$704,890,000	\$199,000,000		\$26,083,860	\$210,378,140	\$268,128,000
Off-Site Arterial Improvements						
Davis Road - Widening r/o Blanco	\$10,000,000	\$0		\$5,570,000	\$3,720,000	\$710,000
Davis Road - New bridge	\$5,000,000	\$0		\$2,030,000	\$2,970,000	\$0
Blanco Road - Widening and bridge	\$12,378,000	\$0		\$6,337,536	\$5,520,588	\$519,876
Reservation Road - Widening	\$12,664,400	\$0		\$9,068,973	\$3,431,417	\$164,010
Del Monte - Seaside/Monterey	\$10,000,000	\$0		\$3,420,000	\$3,460,000	\$3,120,000
Del Monte - Marina	\$5,576,300	\$0		\$4,488,822	\$1,087,379	\$0
California	\$2,460,000	\$0		\$687,500	\$1,162,500	\$600,000
Crescent	\$720,000	\$0		\$720,000	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$68,798,700	\$0		\$32,332,831	\$21,381,884	\$4,113,886
On-Site Improvements						
Gateway and Misc Safety Improvements/Rehab	\$20,300,364	\$9,780,000	DCAG	\$10,520,364	\$0	\$0
Abrams	\$803,000	\$0		\$803,000	\$0	\$0
12th/Imjin	\$9,085,000	\$0		\$4,532,500	\$4,532,500	\$0
Blanco/Imjin Connector	\$4,060,000	\$0		\$4,060,000	\$0	\$0
8th Street	\$3,821,900	\$0		\$3,248,815	\$573,285	\$0
Inter-Garrison	\$4,480,000	\$0		\$3,808,000	\$672,000	\$0
Gigling	\$4,537,800	\$0		\$3,221,838	\$1,315,962	\$0
2nd Avenue	\$7,232,500	\$0		\$5,398,088	\$1,634,432	\$0
North-South Road	\$6,160,600	\$0		\$3,328,724	\$2,633,876	\$0
California	\$2,769,200	\$0		\$1,038,450	\$1,730,750	\$0
Salinas Ave.	\$2,412,000	\$0		\$2,412,000	\$0	\$0
Eucalyptus Road	\$2,880,000	\$0		\$2,880,000	\$0	\$0
Eastside Road	\$6,020,000	\$0		\$4,358,480	\$1,661,520	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$74,382,364	\$9,780,000		\$49,428,039	\$18,164,328	\$0
Transit Capital Improvements						
Transit Vehicle Purchase & Replacement	\$15,000,000	\$0		\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
Intermodal Centers	\$3,800,000	\$0		\$3,800,000	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$18,800,000	\$0		\$8,800,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS/SHARES	\$856,551,064	\$208,780,000		\$116,644,830	\$251,884,349	\$279,241,886

3/30/88/road/irrep/17-1.tbl(4)

- 1) Includes \$56 million in expected STIP funds not yet allocated. Does not include traffic impact fees already collected, that may be used for some of these projects.
- 2) Allocation of costs based on a "Nexus" assessment of individual improvements. Fort Ord and Impact Study Area Development shares based on relative contribution to traffic volume growth on subject facility.
- 3) "Public" includes share for existing congestion and portion of traffic growth attributable to trips outside the study area. (Note: in some instances, where the percentage of trips with one or both ends are external to Fort Ord and the study area is significant, the Nexus requirement cannot be met and the full cost must be covered by non-development sources.)
- 4) Assume that STIP County Minimum funds will be allocated to highway improvements. Specific projects not yet specified.

Table E-5 OFF-SITE REGIONAL FACILITIES LOS SUMMARY				
Roadway	Segment	Daily Volume/LOS		
		Existing (1993/94) Condition	Financially Constrained	Financially Unconstrained
State Highway 1	State Highway 68 to Del Monte Blvd (Seaside)	56,000/D	65,000/E	65,000/E
	Del Monte Blvd (Seaside) to State Highway 218	60,000/D	72,200/F	71,900/D
	State Highway 218 to Fremont Blvd	59,000/D	87,500/F	89,000/D
	Fremont Blvd to Main Gate	75,000/D	101,200/E	99,700/E
	Main Gate to 12th Street	65,000/C	80,200/D	79,700/D
	12th Street to S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd)	71,000/C	75,100/D	75,600/D
	S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd) to Reservation Road	35,500/C	48,400/D	48,900/D
	Reservation Road to N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd)	35,500/C	47,400/C	47,600/C
	N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd) to State Highway 156	37,500/C	53,800/D	52,800/D
State Highway 156 to Santa Cruz County line	30,000/E	60,200/F	70,700/F	
State Highway 68	State Highway 1 to State Highway 218	22,800/F	36,300/F	38,700/C
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio Road (Highway)	20,600/F	30,200/F	10,000/B
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio (Freeway Bypass)	N/A	N/A	21,900/B
	San Benancio Road to Reservation Road	25,000/B	36,000/C	34,600/C
	Reservation Road to E. Blanco Road	29,500/B	43,900/C	42,500/C
State Highway 156	Hwy 1 to 0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd.	22,000/B	35,600/C	30,900/B
	0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd. to US 101	25,000/E	26,500/E	35,500/C
State Highway 183	US 101 to Davis Road	29,500/E	37,900/F	38,900/F
	Davis Road to Espinosa Road	16,000/C	32,900/F	30,700/B
	Espinosa Road to State Highway 156	22,000/D	53,300/F	50,900/D
State Highway 218	State Highway 1 to Fremont Boulevard	14,000/D	19,700/D	22,600/D
	Fremont Boulevard to North-South Road	10,850/B	10,900/B	12,200/C
	North-South Road to Hwy 68	10,850/B	16,500/B	17,800/B

Response to Public Hearing Comment 26

26-1. The commenter does not want Fort Ord to be sold to the world. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or the PEIR. No response is necessary.

26-2. The commenter is concerned with publicity of the Reuse Plan and EIR. One FORA public hearing was televised on the television channel used by the Monterey County Office of Education. Notices of all meetings were advertised in local newspapers. The commenter included a comment letter at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 38.

[End July 1, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 27

27-1. The commenter requests an extended public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

27-2. The commenter requests that public workshops be conducted. FORA did not provide for such workshops. Also, Refer to response to comment 5-1.

27-3. The commenter is concerned with the alternatives discussed in the EIR. A full range of alternative reuse scenarios were developed and analyzed in the Army's FEIS and DSEIS. These include Alternatives 1 through 8 and their subalternatives. Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4 were not pursued as viable alternatives, and they have been eliminated from further consideration by the Army because of significant environmental impacts; therefore, they were not considered in the Draft EIR.

Also, the range of alternatives to be examined in the Draft EIR is governed by the rule of reason which requires that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice need be addressed. The CEQA guidelines require that the number of alternatives analyzed be limited to those that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project (Section 15126(d)(5)).

As it pertains to adding an additional alternative in the EIR which would be a Fort Ord Reuse Plan based on safe yield water use only, the Reuse Plan was written to reflect the constraints associated with the MCWRA delivering 6,600 afy (refer to Volume I, Table 3.11-1, which limits development to water that is available). Subsequently, the constraints to development vis-a-vis water supply has been further refined in the Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) introduced in response to comment 21-1. For additional information on the approach to the alternatives, refer to page 6-1 of the Draft EIR.

Response to Letter 28

28-1. The commenter has a preference for lower density development in the City of Seaside. No changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR are necessitated by this comment. However, this comment must be considered by the FORA board before it makes its decision on the Reuse Plan and PEIR.

Response to Letter 29

29-1. The commenter states that the trailer home he has been living in has been rented to someone else. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or the PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 30

30-1. The commenter is concerned about transportation and water issues. As it pertains to transportation issues, refer to Response to comment 21-1 (pertaining to phasing). As it pertains to water issues, Refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1 (pertaining to phasing).

30-2. Refer to the preceding response.

30-3. The commenter is concerned with the water issue. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

30-4. The commenter requests an extended public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

30-5. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan be subject to a public vote. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 31

31-1. The commenter states that Fort Ord is a major development. The commenter does not address the content of the EIR. No response is necessary.

31-2. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should not be rushed in light of local cities and the county. The commenter does not address the content of the EIR. No response is necessary.

31-3. The commenter is concerned about the use of water 6,600 afy from the Seaside Basin and there is inadequate funding to pay for infrastructure costs. The

Seaside Valley Basin has been and will continue to be the source for irrigation water for the two existing Fort Ord golf courses only (400 afy). Refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to funding, the Business and Operations Plan (Appendix B) of the Reuse Plan contains the estimated costs for infrastructure improvements and the anticipated per unit fair share payment to cover the infrastructure costs.

31-4. The commenter requests a scaled down plan. The commenter has stated an opinion on the proposed project. The comment is for the FORA Board to consider.

Response to Letter 32

32-1. The commenter is concerned with the clean up of toxic materials and unexploded ordnance. The removal of ordnance outside of the 8,000 acre Multi-Range area (MRA) is proceeding under time-critical removal actions in response to safety concerns and to expedite early reuse of Fort Ord. Non-time critical removal actions are planned for the MRA. Ordnance removal actions on Fort Ord are the responsibility of the Fort Ord Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Team which includes the Army, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California EPA. Other toxic materials, such as lead based paints on old barracks buildings, are being handled by various state and/or federal agencies responsible for such toxic materials.

Lead and Asbestos in Buildings

As it pertains to lead and asbestos in buildings, FORA has completed a "Demolition Study" to adequately anticipate the costs of removing buildings that are contaminated with asbestos and lead (Reimer 1996). Refer to response to comment 8-1 for additional discussion on demolition.

Asbestos

Because Fort Ord was established in 1917 and a substantial amount of construction occurred from the 1940's to the 1960's, the majority of buildings on the installation are likely to contain some type of asbestos-containing material. The Army's policy is to remove and encapsulate friable asbestos, which is hazardous to human health; asbestos that is encapsulated or in good condition is not considered hazardous and will be left in place and its presence identified for the new owners or building managers.

The Army concluded an asbestos study of approximately 4,500 buildings at Fort Ord in 1993. The survey report included the location and condition of all material containing friable and non-friable asbestos in each building, and recommendations for remediation or maintenance requirements. The predominant forms of asbestos

identified include pipe insulation, floor tile, joint compound, wall board, and roofs throughout buildings constructed prior to 1978. Removal is ongoing.

A "friable" waste is one which can be reduced to a powder or dust under hand pressure when dry. It is subject to Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 30 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). The management of this waste is subject to any requirements or restrictions which may be imposed by other regulatory agencies operating under separate authority. Asbestos is not presently regulated as hazardous waste under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and therefore, is considered to be a "non-RCRA" waste.

Lead Based Paint

Several buildings at Fort Ord also may contain lead-based paint or other lead contaminants. The Army conducted on site investigations, physical monitoring and risk assessments to identify lead sources and recommend abatement measures. Lead abatement and disposal activities are regulated by Section 408 of the Toxic Substances Control Act Title IV, as amended by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992. Removal is ongoing.

Lead on the Beach

As it pertains to lead on the beach, 1,860 mg of lead is the standard prescribed by the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for beach use. The RI/FS is the document required per the Superfund. Both the U.S. EPA and the State of California Department of Toxic Substance Control have approved the 1,860 mg. The 1,000 and 400 mg are irrelevant to the beach use and pertain to lead disposal standards for landfills and lead based paint standards for housing, respectively (Gail Youngblood, pers. com., December 12, 1996).

Ordnance and Explosives (OE)

Information regarding OE is available in the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) - Phase I. This document, currently in draft form, and available at FORA offices, will be circulated for public comment in April 1997 (anticipated release date). This document details all Army activities pertaining to OE, chemicals, etc. found at Fort Ord. Due to the extensive amount of information in the EE/CA, the commenter is referred to that document for additional information.

In summary, the EE/CA contains a discussion of the areas on Fort Ord which have been identified by the Army to contain OE and areas that do not contain OE. Based on the EE/CA, there are sites which contain no OE (zero-density sites) and sites designated "low-density OE sites" and "moderate- to high-density OE sites". Low-density OE sites are those sites that have been characterized as having an OE density of less than one OE item per acre. Moderate- to high-density OE sites are those sites that have been characterized as having an OE density greater than one OE item per acre.

Each of these categories include subcategories (Groups I, II and III). Group I represents open space, Group II represents parks and recreation and Group III represents institutional/public/commercial/residential/agricultural, etc.

The EE/CA also provides "general recommendations" on how the Army will address the OE issue for each of the sites located with "low-density OE sites" and "moderate-high density OE sites". Furthermore, the EE/CA provides "site specific recommendations" for its zero-density, low-density and moderate- to high-density sites, and sites with insufficient data to make recommendations.

Following are the "general recommendations" contained in the draft EE/CA (number sequence reflects format contained in the draft EE/CA). These are base wide recommendations. The EE/CA also includes recommendations for individual OE sites. A total of 20 OE sites were considered for recommendations for future actions. These sites were organized into three density levels as discussed above: nine sites that were either sampled or subjected to a removal actions and determined to not contain OE, seven sites classified as low-density sites, and four sites classified as moderate- to high-density. An additional six sites were subjected to a risk evaluation, but geographic data and/or sampling coverage were not adequate to make recommendations for these sites (Earth Tech 1997).

Following each numbered recommendation below is a Policy Consideration note for the FORA Board to consider. It is recommended that the FORA board submit the Policy Consideration to the Army as a comment on the Draft EE/CA whereby the Army would consider amending its EE/CA to accommodate the Policy Consideration.

General Recommendations Included in the January 1997 EE/CA

6.1.2 Universally, all parcels disposed of by the Army at the former Fort Ord should carry in the deed a statement that all current and future recipients of Fort Ord property should be made aware that, for nearly 80 years the installation was used for a variety of military activities that involved OE, and that any area of the installation may potentially contain OE, and a warning to prospective future property owners should accompany any subsequent property disposal (i.e., the warning should "run with the land"). While deed restrictions are a useful notice device, a deed restriction is not necessarily a complete notice to all potential users of a parcel. The use of a deed restriction should often accompany the use of other notices, and security, safety, and educational efforts.

Policy Consideration

No policy recommended.

6.1.3 The installation or other reuse planning entity should continue to provide for public education activities such as educational materials, public meetings, public speaking engagements, and public announcements over the long

term. These activities should be coordinated through a central planning function in order to avoid redundancies, and to prevent conflicting information or misinformation from reaching the public.

Policy Consideration

In order for the EE/CA to be effective in reducing the risk associated with OE, FORA should communicate to the Army that they shall be responsible for funding the educational program in the context of labor costs and materials in perpetuity.

6.1.4 As part of the educational effort, the installation or other reuse planning entity should implement a program for the development and construction of display cases. These display cases should provide information sufficient to inform the public of the dangers of OE, the extent of known (i.e. confirmed) or suspected OE, OE sampling removal activities, and history of military operation at the installation. Display cases should be updated with new information on an as-appropriate basis. The display cases should be located in areas where people tend to congregate, including: school administrative facilities, visitors' centers, bus stops, and at proposed commercial facilities such as movie theaters and restaurants. These display cases would supplement those identified for site-specific locations. These activities should be coordinated through a central planning function in order to maximize the effectiveness of the display cases, avoid redundancies, and to prevent conflicting information or misinformation from reaching the public.

Policy Consideration

In order for the EE/CA to be effective in reducing risks associated with OE, FORA should communicate to the Army that the U.S. Government shall be responsible for funding, installation and the maintenance of all display cases.

6.1.5 Deed restriction should be placed upon any property lying within a known or suspected OE site that could potentially be excavated. These restrictions should note the depth to which OE has been removed from the site, the depth to which excavation is considered acceptable, and specify conditions for use of a UXO monitor during excavation activities. On properties that are transferred without deeds (i.e., federal-to-federal transfer[s]), conditions of use should be stipulated in transfer documents. These conditions are loosely referenced as deed restriction throughout this document.

Policy Consideration

No policy recommended.

6.1.6 Patrols by the federal police and /or BLM personnel should be continued to ensure that the public complies with BLM's policy of limiting access to roads and trails that are designated "open." Additionally, the patrolling personnel should actively monitor and document trespass into OE sites that have been signed/fenced

as off limits. Should it be determined that an individual site is being improperly accessed, the control being applied to the site should be reevaluated for effectiveness. For example, if individuals are accessing a site where perimeter warnings have been constructed, consideration should be given to supplementing perimeter signs with a perimeter fence. Additional supplemental measures could include increased patrols, more secure fencing, or additional educational efforts, as appropriate.

Policy Consideration

In order for the EE/CA to be effective in reducing risks associated with OE, FORA should communicate to the Army that they shall be responsible for funding, installation and the maintenance of all display cases.

6.1.7 The entire road and trail system on open space and parks and recreation portions of the installation should be scrutinized to preclude easy access into OE sites. Roads and trails that “dead-end” at sites known to contain OE should be closed at the intersection prior to the OE site. This would preclude a person inadvertently walking/riding into an OE site and would leave such person with no alternative other than to reverse their course or traverse the site.

Policy Consideration

In order for the EE/CA to be effective in reducing risks associated with OE, FORA should recommend to the Army that they shall be responsible for funding, installation and the maintenance of all signs in open space and park areas which contain OE.

6.1.8 A concern exists regarding the safety of employees accessing the site to perform duties associated with land management efforts on much of the installation. Field personnel including biologists, archaeologists, wildland firefighters, and others who may have a need to access or excavate in areas away from existing roads, trails, or other public access areas in OE sites are subject to a higher probability of exposure than a general public that complies with land use regulations (i.e., by staying on designated trails and roads). Field personnel should be fully apprised of the dangers of OE, receive safety briefings, and be escorted by UXO monitors whenever their work might involve activities that exceed the land use limitations placed on individual areas. For example, a wildland firefighter should not construct a fire line in open space areas in OE sites that have received a surface removal. In these instances, either a “let burn” policy should be developed, or individual crew leaders be accompanied by a UXO monitor upon initial attack and during fire-line construction.

Policy Consideration

No policy recommended.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-56. Amend the last significance criteria to read as follows:

- “...potentially create an undue risk of death and/or injury to property and/or persons due to deliberate and/or accidental exposure to OE of upset (accidents) related to human or environmental health or safety.

Page 4-64. Amend the first sentence under impact #5 to read as follows:

Implementation of the proposed project would potentially expose people to unexploded ordnance in the long term, thus creating an undue risk of death and/or injury to property and/or persons due to deliberate and/or accidental exposure to OE of upset (accidents) related to human or environmental health or safety.

The Army has and is currently involved in finding and removing unexploded ordnance (OE). Following hazardous waste cleanup activities, health and safety risks would still exist from long-term exposure to OE. However, as stated in the Army’s Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA), “any area of the installation may potentially contain OE” and the Army’s recommendations contained in the EE/CA “are not intended to persuade individuals that any area is “safe” or “clean”, rather, the recommendations are based solely on analysis of available information and on the professional judgment of the preparers” (Earth Tech 1997). This risk is due to physical and economic limitations associated with the Army not finding all the OE that has been buried at Fort Ord for up to 80 years.

The Army is currently removing OE from various sites it has identified through its archival searches and through interviews. However, this is the extent practical the Army can address the OE issue. The Army does not propose to systematically traverse the entire base with metal detectors to find every OE. The Army does, however, provide recommendations for specific sites and general recommendations for the remainder of the base to reduce risk. The recommendations are included in the EE/CA which will be circulated in April 1997. The Army does not state or imply that its removal activities will reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

The responsibility for OE search and removal is the Army’s, not FORA’s. FORA does not have the necessary means or resources to address the OE issue, nor does FORA have the means to mitigate the impact. FORA is dependent upon the Army to address OE in perpetuity. The Army acknowledges its responsibility in this regard (Earth Tech 1997).

Where necessary, the Army has cordoned off areas for future removal activities. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project could expose people to these risks where the inland training fire ranges were previously located (refer to Figure 4.6-4). For example, the highest density of

unexploded ordnance and spent ammunition is expected in the central portion of the inland range area. Lower densities of unexploded ordnance are expected in the outer portions of the inland range area and in the training areas to the north and east of the inland range area. These lands have been conveyed to the Bureau of Land Management for habitat management use, and they will be closed off to public access. Appropriate fencing and signage is expected to minimize the incidence of trespassing in areas (where there would otherwise be potential land use, conflicts, e.g.) closest to public access and residential land uses.

Unexploded ordnance on former Fort Ord property is recognized in this Draft EIR as a hazardous waste, and policies and programs that make reference to hazardous waste include unexploded ordnance. In addition, the following program for the Cities of Marina and Seaside and Monterey County specifically relates to unexploded ordnance:

Safety Element

(Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety) Program B-1.3: The City/County shall develop and make available a list of the locations and time frame for remediation of those sites containing ordnance and explosive (OE) and shall work cooperatively with responsible agencies, including the Bureau of Land Management, in notification, monitoring, and review of administrative covenants for the reuse or closure of such OE sites.

Implementation of this program, though it reduces risk, will not ~~would~~ render this impact to a less than significant level. ~~would render this impact less than significant.~~ The following mitigations are added to reduce risks.

Mitigation: ~~None required~~

a. All construction plans for projects in the City/County shall be reviewed by the Presidio of Monterey, Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management (DENR), to determine if construction is planned within known or potential UXO areas. Construction crews and contractors must stop all work and contact the federal police when ordnance is found. The contractor must have an Army approved plan for UXO avoidance and the avoidance must be performed by a trained UXO specialist.

b. Before construction activities commence on any element of the proposed project, all supervisors and crews shall attend an Army sponsored UXO safety briefing. This briefing will identify the variety of UXO that are expected to exist on the installation and the actions to be taken if a suspicious item is discovered.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-275. Add the following two programs:

Program A-1.3: All construction plans for projects in the City/County shall be reviewed by the Presidio of Monterey, Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management (DENR), to determine if construction is planned within known or potential OE areas. Construction crews and contractors must stop all work and contact the federal police when ordnance is found. The contractor must have an Army approved plan for OE avoidance and the avoidance must be performed by a trained OE specialist.

Program A-1.4: Before construction activities commence on any element of the proposed project, all supervisors and crews shall attend an Army sponsored OE safety briefing. This briefing will identify the variety of OE that are expected to exist on the installation and the actions to be taken if a suspicious item is discovered.

Response to Letter 33

33-1. The commenter requests an extended public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

33-2. The commenter references a CEQA Section pertaining to the state being required to comment on the Army's cleanup plans. The comment is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 34

34-1. The commenter states the various graphics in the Reuse Plan and EIR inconsistently reference 605 acres in the UC Natural Reserve System.

Vol. 1, page 3-36 of the Reuse Plan identifies the UCMBEST Center in Figure 3.2-5 and in the accompanying text on page 3-37 identifies "approximately 600 (acres) of these lands will be managed by the University's Natural Reserve System (NRS)..." The Reuse Plan and EIR documents show the 605 acres with the UC Natural Reserve System as part of the lands designated for Habitat Management. (See Figures 3.3-1 and 3.6-3.) The Reuse Plan identifies the University of California as one of the agencies with management responsibilities of the Habitat Management Lands. See Vol. 1, Page 3-89 2nd paragraph, fifth sentence.) Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

34-2. The commenter states that there are some conflicts between the numbers used in the various documents. Though the comment is not specific, we hope that this matter has been adequately dealt with.

34-3. The commenter is concerned with infrastructure development financing. It is the intent of FORA to develop infrastructure at a pace that will adequately support new residential and industrial/commercial development. Refer to the Development and Resource Management Plan discussed in response to comment 21-1.

34-4. The commenter notes that the Reuse Plan does not identify the lands that would allow Research and Development on the parcel owned by the University of California (UC) between Imjin Road and Inter-Garrison Road.

The lands that have been conveyed to UC between Imjin Road and Inter-Garrison Road are designated in the land use map as a "Planned Development Mixed Use District." The UC parcel is a portion of the "University Office Park/R&D District" in the "Town Center Planning Area," identified in Table 3.8-1.

The adjacent polygon 8a, located within the County, is designated as habitat management in the Reuse Plan (See Figure 3.3-1). This polygon is located within the University Planning Area listed in Table 3.10-1. UC has been screened for the transfer of this land. When conveyed, the University could use a portion of this land in the southwest corner is an "opportunity site" for research and development activities. The Reuse Plan text should be amended to include the description of research and development activities to clarify this intended use of the land.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Vol. 1. Page 3-134. Add the following language to Monterey County Recreational/Habitat District:

Opportunity Site. Approximately 50 acres located at the southwest corner of the former landfill site, adjacent to the Marina City limits and Inter-Garrison Road is suitable for office/R&D development by the University of California.

Response to Letter 35

35-1. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics exclude the 1,000 foot wide right-of-way for the Highway 68 by-pass. This must be responded to by the FORA board.

35-2. The connection to York Road at a future Highway 68 alternative route is intended to provide the mid-valley residents along the existing Highway 68 corridor an alternative route. A York Avenue route will also reduce the number of vehicles that travel the full length of Highway 68.

Response to Letter 36

36-1. The commenter requests an extended public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

36-2. The commenter request that an “executive summary” be provided. There is no “executive summary” per se, however, the EIR does contain a “summary” which serves the same purpose.

36-3. The commenter is concerned with the cost of the EIR. The cost of the EIR is recognized by FORA, which is why copies were made available at a number of libraries.

36-4. The commenter would like a staged EIR be prepared. As it pertains to a program versus staged EIR, the reader is referred to Response to comment 17-2.

36-5. The commenter states the EIR is too general and lacks adequate details on infrastructure impacts and impacts of mitigation measures. The comment is too general to warrant a specific response, however, the Final Program EIR does provide the necessary level of detail to allow the decision makers to make an informed decision on the project. The Final EIR also provides a discussion of the secondary impacts associated with potential future roadway projects. Refer to response to comment 56-4.

36-6. The commenter is concerned about funding for infrastructure development on Fort Ord. Funding for infrastructure at Fort Ord will be obtained through development fees collected by FORA through the local jurisdictions. The Business and Operations Plan of the Reuse Plan identifies major issues critical to the successful implementation of redevelopment, such as the provision of adequate infrastructure, or of housing supply consistent with an employment center driven by educational and research institutions. Future development will be commensurate with future infrastructure development on Fort Ord.

Response to Letter 37

37-1. The commenter is concerned with uncontrolled access to state beaches. The California Department of Parks and Recreation’s Plan for the beach park includes coastal access parking at the north and south border of the park and a through north-south recreational trail. This should adequately address the commenters concerns about controlled access.

Response to Letter 38

38-1. The commenter requests an extended public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

Response to Letter 39

39-1. Comment is the same as comment letter 33. Refer to response to comment 33.

Response to Letter 40

40-1. The commenter is concerned about a future Highway 68 bypass. A Highway 68 bypass is reflected in the graphics contained in the Reuse Plan and the EIR. This bypass addresses a regional traffic demand whereby the existing Highway 68 is approaching its maximum capacity. Fort Ord development will impact both the existing Highway 68 and the by pass. Future development at Fort Ord will pay its fair share mitigation to these roadways based on a nexus analysis. Refer to response to comment 30-1 for additional information pertaining to transportation issues. The Highway 68 bypass was included in the TAMC traffic model's "optimistically financed scenario" and is included in the Habitat Management Plan.

Response to Letter 41

41-1. Commenter would like additional campgrounds in the inland area of Fort Ord. This is a matter for the FORA board to consider.

41-2. The commenter requests that consideration be given to on-site, land-based treatment of sewage. The sewage treatment provisions of the Reuse Plan envision treatment at the regional sewage treatment facility. This approach will permit the sewage effluent to be treated and enter the regional supply of reclaimed water to help address regional water management issues. The Reuse Plan provides for the use of reclaimed water at Fort Ord. On-site spray application of treated effluent is expected to be an integral part of the water resource management at Fort Ord.

Response to Letter 42

42-1. The commenter is against the proposed project. The comment is for the FORA board to consider.

Response to Letter 43

43-1. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan result in no greater population than existed before closure of the military base.

The declaration of policy, Chapter 1 of law that establishes the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (SB 899), establishes four goals of the Authority Act: "1) To facilitate the transfer and reuse of the real and other property comprising the military reservation known as Fort Ord with all practical speed; 2) To minimize the disruption caused by the base's closure on the civilian economy and the people of the Monterey Bay area; 3) To provide for the reuse and development of the base area in ways that enhance the economy and quality of life of the Monterey Bay community; and 4) To maintain and protect the unique environmental resources of the area." (67651)

SB 899 was developed as a mechanism to allow cities directly impacted by base closure to create economic opportunities. These communities also have the option to provide for future population expansion and economic opportunities through development of the Reuse Plan or without a reuse plan, just as any other community is allowed to plan for its long-term future through a general plan. SB 899 does not specifically prohibit the reuse of Fort Ord to exceed the population that existed at Fort Ord in 1991 (i.e., approximately 31,000 people). In addition, SB 899 was not created with the intent to limit growth to a level commensurate with the economic activity that existed prior to the departure of the 7th Light Infantry Brigade. However, the FORA Board is required to consider the issue raised by the commenter.

43-2. The commenter is concerned about water resources. Refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1 for a growth management discussion.

Response to Letter 44

44-1. Commenter requests a 13-acre cemetery. It is the prerogative of each community to determine where a cemetery, if any, would be most appropriate. Monterey County recently endorsed its support of a veteran's group in their application for property to develop a national cemetery at Fort Ord. The veteran's group wants to create a veterans cemetery on a 156-acre site at Fort Ord which would overlap onto both the county's and the City of Seaside's jurisdictions.

The low density residential (nomenclature used in Reuse Plan is "SFD") land use category contained in Table 3.4-1 - *Permitted Range of Uses for Designated Land Uses* - (Context and Framework document (Volume I, page 3-50)), permitted range of uses will be amended to permit cemeteries. The reader is referred to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

The area currently proposed for a future 156-acre cemetery could be the area bound on the east side by the future Eastside Road and bound on the south side by Polygon

21c and the future Eastside Road. On the west side the cemetery boundary cuts to the north past the most easterly boundary line of Polygon 20h and to the easterly boundary of Polygon 20d and then to the connector road between Giggling Road to the north and the future Eastside Road to the south, where the proposed cemetery boundary then follows this connector road to the north to the southwest corner of Polygon 16. The north side cemetery boundary then traverses along the south side of Polygon 16 to the east where, at the City of Seaside/Monterey County, the cemetery boundary drops to the southeast and diagonally across Polygon 21a and connects to the future Eastside Road.

A portion of the proposed cemetery location is within the proposed POM housing enclave in the city of Seaside's jurisdiction and a portion within Monterey County's proposed low density single-family residential area. If a cemetery were built, the impacts of the proposed cemetery must be considered in light of potential impacts associated with the proposed land uses the cemetery would displace. It is expected that the county would transfer the potential residential development lost as a result of a cemetery to another location within county jurisdiction. This is expected to occur in county Polygons 21a and 21b. The displacement of housing units in Seaside's jurisdictions could be off-set by increasing slightly the residential densities throughout Seaside's residential polygons.

The primary impacts associated with this proposed land use pertains to transportation and biological issues.

Biological impacts and the loss of sensitive species and habitats have been adequately addressed in the Habitat Management Plan (HMP). The HMP describes a cooperative federal, state, and local program of conservation for plant and animal species and habitat of concern known to occur at Fort Ord. The HMP establishes a long-term program for the protection, enhancement and management of all HMP resources with a goal of no net loss of HMP populations while acknowledging and defining an allowable loss of such resources through the land development process. The HMP establishes the conditions under which the disposal of Fort Ord lands to public and private entities for reuse and development may be accomplished in a manner that is compatible with adequate preservation of HMP resources to assure their sustainability in perpetuity. Therefore, the HMP establishes performance standards for all future developments to implement.

As it pertains to the transportation impacts associated with the cemetery, the cemetery will result in fewer traffic impacts than the traffic impacts that would otherwise have been associated with housing (Keith Higgins, pers. com., December 12, 1996). For example, based on the Trip Generation document of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (1991 edition), the highest average vehicle trip end generation rate per acre associated with a cemetery is 4.28 and occurs on Saturday. By comparison, low density residential units' average trip end is 10 per unit. Since there are projected to be up to 5 units per acre, the comparative impact, as measured on a per acre basis, will be much greater for residential uses than for a cemetery (4.28 per acre for a cemetery versus 50 per acre for low density residential).

The development of the cemetery will displace residential units and result in a higher concentration of residential units in the county's Polygons 21a and 21b. However, this is not expected to increase the level of impact on area roadways and will not change the conclusions of the modeled traffic scenarios used in the Reuse Plan and EIR, because the residential traffic, regardless of where it is located in the County jurisdiction of Fort Ord, will be using the same roadways.

The addition of a cemetery is not considered to be a significant change in the project description. Therefore, recirculation of the EIR will not be required. CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a) states that new information in an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an affect (including a feasible project alternative). Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

"Significant new information" requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- a) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- b) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- c) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- d) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

The addition of a cemetery is not considered to be a substantial environmental impact based on the above discussion. Therefore, the inclusion of as cemetery as a permitted use in the Fort Ord jurisdiction's residential land use categories is not considered to be a justification for recirculating the EIR.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-50. Table 3.4-1. Amend each of the residential land uses category "Permitted Range of Uses" to include the following: cemeteries.

Response to Letter 45

45-1. The comment is for the FORA board to consider. The comment is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No response is necessary.

[Start July 11, 1996 Carmel City Council public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 46

46-1. The commenter is concerned about adequate impact analysis in the EIR. The nature of the comment is too broad to warrant a specific response. The comment is for the FORA board to consider.

46-2. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period. No public workshops were facilitated.

46-3. The commenter is concerned about future water and sewer infrastructure. Refer to response to comment 21-1 and Response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 47

47-1. The comment is addressed to the Carmel City Council and is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 48

48-1. The comment is addressed to the Carmel City Council and is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No response is necessary.

48-2. The commenter wants to know where the city demarcations will be. The city boundaries are shown in Figure 3.2-1 of the Draft EIR. However, it is expected that through future annexations, some city's boundaries will change. This is illustrated in Figure 3.6-1.

48-3. The commenter states that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) should have bought the property adjacent to the view corridor. The BLM is currently the property owner of approximately 15,000 acres to the east of the proposed urban development area Fort Ord. It would not be sensible for BLM to own a strip of property along the "view corridor" (read: Highway 1) that contains structures for the purpose of creating "virgin territory".

48-4. The commenter discusses the number of CSUMB students. Based on Volume I of the Reuse Plan (p. 3-44), there are projected, at full buildout, to be 25,000

full-time equivalent students at CSUMB. The EIR (p. 2-8) states 20,000 of these would live on Fort Ord.

48-5. The commenter requests that an executive summary be prepared. There is a Summary provided in both the Reuse Plan and the Draft EIR. Overlay graphics were not provided by FORA. However, the graphics in the Reuse Plan documents and the EIR are adequate to convey the necessary information and are adequate for the decision makers to make an informed decision.

48-6. The commenter is concerned with the water issues. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 49

49-1. The comment is addressed to the Carmel City Council and is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 50

50-1. The comment is addressed to the Carmel City Council and is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No response is necessary.

[End July 11, 1996 Carmel City Council public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 51

51-1. The commenter Water is a political issue as implied by the comment. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

51-2. The commenter states that the "No Project" alternative should be selected as the project. The comment is for the FORA board to consider. The comment is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No response is necessary.

51-3. The commenter states that Fort Ord should not be accepted from the Army until water is available. The comment is for the FORA board to consider. The comment is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No response is necessary.

[Start July 12, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 52

52-1. The commenter states that the EIR is loaded with assumptions and the people need the opportunity to ask where the assumptions lead. The nature of the comment is too general to warrant a response.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 53

53-1. The commenter states that AMBAG has concerns regarding the percentages used in the draft are not AMBAG numbers. The comment is not specific enough to allow a specific response.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 54

54-1. The commenter handed out a memorandum (Same as comment letter #33 and #39).

[End July 12, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 55

55-1. The commenter requests that a staged EIR be provided and that development should be based on a safe yield water source. There is no factual basis provided by the commenter or by CEQA Guidelines that would indicate that a Staged EIR would "limit water consumption to a safe yield". As it pertains to a safe yield, Refer to response to comment 8-5.

55-2. The commenter states that an enforceable mitigation will be sought whereby the program EIR will be required to be continually revised and certified every five years or more frequently.

There is no requirement in CEQA which states that a program EIR must be revised with such frequency. Currently, what is the generally acceptable method by many communities is to redo a general plan and its EIR approximately every 20 years. Some jurisdictions are compelled to redo a general plan and its EIR in much short time period because conditions change significantly enough in a community to make the existing general plan obsolete in a shorter period.

As currently required by CEQA a lead agency will prepare an environmental checklist to determine what is significant, potentially significant or not significant as it pertains to a particular project. Through this checklist process the lead agency staff person conducting the environmental checklist analysis must substantiate conclusions with pertinent facts from currently available documents (e.g., a general plan and its EIR, or other environmental documents that are current and relevant to a particular issue). This approach allows a jurisdiction to continuously return to existing documents as a source of information. If the source of information used by lead agency staff becomes outdated (for example, information pertaining to traffic will become outdated over time), then the proponent of a particular project may be required to fund a new traffic study. This would result in the decision makers having current and adequate information on which to base a decision. Therefore, it is up to the jurisdiction, through the CEQA environmental review process, to determine what additional information may be required. The public then has the opportunity to review the environmental checklist and any subsequent environmental documents such as initial studies and EIRs as well as new technical documents. As required by CEQA, the process is open to public review. Also, refer to the discussion in the EIR section (3.5) titled Redevelopment Planning for Former Fort Ord Properties in the EIR (page 3-9) where future environmental review is discussed.

55-3. The commenter states that SB 899 does not grant authority to FORA to induce growth beyond the population which existed at the time of base closure. Refer to response to comment 43-1.

As it pertains to the adequacy of the Growth Inducing Impact discussion in the EIR, the reader is referred to section 5.2 of the EIR commencing on page 5-10.

55-4. The commenter states that a "statement of overriding considerations" cannot be evoked by FORA because FORA is not mandated to exceed the population projections established by AMBAG's population projections or SB 899. As it pertains to AMBAG's population projections, the following discussion is submitted and is derived from AMBAG's 1994 *Regional Population and Employment Forecast*.

It is critical to the discussion of AMBAG's population projections to understand the projection's fundamental tenets. The population (and employment) totals used for the forecasts for the counties are based on regional, state and national economic and demographic trends, as well as historical data (AMBAG 1994). Major changes in these trends and other unique economic or natural events could result in differences between these forecasts and eventual reality. This information provides the common planning base for the Regional Air Quality Plan, Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Water Quality Plan (*ibid.*).

As indicated in the EIR on page 5-11, Table 5.2-1, the AMBAG 2015 population projection for Fort Ord is 66,612 (of this 20,000 are students). The Reuse Plan forecast for Fort Ord for the year 2015 is 38,859 (of this 10,000 are students). Therefore, the Reuse Plan is consistent with the adopted forecast for the region. Furthermore, AMBAG's employment forecast (21,468) is above that of the Reuse

Plan's 2015 forecast (18,342). Therefore, the Reuse Plan is considered to be consistent with the adopted AMBAG forecast.

If the AMBAG forecasts are used to prepare or evaluate plans which have a regulatory purpose, two general rules should apply. First, the projections are estimates of future employment and population based on statewide economic trends. They are not statements of employment or population policy. If the population differs from the projections, the regulatory plans based on these forecasts should be amended to reflect the new employment and population realities. Second, the projections are more reliable at a regional and county level and appropriate for regulatory use only at that level (AMBAG 1994).

The AMBAG forecasts are desegregated to census tracts to facilitate the regional transportation planning process as mandated by the Federal Government and the State of California. This desegregation is based on historical trends, the availability of vacant land and land use policy as identified by city and county technical advisory committee members (*ibid.*). The forecasts are technical forecasts, which are prepared assuming adopted land use policy. The forecasts should be viewed as planning tools which show the long term result of those historical trends and existing policy. The forecasts do not represent an attempt by AMBAG to identify policy alternatives that might result in different distributions of population in the region. Thus, the desegregated forecasts should be viewed as a result of existing policy rather than as an instrument for the creation of policy. If differences develop over time between the forecasts and local land use policy, AMBAG believes the forecasts should be updated. AMBAG supports the regular update of the forecasts on a consistent schedule to account for changes in historical trends, vacant land inventories and land use policy at the local level. This approach applies to Fort Ord as well (*ibid.*).

It is important to note that the AMBAG Board of Directors asks that all users of the population forecasts include a statement in documents which use the forecasts that conveys to the reader that the forecasts, which are based on approved general plans, are prepared as planning tools and are not an exact prediction of the course of future events. Furthermore, past experience indicates that the forecasts are most reliable at the county level and less so for smaller areas like cities and census tracts (*ibid.*).

At the time of Fort Ord downsizing and the elapsed period since closure, population forecasting has been hindered as it pertains to Fort Ord. This is because of the following issues recognized by AMBAG:

- a. Schedule and cost of clean-up of hazards from toxic materials and unexploded ordnance;
- b. Uncertainty regarding the magnitude of the military uses which would remain at a downsized Fort Ord; and
- c. Uncertainty regarding the disposal of property within the existing base and ultimate reuse plans at the local level.

Resolution of these issues pertinent to Fort Ord by AMBAG could not be provided. However, it was necessary that the forecast process continue and Fort Ord reuse could not be ignored by AMBAG because to ignore Fort Ord from the forecasts would have resulted in the regional plans being understated by a large percentage. Therefore, in this light, AMBAG acknowledges the following:

- a. A completely updated set of population and employment forecasts be prepared for the region on an interim basis (i.e., the 1994 forecasts);
- b. The forecasts should be created in such a manner that new forecast data for Fort Ord reuse could be easily included; and
- c. The regional forecasts would be updated to include local Fort Ord reuse plans as soon as sufficient information data became available.

In conclusion, it should be recognized that no set of forecasts ever represents the last word on future change in the region. Rather, each forecast set is prepared by AMBAG to facilitate the regional transportation and air quality planning process. AMBAG develops forecasts that can be created using the data available at a particular point in time, keeping in mind that over time the data will change, necessitating the preparation of new forecasts. The preparation of new forecasts is not an indication of error in the previous forecasts sets. It is merely an acknowledgment that the world and the Monterey Bay region continue to change and that the region benefits from forecasts based on the most up-to-date data (ibid.).

As it pertains to a statement of overriding considerations, FORA will not have to evoke such tool as it pertains to population consistency because the population associated with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan is within the projection established by AMBAG, as discussed above. Furthermore, a statement of overriding consideration by FORA will not be required vis-a-vis SB 899 because SB 899 does not limit the population to that which existed in 1991.

However, FORA will be required to balance the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable" to FORA (CEQA Section 15093).

As stated in CEQA section 15091(a)(3) - *Findings*, FORA will be required to make findings on the basis of specific economic, social or other considerations which make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final Program EIR. It will be up to FORA to determine exactly what findings to use.

In the comment, it is assumed that the commenter is also referring to the SB 899 goal identified in the EIR (page 3-2), which states "to minimize the disruption caused by the base's closure on the civilian economy and the people of the Monterey Bay area". This goal is construed by the commenter to mean that the Reuse Plan should only replace the previous population and its associated economic activity with a like

population and its associated economic activity. This goal is not interpreted by FORA to specifically limit reuse to such a level. However, the goal apparently is subject to interpretation which must be considered by the FORA Board.

55-5. The commenter is concerned with the water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

55-6. The commenter wants to know where storm water would be impounded. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

55-7. The commenter would like to know where a desalination plant would be located and would like to know if depositing brine into the bay is allowed. The desalination plant would be located in Polygon 14c. It is uncertain if the disposal of highly concentrated brine water that is a byproduct of desalination would be allowed to be discharged to the Monterey Bay Sanctuary. At this time the issue has not been resolved and it is recognized as a significant environmental issue requiring reconciliation with federal and state agencies. Refer to desalination discussion in Response to comment 8-5.

55-8. The commenter has a concern with lead removal on the beaches. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

55-9. The commenter states that AMBAG pointed out that the proposed mitigations for the loss of cumulative water supply, traffic congestion and adverse impacts on the viewshed are inadequate. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to traffic impacts and viewshed impacts the EIR adequately addresses these issues. However, for additional information included as a response to other comments on the subject of transportation issues, refer to response to comment 22-1. For additional information included as a response to other comments on the subject of visual issues, refer to response to comment 89-9.

55-10. The commenter is concerned with the issue of unexploded ordnance. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

55-11. Commenter states that the EIR does not adequately discuss unexploded ordnance. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

55-12. Commenter states that the EIR must be consistent with local plans and the EIR should be withdrawn until after these revisions are adopted. The commenter is correct by stating that the EIR must be consistent with local plans. However, withdrawing the EIR from circulation is not necessary nor is it mandated by CEQA. The Reuse Plan is consistent with local plans vis-a-vis the proposed Reuse Plan's population (37,350) being less than the AMBAG forecast (66,612). Refer to response to comment 55-4.

The Reuse Plan is developed for an area of the Monterey Peninsula that has historically been without a plan. None of the existing County Area Plans cover Fort Ord. Therefore, the Reuse Plan will be used by Monterey County to revise its

Monterey County General Plan pertaining to Fort Ord. This may be done through an entirely new planning document specific to Fort Ord, or by amending the County's Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan, or other Area Plan the County deems appropriate to accommodate Fort Ord. Also, the proposed project was compared to the applicable policies of the County General Plan and as a result new objectives, policies and programs are provided in the Reuse Plan for Monterey County to use in a revised County General Plan. For additional information on this issue, refer to page 3-9 in the EIR.

The Reuse Plan is subject to the coastal act because the area west of Highway 1 is within the Coastal Act boundary area. The Reuse Plan states that widening Highway 1 to six lanes would be required to accommodate future traffic volumes associated with Fort Ord development. The area proposed for widening (from 4 to 6 lanes) is the length of Highway 1 between Highway 218 and the south end of Del Monte Boulevard. The California Coastal Commission has indicated that there should be no widening of Highway 1 to accommodate Fort Ord reuse unless all other feasible alternatives for serving the transportation demand of the base have been exhausted (California Coastal Commission 1994). The proximity of the roadway to the coastline introduces potentially significant environmental concerns involving both habitat and wetlands issues.

Response to Letter 56

56-1. The commenter states Table 4.7-2 does not contain information referenced in the text of the EIR. Table 4.7-2 and Table 4.7-3 were inadvertently mislabeled. Table 4.7-2 should read 4.7-3 and visa versa. Therefore, the information requested is contained in Table 4.7-3. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-74: Change Table 4.7-2 in the EIR to read: Table 4.7-3.

Page 4-79: Change Table 4.7-3 in the EIR to read: Table 4.7-2

56-2. The commenter states that the EIR should be revised to include an analysis of the project's impacts on the existing environment. The traffic modeling conducted was based on conditions in 1993/94 because of the comprehensive data available for that year. The base closure year (1991) was not used because of the lesser traffic data available. Further clarification on this issue is located on page 4-73 of the PEIR.

56-3. The commenter would like the "Financially Constrained" and "Optimistically Financed" roadway systems discussed in the EIR to be either mitigations to project impacts or as part of the project description.

The scenarios referenced in the comment were developed to determine what the Level of Service would be for different roadway networks and land use assumptions for Fort Ord and the region. The EIR concludes that Fort Ord development will pay for most of the new road construction on Fort Ord with funds originating from Fort Ord development. Also, based on a nexus analysis, the fair share mitigation of future development on Fort Ord on the regional transportation system is required.

The request that the "Financially Constrained" scenario be used as a mitigation or be included in the project description has been addressed already, as stated in the EIR (fourth bullet statement; page 4-82):

"the Optimistically Financed scenario is assumed to represent the proposed project, since it reflects FORA's specific attempts in the Reuse Plan to mitigate any impacts resulting from reuse. However, to the extent that the mitigating measures built into the plan for off-site improvements lie within the jurisdiction of agencies outside FORA's control, and cannot therefore be assured by FORA, the ultimate basis for existing impact significance at the regional level must remain the Financially Constrained scenario."

In other words, this means that there will be some significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the regional transportation system. The agencies responsible for implementation of transportation improvements outside of those FORA is responsible for may include TAMC, CalTrans and/or Monterey County.

The commenters request that the Reuse Plan EIR be responsible for an analysis of transportation mitigation measures to be implemented by other agencies goes beyond the scope of work for the EIR. Because Fort Ord is only responsible for its fare-share of regional impacts and necessarily its associated mitigations, a detailed discussion of implementation and monitoring of transportation mitigations by other agencies is beyond the scope of this EIR and is not the responsibility of FORA.

As stated in the EIR, future development of Fort Ord will have regional impacts. These impacts have been adequately discussed in the EIR through use of the TAMC regional road system traffic model. The results of the traffic modeling indicates (page 4-78) improvements to the regional transportation system level of service would occur under the Optimistically Financed scenario. However, to the extent that the mitigating measures built into the Reuse Plan for off-site improvements lie within the jurisdiction of agencies outside FORA's control, and cannot therefore be assured by FORA, some significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the regional transportation system will remain.

56-4. The commenter would like the EIR to include CEQA mandated secondary impacts of a mitigation. In this case, as it pertains to future prescribed roadway construction. CEQA Section 15126.c. requires an analysis of such secondary impacts, but the level of detail contained in the discussion need not be as detailed as that for the impacts of the proposed project. The reader is referred to the

revised language under Changes to the EIR section below. It is important to state that future roadway construction will be subject to additional environmental scrutiny to assure that mitigations are incorporated in a future roadway construction. This is especially important because of potential plant and wildlife impacts.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-86: Add the following discussion after the last sentence in the section titled Conservation Element.

The potential future construction projects related to road widening may have environmental impacts. The general nature of these impacts are as follows:

Highway 68 in Monterey: The project would entail four-laning most or all of the existing highway. The impacts would be primarily associated with the removal of existing trees.

Del Monte Boulevard in Monterey/Seaside: This would primarily entail installation of turn movement lanes within developed areas. Building frontage area between existing structures and Del Monte Boulevard would be narrowed. There are no known potentially significant environmental impacts associated with this project. However, roadwork would occur within the coastal zone.

Highway 218 south of Seaside: This section of roadway is adjacent to riparian habitat which flanks this highway. Further study of project impacts would be required and mitigations may be required.

Reservation Road in Marina: This project would entail expansion to six lanes. Maritime chaparral and associated plant and animal species adjacent to Reservation Road would be potentially impacted.

Highway 1 in Seaside/Sand City: This would entail 6-laning the existing 4-lane highway. Impacts would pertain to views and sand dune habitat.

Highway 1 north of Castroville: This would entail 4-laning the existing 2-lane highway. The primary impacts would be related to loss of agricultural land. In the area of Moss Landing, the primary impact would relate to the slough and associated wildlife and encroachment into commercial areas.

Highway 156 east of Castroville: This would entail 4-laning the existing 2-lane highway. The primary impacts would be associated with the loss of agricultural land and loss of trees. Noise impacts relative to the existing residential subdivision would be expected to be increased.

Highway 183 north of Salinas: Located between Davis Road and Highway 156. This would entail 4-laning the existing 2-lane highway. The primary impact would be associated with loss of agricultural land.

Blanco Road west of Salinas: This would entail 4-laning the existing 2-lane highway. The primary impact would be associated with loss of agricultural land.

Highway 68 Bypass: Located north of the existing alignment and on Fort Ord property. The primary impacts would be associated with noise impacts to existing residences and impacts to maritime chaparral and associated plant and animal species. Based on an approximately 6 mile length and an average road right-of-way width of 1,000 feet, it would be expected that approximately 740 acres of maritime chaparral and other habitat would be removed.

Del Monte Boulevard in Marina: This would entail 6-laning the existing 4-lane. Frontage space between existing structures and Del Monte Boulevard would be narrowed.

Note: Because of known locations of OE and areas with suspected OE, all future road construction projects on Fort Ord will be required to implement federal policies pertaining to construction activities in areas of known and suspected OE. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

56-5. The commenter states that recommended future roadway improvements are not in the Financially Constrained Action Elements of the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan. CEQA requires that a project's impacts be identified, thoroughly discussed and mitigations provided. That is exactly what the Reuse Plan EIR has accomplished. Whether the mitigations are or are not in a regional plan such as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan is irrelevant, because impacts must be mitigated. The regional plan will be required to be amended at a future date to reflect the Reuse Plan EIR mitigations.

As it pertains to the comment requesting that a new traffic model be run that accommodates only constrained on- and off-site improvements, this has been done already and the results included in the EIR and discussed on pages 4-77 and 4-78.

56-6. The commenter corrects the statement in the EIR on page 4-94 regarding the Army and emission reduction credits. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-94: change the first paragraph at top of page to read as follows:

During closure, The Army has transferred air permits to new owners or has maintained the equipment requiring such permits under active permits.

~~obtained emission reduction credits as Fort Ord's emission sources were shut down.~~ Emission reduction credits are surplus emission reductions that represent a permanent enforceable and quantifiable decrease in emissions. Emission reduction credits are only needed in the MBUAPCD's permitting process for major sources of air emissions over 137 lbs/day of reactive organic gases or oxides of nitrogen. Emission reduction credits are important to the reuse of former Fort Ord lands because credits may be used to offset emissions associated with future economic growth (COE 1993). In general, emissions from population and economic growth related to Fort Ord are accommodated in the planning process rather than through emission reduction credits. The 1994 AQMP accommodates projected growth at Fort Ord through the year 2005.

56-7. The commenter requests language on Rule 1000. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-96: Add the following paragraph to the section titled Toxic Air Contaminants:

The MBUAPCD regulates toxic air contaminants (TAC) from new or modified sources under Rule 1000, which applies to any source which requires a permit to construct or operate pursuant to District Regulation II and has the potential to emit any of 23 carcinogenic TAC or any of several hundred non-carcinogenic TACs listed in Title 8 of the California Administrative Code (§ 5155). Rule 1000 also requires that sources of carcinogenic TACs install best control technology and reduce cancer risks to less than one incident per 100,000 population.

56-8. The commenter requests new information be added to the existing ambient air quality discussion. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-95: Amend the first paragraph to read as follows:

Ambient air quality in the project area is monitored at eight locations in the MBUAPCD. In addition, the National Park Service operates a station at the Pinnacles National Monument. Based on the monitoring data provided by the MBUAPCD, ozone concentrations exceeded state standards on nine days in 1992, sixteen days in 1993, six days in 1994, eight days in 1995 and twenty-one days in 1996 (Janet Brennan, pers. com., November 4, 1996). [...] For PM10, the NCCAB violated the state standard one time in 1992, seven times in 1993, one time in 1994, and exceeded one day in 1995.

56-9. The commenter requests that a consistency determination be provided. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-96: Add the following paragraph after the first paragraph:

A consistency determination with AMBAG population figures is required to base a conclusion that consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan exists. As indicated in Table 5.2-1 on page 5-11 of the PEIR, the AMBAG 2015 population projection for Fort Ord is 66,612 (of this 20,000 are students). The Reuse Plan forecast for Fort Ord for the year 2015 is 38,859 (of this 10,000 are students). Therefore, the Reuse Plan is consistent with the adopted forecast for the region. Furthermore, AMBAG's employment forecast (21,468) is above that of the Reuse Plan's (18,342). Therefore, the Reuse Plan is considered to be consistent with the adopted AMBAG forecast and is therefore also consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan.

56-10. The commenter notes that regional projects require a conformity determination vis-a-vis the Transportation Conformity Rule. This determination would be made by AMBAG.

56-11. The commenter states that policies should apply to all existing and future jurisdictions within Fort Ord. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the EIR section below. No changes to the Reuse Plan are required in this case.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-98: The last full sentence under impact #1 should read as follows:

The Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan identifies the following policies and programs ~~for the Cities of Marina and Seaside~~ that address potential significant impacts to the NCCAB.

56-12. The commenter states clarification is required as it pertains to its relationship to EPA requirements. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan and Changes to the EIR sections below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-213: Remove the last sentence under program A-2.1 and replace with the following sentence:

As a responsible agency, the MBUAPCD implements rules and regulations for many direct and area sources of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-99: Remove the last sentence under program A-2.1 and replace with the following sentence:

As a responsible agency, the MBUAPCD implements rules and regulations for many direct and area sources of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants.

56-13. Commenter requests that the carbon monoxide analysis (Caline4) be revised to reflect a new traffic analysis. The traffic analysis contained in the EIR is appropriate and adequate for FORA to base an informed decision on. Therefore, no new traffic analysis will be conducted making a new carbon monoxide analysis moot.

56-14. The commenter defines "sensitive receptor" as a member of the public who would be exposed to 8-hour concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO) above the standard minimum standards. The analysis contained in the EIR was based on this definition.

56-15. The commenter states that a consistency determination with the AMBAG population projections is required. The reader is referred to response to comment 55-4.

Response to Letter 57

57-1. The commenter requests that Fort Ord be developed with consideration for managed growth vis-a-vis available water supply, transportation facilities and costs for infrastructure. As it pertains to managed growth, the reader is referred to response to comment 21-1. As it pertains to careful consideration for costs of infrastructure and community services, the Reuse Plan provides for standards for service to be maintained for transportation, water supply, wastewater, habitat management and fire protection. These standards are set forth in Table 3.11-1 of Vol. 1.

The PFIP identifies the necessary public infrastructure and costs projected to provide the necessary infrastructure. The Public Services Plan, in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan, identifies the public financing mechanisms for public services including police and fire. The Public Service Plan does not include a financing plan for schools but the Reuse Plan does incorporate the transfer of five existing schools and a site for a sixth. The Comprehensive Business Plan provides a benchmark guide to illustrate the financial viability of developing at Fort Ord in a coordinated way that can

provide the necessary capital investment in infrastructure and compensate for the potential fiscal impacts due to revenue shortfalls in the provision of public services. The ultimate financing approaches that FORA selects to implement development at Fort Ord will need to be flexible and can be expected to utilize any or all of the financing mechanisms identified in SB 899 or available to the land use jurisdictions that are within the foot print of the former Fort Ord. No matter what the ultimate combination of financing measures, development at Fort Ord will need to achieve the service standards embodied in the Reuse Plan.

57-2. Commenter states that conveyance of Polygon 29c to the City of Monterey has not occurred to date. Comment acknowledged. No changes to the Reuse Plan or EIR are necessary.

57-3. The commenter requests that the city design standards be applied to the York Road Planning Area. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-144: Add the following paragraph to the discussion titled *General Development Character and Design Objectives*.

3. The City of Monterey's Ryan Ranch development and design standards shall be integral to future development within the York Road Planning Area.

57-4. The commenter states that a portion of 8-mile Gate Road should be constructed in the York Road Planning Area. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-144: Add the following paragraph to the discussion titled *General Development Character and Design Objectives*.

4. The Section of 8-mile Gate Road between York Road and South Boundary Road shall be constructed in the York Road Planning Area.

57-5. The commenter states that an 80-foot wide floating easement needs to be provided in the York Road Planning Area. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Volume I. Page 3-144: Add the following paragraph to the discussion titled *General Development Character and Design Objectives*.

5. An 80-foot wide floating easement shall be provided connecting Ryan Ranch Road to South Boundary Road and Upper Ragsdale Drive to South Boundary Road in the York Road Planning Area.

57-6. The commenter states that the EIR text should be corrected as it pertains to the widening of Del Monte Blvd. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below. The City of Monterey requests reimbursement of FORA's fair share cost of Del Monte Avenue shall be paid as a transit in-lieu of fee. Also, see Policy Consideration, below.

Change to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-67: Amend the paragraph under Del Monte (Monterey) to read as follows:

This facility provides the primary link between the Peninsula and points to the east including Highway 1 and the former Fort Ord. Improvements to sections of this roadway are underway. The 2015 network includes widening of this facility to four to five lanes ~~six lanes~~ from Monterey to Highway 1. This widening assures increased traffic from reuse of Fort Ord. The preferred scenario in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan project the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 50% in the period to 2015.

Policy Consideration

In the comment, the City of Monterey requests reimbursement of FORA's fair share cost of Del Monte Avenue shall be paid as a transit in-lieu of fee. This requires a policy decision by FORA.

57-7. Commenter thanks FORA board for extending the public review period. Comment acknowledged.

57-8. Requests a comprehensive list of all polygons. A comprehensive table of all polygons with their land use program, acreages and development program is part of the on-going data management that FORA is presently pursuing. The table will be subject to minor refinements as completed boundary surveys are incorporated into the maps and data base. This on-going reconciliation is the result of the continuous stream of surveyed conveyances that the US Army completes and reconciliation in boundaries between jurisdictions and roadway engineering requirements. The Reuse Plan should be viewed as a General Plan level of description and commitment.

57-9. Commenter requests amendment to Table 3.3-1 in Volume I of the Reuse Plan to identify separately the Monterey Corporation Yard. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend Table 3.3-1, page 57-9 in Volume I of the Reuse Plan to add a separate line entry for the Monterey Corporation Yard within the York Road Planning Area.

57-10. Commenter requests that a separate line be included for the City of Monterey Corporation Yard District in table 3.10-1, page 3-130 of Volume I. This land use is currently designated as a 33 acre portion of the office park /R&D District.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend Table 3.10-1, page 3-130 of Volume I of the Reuse Plan to add a separate line entry for the Monterey Corporation Yard within the York Road Planning Area.

57-11. Commenter requests that the Reuse Plan stipulate that polygons 29b and 29d are those areas within the Office Park/R&D District.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend Volume I of the Reuse Plan, page 3-143, to insert into the Office Park/R&D District:

This land use area, consisting of polygons 29b and 29d, is approximately 147 acres and will accommodate up to 413,000 sq. ft. of office and/or research and development uses.

57-12. Commenter requests that the Reuse Plan stipulate that polygon 29e is the site reserved as a park and to remove reference to community park as "temporary."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend Volume I of the Reuse Plan, page 3-144. Community Park District description as follows:

The site, consisting of polygon 29e, is reserved as a ~~potentially temporary~~ community park and may eventually be used for construction of the State Highway 68 By-Pass corridor.

57-13. Commenter requests that the Reuse Plan stipulate that polygon 29c is the site for the Monterey City Corporation Yard.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend Volume I of the Reuse Plan, page 3-144, Monterey City Corporation Yard District description as follows:

The City of Monterey will utilize this undeveloped site, consisting of polygon 29c, for future corporation yard activities near State Highway 68.

57-14 Commenter refers to the maps depicting the Land Use Polygons for the Base Reuse in the Fort Ord Reuse Infrastructure Study Master Plan Report,

November 1994 and identifies a number of suggested corrections to the land use map in the Reuse Plan, (Figure 3.3-1). Refer to response to comment 7-4.

57-15. The commenter requests an amendment to the Reuse Plan. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-127: Amend Table 4.3-3 to read as follows:

MONTEREY COUNTY

Park in Polygon 19a	Neighborhood Park	10	10
<u>Park in Polygon 29e</u>	<u>Community Park</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>

<u>TOTALS</u>			<u>35 Acres</u>
---------------	--	--	-----------------

57-16. The commenter points out that the reference to Natural Resource Management Area (NRMA) in Table 3.2-1 on page 3-7b (reference to Polygon 25) of the PEIR indicates that NRMA is not relevant to the proposed project. The new reference is "Habitat Management". Therefore, the commenter requests that reference to NRMA in the Reuse Plan be removed. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

In addition, the commenter requests a map to indicate the habitat management areas. The habitat management areas are indicated in two maps in Volume I, Section 3.6 Conservation, Open Space and Recreation Concept. Figure 3.6-2 indicates the draft management framework for lands outside the jurisdiction of the Fort Ord Dunes State Park and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Figure 3.6-3 indicate the lands to be managed by State Parks and the BLM.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend Volume I and 2 to replace all references to "NRMA "with the revised designation, "Habitat Management."

57-17. Commenter refers to the maps depicting the Land Use Polygons for the Base Reuse in the Fort Ord HMP Planning Area, Exhibit B: of the Working Draft "Implementing/Management Agreement," which is reproduced for convenience in Appendix A of the Reuse Plan. Exhibit B in the HMP Working Draft is based on an earlier base of the Former Fort Ord and does not reflect the revised boundaries to the polygons in this area that have been made during the Reuse Planning process. See response 7-4.

In addition, the commenter requests changes in the City of Monterey designations on the sphere of influence and annexation requests on figure 4.1-4, page 4-17 of Volume II of the Reuse Plan. The figure is conceptual and the boundaries indicated

can be changed with the agreement of FORA. There may be an error on the City of Monterey sphere of influence boundaries. Though no corrections or changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for corrections or changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the corrections or changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

57-18. Commenter requests that Table 2.4-1 be revised so that it adds up to 100%. The numbers are rounded and therefore the table sums to greater than 100%.

57-19. Commenter notes that none of the maps in the Reuse Plan or the EIR indicate "NRMA" designated areas. However, at various locations in the EIR "NRMA" is still used incorrectly.

Changes in the EIR

Amend the EIR to replace all references to "NRMA" with the revised designation, "Habitat Management."

57-20. Commenter notes that the reference to Appendix A on page 4-40 of the EIR should read Appendix B. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-40: Amend the second sentence in first paragraph to read as follows:

The Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan (Appendix B: Business and Operations Plan)

57-21. The commenter refers to the depiction of polygon boundaries on the maps in the EIR. Please refer to responses 57-17 and 7-4.

57-22. Commenter request change to the depiction of polygon boundaries in figure 3.3-1 in the Business Plan (Appendix B). Please refer to responses 57-17 and 7-4.

Response to Letter 58

58-1. The commenter implies that population growth is causing changes. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 59

59-1. The commenter agrees with the Summary discussion. The commenter does not address the content of the EIR. No response is necessary.

59-2. The commenter believes that the discussion in the EIR pertaining to transportation, water, sewer, air and population is inadequate. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to transportation, water, sewer and population relative to phasing development at Fort Ord to reflect resource constraints, refer to response to comment 21-1.

59-3. The commenter does not like the format of the EIR "summary". The intent of a "summary" is to summarize the contents of a report. Therefore, to obtain a full understanding of the project it is required of the reader to read the entire document. As it pertains to whether the summary is legal or not legal, it is FORA's contention that the summary is adequate for the intended purpose and meets the requirements of CEQA (CEQA Section 15123).

59-4. The commenter states that jurisdiction delineation on maps use different graphics type nomenclature, which makes understanding the graphics difficult. Line conventions are generally followed but based on the graphic message to be conveyed on a particular figure, a line type may be used to enhance the distinction within the exhibit at the expense of convention. The graphic lines are internally consistent within a figure and selected to provide the greatest legibility practical.

59-5. The commenter would like to know how many students equal a Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) student. One FTE equals 15 units per semester, which can mean 1 student takes 15 units or 15 students taking 1 unit each. Based on current CSUMB conditions, the student to unit ratio is currently .7 to .8 (Trisha Lord, pers. com., January 8, 1997). Therefore, to get a rough headcount of the number of existing students, take the existing FTE and add 25 to 30 percent. Based on this methodology, 25,000 FTE (at full build out) will result in as many as 32,500 students. It is important to note that of the potential 32,500 students most will be "Extended Education" students which means they are not at Fort Ord 5 days per week.

59-6. The commenter wants to know if the two parallel dashed lines shown in the southern boundary area of Fort Ord is the Highway 68 bypass. The Highway 68 bypass indicated on various maps in the Reuse Plan and the EIR is shown in the southern boundary area of the Fort Ord property and is delineated by two parallel dashed lines following a curvilinear path. The right-of-way for this proposed alternative Highway 68 route is approximately 1000 feet wide.

59-7. The commenter would like to know what the dashed lines indicate. The dashed lines the commenter refers to delineate jurisdiction boundaries.

59-8. The commenter states that Table 5.1.1 on page 5-1 of the EIR does not include the Hatton Canyon Freeway, but the Reuse Plan does on page 3-66. The Hatton Canyon Freeway is a critical link in the regional network. This link is included in TAMC's regional modeling and is also on TAMC's list of proposed

facility improvements. The link appears on several tables in the Reuse Plan in order to provide a complete picture of the contribution of trips from Fort Ord to every link in the regional network. (See PFIP page 1-26, of Appendix B of the Reuse Plan.)

The traffic analyses completed for the DEIR, verified by subsequent modeling by TAMC (JHK 1997), indicate that development at the former Fort Ord does not produce a significant contribution to traffic on the Hatton Canyon link and no financing nexus exists. To clarify this issue, refer to the changes in the Reuse Plan below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend Volume I of the Reuse Plan, page 3-66, third paragraph, State Highway 1, beginning with the second sentence as follows:

This improvement includes the widening of the Highway to six lanes between the Fremont and Del Monte Interchange resulting in a network pattern intended to minimize the impact on State Highway 1 in this area. The preferred scenario in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 32% in the period to 2015. The 2015 network also assumes completion of the Hatton Canyon improvements in the Carmel area, even though the transportation modeling indicates that Fort Ord's contribution to traffic on the Hatton Canyon link is not significant. ~~The preferred scenario in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 32% in the period to 2015.~~

Amend Appendix B of the Reuse Plan, Table PFIP 1-3, Public Improvement Project Listing - Transportation System to add the following link and improvements following Highway 1 - North County, and adjust totals:

Highway 1- Seaside/Sand City; from 218 to Del Monte; Upgrade to 6 lanes; \$20,000,000 total costs; 32% Fort Ord contribution; \$6,400,000 Fort Ord capital cost; 2006 -2010 period.

59-9. The commenter points out that the EIR and Reuse Plan indicate conflicting positions on whether the Hatton Canyon project will be constructed or not and the EIR does not provide an analysis of what the characteristics of local roadways will be without construction of the Hatton Canyon project. Fort Ord development does not have a significant impact on the Hatton Canyon corridor. Therefore, an analysis of traffic on other roadways with or without construction of the Hatton Canyon freeway is not relevant to the project. Refer to response 59-8.

59-10. The commenter points out that the EIR does not provide an analysis of what the characteristics of local roadways will be without construction of the Highway 68 by pass. The EIR assumes construction of this roadway. There is no compelling basis for running the model without the Highway 68 bypass. However, without the bypass, traffic levels on other roadways would increase.

59-11. The commenter requests information on the Marina Coast Water District. The district obtains its water from three production wells that are connected to the 900 foot aquifer. The water is pumped anywhere from 1,500 to 2,000 feet. A back-up well, which is occasionally operated, provides water from the 400 foot aquifer. The basis for such deep wells is to avoid seawater intrusion and provide a potable water supply to the city of Marina. The MCWD used approximately 2,100 acre-feet of water last year (Rich Youngblood, pers. com., February 3, 1997)

59-12. The commenter states that for alternative modes of transportation to work in reducing emissions, people must be informed of the correlation between alternative modes and improved air quality, otherwise mitigation will be required. The EIR provides all the required and necessary mitigations as it pertains to air quality.

59-13. The commenter requests discussion on mitigations associated with population increase. A population increase by itself is not a significant impact (*Goleta Union School District v. The Regent's of the University of California* (36 Cal. App. 4th 1121, 1995)). What is potentially significant, however, are the impacts that human activities are projected to have. For example, the vehicle miles traveled create impacts on roadways as well as increase emissions. These impacts and other impacts associated with human activity are adequately discussed in the EIR and provide the necessary background information for the decision makers to base their informed decision on.

59-14. The commenter requests that development occur in a phased manner. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

59-15. The commenter states that FORA should proceed carefully with approving the project and consider its ramifications. The commenter does not address the content of the EIR. No response is necessary. However, the FORA Board should consider the intent of the comment in its deliberations before approval of the Reuse Plan and certification of the EIR.

Response to Letter 60

60-1. The commenter points out that the annexation process is not adequately addressed in the text and maps of the Reuse Plan and EIR.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-7. Section 4.1.1.1. Add the following sentence after the LAFCO sentence:

"Monterey County LAFCO is authorized under the Cortex-Knox Act and based on a resolution adopted by LAFCO, will not consider any boundary

changes at Ford Ord until an EIR is certified by the FORA Board. Once this action is complete, and the Reuse Plan is adopted, LAFCO will begin to consider formal requests for reorganizations (i.e., boundary changes) form individual jurisdictions. These require formal action by LAFCO once a property tax transfer agreement has been reached between the county and the individual jurisdictions”.

60-2. The commenter states that page IV-18 of the Reuse Plan has dramatic impact on the role and financial future of FORA. Refer to response to comment 7-2.

60-3. The commenter states that, based on proposed annexations, there should be five land use/political jurisdictions at Fort Ord, not three. There are only three land use designations discussed in the Reuse Plan and the EIR because that is what currently exists. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-4. The commenter would like the text edited to reflect that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey are proposed land use jurisdictions. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-2: Add the following sentence to the end of the first paragraph under Section 4.

Del Rey Oaks and Monterey are prospective land use/political jurisdictions.

60-5. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-6. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-7. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-8. The commenter requests that names be referenced in the Reuse Plan. Including names in the document as proposed is not necessary to convey the necessary information, nor is it advisable, because it would then justify everyone's name and their title be included in the Reuse Plan.

60-9. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-10. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-11. The commenter states that Fort Ord was selected for closure in 1991 not 1990. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-2: Amend reference to "1990" in second paragraph under section 3.1 to read "1991".

60-12. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-13. The commenter states that Polygons 31a and 31b have not been properly labeled or identified in the Reuse Plan [and by association the EIR]. Refer to response to comment 7-4.

60-14. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-15. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-16. The commenter request a text amendment pertaining to description of Neighborhood Retail locations. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-56. Amend the fourth sentence in the second paragraph to read as follows:

Two locations have been designated as Neighborhood retail, one adjacent to the CSUMB campus at the southeast corner of the intersection of North-South Road and Light Fighter Lane, and one at the connecting road between Coe Avenue and the proposed East Boundary Road ~~at the cross-sections of North-South Road and the East Boundary Road.~~

60-17. The commenter requests text amendment in the Reuse Plan that the current CalTrans proposal to realign State Highway 68 will not impact the commercial properties within the City of Del Rey Oaks at the intersection of Canyon Del Rey Road. CalTrans has not defined the alignment and engineering design of the project and FORA's Reuse Plan is not an appropriate venue for commenting on detailed design aspects of this CalTrans project. The environmental review of the CalTrans project will provide an opportunity to address the commenter's concerns.

60-18. The commenter requests that York Road be shown on maps as connecting Highway 68 and the Highway 68 by-pass. Modifications to figures contained in the Reuse Plan and EIR are not, by contractual agreement between the

consultant and FORA, a funded aspect of the preparation of the Final EIR and revised Reuse Plan. However, all changes requested by commenter will be listed by the consultant and delivered to FORA for their use in the case FORA decides to make amendments to the figures. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-65: Amend Figure 3.5-1 to include York Road connection between South Boundary Road Highway. 68 and the clarify the configuration (2 lanes) of North-South Road between Highway 218 and South Boundary Road.

60-19. The commenter notes incorrect directional reference pertaining to the location of open space at Fort Ord. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-80: Amend the first sentence in the second paragraph to read as follows:

Roughly two-thirds of the base consists of the undeveloped lands south and east west of the Main Garrison area.

60-20. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-21. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-22. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-23. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in a revised figure. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. Refer to comment 7-1.

Policy Consideration

FORA should consider whether graphics and tables in the Reuse Plan should refer to Del Rey Oaks in lieu of the South Gate Planning Area and Monterey in lieu of the York Road Planning Area.

60-24. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comments 7-1 and 60-23. The commenter requests additional language in Volume I, page 3-141. The reader is referred to the change below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-141. Section 3.10.5 Add the following:

This District includes an Office Park/R&D District surrounding the planned visitor-serving hotel and golf course development. The combination of uses anticipates strong synergy between them. The area is located outside of the core infrastructure area but has been identified as a development "opportunity site."

60-25. The commenter states that open space relating to the "Frog Pond" (Polygon 31a) should be 15 acres not 22 acres. The acreage should be revised to 15 acres (Dennis Potter, pers., com., January 22, 1997).

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-143. Amend second paragraph to read as follows:

Open Space Land Use. ~~22~~ 15 acres are projected for this park use and habitat protection.

60-26. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-27. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-28. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in a revised figure. Modifications to figures contained in the Reuse Plan and EIR are not, will be completed following the certification of the Final PEIR. All changes requested by commenter will be listed by the consultant and delivered to FORA for their use in the case FORA decides to make amendments to the figures. Refer to comment 7-1 and 60-23.

Policy Consideration

FORA should consider whether graphics and tables in the Reuse Plan should refer to Del Rey Oaks in lieu of the South Gate Planning Area and Monterey in lieu of the York Road Planning Area.

60-29. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in a revised figure. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR

graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. For labeling changes, refer to comment 7-1, 60-23 and 60-28. For polygon boundary changes, refer to comment 7-4.

Policy Consideration

FORA should consider whether graphics and tables in the Reuse Plan should refer to Del Rey Oaks in lieu of the South Gate Planning Area and Monterey in lieu of the York Road Planning Area.

60-30. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-31. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-32. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-46: Amend the list under Retail and Service Centers by adding the following:

- County South Gate Area: Adjacent to planned hotel and golf course development.

60-33. The commenter requests that South Gate Planning Area be added to the list of Business Park/Light Industrial and Office/R&D designated land uses. (Note, the list is also augmented to correctly include the York Road Planning Area.) The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-56: Amend the list under Business Park/Light Industrial and Office/R&D at the bottom of the page by adding the following:

South Gate Planning Area (Polygons 29a, 31a, and 31b); 48 acres; .20 FAR; 415,127 square feet.

York Road Planning Area (Polygons 29b, and 29d); 147 acres; .06 FAR; 413,000 square feet.

60-34. The commenter requests that the South Gate Planning Area be added to the list of Convenience /Specialty Retail designated land uses. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II, Page 4-57: Amend the list under Convenience/Specialty Retail to include:

South Gate Planning Area (Polygons 29a, 31.a, and 31b); 5 acres; .14 FAR; 30,000 square feet.

60-35. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-36. The commenter points out that Program D-1.2 is out of place.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend Volume II of the Reuse Plan, Page 4-58, Program D-1.2, as follows:

The ~~City of Marina~~ County of Monterey shall designate convenience/specialty retail land use on its zoning map and provide standards for development within residential neighborhoods.

60-37. The commenter points out that the reference to “club house” should be pluralized. Verification of this comment indicates there area two golf courses and one club house. Therefore, the text in the Reuse Plan is correct and will not be amended.

60-38. The commenter notes that the Broadway Avenue gate access to Fort Ord is open. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-94: Amend the third sentence in the third paragraph to read as follows:

There is a gate at Broadway, which ~~would~~ currently provides access to Seaside ~~if it were open~~.

60-39. The commenter requests that the connection of South Boundary to York Road be included in Figure 4.2-2, Page 4-98. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the

changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-98: Amend Figure 4.2-2 to show the connection of South Boundary to York Road.

60-40. The commenter requests that the proposed bicycle network be augmented to add South Boundary Road to York Road. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 4-115: Amend Figure 4.2-6 to show a bike trail on South Boundary Road from North-South Road to York Road.

60-41. The commenter states that Seaside has been left out of the soil conservation policies. The Seaside element of the soil conservation policies commences on page 4-151. Therefore, Seaside is covered in the discussion. However, the City of Marina was left out. A new policy is included in the following Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-150. Add the following new policy after Program A-5.1:

“Soils and Geology Policy A-6: The City shall require that development of lands having a prevailing slope above 30% include implementation of adequate erosion control measures.

Program A-6.1: The City shall prepare and make available a slope map to identify locations in the study area where slope poses severe constraints for particular land uses.

Program A-2.1: See description of this program above.

Program A-2.2: See description of this program above.

Program A-2.3: See description of this program above.

Program A-6.2: The City shall designate areas with extreme slope limitations for open space or similar use if adequate erosion control measures and engineering and design techniques cannot be implemented”.

60-42. The commenter states that the safe yield of the Seaside basin has not been determined. The safe yield of the Seaside basin has been determined and is not exceeded by the Fort Ord golf courses using 400 afy from this source (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1993). However, it is the safe yield of the Salinas Groundwater Basin vis-a-vis salt water intrusion in the Fort Ord area that is a concern. The safe yield water extraction from Fort Ord wells is known to be at a level less than 4,700 afy.

60-43. The commenter states that the ephemeral drainage into the Frog Pond from development should not be precluded because implementation of Best Management Practices can preserve the quality of the habitat in the Frog Pond. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-201: Amend the last paragraph to read as follows:

Program A-8.1: The County shall ~~allow~~ ~~prohibit~~ development in Polygon 31b to discharge storm water ~~only or other drainage~~ into the ephemeral drainage in this parcel that feeds into the Frog Pond ~~if a reasonable and cost effective alternative is not available subject to the, and only with the provision that future applicants for development that could impact the Frog Pond be required to submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that uses storm water “Best Management Practices” to control storm water, erosion and sedimentation. Such a plan shall both maintain the Frog Pond at its current level of biological diversity and health, and shall improve its level of biological diversity and health if its current condition is compromised due to existing uncontrolled storm water quality.~~

60-44. The commenter states that Seaside has been left out of the biological resources section. Seaside has not been left out of the biological resources section. The reader is referred to page 4-190 where the Seaside section commences.

60-45. The commenter notes an inappropriate reference to Marina is contained in the County of Monterey section on cultural resources. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-221: Amend the first sentence under Cultural Resources Policy A-2 to read as follows:

The County of Monterey City of Marina shall provide.....

60-46. The commenter states that Figure 3.2-1 is incorrectly drawn. The NAE (Habitat Management) area appears to be too large and the polygon border and label are inaccurate. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. Refer to comment 7-4, 60-13, and 60-25.

60-47. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text as proposed land use jurisdictions. This issue is addressed in the EIR on page 3-10 and in sufficient detail. No changes to the text are required.

60-48. The commenter requests that the EIR acknowledge that Del Rey Oaks has made a formal request to LAFCO to annex properties in Monterey County Jurisdiction. The issue of annexation is adequately discussed in the EIR on page 3-10. The level of detail requested by the applicant to be inserted in the EIR is not necessary for the decision makers to base an informed decision on. No changes to the text are required.

60-49. The commenter states that Figure 3.6-1 is incorrectly drawn and should reflect the current status of request to LAFCO. FORA is not aware of any inaccuracies in the figure when the document was produced. However, if changes need to be made to the figure, these will be reviewed and approved by the FORA board. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. The reader is referred to the Changes to the EIR section below. Refer to comment 7-1.

60-50. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in text and tables. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-51. The commenter states open space relating to the "Frog Pond" (Polygon 31a) should be 15 acres not 22 acres. Refer to comment 6-25. Refer to comment 7-1 for jurisdictional status. The commenter states that Del Rey Oaks will not allow noise, visible activity, or air pollution to adversely affect recreational activities in the NAE. Comment noted, no response necessary.

Change to the EIR

Amend the EIR, page 4-9 line 4 as follows.

"... a ~~22-acre~~ 15-acre expansion of the Regional Park District ..."

60-52. The commenter points out that the Seaside basin provides water to other uses other than the Fort Ord golf courses. The Seaside basin water used at Fort Ord is used for existing golf courses only and will continue to be used so. Seaside water is not and will not be used for any other use at Fort Ord. No changes to the text are required.

60-53. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks be referenced in text. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-54. The commenter states that Figure 4.7-2 should show York Road. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. Refer to comment 60-18.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-78: Amend Figure 4.7-2 to include South Boundary Road connecting to York Road.

60-55. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks be referenced in text. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-56. The commenter states that there should not be barriers to access to Polygon 31a. The commenter is correct and the EIR should be revised to eliminate this language.

Changes to the EIR

Amend page 4-135 line 2 as follows:

~~Barriers should be designed to prohibit unauthorized access into Polygon 31a.~~

60-57. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks be referenced in text. If and when the City of Del Rey Oaks takes over this polygon, then they would be responsible for the stormwater discharge quality to the Frog Pond.

60-58. The commenter requests that a figure be provided in color. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. The reader is referred to the Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Page A-28: Provide Figure 3.3-1 in color instead of black and white.

60-59. The commenter states that the Business Plan has not been thoroughly integrated into the Reuse Plan and EIR. The Comprehensive Business Plan provides a simplified model to illustrate the basic financial feasibility and fiscal consequences for the reuse of the former Fort Ord and relies on an infrastructure financing model that is efficient and prudent, relying on "pay-as-you-go" financing. FORA, and the land use jurisdictions have the choice and the powers to utilize a wide range of alternative financing methods. The role for FORA outlined in the Comprehensive Business Plan is consistent with the intent of SB 899 and provides a "base case" that simulates the consequences of coordinated marketing and development in order to realize financial savings. This model for FORA's role and the financing measures simulated in the Comprehensive Business Plan yield are the recommendations of the financing and business consultants. The inclusion of the Comprehensive Business Plan in the public documents is based on the desire to communicate the overall financial feasibility of coordinated redevelopment of the former Fort Ord. It is expected that FORA will use this "base case" scenario as well as other financing models to refine its Business strategy. From these on-going deliberations, FORA's role will emerge.

The maps and figures in the PFIP and particularly the CIP are an important implementation tool for realizing development at the former Fort Ord. The maps, charts, figures, exhibits, and tables are reflective of the draft Reuse Plan. Changes to the draft, adopted by FORA would result in updates to these implementation tools. FORA is expected to monitor and revise these tools on a regular basis.

With respect to subsequent annexations, refer to comment 7-1.

60-60. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be included in an exhibit showing jurisdictions that will have responsibility for municipal and public service functions. Refer to response to comment 7-1.

60-61. The commenter points out that "RKS" should read "RKG". The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Business and Operations Plan section below.

Changes to the Business and Operations Plan

Page II-4. Amend "RKS" in the second sentence of the third paragraph to read "RKG".

60-62. The commenter states that the absorption rates forecast needs to include a golf course in the 1996-2000 planning horizon. The exhibit referred to is a projection of market demand by the real estate market consultant. FORA cannot change the projected demand for development by policy directive, the real estate market is a context within which FORA must make plans and policy. The market place is a dynamic setting, however, and the planning for the Reuse Plan is based on

a long-range projection. The Reuse Plan permits a wide range of uses and will flexibly accommodate faster absorption rates.

60-63. The commenter states that the costs in exhibit 4 need to include the phasing of capital improvements more closely linked to proposed development scenarios. The financial model in the Comprehensive Business Plan is more disaggregated in the supporting Exhibits 9 through 12. (Refer to corrections and modifications to the Comprehensive Business Plan in response to comment 7-2.

60-64. The commenter questions whether the costs identified in Exhibit 4 would make future development at Fort Ord financially questionable. The exhibit projects front-end capital investments to be carried by development at Fort Ord and the financial model tested illustrate that these capital costs can be carried by the aggregate of uses projected. The flow of capital (taking into account sources of funds and use of funds is summarized in Exhibit 10. Net cash flow and cumulative cash flow are shown at the bottom of the exhibit by time period through 2015. This exhibit has been revised to reflect corrections and refinements from the real estate economic consultant (Refer to comment 7-2). The sunk costs are not expected to be an impediment to the feasibility of subsequent development beyond the 20 year time frame. The model indicates the potential to recover the expected costs.

The commenter asks what the financial role of the major educational institutions at Fort Ord will be. The University of California is treated simply as one of many potential developers at the former Fort Ord. Since they have already been conveyed lands to implement UCMBEST, their contribution to financing is based on the nexus for need for transportation. Other infrastructure improvements are modeled on a user-fee basis requiring the recovery of capital costs through on-going fees by the service user. CSUMB is treated in the financial analysis in a similar way to UC since they too have been conveyed lands for the campus. If CSUMB does not contribute to traffic and infrastructure costs on the basis of a nexus (as modeled), then their contribution would need to be made up from the other contributing land uses. This scenario is the subject of on-going financial modeling for FORA as part of the Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) process. One potential mechanism for covering the infrastructure costs for CSUMB is the use of redevelopment financing.

60-65. The commenter requests additional language be added to the text pertaining to Community Building Strategy. The suggestion is appropriate and important.

Changes to the Reuse Plan Comprehensive Business Plan

Amend page III-2 section 4. Community Building Strategy to add a 9th strategy as follows:

(9) integrate new visitor serving uses at Fort Ord into the overall tourism strategy for the Monterey Peninsula.

60-66 through 60-69. The commenter states that the “opportunity zone” concept for the South Gate Planning Area should be included in the discussion of Early Sites Marketing Action Plan. The purpose of this Early Sites Marketing Action Plan is to reflect the sites poised for development in the first five years within the limits of projected market support representing the period from 1995 to 2000. The Site referred to is not included because there are competing sites with equivalent amenity and existing infrastructure services. The financial model projects a particular development sequence in order to construct a model for financial and fiscal performance but this is not the only sequence possible.

60-70. The commenter states that Figure 3.3-1 does not correctly depict Polygon 31a and 31b. Refer to comment 7-4.

60-71. The commenter states that the exhibit should include reference to the cities of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey. Refer to comment 60-23 and 7-1.

60-72 and 60-73 The commenter questions some of the financial performance model results. Corrections and revisions have been made to the text and tables. Refer to comment to letter 9.

60-74. The commenter questions the demolition costs as unrealistically high. These projections have undergone scrutiny by FORA in the months following the Draft Comprehensive Business Plan. Current professional judgment by a wide range of consultants have maintained a number very similar to the one used in the Draft Comprehensive Business Plan. It is true, however, that these projections are based on a number of inputs and variables and represent the best professional judgment of the consultants.

60-75. Commenter questions some of the financial performance model results. Refer to comment 60-72 and 73 and letter 9.

60-76 Commenter observes that the results of the model may not be realistic if other assumptions do not materialize. The observation is correct and that is why the model identifies the key assumptions.

60-77. Commenter questions some of the financial performance model results. Refer to comment 60-72 and 73 and letter 9.

60-78. Commenter observes that a program for sharing revenues and costs among affected local governments has not been approved. The principal of using FORA to mitigate fiscal shortfalls in the land use jurisdictions was reviewed by the FORA Administrative Committee to be explored in the Draft Business and Operations Plan. The Draft Business Plan concludes that if infrastructure costs can be rigorously managed, there is likely to be sufficient funds to offset fiscal shortfalls, and these shortfalls could be part of the subsequent negotiations for the Economic Development Conveyance. The Draft Business Plan is a benchmark model to test a wide range of assumptions and does not reflect specific FORA policy. It is expected

that FORA will continue to refine its financial and fiscal models relying on the cumulative learning that is possible from ongoing financial management.

60-79 and 60-80. Commenter requests identification of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey as proposed land recipients. Refer to comment 7-1.

60-81. Commenter requests that the PFIP and PSP have an integrated executive summary. The Comprehensive Business Plan serves as an integrating summary to supplement the individual summaries of the PFIP and PSP.

60-82. Commenter requests that a general geographic reference to the Southwest and Northwest service areas be changed to the "Southgate Planning Area." This would be an incorrect change. The general geographic description of the Southwest includes more than just the "Southgate Planning Area."

60-83. Commenter suggests that "key informants" should be identified. The PFIP is a summary document with many background engineering reports.

60-84. Commenter requests that the phasing and financing of improvements to North South Road must be clarified (pages PFIP 1-130 and 1-132). It appears the commenter is referring to the phasing and cost allocation to Fort Ord on pages PFIP 1-30 and 1-32. None of the infrastructure planning and financing models include more discreet phasing steps than the five-year periods indicated in the table. The models are broad-based projections of many components for the discreet periods indicated in the table. All of the North South Road improvements are included in the overall on-site improvements within Fort Ord that breakout the Fort Ord nexus from the regional nexus. How the roads will be financed is reviewed in the Comprehensive Business Plan.

60-85. The commenter asks if a figure PFIP 1-3 on page PFIP 1-50 is consistent with the detail in the tables. The figure collapses the detail in the tables to a simplified graphic representation of the phasing of the roadways modeled. However, the Blanco Road extension is inadvertently omitted from the figure.

60-86. The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey should be identified. Refer to comment 60-23 and 7-1.

60-87. The commenter suggests that the wastewater demand forecasts may need to be adjusted if the City of Del Rey Oaks uses reclaimed water on site rather than using the capacity of the MRWPCA plant in Marina. The demand forecasts should be the same so long as the development program is consistent and the projections of percent use of non-potable water remain the same. The source of the non-potable water supply would not be expected to change the demand factors.

60-88. The commenter suggests a change to the wastewater screen summary based on comment 87. The change is speculative at this time, but the PFIP is expected to be revised during the buildout of the plan to reflect infrastructure implementation.

60-89. The commenter suggests the infrastructure costs exceed current land values. The Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFIP 5) recognizes that not all land uses can support the expected direct nexus for infrastructure costs but that in aggregate, the desirable land uses are financially viable. Refer to comment letter 9.

60-90. The commenter notes that the PFIP correctly identifies the habitat area as 15 acres on Polygon 31a. Comment noted.

60-91. The commenter states the total costs of public improvements in Table PFIP 4-1 are not consistent with the costs identified in PFIP 2-23. The discrepancy in the PFIP reflects one table not having been updated. Regardless, the information contained in the PFIP the commenter refers to has been subsequently updated and will continue to be updated to reflect changing conditions associated with reuse.

60-92. The commenter states the dollar amounts do not agree with Table PFIP 3-7. Refer to response to comment 60-91.

60-93 through 60-112 (excluding 60-109). All of these comments refer to the Public Services Plan (PFIP) and all comments request that the analyses, tables, and text include the identification of the Cities of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey. Refer to comment 7-1.

60-109. The commenter suggests that the inflation rate assumed in the analysis should be reviewed and alternative scenarios included. Comment noted.

[Start July 31, 1996 City of Pacific Grove public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 61

61-1. The commenter requests information on future transit at Fort Ord. Refer to the EIR section on transit on page 4-72 and 4-85 and section 4.2.3 - *Transit* - in Volume II of the Reuse Plan.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 62

62-1. The commenter is concerned about payment to the Army for the Fort Ord property. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 62-1 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

62-2. The commenter is concerned that the proposed Reuse Plan exceeds replacement of the former Fort Ord population. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 62-2 in Volume I of the Final PEIR. Also, Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 63

63-1. The commenter wants to know if the \$137 million was for on base improvements. Refer to comment 21-1 for information on roadway infrastructure implementation timing, monitoring and funding.

63-2. The commenter wants to know if proposition 218 has been weighted in the Reuse Plan. Proposition 218 was an initiative to amend the State Constitution which would require that all future local general taxes must be approved by a majority vote of the people and existing local general taxes established after December 31, 1994, without a vote of the people, be placed before the voters within two years. There has been no "weighted" analysis of the impacts to funding the Reuse Plan. Regardless of this proposition, the necessary funds to accommodate new infrastructure at Fort Ord will be borne by new residents at Fort Ord. New property owners at Fort Ord will "walk in" to an already established fee structure (based on nexus analysis) to accommodate the necessary infrastructure improvements. Beyond the Fort Ord mitigated impacts, unmitigated impacts would continue to be unmitigated until funding is obtained through new majority votes, if any. In other words, as it pertains to regional transportation impacts, there would be required to be a regional solution. A regional solution would most likely require a vote per the requirements of Proposition 218. A majority vote of the people to mitigate regional transportation impacts would be required.

63-3. The commenter wants to know if the Reuse Plan's "balanced budget" would be "unbalanced" if it were modified. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 63-3 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 64

64-1. The commenter wants to know if costs contained in the Reuse Plan were firmer than the income/revenue estimates. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 64-1 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

64-2. The commenter wants to know if the requirement to pay the Army for the land would kill the project. It is speculated that the Army would not insist on a price "that would kill the project". This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 64-2 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

64-3. The commenter wants to know what agency is responsible for providing water to Fort Ord. Currently, water is the responsibility of the Army. However, when the base is turned over it is expected that the MCWD will be the water purveyor. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 64-3 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 65

65-1. Who will be “balancing” development at Fort Ord. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. The Reuse Plan is administered by FORA. Refer to response to comment 65-1 in Volume I of the Final PEIR and to response to comment 21-1 in Volume II.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 66

66-1. The commenter wants to know where the funds are coming from that would fund future transportation costs. Refer to response to comment 22-1. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 66-1 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

66-2. The commenter wants to know if the financial information is available for public review. Refer to Appendix B of the Reuse Plan. Also, this issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 66-2 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

66-3. The commenter wants to know who is responsible for Mello-Roos financing. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 66-3 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

66-4. The commenter wants to know how realistic is the plan adoption scenario. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 66-4 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 67

67-1. The commenter would like to know where the impact is that was suffered when Fort Ord closed. Regardless of the economic conditions that existed in 1991 or currently exist, the reuse of the base will proceed. SB 899 was not created with the intent to limit growth to a level commensurate with the economic activity that existed prior to the departure of the 7th Light Infantry Brigade. However, the FORA Board is required to consider the comment. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

67-2. The commenter would like to know where the public sentiment factor is. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 67-2 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

67-3. The commenter would like to know what are the alternatives to the plan. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to

comment 67-3 in Volume I of the Final PEIR. The alternatives are discussed in the Draft EIR commencing on page 6-1.

67-4. The commenter would like to know if the economic analysis assumptions are in the Draft EIR or Reuse Plan. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 67-4 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

67-5. The commenter would like to know what it would take to reduce the plan by one-half or two-thirds. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 67-5 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

67-6. The commenter would like to know what happened at Hamilton Air Force Base. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 67-6 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 68

68-1. The commenter would like to know if open space includes unexploded ordnance and would preclude public use as open space. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 68-1 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

68-2. The commenter would like to know if there would be height restrictions. There are no specific design guidelines for the Highway 1 corridor at this time. However, Residential Land Use Policy I-1 requires that the City/County shall support FORA in preparation of regional urban design guidelines, including a scenic corridor overlay. Program I-1.1 supports this. Though specifics such as height, colors, textures, etc., have not yet been developed, the discussion under Community Design Vision in Volume I of the Reuse Plan - *Context and Framework*, adequately provides a framework for future corridor viewshed protection.

Height limits are typically established through zoning. Per SB 899, the sequence of events following certification of the EIR and approval of the Reuse Plan by FORA includes general plan amendments by Fort Ord jurisdictions, followed by zoning changes. These are then returned to FORA for review for consistency with the approved Reuse Plan. Therefore, the Reuse Plan only intended to provide direction to each jurisdiction's zoning ordinance development.

However, the design objectives contained in the Reuse Plan includes language specific enough to indicate what the future design parameters will be for future development within view of Scenic Highway 1.

Volume I. Page 3-18 - Establish a special identity for major development sites, but keep all development compatible with the low density character of the greater Peninsula, particularly in terms of the scale and height of new buildings.

Volume I. Page 3-110 - (c) *Establish a maximum building height related to an identified mature landscape height to accommodate higher intensity land uses appropriate to this Town Center without detracting from the regional landscape character of the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor.*

Volume II. Page 4-39 - *The City of Seaside shall support FORA in the preparation of regional urban design guidelines, including a scenic corridor design overlay area, to govern the visual quality of areas of regional importance (applicable to all Fort Ord jurisdictions).*

Volume II. Page 4-52 - *The City of Marina shall support FORA in the preparation of regional urban design guidelines, including a scenic corridor design overlay area, to govern the visual quality of areas of regional importance (applicable to all Fort Ord jurisdictions).*

Volume II. Page 4-129 - *Enhance the visual character of the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor with detailed siting, grading and design plans and landscaping programs that minimize the visual intrusion of buildings and large paved areas for overnight RV vehicles and campground parking.*

68-3. The commenter states there is no alternative to the proposed project and there is the potential for pumping which could cause salt water intrusion. The commenter would also like to know how much water is being pumped at this time. The alternatives to the plan are discussed in the EIR commencing on page 6-1. The potential for seawater intrusion does exist. The safe yield has not been defined at this time, but as stated in the EIS (Volume I, page 4-57), the safe yield may be less than the total pumpage of 4,700 acre-feet per year (1991 baseline year). The Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) addresses the safe yield water use issue. Refer to response to comment 21-1. Also, refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional discussion on a long term water source for Fort Ord. The current pumping is estimated to be approximately 1,700 afy from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin (based on 1.5 mgd water use)(Jim Bowles, pers. com. February 3, 1997). This does not count water used on the two existing golf courses.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 69

69-1. The commenter would like to know if there are no solutions to long range planning then why proceed. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 68-4 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 70

70-1. The commenter would like to know where UCSC is, what is the current status of the cemetery and why the Army gave land away and spent \$500 million to clean it up. The commenter would like to know if there are no solutions to

long range plan then why proceed. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 70-1 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 71

71-1. Where will the proceeds from the sale of land go. The commenter would like to know if there are no solutions to long range plan than why proceed. This issue was addressed in a response at the hearing. Refer to response to comment 71-1 in Volume I of the Final PEIR.

[End July 31, 1996 City of Pacific Grove public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 72

72-1. The commenter addresses transportation, water, pollution, loss of open space and wildlife as it pertains to the proposed project. The commenter is referred to the EIR document for a discussion of these issues. Furthermore, the reader is referred to response to comment 8-5 pertaining to water and Response to comment 21-1 pertaining to phased growth.

72-2. The commenter requests that the proposed project be limited to a population that existed at Fort Ord when the Army was present. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

Response to Letter 73

73-1. The commenter is concerned with the proposed project's population. The comment is not specific enough to allow a specific response. However, the issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

73-2. The commenter is concerned about traffic on Highway 68. Future development of Fort Ord will result in impacts to this roadway. Impacts will be partially mitigated by Fort Ord development through its fair share payment of traffic mitigation fees. As stated in the EIR, future Fort Ord development will exacerbate traffic impacts on Highway 68 and other regional roadways. Regional funding for expansion of vehicle capacity on Highway 68 and other regional roadways does not exist or is inadequate at this time to fund for expansion. For this reason, the EIR concludes that there are some significant and unavoidable impacts.

73-3. The commenter is concerned about water issues. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

73-4. The commenter wants to know if existing residents now living in the area should suffer to allow development for a new population. The readers preference appears to not allow new population in the region. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

73-5. The commenter is concerned about pollution. Refer to the air quality discussion in the EIR for a response to this comment.

73-6. The commenter states that the proposed project has too many visitor-serving facilities and that visitors clog roads, take long showers, leave their pollutants and then leave town. The visitor-serving facilities accommodated in the plan reflects both the marketing analysis and the interests of local jurisdictions who want as much commercial/industrial acreage as possible. Acreage dedicated to commercial/industrial use was reduced from its level in the December 12, 1994 Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan to its current level because the infrastructure costs were higher for the 1994 Plan. Generally, a preponderance of jobs in one area, without the housing to go with it, will require increased roadway capacity to accommodate massive influxes in and out of the jobs area. This usually results in the need for multi-lane freeways. The current Reuse Plan provides a more reasonable jobs/housing balance. This more reasonable approach reduces per unit roadway infrastructure costs and reduces impacts to regional roadway systems by keeping more of the traffic on local roadways through provision of adequate housing stock.

73-7. The commenter states the Fort Ord Reuse Plan does not consider the needs of Monterey County residents. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

[Start August 1, 1996 City of Carmel public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 74

74-1. Commenter invites those in attendance to visit Hopkins Marine station to look at Fort Ord. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or EIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 75

75-1. The commenter would like an extended public review period. Refer to response to comment 5-1.

75-2. The commenter is concerned about transportation, water, sewer and capacity vis-a-vis the available water. Refer to response to comment 8-5 pertaining to the water issue and Response to comment 21-1 pertaining to phasing development so that resources are not exceeded.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 76

76-1. The commenter is concerned about the limitation that water resources would place on the project. Refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1.

76-2. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period, 8-5 pertaining to the water issue and Response to comment 21-1 pertaining to phasing development.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 77

77-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

77-2. The commenter provides a statement about the impacts of the proposed project. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 78

78-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 79

79-1. The commenter states that one reason for the time frame associated with public review period is a financial one. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

[End August 1, 1996 City of Carmel public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 80

80-1. The commenter states that the EIR does not disclose all the impacts and future development should be based on a safe yield. The CEQA process provides the venue for concerns to be aired by the public and the various agencies so that all the relevant potentially significant impacts will be disclosed and discussed. This Final PEIR is part of the full disclosure process. As it pertains to safe yield, refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1.

80-2. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

80-3. The commenter states that two-thirds of the water needed for full buildout of Fort Ord does not exist on Fort Ord. Refer to Response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 81

81-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

81-2. The commenter provides a rhetorical list of his projections as it pertains to the CEQA process. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

81-3. The commenter states the EIR does not analyze impacts. This is a subjective statement on the content of the EIR. No response is necessary.

Also, the commenter wants to know how many lots of record will be within the Monterey Peninsula Water District (MPWMD). The number of lots of record within the MPWMD is irrelevant to the future development of Fort Ord. The future sources of water for Fort Ord reuse is separate from the MPWMD water sources. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on water issues and long term sources of water and their potential environmental impacts.

81-4. The commenter states that 800 million dollars of off-site highway construction is proposed. Refer to response to comment 22-1.

As it pertains to “huge negative impacts [financial] on existing property owners”, the proposed plan would not result in financial impacts to existing property owners. Fort Ord reuse is not a conduit for increasing taxes on existing residents of Monterey County to pay for the existing regional transportation infrastructure deficiencies.

81-5. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

81-6. The commenter states the proposed project should be downsized. Refer to response to comment 21-1. Also, this is an issue for the FORA Board to consider.

Response to Letter 82

82-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

82-2. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

82-3. The commenter would like to know if the EIR provides adequate impact analysis and realistic mitigations. Upon completion of the Final PEIR, the environmental document will have considered all the relevant significant environmental impacts and will have adequately mitigated them, or recommended a statement of overriding consideration be used by the decision making body. FORA acknowledges that there are cumulative regional impacts that it is part of but cannot mitigate, therefore a statement of overriding consideration would pertain to cumulative water impacts, law enforcement, fire protection, traffic and circulation, and visual resources.

82-4. The commenter would like to know if there are project alternatives including one designed to reduce significant impacts. This issue is adequately discussed in the Alternative discussion in EIR commencing on page 6-1. Specifically, the "No Project" and "Alternative 6R" are the "environmentally superior alternatives".

82-5. The commenter states that the EIR does not discuss a project alternative that reduces impacts. The EIR discusses the "No Project" alternative commencing on page 6-16 of the EIR. Please refer to this discussion which outlines how the No Project alternative has fewer impacts than that of the proposed project.

82-6. The commenter is concerned with an alternative project description that does not exceed the available water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

82-7. The commenter provides a rhetorical list of his projections as it pertains to the CEQA process. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

82-8. The commenter states that the EIR does not discuss the impacts of future water infrastructure, new roadways and does not provide an on-site location for a wastewater treatment plant. As it pertains to water infrastructure, the EIR adequately addresses water use to the year 2015. Additional discussion on the long-term water supply is included in Response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to impacts of new roadways, more specific impacts associated with future roadway expansion will be analyzed through the CEQA process at a later date. It is anticipated that the primary impacts of future transportation projects will be associated with plant and wildlife species which are required to be mitigated as required in the Habitat Management Plan (HMP). Through implementation of the HMP preservation and sustainability of important species is assured. Refer to response to comment 56-4 for additional discussion on the impacts associated with future road construction.

As it pertains to commenter's concern about wastewater treatment, the existing wastewater at Fort Ord is treated the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA). This facility has a capacity of 29.6 mgd.

The current average flow to the MRWPCA is 20 mgd (Keith Israel, pers. com., December 30, 1996). Of the total amount of effluent currently flowing to the MRWPCA, .9 mgd is from Fort Ord (ibid.).

Future wastewater needs at Fort Ord are accommodated by an existing contractual agreement between the U.S. Army and the MRWPCA, whereby Fort Ord currently has 3.3 mgd treatment capacity set aside. As stated in the EIR, full buildout at Fort Ord is projected to use 9.8 mgd (Table 4.2-1, page 4-40). Therefore, there is a deficit long-term wastewater treatment capacity for Fort Ord of 6.2 mgd. Based on the 9.8 mgd projection, FORA expects to incrementally expand its treatment capacity rights in the regional treatment plant by 4.0 mgd between 2005 and 2045 (EDAW, Inc. and EMC Planning Group, Inc. - Business and Operations Plan 1996). Additional capacity could be available at a later date. It is important to note that there is the possibility that in the distant future the MRWPCA could be expanded by an additional 4 mgd to accommodate increased demand for wastewater treatment from throughout its service area. Therefore, it is possible that Fort Ord buildout could be accommodated entirely at the MRWPCA facility. It is also possible that increased demand throughout the MRWPCA service area could cut short the long-term wastewater needs of Fort Ord. This later scenario would require future expansion of treatment facilities or a future moratorium on development within the MRWPCA's district.

Based on the current rate of new sewer hook-ups to the treatment plant, there is a projected capacity that would last the next 20 years without considering the additional 4.0 mgd expansion capability (Keith Israel, pers. com., December 30, 1996).

82-9. The commenter states that Fort Ord redevelopment should be phased so as to not exceed safe-yield water. Refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1.

82-10. The commenter requests that a revised Draft EIR be recirculated. The Final PEIR will adequately address all concerns, thus addressing the requirements of CEQA that the environmental document provide adequate discussion of all the relevant significant environmental impacts.

Response to Letter 83

83-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 84

84-1. The commenter is concerned about the limitation that water resources would place on the project. Refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1.

84-2. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 85

85-1. The commenter states that the widening of Highway 1 under the optimistically financed heading is not adequate. Fort Ord reuse will pay its fair share to mitigate impacts to regional roadways. As a general rule, the closer the regional roadway is to Fort Ord the higher the percentage that Fort Ord redevelopment will pay for improvements to a particular roadway. The farther the roadway is from Fort Ord, it stands to reason that the impact from Fort Ord redevelopment, as a percentage of total vehicle trips on the particular roadway, will drop. Therefore, the percentage of the fair share fee paid by future development at Fort Ord will drop. More specific information on the projected Fort Ord redevelopment fair share funding for various roadways is located in *Appendix B: Business and Operations Plan*, commencing on page 5-9. Also, refer to Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study (JHK 1997).

It is also important to point out that the EIR recognizes that Fort Ord redevelopment shall only be responsible for its fair share of the mitigations to transportation infrastructure and that, due to the lack of a regional funding mechanism to cover the costs of future transportation infrastructure, there will be a residual and significant unavoidable impact.

85-2. The commenter states that future transit needs necessitates intercounty coordination. The Reuse Plan and EIR are amended to reflect this comment.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Page 4-112: Add the following new programs:

Program A1-4: MST shall coordinate with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District to provide an integrated intercounty bus transit system.

Program A1-5: Existing rideshare programs shall be expanded to accommodate intercounty travel.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-85: Add the following new programs:

Program A1-4: MST shall coordinate with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District to provide an integrated intercounty bus transit system.

Program A1-5: Existing rideshare programs shall be expanded to accommodate intercounty travel.

85-3. The commenter states that the Final PEIR should reference the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County's (TAMC) rail studies and how future rail service might alleviate future traffic impacts.

TAMC is currently working on re-establishing the railroad service between Monterey and San Francisco that existed approximately 30 years ago. The extent that rail transit might alleviate future traffic impacts associated with the reuse of Fort Ord is speculative, though it is anticipated that it will be successful. No rail transit currently exists and it is uncertain how rail transit could benefit future redevelopment. The Reuse Plan addresses the rail transit issue on page 4-111 of the Reuse Plan (Volume II).

85-4. The commenter states that the EIR should be reviewed for consistency with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. This issue was addressed previously in comment 56-5.

Response to Letter 86

86-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 87

87-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 88

88-1. The commenter requests that the proposed project be limited to a population that existed at Fort Ord when the Army was present. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

88-2. The commenter would like to know how water, wastewater and trash disposal will be resolved pertaining to the proposed full buildout. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1. As it pertains to wastewater, refer to response to comment 82-8. As it pertains to trash disposal, this will be addressed through implementation of recycling programs as mandated by Assembly Bill 939 and discussed on page 4-40 of the EIR.

88-3. The commenter is concerned that transportation impacts are not adequately discussed in the EIR. Refer to response to comment 22-1, 56-3, 56-4 and 56-5.

88-4. The commenter would like to know who is responsible for the infrastructure required. Future development at Fort Ord will pay it fair share of all infrastructure requirements. This is discussed in detail in *Appendix B: Business and Operations Plan*.

88-5. The commenter requests that the EIR discuss cumulative impacts. The cumulative impacts discussion in the EIR (commencing on page 5-1) adequately discusses the necessary cumulative impacts as required by CEQA.

88-6. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan documents are inadequately prepared. The comment does not address any particular part of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

88-7. The commenter requests that FORA staff or an independent authority review the EIR for their professional judgment. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 89

89-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

89-2. The commenter is concerned about adequate discussion of impacts associated with development beyond the year 2015. As it pertains to water, the impacts pertaining to buildout development at Fort Ord have been addressed in more detail in response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to transportation issues, as the EIR states, beyond the year 2015 transportation forecasting could not go beyond 2015 because the regional land use forecasts (population and employment) from AMBAG were not available beyond 2015. To compensate for this, the transportation analysis beyond 2015 was approached through a qualitative extrapolation of the 2015 results.

89-3. The commenter would like to know where the 18,000 acre-feet of water come from. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

89-4. The commenter is interested in how wastewater treatment will be expanded. Refer to response to comment 82-8.

89-5. The commenter would like to know how future road widening would be funded. Funding would come from fees collected from Fort Ord redevelopment. The funding would only cover the fair share of Fort Ord redevelopment impacts on regional roadways. The on-going regional developments, which are not currently

required to mitigate their regional impacts, would result in many regional roadways not being mitigated. This is fully addressed in the EIR on page 4-86. Also, refer to response to comment 22-1.

89-6. The commenter would like to know why the Reuse Plan accommodates a larger population than was here before. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

89-7. The commenter would like to know if the Reuse Plan assumes a new Hatton Canyon roadway. Yes. It was determined that the Reuse Plan would have very little impact (on the order of less than 2 percent on Highway 1 south of Carpenter Street). However, with or without the Hatton Canyon project, there is no residual impact to other roadways impacted by Fort Ord.

89-8. The commenter would like to know how the Highway 1 corridor can be kept from being visually impacted without design guidelines. Refer to response to comment 68-2.

89-9. The commenter would like to know why there are no height limits on new buildings. Refer to response to comment 68-2.

89-10. The commenter would like to know if the Monterey Peninsula can absorb an increase in population by 72,000. Through the planning process and implementation of mitigations a population of 72,000 can be accommodate at the former military base.

89-11. The commenter would like to know if the Monterey Peninsula can absorb an additional 1,800 more hotel rooms and its tourists who do not worry about water conservation. Yes, and within the restraints of available water. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on water resources.

89-12. The commenter would like to know if the plan has factored in the existing hotel rooms and development currently under construction. The cumulative discussion in the EIR accommodates current and proposed projects.

89-13. The commenter would like to know if the Reuse Plan has taken into account the growth in the entire region. The cumulative discussion in the EIR accommodates current and proposed projects within the region.

89-14. The commenter states that when the Reuse Plan is adopted it will be "far harder, if not impossible, to modify". The EIR provides future CEQA review for proposed projects if they would result in specific conditions as outlined in section 1.3 of the EIR (page 1-3). Furthermore, SB 899 and SB 1600 put restrictions on local government's powers within the former Fort Ord territory and required local plan and zoning conformance with the Reuse Plan.

89-15. The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate a reduced project supported by a source of on-site, safe yield water only. Refer to response to comment 80-1.

As it pertains to safe yield, Refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to the EIR discussing only a population supported by a safe yield water supply, this is a matter for the FORA Board to consider. As it pertains to population growth at Fort Ord without exceeding the water and transportation resources and infrastructure, refer to Development and Resource Management Plan contained in response to comment 21-1. Also, the "No Project" alternative is provided in the EIR for the lead agency to consider.

Response to Letter 90

90-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

90-2. The commenter states the proposed project would use too much water. This is a subjective opinion and should be considered by the decision makers prior to making a decision on the Reuse Plan. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

90-3. The commenter states the proposed project would use 90 percent of the wastewater treatment plant. The treatment plant referred to by the commenter is the MRWPCA treatment plant. For additional information on wastewater issues Refer to response to comment 82-8.

90-4. The commenter states the Reuse Plan would severely impact peninsula highways. This issue was adequately addressed in the Draft EIR. Additional information on this issue is included in response to comment 22-1.

90-5. The commenter would like the EIR revised to reflect development at Fort Ord based on water resources that now exist at Fort Ord. The EIR will not be revised to accommodate this request. Future water for Fort Ord is provided through a contractual agreement between the U.S. Army and the MCWRA.

[Start August 7, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 91

91-1. The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate a reduced project supported by a source of on-site, safe yield water only. Refer to response to comment 89-15. Also, the "No Project" alternative is provided in the EIR for the lead agency to consider.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 92

92-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

92-2. The commenter would like to know why all the FORA board members are not present. The comments submitted at the August 7 hearing were later submitted to the Board for their review. In addition, the comments in this Final PEIR will be reviewed by the FORA Board.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 93

93-1. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water. As it pertains to growth inducement, refer to the Growth Inducing section of the EIR (page 5-10) for a discussion on this issue.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 94

94-1. The commenter is concerned about the potential environmental impacts associated with a desalination plant. The desalination plant is discussed in the EIR in the context of a long-term water source only. The exact potable water production of such a facility is speculative at this time because it is uncertain which of the long-term water sources would be preferred as a source of future water for the buildout of Fort Ord. Also, the level of analysis the commenter is requesting is not appropriate for a program level EIR, but is appropriate for a future desalination facility. In addition, refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on desalination.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 95

95-1. The commenter states that the proposed buildout population of 72,000 is not justified by the enabling legislation that created FORA as a means to economic recovery. The use of economic recovery as a means to justify a statement of overriding considerations will be challenged. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 96

96-1. The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate because it does not discuss the specific location of future groundwater recharge areas which would result in a reduction of the area for urban development. Water impoundment on Fort Ord in the context discussed in the EIR is now considered to be speculative at this time. There are currently other sources of water being studied that would provide for the buildout of Fort Ord. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 97

97-1. The commenter would like to know what are the groundwater policies. Refer to the policies contained in Section 4.4 and 4.5 of the EIR.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 98

98-1. The commenter is concerned with the transportation costs. As it pertains to transportation costs, the 800 million represents county-wide transportation infrastructure improvements needed with or without Fort Ord redevelopment.

98-2. The commenter is concerned with toxics and the timing of buildout. Future development cannot be built on areas of known unexploded ordnance and toxic materials.

98-3. The commenter would like to know what the percentage of the total population growth will be in the year 2015. It is expected that approximately 37,350 people would reside at the former military base in the year 2015.

98-4. The commenter would like to know if there is a smaller project alternative. The EIR discusses the "No Project" alternative. This alternative correctly assumes that without "reuse" there will remain populations associated with the UCMBEST Center, CSUMB and the Presidio of Monterey Annex.

98-5. The commenter would like to know if the cost of demolition will be partially paid by other peninsula cities. No. Costs will be borne by future residents of Fort Ord through land purchase costs and/or through federal funds.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 99

99-1. The commenter has stated that the information on the 180 and 400 foot aquifers is not up to date. The most current seawater intrusion information contained in the most current MCWRA's Water Resources Data Report is from the early 1980's.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 100

100-1. The commenter states that FORA is not mandated to exceed the population which existed at Fort Ord in 1991 (i.e., 31K). Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

The commenter states that the population figures and water figures are not proportional. The water figure used for full buildout in the EIR was 18,262 afy. This number is incorrect and should read "13,500 afy". Also, refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional water discussion.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 101

101-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 102

102-1. The commenter is requesting that each FORA Board member city provide an economic profile for the fiscal year preceding the closure of Fort Ord and for the most recent fiscal year to determine the need for "economic recovery". SB 899 does not state that the population of Fort Ord or economic activity associated with reuse be based on a "like for like" replacement. Therefore, the request for economic information at the level of detail requested is not appropriate. The level of detail included in the Reuse Plan is adequate for the proposed project definition and objectives and provides a level of information that is adequate for the decision makers to base their decision on. Refer to response to commenter letter 43-1 and 55-4 for additional information on SB 899.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 103

103-1. The commenter requests water information. The information requested is in the EIR commencing on page 4-36. Also, refer to response to

comment 8-5 regarding future water sources and 21-1 regarding growth-management vis-a-vis water resources.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 104

104-1. The commenter would like to know when BLM will take over. BLM has already received its property.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 105

105-1. The commenter states that Fort Ord is necessary for economic health of the community. The Reuse Plan is the conduit for base reuse and as such will provide job opportunities.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 106

106-1. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water. As it pertains to the EIR including an alternative discussion that uses a safe-yield water only, the safe yield is known to occur somewhere between "no pumping" and pumping 4,700 afy from Fort Ord wells (Corps of Engineers 1993). To determine what level of pumping from Fort Ord wells will result in seawater intrusion will require monitoring wells. The installation of wells will likely be the result of the Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) proposed to be included as part of Volume I of the Reuse Plan and currently contained in response to comment 21-1.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 107

107-1. The commenter would like additional information on the water storage facilities discussed in the EIR. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

107-2. The commenter would like to know if geologic studies have been done for the water storage facilities. The level of detail requested by the commenter is required at a future date for any water storage facilities proposed, thus assuring appropriate environmental impact analysis. It is not necessary, nor is it a requirement of CEQA that a Program Level EIR include this level of detail. The MCWRA is currently working on an environmental document for a proposed north Salinas Valley water storage facility. This report is expected to be released by the end of 1997. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 108

108-1. The commenter would like to know if more housing will be allocated to CSUMB. The Army has conveyed 1,253 residential units to the University and a portion of these units are currently occupied by staff, faculty and students. In addition, the campus has remodeled facilities on the central campus core for a limited number of dormitory units. The Reuse Plan accommodates a buildout capacity for the University that would total 3,093 residential units plus the equivalent of 5,100 residential units on the central campus core to house 80 percent of the projected 25,000 FTE.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 109

109-1. The commenter would like to know if the proposed Armstrong Ranch development will be allocated water in exchange for making land available for a reservoir. The planning for Armstrong Ranch is the responsibility of the City of Marina. A planned facility for reclaimed water is in the planning stages by the MRWPCA and MCWRA on the Armstrong Ranch (Airport Site). The alternatives under consideration include a 3,000 acre foot (af) surface reservoir or an aquifer storage and recovery field (i.e. recharge wells) (CH2MHILL 1996). The Reuse Plan does anticipate using reclaimed water provided from the MRWPCA.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 110

110-1. The commenter would like to know who will be paying for the land at Fort Ord. The Army has already conveyed substantial acres of land to the BLM, University of California, and California State University, and California Department of Parks and Recreation. Additional lands will be conveyed through Public Benefit Conveyances based on requested conveyances for approved public purposes. The remaining land will be conveyed by the Army subsequent to the adoption of the Reuse Plan and Certification of the EIR. The planned mechanism is an economic development conveyance (EDC) for parts or all of the remaining lands. FORA is currently investigating the preparation of an EDC application that will form the basis for the negotiating of terms for the land conveyance. If an EDC is not negotiated between the parties, the BRAC law provides for the property disposition by the Army through normal governmental procedures that can include direct sale.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 111

111-1. The commenter would like to know if future City of Marina plans for the coast will affect plans for coastal development within Fort Ord. There is no correlation between the two.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 112

112-1. The commenter would like to know how much water was allocated to the U.S. Army when they were at Fort Ord. The Army did not have any allocations imposed upon them. In 1991, the known water use was 4,700 afy. The average use between 1986 and 1989 was 5,100 when the population on the base was 31,986 (includes residents and employees). The peak water use year was 1984. Also, refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 113

113-1. The commenter would like to know what the impacts of future road construction will be on Reservation Road and Highway 68. Future road construction on Reservation Road is identified in the EIR to be six laning the period to 2015. Highway 68 would remain the same potentially, except there may be funding collected from private developments fronting Highway 68 and funding from county wide sources which could result in four-laning this roadway. In the case the Highway 68 by-pass is constructed, traffic flow on the existing Highway 68 would be expected to be reduced. Construction of the by-pass may reduce the need to expand Highway 68 to four-lanes.

113-2. The commenter would like to know what the off-site traffic impacts will be on the Peninsula. Transportation is adequately discussed in the EIR. Refer to the transportation section of the EIR. Also, Refer to response to comment 56-4.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 114

114-1. The commenter would like to know if the Reuse Plan is consistent with the County's 1,200 [actually 1,253 units] low and moderate income housing units set aside at Fort Ord. In 1992, the County Board of Supervisors voted to ensure that housing units in Fort Ord be retained as "permanently affordable" (Monterey County 1992). Subsequent to this resolution, the 1,253 units have been absorbed by the CSUMB for use as affordable faculty, staff, and student housing.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 115

115-1. The commenter would like specific information on current water use and water line loss conditions at Fort Ord. The EIR determines whether the proposed project may have a significant impact on the environment based on physical conditions that were present at the time the decision became final to close Fort Ord as a military base (September 1991). Refer to page 1-3 (section 1.2.2) in the EIR.

Existing development at Fort Ord uses approximately 1,700 acre feet of water per year from existing Fort Ord wells. Only non-military water users are currently metered. Current line loss is estimated at approximately 10 percent.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 116

116-1. The commenter is concerned that the water discussion is inadequate. Refer to response to comment 8-5. The conclusions made in the EIR

Response to Public Hearing Comment 117

117-1. The commenter would like to know why the proposed project with twice the population of alternative 6R would have fewer impacts to sensitive habitat. The response to this comment is located in the alternatives discussion on page 6-7 of the EIR.

117-2. The commenter would like to know why Alternative 6R fails to meet economic recovery when it provides approximately the same number of jobs as there were when Fort Ord was a military base. The EIR does not imply or state that Alternative 6R does not meet economic recovery. FORA has selected the proposed project with its population forecast of 72,000 at full build out as the preferred project. The FORA Board retains the option to select another alternative. Refer to response to comment 43-1.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 118

118-1. The commenter would like to know if the Army has expressed an intention to sell the lands at Fort Ord and which section of the BRAC law would allow the Army to do so. Refer to response to comment 110-1.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 119

119-1. The commenter would like information on a national cemetery. The Reuse Plan has been amended to accommodate cemetery uses. Refer to response to comment 44-1.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 120

120-1. The commenter would like to know who determined the “planning premises” for the Reuse Plan. The Draft Reuse Plan is a broad-based community

plan. The history of this community involvement is summarized in Volume I, Page 2-1 through 2-9) "Strategic Themes" were defined in the December 12, 1994 Interim Base Reuse Plan. Subsequent planning by FORA are reflected in the "Community Design Vision" on Pages 3-1 to 3-19. The implementation strategies for the former Fort Ord are described in section 3.11 of the Reuse Plan, Volume I Pages 3-147 and reflect consensus of the Administrative Committee as a basis for drafting the Reuse Plan for consideration of the FORA Board and public comment.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 121

121-1. The commenter is concerned with regional water problems. The project would not solve regional water problems which stem from overdraft and seawater intrusion. It has been determined that to solve these two problems distribution of reclaimed water and groundwater to those areas with overdraft and seawater intrusion is needed. This is currently underway in the form of reclaimed water (sewage converted into a usable water), new distribution lines, and new and expanded water storage facilities. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 122

122-1. The commenter states that the need to recover lost jobs will be used as a basis for an overriding consideration. The use of economic recovery as a means to justify a statement of overriding considerations will be challenged. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 123

123-1. The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate because it fails to provide alternatives that comply with the required reuse plan elements contained in SB 899. Senate Bill 1180 states that the lead agency may use an environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to federal law as the environmental impact report for a federal military base reuse plan. In this context, the EIR used the existing EIS's alternatives and included a CEQA mandated "No Project" alternative. Also, Refer to response to comment 27-3.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 124

124-1. The commenter would like to know how many acre-feet per year could be taken from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin within the Fort Ord political jurisdiction which would not result in overdraft or seawater intrusion. Safe yield extraction of water is a function of the gradient of groundwater relative to seawater,

the amount extracted and other environmental factors. The MCWRA is currently addressing the problem with a long term commitment to water recharge in north Salinas Valley. This would influence the wells at Fort Ord because they are integral to the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. Based on the Fort Ord Disposal and Reuse EIS, the safe yield is known to be at a level less than 4,700 afy. The exact level of water extraction that would result in "safe yield" is not currently known. Future water use will be based on a safe yield water extraction from area wells. This will be assured through implementation of the Development and Resource Management Plan discussed in response to comment 21-1. Also, Refer to response to comment 8-5 for an expanded discussion on long-term water sources and their potential impacts.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 125

125-1. The commenter does not approve of the proposed project because of water and transportation problems. The intent of the Reuse Plan and the EIR is to provide adequate and necessary infrastructure to accommodate future development at Fort Ord.

[End August 7, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 126

126-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

126-2. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan contains speculative "assumptions". Without knowing specifically what it is the commenter is referring to a meaningful response cannot be provided. However, it is anticipated that through preparation of the response to comments the commenters concerns are addressed.

Response to Letter 127

127-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 128

128-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 129

129-1. The commenter is concerned with new development and loss of open space in light of water supply problems. The Reuse Plan provides for adequate water infrastructure and sets aside 62 percent of the former military base for habitat management. The beach area (Fort Ord Dunes State Park) and the golf courses (existing and proposed) comprise an additional 10 percent of the base that will be preserved as open space.

Response to Letter 130

130-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended and would like Fort Ord developed to include a national cemetery, as well as facilities for the indigents and the homeless. As it pertains to the public review period, refer to response to comment 5-1. As it pertains to a national cemetery, refer to response to comment 44-1. There are federal, state and locally funded organizations that have used the McKinney Act to obtain existing housing at the former Fort Ord through Public Benefit Conveyances for use by the indigent and the homeless.

Response to Letter 131

131-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 132

132-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

[Start August 9, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 133

133-1. The commenter states that the EIR should consider a safe yield alternative. The proposed project is subject to a safe yield water source whereby seawater intrusion is in abeyance. Refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 134

134-1. The commenter states without submitting any particulars that the EIR is incomplete and inadequate. Because there is no specific comment to the Reuse Plan or the EIR, no specific response can be provided. However, it is anticipated that the Final EIR adequately addresses all the issues.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 135

135-1. The commenter supports the previous two comments. No response necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 136

136-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 137

137-1. The commenter agrees with the previous comment. No response necessary.

[End August 9, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 138

138-1. The commenter is requesting that each FORA Board member city provide an economic profile for the fiscal year preceding the closure of Fort Ord and for the most recent fiscal year to determine the need for "economic recovery". Refer to response 102-1.

138-2. The commenter also states that economic recovery should not be used by the FORA Board as a basis for a statement of overriding considerations. Refer to response to comment 43-1, 55-4 and 95-1.

Response to Letter 139

139-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

139-2. The commenter states that the EIR must be revised to address environmental impacts such as water systems and road projects. The Final EIR

addresses these issues in more detail. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on water supply, and refer to the Development and Resource Management Plan vis-a-vis water resources and transportation infrastructure discussion in response to comment letter 21-1.

139-3. The commenter states that the EIR fails to address a reasonable range of alternatives because the alternatives cannot meet the requirements set forth in SB 899. Also, refer to response to commenter letters 43-1, 55-4.

139-4. The commenter would like additional information on the stated project objective (EIR, page 3-2) to accommodate regional growth. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

139-5. The commenter would like additional information on "aggregate totals" and "not to exceed envelopes". The comment is evidently addressing the EIR but is not specific enough to allow a response. No response is feasible.

139-6. The commenter would like additional information on asbestos and lead contamination clean up. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

139-7. The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate. It is anticipated that after completion of the Final EIR that all environmental issues will have been adequately discussed.

139-8. The commenter requests that the CSUMB master plan be included in the Reuse Plan EIR. The CSUMB master plan is being independently produced by CSUMB and is not available at this time because it has not been completed. If the reader would like to see the CSUMB document, it will be necessary for the reader to obtain this document independently of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and EIR.

139-9. The commenter states that CalTrans needs an alternative Highway 68 alignment. There is such an easement included in Reuse Plan and EIR graphics as well as reference to it in the EIR text. Refer to response to comment 40-1.

139-10. The commenter would like to know if the plan is consistent with the coastal act. Refer to response to comment 55-12.

139-11. The commenter states that there are no accurate estimate for demolition costs. Refer to response to comment 8-1.

139-12. The commenter states that the density limits are not acceptable. It is assumed that the commenter means that the densities are too high. The densities proposed in the Reuse Plan for the various residential types of land use (low, medium and high density) reflect market demand as well as the need to provide a variety of housing types for a broad range of incomes. Furthermore, there are also other factors involved in densities. For example, providing higher residential densities provides a larger number of potential transit riders and supports a more efficient transportation system. Activities located closer together facilitate mode

shifts from automobiles to walking, biking and transit. Activities located spatially closer together reduce travel distances.

139-13. The commenter would like more information on “economic recovery” as a project objective. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

139-14. The commenter requests that the design guidelines be included in the EIR. The EIR does contain visual guidelines that are contained in the Reuse Plan commencing on page 4-147 of the EIR. Also, refer to response to comment 68-2.

139-15. The commenter would like more information on growth inducing impacts. Without a more specific request, a specific response cannot be provided. The discussion in the EIR on growth inducing impacts is adequate for the decision makers to base their decision on.

139-16. The commenter would like more information on the discrepancy in growth projections between the EIR, AMBAG and historic. The reader is referred to section 2.2 in Volume I (Context and Framework) where there is a discussion of projections. Also, Refer to response to comment 55-4. In general, forecasts are based on economic studies and historic activity. Often, they will conflict with other projections because of the methodology used and the time they are developed. They are meant as planning tools so that planning can proceed with relative accuracy.

139-17. The commenter would like more information about height limits. Refer to response to comment 68-2.

139-18. The commenter would like more information on the number of hotel units currently in the planning stages in the Monterey Bay area. It is uncertain what purpose this information would have. The information requested is construed to not serve the intent of the CEQA process. Therefore, the information is not provided.

139-19. The commenter would like information on baseline data. Because the nature of the comment is vague, no specific response can be provided. Baseline data is included in the Fort Ord EIS and SEIS as well as the DEIR. However, it is anticipated that through preparation of the Final PEIR, the baseline data will be complete.

139-20. The commenter would like more information on inclusionary housing and use of “zones” for “group homes.” The Reuse Plan is a “general plan” level document that identifies a “permitted range of uses for land uses.” See Table 3.4-1. Zoning for the lands within Fort Ord is the responsibility of the land use agencies, specifically the County of Monterey, the City of Monterey and the City of Seaside.

139-21. The commenter would like information on internal inconsistencies. Because the nature of the comment is vague, no specific response can be provided. However, it is anticipated that through preparation of the Final PEIR, the internal inconsistencies will no longer be.

139-22. The commenter would like more information on land sales. Because the nature of the comment is vague, no specific response can be provided.

139-23. The commenter states that the EIR uses 10,000 acres whereas the Army built on 5,000 acres. The commenter is referring to the acreage to be used for urban uses as a result of project implementation. Review of Table 3.3-1 in Volume I indicates that the total square footage of future development (including CSUMB, POM, Housing, Business Park, Light Industrial, Office, R&D, Retail, Visitor Serving, and road rights-of-way) equals to approximately 8,686 acres.

139-24. The commenter would like more information on the landfill site. The landfill is currently part of the city of Marina and is proposed for a golf course and equestrian center. Refer to figure 4.3-1 in Volume II of the Reuse Plan. For a golf course to exist on the landfill site will require re-engineering and reconstruction of the landfill lens cap to accommodate vegetation typically associated with a golf course, primarily trees (Dave Eisen, pers. com., February 25, 1997).

139-25. The commenter states that mitigation measures should not be confused with the project. It cannot be determined what is meant by this comment.

139-26. The commenter would like more information on "newly excessed parcels". Property has been turned over to UC, CSU and the city of Seaside. The Reuse Plan identifies the major lands that have already been conveyed by the Army. These are described in section 2.4.3 PBC, EDC Process, Volume I, beginning on Page 2-36. Additional parcels will be disposed as described in the Reuse Plan. For example, the City of Seaside has recently gained title to the two existing golf courses.

139-27. The commenter states that the "no project" alternative could result in 34,000 residents requiring 9,000 afy of water. The population number is correct, however, the water figure is incorrect and should read "6,067 afy". The wastewater demand figure changes as well. Refer to the following Changes to the EIR section.

Changes to the EIR

Page 6-19. Amend last sentence in first full paragraph to read as follows:

The demand for water would be approximately 6,067 9,346 afy, and the amount of wastewater generated would be approximately 4.85 5.80 mgd.

139-28. The commenter would like to know what the expenses would be associated with moving the POM. No detailed estimate has been made to move the Presidio of Monterey Annex. Specific financing plans have not been prepared for every potential project. In broad terms, however, the costs will be related to the difference between rebuilding approximately 1,590 existing units less the land value that can be attributed to the property vacated by the Presidio Annex. The land value will be determined in subsequent applications and negotiations with the Army.

139-29. The commenter would like information on phasing. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

139-30. The commenter would like more information on the “Planned Development Mixed Use Districts”. The information presented in Volumes 1 and 2 are adequate for the decision makers to make a decision on. Refer to these two volumes as it pertains to the “Planned Development Mixed Use Districts”.

139-31. The commenter states that the policies and programs are not legally enforceable. The Draft Reuse Plan includes programs and policies for adoption as the General Plan provisions for the former Fort Ord for the County of Monterey, the City of Marina, and the City of Seaside. The Reuse Plan illustrates the adoption process in the Implementation Chapter of Volume I of the Reuse Plan, beginning on Page 3-147. As provided in SB 899, the local jurisdictions will be able to establish the responsibilities for land use approvals when they have adopted General Plan provisions for their respective portions of the former fort Ord and when FORA has certified that the General Plan provisions are consistent with the Reuse Plan. This internal consistency will provide the basis for enforceable policies and programs.

139-32. The commenter states that the program EIR is misused in this case. Refer to response to comment 16-3.

139-33. The commenter states that the EIR lacks feasible and reasonable alternatives. Refer to response to comment 27-3.

139-34. The commenter states the EIR omitted cumulative projects. The list of projects in Table 5.1-1 on page 5-1 of the EIR is complete.

139-35. The commenter would like more information on recycled water. The wastewater will be conveyed to the wastewater treatment plant north of Marina where it will be treated and discharged through the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project pipelines, or, in the case that the Marina Coast Water District is delegated responsibility as Fort Ord’s wastewater agency, the effluent flow from Fort Ord (and Marina) would be returned to Fort Ord and Marina as reclaimed water for use on golf courses and landscaping.

139-36. The commenter would like more information on the importance of SB 899. Refer to page 1-1 and 2-1 in the EIR as well as page 1-3 in the Business and Operations Plan.

139-37. The commenter would like more information on school siting. Figure 3.2-1 of the EIR indicates where schools and universities will be located.

139-38. The commenter would like more information pertaining to seismic hazards. The general seismic hazards are discussed in the Reuse Plan (Volume II) in the Soils and Geology section (pages 4-145 to 4-158). The EIR also contains a discussion of soils and geology at Fort Ord in section 4.3 (pages 4-27 to 4-36). More specific information is not required at this program level.

139-39. The commenter would like more information on the “shared revenue stream”. This line item in the Draft Comprehensive Business Plan refers to the moneys available to off-set the potential fiscal deficits accumulated in the individual jurisdictions within the former Fort Ord boundaries attributable to development at Fort Ord.

139-40. The commenter would like more information on the peculiarities and conflicts associated with spheres of influence. Refer to response to comment 57-17.

139-41. The commenter states that a stable and finite project description is lacking. Without a more specific comment a specific response cannot be provided. However, it is anticipated that through the Final PEIR a full project description would exist.

139-42. The commenter would like more information on the characteristics of dune outfall pipe relating to stormwater runoff. Stormwater quality is adequately discussed in the Reuse Plan (volume 2) commencing on page 4-158. Policies and programs are established to protect water quality, especially Monterey Bay.

139-43. The commenter would like more information regarding the sale of land by the Army without a local reuse plan in place. The U.S. Army has and will continue to sell land or deed it over to government agencies regardless of a Fort Ord Reuse Plan. For example, the sale of the golf courses to the city of Seaside and deeding over of properties to the city of Marina (Fritzsche Field), UC (area around Fritzsche Field) and CSUMB for their Monterey Bay campus has already occurred. Furthermore, this situation reflects the “no project” alternative discussed in the EIR.

139-44. The commenter would like more information on the subject of toxics. Refer to response to comment 55-8 for information on lead on the beach and response to public hearing comment 136-6. Also, the EIR discusses issues pertaining to toxics in the Public Health and Safety section (4.6).

139-45. The commenter would like more information on the impacts associated with future roadway projects. Refer to response to comment 56-4.

139-46. The commenter would like the UC Master plan included in the EIR. As was stated above in response to comment 139-8, it is not required that a master plan of a state agency with jurisdiction within FORA jurisdiction be integrated into the overall Fort Ord Reuse Plan and EIR. A summary of the Draft Master Plan, including four figures, is provided in the DEIR, beginning on page 4-157.

139-47. The commenter would like more information on unexploded ordnance. Besides the information included in section 4.6 of the EIR, the commenter is referred to response to comment 32-1.

139-48. The commenter would like more information on undevelopable areas at Fort Ord. It is assumed that the commenter is referring to areas with unexploded ordnance. This area, approximately 8,000 acres of the approximately 15,000 acres

conveyed to the Bureau of Land Management, will be cleaned of its unexploded ordnance and converted to usable open space. Also, refer to response to comment 32-1.

139-49. The commenter would like more information relating to wastewater treatment capacity. Refer to response to comment 82-8 for a discussion on wastewater treatment.

139-50. The commenter would like more information on future water sources. Refer to response to comment 8-5 with respect to water supply and response to comment 21-1 as it pertains to management of development and resources.

139-51. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended and that a revised EIR be prepared. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 140

140-1. The commenter would like a project alternative included in the EIR that includes a project based on safe yield water use only. This issue is addressed in the Safe Yield Water Supply discussion in response to commenter 8-5. Also, refer to response to comments 43-1, 55-4 and 123-1.

Response to Letter 141

141-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 142

142-1. The commenter states that the EIR does not prove that economic dislocation has occurred. There is no federal or state requirement that a base reuse plan or a general plan prove that economic dislocation occurs. The nature of a reuse plan and a general plan is to fulfill the requirements of state law pertaining to long term planning documents. The estimate of jobs lost on the Peninsula with the closing of the former Army Base is summarized in Volume I of the Reuse Plan, Page 2-14. Also, refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

142-2. The commenter states the EIR does not take into account the recession/depression that occurred at the time of base closure and has continued until recently. There is no federal or state requirement that an EIR take into account such concerns. Economic effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects

on the environment, unless the effects result in physical changes to the environment. The EIR includes an economic discussion commencing on page 4-20.

142-3. The commenter states that Vol. 1 of the Reuse Plan contradicts numerous studies and articles referenced in the Monterey Herald newspaper over the last 4 years. The information in Vol. 1 of the Reuse Plan is based on the discipline of economic analyses that relies on a wide array of statistics gathered by local agencies and the State of California. The commenter is referred to the "Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan," (SKMG 1995).

142-4. The commenter states that the EIR is not objective in its presentation of economic issues. The commenter submits an opinion on the EIR. The economic analysis contained in the EIR is considered to be adequate for the decision makers to base their decision on. Also, refer to response to comment 138-1.

142-5. The commenter repeats comment one above.

142-6. The commenter states that a program EIR is too general. Refer to response to comment 16-3.

142-7. The commenter is requesting an alternatives discussion that includes a project based on safe yield water use only. As it pertains to alternatives and safe yield water supply, Refer to response to comment 8-5, 21-1, and 27-3.

142-8. The commenter would like more information on water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

142-9. The commenter would like more information on aesthetics and viewsheds. Refer to the Reuse Plan, Volume I, pages 3-8 to 3-20 and Section 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10 in Volume I (commencing on page 3-103). Also, refer to response to comment 68-2.

142-10. The commenter would like more information on potential future development on the east and west side of Highway 101. Development in this area is outside the physical impact area of Fort Ord, therefore, it is not relevant to the proposed project. The regional models used in the DEIR analyses such as economic growth, traffic projections and air quality impacts utilize the adopted growth assumptions for these areas provided by AMBAG.

142-11. The commenter would like more information on transportation mitigations. Based on previous comments submitted, this comment is interpreted to refer to the potential impacts associated with transportation mitigations. Refer to response to comment 56-4.

142-12. The commenter would like more information on growth. Without more specific information a specific response cannot be provided. However, as it is

presented in the EIR, the growth inducement discussion is adequate for the decision makers to base a decision on.

142-13. The commenter would like more information on economic development. The information presented in the EIR is adequate for the decision makers to base a decision on. Furthermore, the decision makers have the economic information contained in Volume I and Appendix B (Business and Operations Plan) of the Reuse Plan to base their decision on.

142-14. The commenter states that the cumulative impacts analysis in the EIR is inadequate. The cumulative impacts discussion in the EIR is adequate for the decision makers to base their decision on. Without more specific request for information from the commenter, a more specific response cannot be provided.

142-15. The commenter states that the EIR does not adequately discuss the implications and impacts of the creation of many legal lots of record. The Program EIR is based on the fact that there will be future subdivision and reuse of the base. Without more specific request for information from the commenter, a more specific response cannot be provided.

142-16. The commenter would like an executive summary. The EIR contains a summary. Refer to response to comment 17-2.

142-17. The commenter states that the lack of easy availability of the EIR seems to violate the intent of CEQA. The commenter has stated an opinion based on her interpretation of CEQA section 15087(e). FORA distributed the Reuse Plan and EIR to all local libraries for a period of 133 days (June 1, 1996 to October 11, 1996). Though there was only one set of the Reuse Plan and EIR available at each library, the length of time they were available to the public would adequately meet the intent of CEQA. Regardless, FORA will make available five copies of the Final PEIR for public review at each of the libraries used as a repository for the Draft EIR.

Response to Letter 143

143-1. The commenter would like more information on water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

143-2. The commenter would like to know if the Monterey Peninsula can accommodate an additional 57 percentage increase in population. Through the planning process and implementation of mitigations prescribed in the EIR, a buildout population of 72,000, and a projected population of 37,400 by the year 2015 can be accommodated at the former military base.

143-3. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 144

144-1. The commenter would like more information on water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

144-2. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 145

145-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 146

146-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 147

147-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

[Start August 12, 1996 Marina public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 148

148-1. The commenter would like more information on vocational service relative to housing development. There is no vocational service proposed as part of the Reuse Plan. This would be an issue for the City of Marina to discuss and perhaps act upon at a later date and after approval of a reuse plan.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 149

149-1. The commenter states that Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) at Marina would excel in occupational training. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 150

150-1. The commenter supports keeping some large lots at Fort Ord as in Marina. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 151

151-1. The commenter states that the 20-year plan water infrastructure may need to be scaled down because of cost. The water infrastructure system must be in place in order to accommodate future development. If funding is limited and portions of the system are constructed, this will dictate the number of units and commercial square footage that would be able to be supported.

[End August 12, 1996 Marina public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 152

152-1. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

152-2. The commenter would like to know how much water is currently needed for properties that have already been conveyed. Current water consumption at Fort Ord is estimated to be approximately 1,700 afy. The "No-Project" Alternative in the DEIR is a close surrogate for Reuse of the lands that have already been conveyed. The water demand is estimated to be 6,067 afy. The commenter is referred to comment 139-27.

152-3. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development.

152-4. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for a discussion on safe yield water use.

152-5. The commenter would like more current information on economic conditions. Refer to response to commenter letter 138-1, 142-1, 142-2 and 142-3 for a discussion on economic issues.

Response to Letter 153

153-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 154

154-1. The commenter states that the transit facilities are not correctly depicted in the text or graphics. Refer to response to comment 2-1.

154-2. The commenter states that transit service funding has and is being cut back by the federal government, therefore a new source of funding will be required to provide transit service at Fort Ord. The Reuse plan distinguishes between capital costs and operations and maintenance costs for the provision of transit services at Fort Ord. The Public Facilities Implementation Plan and Public Services Plan in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan provide for the financing of the capital improvements anticipated to support transit at Fort Ord through the 2015 period. The transportation nexus analysis in the PFIP, establishes a total of \$3,800,000 in capital improvements for the "intermodal centers" on Fort Ord. In addition, the PSP, establishes a nexus of \$4,950,000 for the purchase of 15 buses as part of the capital expenditures required to support transit. The Reuse Plan does not address the financing of operations and maintenance. This is traditionally the responsibility of Monterey-Salinas Transit. Funds for transit operations and maintenance are derived through a combination of sources including federal Section 9 funds, State Transit Assistance (STA) and Transit Development Act (TDA) funds, and farebox revenues.

The recently completed "Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study" (JHK 1997), suggests that there is an unfunded shortfall of \$76 million for the district through the 2015 period for operations and maintenance. This amount is broken down into "Fort Ord Development" and "Other Development". Of the total O&M shortfall, MST figures indicate that Fort Ord development is responsible for \$38.5 million. Refer to Table 7-5, Page 7-14 in the JHK report. It is a policy decision for the FORA Board to consider whether to contribute to the funding of MST operations and maintenance. Also, refer to response to comment 22-1 for additional information on transportation funding.

Policy Consideration

Appendix B. PFIP and PSP. The FORA Board shall consider whether to establish policy to contribute to the funding of operations and maintenance for MST.

Regardless of FORA funding its share of MST O&M, there will remain a significant environmental impact because the funding of MST O&M would be short \$37.5 million as a result of "Other Development". Refer to the following Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-82. Add the following to the list of Significance Criteria:

“result in the need for new or altered transit services that are not funded in their entirety”.

Page 4-91. Add the following new impact discussion.

Impact: Increased Demand for Transit Services.

The reuse of Fort Ord will increase the demand for transit services. However, FORA intends only to fund capital facilities such as new buses, a new transit center and two new park and ride lots. FORA does not propose to fund MST operations and maintenance. Based on MST information, this would leave MST with an unfunded \$37.5 million operations deficit associated with Fort Ord development.

O&M funding for transit agencies is traditionally the responsibility of the transit agency. Funds for transit operations and maintenance are derived through a combination of sources including federal Section 9 funds, State Transit Assistance (STA) and Transit Development Act (TDA) funds, and farebox revenues.

In the event that FORA did contribute towards MST O&M funding, there would remain an outstanding unfunded amount associated with regional development.

Since FORA cannot assure that funding will be obtained to support adequate transit services, even with funding of capital facilities, this impact should be considered significant and unavoidable.

Page 5-6. Amend the last sentence in section 5.1.7 to read as follows:

“The cumulative impact of demands on the regional roadway network and transit operations and maintenance is considered to be significant unavoidable, since funding for all off-site improvements and transit maintenance and operations cannot be assured”.

Page 5-14. Add the following to the next to the last list of bullet statements:

- Impact of unfunded transit operations and maintenance

Page 5-14. Add the following to the last list of bullet statements.

- Cumulative impacts on transit services

154-3. The commenter states the Public Facilities Implementation Plan does not address transit service needs in the same manner as it addresses regional

roadway improvements vis-a-vis assigning the costs of roadway improvements to the reuse of Fort Ord. The commenter also requests that operating costs deficiencies should be included in the Public Services Plan. The commenter notes that MST has identified a number of deficiencies in their service area including providing service to and from Fort Ord. The commenter also notes that the life of a transit coach is twelve years and replacement coaches must be programmed into the capital improvement plan for Fort Ord. As it pertains to funding transit O&M, the EIR concludes that impacts to transit O&M is significant and unavoidable. Refer to response to comment 154-2.

154-4. The commenter points out that the Reuse Plan is partial to discussion of streets and road but leaves out a similar discussion pertaining to transit. The commenter suggests a bus operations plan should be prepared for the Reuse Plan. The Reuse Plan is a general plan level document that includes a draft CIP to address the anticipated capital improvements through the year 2015. A more detailed transit operation plan including bus operations would not be necessary in the Reuse Plan and would be futile in addressing specific MST issues at this time because transit issues could change in the future, thus negating some elements of a discussion.

154-5. The commenter states that the discussion of park and ride lots should specifically identify the two locations where MST plans to develop park and ride lots. The commenter also states that additional park and ride lots should be developed throughout Fort Ord where appropriate. Refer to response to comment 2-1.

154-6. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan discusses parking management but fails to endorse it. Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan contains a Transportation Demand Management Policy and Programs (page 4-117) which address this concern. The EIR also uses the policy and programs to mitigate impacts (page 4-85).

154-7. The commenter would like the Marina design objectives on page 3-103 of Volume I to include a language promoting the use of the park and ride facility which is planned for the corner of Imjin Road and 12th Street.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-108. Add the following objective:

7. Promote the use of the Park and Ride facility which is planned for development at the corner of Imjin Road and 12th Street.

154-8. The commenter would like the Marina design objectives on page 3-108 of Volume I to include language that encourages the use of and compliment the Fort Ord Transportation Center at First Avenue and Fifth Street.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-111. Add the following objective:

8. Create uses which encourage the use of and compliment the Fort Ord Transportation Center at First Avenue and Fifth Street.

154-9. The commenter would like the CSUMB design objectives on page 3-118 of Volume I to include language that encourages the use of alternate transportation by providing convenient and direct transit access to campus activity centers.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-118. Add the following objective:

2. Encourage the use of alternate transportation by providing convenient and direct transit access to campus activity centers.

154-10. The commenter would like the Marina design objectives on page 3-103 of Volume I to include a language promoting the use of the park and ride facility which is planned for the corner of Gigling Road and Eighth Avenue.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-124. Add the following objective:

6. Promote the use of the Park and Ride Facility which is planned for development at the corner of Gigling Road and Eighth Avenue.

154-11. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan (Volume I, page 3-149) contain a more balanced view of all circulation components, not just roadway improvements to increase single occupancy vehicle use, especially as it relates to the preparation of phasing scenarios. The phasing scenarios referred to in the comment reflect the overall financial implications of alternative development patterns. As such they are more sensitive to the major cost factors resulting from roadway construction and the effect of these costs on the bottom line. However, the commenter's request is not inconsistent with the overall approach to circulation taken in the preparation of the Reuse Plan.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-149. Circulation Factors, insert the following at the end of the bulleted paragraph:

as well as the pattern of development mix and density that can support efficient transit operations;

154-12. The commenter points out that the circulation strategy discussion on page 3-150 of the Reuse Plan needs to include more comprehensive discussion of all circulation issues. The commenter is referred to response to comment 154-11.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-150. Circulation Strategy, insert the following at the end of the bulleted paragraph:

- 6) promote a development mix and pattern that will support efficient transit operations and specifically concentrate trip-ends along the multimodal corridor.

154-13. The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-31 of Volume II of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program, which would state that the City of Marina shall encourage the development of an integrated street pattern for new developments which provides linkages to the existing street network and discourages cul-de-sac's or dead-end streets The Reuse Plan includes Air Quality Program A-3.1 (Volume II, page 4-213) which addresses this issue.

154-14. The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-36 of Volume II of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program, which would state that the City of Seaside shall encourage the development of an integrated street pattern for new developments which provides linkages to the existing street network and discourages cul-de-sac's or dead-end streets.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-37. add program E-1.3

Program E-1.3: The City of Seaside shall encourage the development of an integrated street pattern for new developments which provides linkages to the existing street network and discourages cul-de-sac's or dead-end streets.

154-15. The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-41 of Volume II of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program, which would state that the County Monterey shall encourage the development of an integrated street pattern for new developments which provides linkages to the existing street network and discourages cul-de-sac's or dead-end streets.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-41. add program E-1.3.

Program E-1.3: The County of Monterey shall encourage the development of an integrated street pattern for new developments which provides linkages to the existing street network and discourages cul-de-sac's or dead-end streets.

154-16. The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-52 of Volume II of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program, which would allow the City of Marina to increase densities of up to ten percent for projects which promote the use of alternate transportation as evidenced by the inclusion of some or all of the following: provision of bus turn-outs, provision of bus shelters, provision of bicycle lockers, secure bicycle racks, showers, and development and implementation of employee trip reduction programs. The commenter's concerns are already addressed in the Reuse Plan, Volume I, Page 4-111 with transit Program A-1.2.

154-17. The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-55 of Volume II of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program, which would allow the City of Seaside to increase densities of up to ten percent for projects which promote the use of alternate transportation as evidenced by the inclusion of some or all of the following: provision of bus turn-outs, provision of bus shelters, provision of bicycle lockers, secure bicycle racks, showers, and development and implementation of employee trip reduction programs. The commenter is referred to response to comment 154.16.

154-18. The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-59 of Volume II of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program, which would allow the County of Monterey to increase densities of up to ten percent for projects which promote the use of alternate transportation as evidenced by the inclusion of some or all of the following: provision of bus turn-outs, provision of bus shelters, provision of bicycle lockers, secure bicycle racks, showers, and development and implementation of employee trip reduction programs. The commenter is referred to response to comment 154.16.

154-19. The commenter points out that the RIDES Paratransit program currently provides service from 7:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m., not from 10:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. as stated on page 4-103 in Volume II.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-108. Amend the last line on the page to read as follows:

"... life-equipped vans Monday through Friday between 7:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. ~~10:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m.~~ ..."

154-20. The commenter points out that the figure on page 4-110 of Volume II of the Reuse Plan - *Transit Activity Centers and Corridors*, incorrectly depicts the proposed MST transit center to be at First Avenue and Eighth Street. It should be shown at the intersection of First Avenue and Fifth Street. The commenter also points out that the park and ride lots are not indicated and could enhance the diagram. Refer to response to comment 2-1.

154-21. The commenter points out that there should be more transit activity centers shown on figure 4.2-5 in Volume II of the Reuse Plan. The consultant concurs, it should be shown on the figure. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

154-22. The commenter would like the Key Transit Corridors in Figure 4.2-5 in Volume II to include additional roadways. The roadways recommended for inclusion include First Avenue, Gigling Road between North-South road and Eighth Avenue, Monterey Road, Reservation Road between Del Monte Blvd. and Blanco Road, and Inter-Garrison Road between the main CSUMB Campus and the CSUMB housing area. This level of bus corridor planning is premature and may not be responsive to the phasing requirements of development. This level of detail is more appropriate to bus operation master plans. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

154-23. The commenter would like to know if the program language included in section 4.2.3.3 - *Transit Policies and Program*, pertaining to "support" is financial or "moral" support. If it is the case that it is moral support, then the activity centers, corridors and bus stop facilities identified in the Reuse Plan programs cannot be implemented by MST. FORA's PFIP indicates a capital improvement of approximately \$9,000,000 for transit capital costs through the 2015 period. Also, refer to response to comment 154-2.

154-24. The commenter is disappointed that the EIR concludes that there would be an unavoidable significant impact relative to traffic and circulation. The commenter believes that his agency would be able to provide the necessary service that would result in mitigating the impact. Therefore, the commenter requests that the role of transit in ameliorating regional impacts be clarified.

The commenter is implying that MST could reduce the impact of regional transportation deficiencies. Based on the historical mode splits which are integrated into the 2015 transportation model run, this is highly unlikely due to the public's preference for driving their vehicles. Also, based on the historical mode split between vehicles and alternative transportation, the EIR takes a conservative

approach to transportation planning and assumes no change in the LOS of regional roadways as a result of implementing expanded transit service to Fort Ord.

Also, FORA provides fair-share funding for future transportation projects and provides land uses which promote the use of alternative modes of transportation. The plan is established on historical mode splits which were used in the model. Therefore, the transportation analysis reflects a worst case scenario and not an optimistic transit use that exceeds 2 percent. Also, as it pertains to transit operations and maintenance, refer to response to comment 154-2.

154-25. The commenter implies that the regional mode split assumptions used in the traffic analysis could in fact be worse (i.e., more vehicle trips on area roadways) unless adequate funding is provided to allow necessary expansion of transit services at the same rate overall as vehicle trips increase. The Reuse Plan funds for 15 new buses and a variety of transit facilities (capital facilities) to be funded by base-wide fees. It is not anticipated that this would result in an increase or decrease in the historical ridership. It is likely that college students will use transit more than other segments of the community. Also, refer to response to comment 154-2.

154-26. The commenter states that the Fort Ord transportation infrastructure will fail to deliver the adequate service unless adequate funding is provided for transit service. Refer to response to comment 154-2 and 154-24.

154-27. The commenter states that the coordinating efforts described in Policy A-1 on page 4-84 of the EIR can only work if funding is available to provide transit services. Refer to response to comment 154-2 and 154-24.

154-28. The commenter requests that Table 4.7-2 in the EIR be amended to include regional transit capital improvements information. The capital cost allocation indicated corresponds to that costs included in the PFIP of the Reuse Plan representing \$5,000,000. The PFIP projection is \$4,950,000. The table will be added to the EIR to reflect the back-up to this calculation.

154-29. The commenter states that the life of a transit coach is twelve years and accordingly this must be reflected into the capital improvement plan. The CIP does not include a replacement schedule for buses. The CIP, however, will be annually updated by FORA and this information could be included.

154-30. The commenter points out that the traffic and circulation section of the EIR includes figures depicting the transportation network for the year 2015 and full buildout, but does not include a figure showing the proposed transit network. The commenter is referred to response to comment 154-22.

Changes to the EIR

Add table "Regional Transit Capital Improvements"

TABLE 4.7-2A

Regional Transit Capital Improvements (in thousands)

<u>Capital Improvements</u>	<u>Capital Cost for Bus Acquisition</u>	<u>Percentage Allocated to Fort Ord</u>	<u>Capital Cost Allocated to Fort Ord</u>
<u>Route Coverage</u>			
<u>One bus for service to Hidden Hills, Laguna Seca, San Benancio and Corral de Tierra along Highway 68</u>	<u>\$330</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>\$66</u>
<u>One bus for developments along Highway 156 between Castroville and Prunedale</u>	<u>330</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>99</u>
<u>Monterey Peninsula Airport and Laguna Seca on Sundays</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Two buses for direct service Monterey to Watsonville</u>	<u>660</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>264</u>
<u>Two buses for direct service Monterey to San Benito County</u>	<u>660</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>198</u>
<u>Service Hours</u>			
<u>Earlier Weekend Service</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>Service Frequencies</u>			
<u>Two buses for additional service on Line 20: Salinas-Monterey</u>	<u>660</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>264</u>
<u>Two buses for additional service on Line 21: Salinas-Monterey</u>	<u>660</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>132</u>
<u>Facilities</u>			
<u>Operations and Maintenance Facility</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>50</u>

Source: Monterey-Salinas Transit

Response to Letter 155

155-1. The commenter states the EIR does not adequately address the impacts associated with water, transportation, etc. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to transportation, Refer to response to comment 56-4.

155-2. This comment is the same as comment 155-1. The response is the same as it is for 155-1.

155-3. The commenter would like to know if the programs and policies are enforceable.

There are two phases associated with enforcement of the programs and policies. The first phase is during FORA's tenure. The second phase is after FORA's tenure. SB 899, which creates FORA, would become inoperative (i.e., FORA would cease to exist under SB 899) when the FORA Board determines that 80 percent of the territory of Fort Ord that is designated for development or reuse in the Reuse Plan has been developed or reused in a manner consistent with the Reuse Plan, or June 30, 2014, whichever occurs first, and would be repealed on January 1, 2015.

During the FORA tenure, though each jurisdiction must go through an implementation process and a set of procedures defined in Volume I of the Reuse Plan (p. 3-155 - 3-161), nothing prohibits local jurisdictions from changing their respective elements of the Reuse Plan. A change to the Reuse Plan is likely to result in a change to the conclusions contained in the EIR. Therefore, it is likely that the Reuse Plan EIR would require additional environmental analysis. Any revisions to the Reuse Plan and/or the EIR would be funded by the jurisdiction proposing Reuse Plan changes. It is important to note that the Reuse Plan elements and the EIR will be assimilated into the local jurisdiction's general plans.

The EIR states on page 1-3 that future CEQA analysis, beyond that which is included in the Reuse Plan EIR, shall be conducted if any events specified in Public Resources Code Section 21166 should occur, as follows:

"When an environmental impact report has been prepared for a project pursuant to this division, no subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report shall be required by the lead agency or by any responsible agency, unless one or more of the following events occurs:

- a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the environmental impact report;
- b) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the environmental impact report; or

c) New information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete, becomes available.”

CEQA environmental review conducted for future individual projects that implement the Final Fort Ord Reuse Plan will be tiered to EIR to the extent this program-level analysis remains adequate for such purposes. Section 15152(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines establishes:

“Where an EIR has been prepared for a program, plan, policy, or ordinance consistent with the requirements of this section, any Lead Agency for a later project pursuant to or consistent with the program, plan, policy, or ordinance should limit the EIR on the project to effects which:

- 1) Were not examined as significant effects on the environment in the prior EIR; or
- 2) Are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means.”

Additional CEQA analysis may also be required at the specific project level to give decision makers more information about site-specific issues which are not addressed in this program-level EIR.

During the period following FORA’s tenure, the Reuse Plan elements and EIR will remain assimilated in local general plans. Any potential future amendments to the Reuse Plan will also remain subject to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(a), which defines an amendment to a general plan (i.e., reuse plan) as a “project” and thus subject to environmental analysis. It is unknown if noticing of a proposed amendment (in the context where FORA does not exist) would be required beyond the political boundaries of the jurisdiction proposing the amendment. Because the Reuse Plan and its EIR were developed in the context of a large political area, it would appear that noticing throughout the region would be required, but this is not addressed in either SB 899 or SB 1600. However, there are other means for the public to be notified of proposed amendments to local jurisdiction’s general plans. This would include the AMBAG notices, a mailing list created by each local jurisdiction that would include individuals and organizations interested in future Fort Ord development, notification in a local newspaper with general circulation, etc.

155-4. The commenter states the feasibility and enforcement of all mitigations must be addressed. CEQA requires that all mitigations be feasible, reasonable, and enforceable. This is the basis of all programs, policies and mitigations contained in the Reuse Plan and the EIR. In addition, the Development and Resource

Management Plan (DRMP) contained in response to comment 21-1 implements funding and monitoring programs for future transportation improvement, as well as future water sources.

155-5. The commenter would like an alternative that includes development limited to the year 2015.

The Final PEIR identifies an additional mitigation measure to address the phasing of future growth at Fort Ord to mitigate potential environmental impacts associated with: 1) traffic and circulation (section 4.7) addressing roadway capacity and capital resources to fund required improvements; 2) hydrology and water quality (section 4.5) including available water supply and seawater intrusion into the aquifer; 3) public services; and 4) capital resources to fund required improvements. The additional mitigation measure is a Development and Resource Management Plan to monitor development at Fort Ord to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities and water supply. The components of the Development and Resource Management Plan include: 1) management of transportation improvements, 2) management of available water supply, 3) provision of adequate public services; and 4) capital planning. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

155-6. The commenter states that impacts associated with development beyond 2015 are based on modeling. The modeling that was used in the transportation analysis stopped at the year 2015 because that is the extent of the empirical data. Beyond that time impacts are speculative. The modeling associated with financing is based on the best data available and extrapolation. This is the approach taken to prepare a report for any project, whether it is a reuse, a general plan, or a private development project.

155-7. The commenter provides clarification on the "underlying activity" described in the EIR. No response warranted.

155-8. The commenter would like to know what "CEQA case" is being referred to in the EIR on page 4-2. The case law is the San Francisco Ecology Center v. City and County of San Francisco (3d Dist. 1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1011.

155-9. The commenter states that the jobs/housing ratio at Fort Ord at the time of base closure was .77 and the proposed ratio is 2.05. Therefore, to conclude that the proposed project would be an improvement over Alternative 7's jobs/housing ratio indicates a misunderstanding of CEQA. The commenter states the comparison should be made between the 1991 conditions and the proposed project. The commenter also states that creating a large number of jobs may have potentially significant impacts

The proposed project does contain more jobs than the number of jobs that existed at the time of base closure (vis-a-vis the number of housing units), but will have fewer jobs than the alternatives. It is in FORA's purview to provide economic recovery within the resource constraints of Fort Ord and provide housing. In preparing the

Fort Ord Reuse Plan the optimum jobs/housing range was determined to be 2.05. This would provide adequate housing and a strong economic base. Though the optimal range is .75:1.25, FORA is not required to implement this ratio. However, it is also in FORA's purview to reduce the number of jobs in order to obtain the optimum ratio range.

To offset the impact associated with the project's 2.05 ratio, the plan concentrates commercial development and jobs associated the town-center, CSUMB and UCMBEST along the planned multi-modal corridor and help encourage the long range viability of transit use in that corridor.

The commenter also points out that the jobs/housing ratio number for Alternative 8 in Table 2.4-1 (p. 2-8) in the EIR should read 2.39. Though no changes to Reuse Plan and EIR tables and graphics will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to tables and graphics will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

Changes to the EIR

Page 2-8. Amend Table 2.4-1. Alternative 8 jobs/housing ratio from 3.39 to 2.39.

155-10. The commenter is concerned with the availability of water. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional discussion on water resources and 21-1 for implementation of a safe yield monitoring program relative to future water use.

155-11. The commenter disagrees with the conclusion contained in the EIR regarding water impacts. The basis for the EIR concluding that there would be no significant environmental impact is based on the potential to provide water from Fort Ord through desalination. The conclusion is further reinforced through additional information on water included in response to comment letter 8-5.

155-12. The commenter requests that a water allocation and monitoring plan be implemented as part of the proposed project. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

155-13. The commenter states that the traffic and circulation analysis does not include an evaluation of the project's impacts on existing roads and highways and does not clearly identify mitigation measures. On the contrary, the EIR does include an evaluation of the impacts. This discussion commences on page 4-77 of the EIR. Mitigations are included as well commencing on page 4-83.

As it pertains to the comment on "construction of projects not approved", CEQA requires that impacts be identified and mitigations provided to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. It is irrelevant if the projects are not approved at this time. Funding for transportation infrastructure is based on the project's "nexus" on roadways only, though there is an added mitigation (p. 4-86), which allows FORA to take some of its funding and allocate it toward one particular off-base regional

roadway which it feels will maximize the effectiveness of its fair share contributions in reducing traffic impacts to the regional roadway system.

As it pertains to the comment that the traffic and circulation section of the EIR concludes that travel demand is "less than significant", this is the conclusion made in the EIR as it pertains to increased demand within Fort Ord. It is not the conclusion made pertaining to increased travel demand on the regional transportation system. The EIR concludes that the impacts to the regional transportation system cannot be fully mitigated, regardless of Fort Ord's fair share payment toward the regional transportation system, and, therefore, significant impacts would remain.

155-14. The commenter points states that the reference to AMBAG in Table 5.2-1 is incorrect. The table is in error as it pertains to the reference. Reference #4 should not include reference to AMBAG. As it pertains to the CSUMB population figure of 10,000 by the year 2015, CSUMB is projecting a lower population by 2015 and will report this in February 1997.

There is an error in the table. The 2015 population is derived through preparation of the Reuse Plan by FORA. It is not a population figure generated by AMBAG as indicated in the footnote (footnote #4).

155-15. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended and that the EIR be recirculated. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period. The EIR will not be recirculated because the Final PEIR will adequately discuss all the potentially significant issues.

155-16. The commenter states that the proposed buildout population of 72,000 is not justified by the enabling legislation that created FORA as a means to economic recovery. Furthermore, the commenter states that the proposed project goes beyond the economic recovery of Marina and Seaside. Refer to response to comments 43-1, 55-4 and 142-1.

155-17. The commenter states that the EIR does not contain demographic data the Reuse Plan contains and points out that the Reuse Plan states the county's net population loss was 13,000. The commenter is incorrect, the Reuse Plan states the population loss to be 18,000.

155-18. The commenter recommends to the decision makers to recognize that economic success depends on conservation of its natural resources.

155-19. The commenter requests that additional information on financing be provided. The commenter misunderstands the intent of the financing program. The reuse of Fort Ord is not dependent upon funding from the existing population of the Monterey Peninsula or the county. Funding will originate from those who develop at Fort Ord.

155-20. The commenter states that a housing element is required because the reuse plan is a general plan and all general plans require a housing element. SB 899 was explicit in describing what the contents of the reuse plan would include. As stated in the SB 899 legislation (Chapter 4) the Fort Ord Reuse Plan shall include all of the following five elements. The first element is a land use plan for the integrated arrangement and general location and extent of , and the criteria and standards for, the uses of land, water, air, space, and other natural resources within the area of the base. The land use plan shall designate area of the base for residential, commercial, industrial and other uses, and may specify maximum development intensities and other standards and criteria. The land use plan shall provide for public safety. The remaining element include a transportation plan; a conservation plan; a recreation plan; and a capital improvement program. It will be the responsibility of each jurisdiction at Fort Ord to modify their housing elements to accommodate Fort Ord.

155-21. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should include the use/destruction/sale of housing in the Housing Element. Refer to response to comment 155-20.

155-22. The commenter would like an inclusionary housing program included in the Housing Element of the Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comment 155-20.

155-23. The commenter requests that the statement contained in the Business Plan that states "both Seaside and Marina have a sufficient supply of low income housing within their existing residential areas" be substantiated. A market report was prepared, titled Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan, (JHK 1995) as part of the Reuse Plan. Included in the market study is the information the commenter is requesting. Additional information on available housing in the cities of Marina and Seaside is available in these respective city's housing elements.

155-24. The commenter states that housing to meet the needs of the community is needed. The basic premise of the Reuse Plan is to provide market rate housing outside of that housing used by CSUMB and housing conveyed through the McKinney Act.

Response to Letter 156

156-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 157

157-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment letter 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 158

158-1. The commenter wants existing housing units to be rented. Except for POM, CSUMB housing and McKinney Act housing, the sale or rental of housing units on Fort Ord cannot occur until after the Reuse Plan is approved.

Response to Letter 159

159-1. The commenter states that the CalTrans right-of-way proposal for the Highway 68 Bypass was not properly advertised by CalTrans and the commenter requests that the right-of-way for this bypass depicted in the Reuse Plan be removed. Regardless of what CalTrans did or did not do pertaining to the right-of-way's, the right-of-way is now integral to the Reuse Plan. The bypass is referenced in the EIR traffic and circulation section and in the Habitat Management Plan (HMP) as well.

Response to Letter 160

160-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment letter 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 161

161-1. The commenter requests that the public review period be extended. Refer to response to comment letter 5-1 pertaining to the review period.

Response to Letter 162

162-1. The commenter would like to know if there will be a redevelopment agency at Fort Ord. The commenter would also like to know what will be FORA's main funding sources. SB 1600 section 67679.5 permits a redevelopment agency if needed. FORA's main funding source will be land sales and one-time development fee, and potentially Mello-Roos taxes and redevelopment "tax increment" financing.

162-2. The commenter points out a clarification in the text pertaining to sharing costs for costs of habitat should be limited to Fort Ord jurisdictions. The intent of the language in the Reuse Plan is that only those agencies with jurisdiction within Fort Ord will participate.

162-3. The commenter points out that a Fort Ord area transportation impact fee should be discussed in the EIR. The transportation discussion in the Final PEIR includes three funding sources: Fort Ord development, "impact study area" and public. Refer to response to comment 22-1 for additional information.

162-4. The commenter states that institutional facilities will enhance the economy. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

162-5. The commenter states that Fort Ord may be difficult to market because of the costs of water and road systems. These are issues addressed in the EIR and the Business and Operations Plan. Constraints do exist and pose a challenge to future reuse of Fort Ord.

162-6. The commenter points out that because there are three jurisdictions at Fort Ord developing clear development agenda and process at Fort Ord may be difficult. The commenter states that this situation would result in a difficult land use entitlement process. The jurisdictions are aware of the potential problems associated with multiple jurisdictions. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

162-7. The commenter points out that Fort Ord will be perceived as "extremely sensitive to environmental growth issues". The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

162-8. The commenter states that the future forecast for light-industrial development by 2015 is relative small compared to the City of San Jose. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

162-9. The commenter states that the future forecast for research and development is unpredictable. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

162-10. The commenter states that future Fort Ord housing will compete with Sand City housing. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

162-11. The commenter questions if the economic forecast for an "entertainment center", which includes shopping, restaurants and multi-screen theaters, would be in demand during the projected construction period 2011 to 2015. Based on the study, the interest in entertainment appears to be long lasting.

162-12. The commenter points out that lodging facilities proposed at Fort Ord will be good for Sand City and will not compete with the Sand City lodging facilities that are coastal oriented. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

162-13. The commenter states that the desalination plant should be identified in the Dunes State Park Plan. This use has been accommodated in the Park Plan.

162-14. The commenter reiterates comment 2 above.

162-15. The commenter states that the city supports restoration of economic and housing activity that existed prior to the base closure. This is an option available to FORA and will be considered by FORA.

Response to Letter 163

163-1. The commenter reiterates his previous comment (#159).

Response to Letter 164

164-1. The commenter would like to know if there is policy that relates to building a freeway and/or expressway adjacent to a school. There is no state policy that would preclude construction of a highway or expressway adjacent to a school (pers. com., January 17, 1997).

164-2. The commenter would like information on a new runway and runway extension at the airport. The airport referred to is the Marina Municipal Airport which was previously owned by the Army and known as Fritzsche Airfield. Any information pertaining to this airport should be obtained by reviewing the master plan and EIR prepared recently for that airport.

164-3. The commenter states that the "village" commercial viability is questionable due to the proximity of "big box" retailers. There are no guarantees for success for any retailer, whether large or small. The success of commercial enterprise in the village setting will be premised on "niche" retailing, as well as ambiance and proximity to the customer base.

164-4. The commenter would like to know what the population impact will be associated with reuse. The EIR discusses a number of issues pertaining to transportation, water, public services, land use, etc. which are predicated on population expansion. The reader is referred to the socioeconomic discussion commencing on page 4-20 of the EIR for information on population, housing, employment, etc.

164-5. The commenter would like to know why the EIR does not reflect the CSUMB president's statement that the population at CSUMB would probably never achieve 25,000 full-time students. The CSUMB long-range plans accommodate 20,000 students on-site (living on campus) at full buildout. This is what must be considered in developing the Reuse Plan and the EIR.

164-6. The commenter would like additional information on the existing housing market. Refer to response to comment 155-23.

164-7. The commenter would like to know if the road infrastructure will be constructed prior to or after light industrial land uses are in place. The development of roadways on base will be premised on the availability of funds. For example, FORA is currently using limited funds from the Economic Development Administration to upgrade existing roadways at Fort Ord prior to development of light industrial properties and prior to CSUMB gaining a significant population. Roadway construction will be ongoing effort by FORA using grant funds as well as impact fees as new development comes on line at Fort Ord. After the reuse plan is approved, properties will be conveyed from the U.S. Army to the cities of Marina and Seaside, as well as Monterey County. Therefore, it is the intent of the Reuse Plan and the EIR to match development of infrastructure and new development as the flow of funding will allow so that there are no gaps in the development of infrastructure.

164-8. The commenter apparently disapproves of using Highway 156 to attract Silicon Valley satellite facilities. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

164-9. The commenter would like to know what guarantee is there that CalTrans will not expand the two lane area of Highway 218 between North/South Road and Fremont Boulevard. There are no guarantees that CalTrans will do anything. However, based on the fact that the length of Highway 218 between North/South Road and Fremont Boulevard is closely flanked by housing on steep slopes, it was prudently concluded that widening in this area would not occur.

164-10. The commenter would like to know if "big semi-trucks going into the new business parks at Fort Ord" is discussed in the EIR. This issue was not specifically addressed in the EIR because there are no known "significant" environmental issues associated with this type of vehicle. In determination of whether an effect may have a significant effect on the environment calls for judgment based on scientific and factual data, as well on there being a substantial body of public opinion that considers or will consider the effect to be adverse. Scientific and factual data, as well as public opinion did not justify the EIR consultant discussion "big semi-trucks".

164-11. The commenter would like to know where in the EIR is there a discussion of the approved and proposed developments. The commenter is referred to the cumulative impacts discussion commencing on page 5-1 of the EIR.

164-12. The commenter would like to know how the county can make planning decisions for Fort Ord without adopting land use designations first, following county land use guidelines. The county has been involved with the reuse effort since 1991 and helped to create the Reuse Plan that was circulated in 1996.

The land use designations it selected for the area within its jurisdiction within Fort Ord was based on its state mandated right to plan for property within its jurisdiction.

164-13. The commenter would like to know what changes to the EIR will be required to accommodate known threatened and endangered species that occur in the coastal dunes.

Fort Ord supports a variety of biological habitats identified in the Habitat Management Plan (HMP) that are unique to the central coast, such as maritime chaparral and coastal dunes and the plants associated with these habitats. These resources have been maintained at Fort Ord due in part to restricted access associated with the military use of the base. Several plant and animal species have been identified that have been designated or are proposed for listing as rare, threatened, endangered or otherwise sensitive by various state and federal agencies.

The HMP effectively serves as the basis for the Army's "permit" for incidental take of federally-listed species under the ESA. "Listed" species are those species designated "threatened" or "endangered" by the USFWS. Conformance with the requirements of the HMP is a prerequisite for the transfer of land from the Army to other entities.

A primary goal of the HMP is to promote preservation, enhancement and restoration of special status and animal species and their habitats at former Fort Ord, while allowing economic recovery through reuse and development of the base. To achieve this goal, some parcels at former Fort Ord are designated for development with no restrictions, others have certain management guidelines or prescribed set-asides, and other are designated as habitat preserves with little or no development allowed.

The HMP does not preclude future landowners from complying with environmental regulations enforced by federal, state or local agencies. These regulations could include obtaining Section 7 or Section 10(a) permit from the USFWS pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), complying with measures for conservation of state-listed threatened and endangered species and other special-status species recognized by CDFG under the California ESA and CEQA, and complying with local land use regulations and restrictions (COE 1994).

However, implementation of the HMP will simplify regulatory compliance. The HMP will provide a basis for recipients of former Fort Ord lands to seek Section 7 and Section 10(a) permits as applicable for the "take" of federally listed species within the parcel they received. Because the HMP provides mitigation for impacts on federally listed species, little or no additional mitigation will be required to obtain a Section 7 or 10(a) permit. Also, because the HMP addresses several federal candidate species, the document is considered a prelisting conservation agreement between the USFWS and local agencies. This agreement will preclude the need to develop additional mitigation measures, should the candidate species addressed in the HMP become listed. The California Department of Fish and Game has reviewed

and provided input during HMP development and will consider mitigation described in the HMP when reviewing development plans for compliance with the California ESA and CEQA.

The Biological Resources Management Program (BRMP) serves as the first step in translating the Army's requirements into a practical planning tool for local jurisdictions. It provides the polygon-by-polygon analysis of the requirements of the HMP, discusses the planning implications of and provides guidelines for addressing those requirements through the planning process. In tiering-off of the HMP, the BRMP is intended to establish the framework for CEQA and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) approvals and to realize economic recovery while protecting the biological resources at Fort Ord. The BRMP recommends future surveys to identify specific biological resources in each polygon impacted by future development.

Though from a federal perspective the HMP species are considered protected through implementation of the HMP and no further mitigation beyond the HMP is required to satisfy the USFWS and the ESA, the HMP has not been approved by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). CDFG has given tentative approval to the HMP as adequate mitigation for HMP species under CEQA but has requested that an Implementing Agreement, signed by all affected jurisdictions, be drafted as a binding state-level document (Leslie Zander, pers. com. February 13, 1996).

To manage the numerous federal, state and local holdings in the former base that will be used as habitat management areas, a Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) program was recommended by the HMP as a practical means of coordinating basewide resource management and planning at Fort Ord. This program is an established process used throughout the country for land management and planning purposes and agreed upon through a Memorandum of Understanding. The CRMP is a resource planning, problem solving and management process administered by a group of agency staff, professional biologists and concerned citizens, which allows for direct participation of everyone concerned with natural resources management in a given planning area. An inter-agency and inter-jurisdictional CRMP has been established at Fort Ord, whose objective is to serve as a clearinghouse by providing a forum for information and resource exchange on habitat-related issues, to develop standards for habitat management, monitoring and reporting and to coordinate the implementation of the HMP. The CRMP is intended to benefit all parties by providing for shared resources/expertise for HMP implementation.

The HMP did not identify or accommodate maintenance or replacement of existing Fort Ord infrastructure facilities. However, this situation should not be expected to preclude work on infrastructure facilities, nor should the proposed project be counted as part of other agency's allowable area of disturbance. For example, in the HMP and the Biological Resources Management Planning document prepared in September 1995, future development in polygon 6b is limited to an area not to exceed 1 percent of the total natural habitat within this polygon.

In addition, there are other sensitive biological resources at Fort Ord that were not addressed in the HMP. These resources typically include species or habitat that have limited legal protection status but may be considered sensitive for various reasons by CDFG, other resource agencies and interest organizations. A list of these sensitive species and habitats known to occur at Fort Ord but not addressed in the HMP are available in Biological Resources Management Planning report (Zander 1995). Both the HMP and the Biological Resources Management Planning report are referenced herein by reference.

The CEQA Guidelines state that any activity that would substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered species would be considered a significant impact. Some of the species of plants and animals listed in the Zander report may meet the definition of rare or endangered provided in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines. If, through the CEQA review, impacts on these special status species are determined to be significant, additional mitigation satisfactory to CDFG to reduce the effect of the impact may be required.

164-14. The commenter would like to know where in the EIR are specific plans to protect threatened and endangered species. Refer to the section 4.10 of the EIR - (Biological Resources), for this discussion.

164-15. The commenter would like to know where in the EIR is there a discussion on the protection of "high sensitivity" archaeological resources. Refer to pages 4-153 to 4-156 in the EIR.

164-16. The commenter would like economic and market analysis for justifying golf courses. The commenter should review the document titled Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data for the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan prepared in November 1995, by SKMG, and included herein by reference. Volume I of the Reuse Plan is partially based on this document. The conclusion of the report (page VI-13) is that two additional golf courses on Fort Ord during the next 20 years would be viable if offered in conjunction with residential communities and hotel/conference centers.

164-17. The commenter would like to know if future golf courses will be using potable water and if so will development occur first so that development's treated wastewater can be used. The total build out water use for Fort Ord is 13,500 afy. Of this amount 3,000 afy will be recycled water (treated wastewater) from the MCWPCA wastewater treatment plant to be used for landscaping (e.g. golf courses) and some industrial and commercial uses.

164-18. The commenter recommends to the FORA board that South Boundary Road be included as a bike and pedestrian trail. The commenter would like to know what hiking and bicycle clubs and associations were consulted by FORA when it developed the Fort Ord trails plan. The State and County Parks Departments were contacted, as well as the Bureau of Land Management.

Modifications to figures contained in the Reuse Plan and EIR , will be completed following the certification of Final PEIR. All changes requested by commenter will be listed by the consultant and delivered to FORA for their use in the case FORA decides to make amendments to the figures. The reader is referred to the revised language under Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 4-115: Amend Figure 4.2-6 to show a Class 2 bike trail on South Boundary Road from North-South Road to York Road.

164-19. The commenter would like to know what an HOV is. An HOV means high occupancy vehicle.

164-20. The commenter would like to know what "fine-grained" means. The reference to "fine-grained" is located on page 3-12 of Volume I and is meant to convey to the reader that may be in the context of the urban design measures discussion in the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 165

165-1. The commenter states that the EIR does not fulfill any of the requirements of CEQA he lists. The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR which the EIR consultant does not consider to be correct.

165-2. The commenter states that the level of analysis in the program level EIR prepared for the Fort Ord Reuse Plan is inadequate based on his interpretation of CEQA. With completion of the Final PEIR, all the necessary information required for the decision makers to base an informed decision on will be available. As it pertains to a detailed matrix showing what agencies are responsible for what mitigations, the EIR contains, by jurisdiction (i.e., Marina, Seaside and Monterey County), a well organized mitigation structure that precludes the necessity to create a matrix.

165-3. The commenter states that the use of a statement of overriding conditions based on economic recovery or infeasible alternatives should not be considered by FORA. This is a matter for FORA to consider.

165-4. The commenter states that an alternative that is limited by the constraints of existing infrastructure or support facilities needs to be included in the EIR. The EIR does include such an alternative. It is the No Project alternative. This alternative represents the current status of base reuse, which is manifest in the U.S. Army turning over its property to other federal agencies and state agencies. To date this includes the UCMBEST Center, CSUMB, Fritzsche Field, BLM, and California Department of Parks and Recreation. The major population generators will be UCMBEST, CSUMB and Fritzsche Field which is in Marina jurisdiction. The

particular types of impacts associated with the No Project alternative are discussed at a level of specificity that is appropriate commencing on page 6-16 of the EIR.

165-5. The commenter would like a discussion of baseline conditions associated with the No Project alternative. The baseline would be associated with the conditions that existed in 1991. The commenter is referred to the discussion in section 1.2.2 on page 1-3 of the EIR regarding baseline determination. Based on 1991 being the baseline year, the discussion of alternatives would necessarily be tied to this benchmark year and not existing environmental conditions as requested in the comment.

165-6. The commenter requests that each alternative be compared based on economic information. An economic analysis at a level of detail requested by the commenter is not included as part of the scope of work for the EIR because SB 899 did not require this type of analysis. However, with the existing summary matrix (p. 2-10 in the Draft EIR) and the alternatives discussions in the EIR (commencing on page 6-1 in the Draft EIR), the general economic conditions of the alternatives relative to the proposed project have been adequately discussed.

165-7. The commenter would like the EIR to include an alternative which is based on existing infrastructure limitations. The No Project alternative addresses this issue. With the current conveyance of land from the U.S. Army to other agencies base reuse is proceeding, which will promulgate infrastructure improvements regardless of the reuse plan, but not to the extent the Reuse Plan would promulgate infrastructure improvements. As it pertains to limiting future development to a safe yield water supply, it is the intent of FORA not to exceed the safe yield water supply within the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, which Fort Ord wells extract water from. However, the commenter must be informed that through a regional approach to addressing seawater intrusion in Monterey County administered by the MCWRA, safe yield water use is expected to increase in the future as water storage and distribution facilities and the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (reclaimed water from the MCWPCA) are brought on-line. The commenter is referred to the Safe Yield Water Supply discussion in response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 which includes a discussion of the Development and Resource Management Plan.

165-8. The commenter states the EIR mitigations are vague and unquantifiable. The commenter also lists five elements (avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, and compensate) to consider when selecting a mitigation measure, which the commenter states must be included in the EIR. The mitigations in the EIR were developed based on these five elements.

165-9. The commenter states that mitigations in the EIR are inadequate because they rely on future studies or consultation with regulatory agencies. In *Sacramento Old City Association v. City Council of Sacramento* (3d Dist. 1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1011, the deferral of mitigations was considered acceptable when premised on accepted performance standards that the lead agency can and will guarantee to implement. Future development will be required to provide mitigation monitoring

programs that implement the programs contained in the Reuse Plan (note that Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(b) requires that mitigations shall be incorporated into the Reuse Plan as programs, therefore a mitigation monitoring program would be moot). Also, the Reuse Plan policies and programs are required to be implemented by local agencies and projects are required to be consistent with these policies and programs (CEQA Guidelines 15063(d)).

Furthermore, Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code (AB 3180) applies to actions such as the adoption of a general plan where there are no conditions of approval and mitigation is provided through policies and programs that are, or will be incorporated into the general plan or zoning.

In the case of a general plan, the intent of the AB 3180 monitoring program can be augmented with the annual general plan status report required of each planning agency under Government Code Section 65400. Also, each Fort Ord jurisdiction is required to develop a mitigation monitoring program for future projects which implement the Reuse Plan programs. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-164. Add the following section.

3.11.8. Monitoring of Reuse Plan Programs

General Plan Annual Status Report (by local land use jurisdiction)

In order to measure the adequacy and effectiveness of programs contained in the Reuse Plan that are pertinent to the particular jurisdiction, each local jurisdiction shall provide FORA the annual general plan status report, prepared by land use jurisdictions pursuant to Government Code Section 65400.

Amendments to the FORA Reuse Plan

If the local jurisdictions determines that is necessary to provide new programs and/or amend existing programs to improve the performance of the Reuse Plan programs as mitigations to impacts identified in the Reuse Plan EIR, the local jurisdictions will provide recommendations to FORA, via the Annual Status Report, for their consideration and approval.

165-10. The commenter would like to know how additional water will be ensured. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

165-11. The commenter would like to know specific details on timing, financial implications, environmental impacts, and water fees for future hook-ups and monthly service. As it pertains to environmental impacts, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to the remainder of the comment the reader is referred

to the Business and Operations Plan (Appendix B of the Reuse Plan) for an extensive discussion of public services.

165-12. The commenter would like to know how the water infrastructure will be administrated. The Business and Operations Plan (Appendix B of the Reuse Plan) provides this information.

165-13. The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.1 will be implemented. The commenter would like to know what interagency agreement will be adopted to mandate that potential reservoir and water impoundment sites on Fort Ord be identified. There is currently no such agreement, nor is there at this time a specific development plan. To provide a detailed discussion on the subject of reservoir and/or water impoundment sites for which there are no current plans would be speculative at this time. The commenter is referred to response to comment 8-5 for additional discussion on future water sources.

The funding for future studies would be provided by whoever would be the beneficiary of the water. The jurisdiction where the proposed water facility would be located would identify the water facility on its maps after environmental documents are certified by the lead agency and the project is approved. Rezoning of a jurisdictions zoning maps would then follow. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1

165-14. The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.2 will be implemented. There may or may not have to be any interagency agreements. Future agreements would be multi-jurisdictional and would most likely exist between the Fort Ord jurisdictions, including FORA, and the MCWRA. Funding for the studies would be provided by Fort Ord jurisdictions or whomever they have contractual agreements with. The contents of this agreement cannot be determined at this time and to discuss the potential contents would be speculative. If water supplies are not available or feasible then no water would be available for additional development. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1.

165-15. The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.3 will be implemented. The water conservation goal is approximately 15 percent average overall between all types of land uses at Fort Ord, or, more specifically, 33 percent on residential water use. No multi-jurisdictional agreements have been developed at this time. Enforcement of conservation efforts will be conducted by the jurisdictions, with FORA reviewing the results. Funding for this effort will be negligible except for an annual report to FORA from each jurisdiction. After FORA's tenure, the water purveyor would be expected to account for water conservation efforts. The ordinance will be developed and adopted after the Reuse Plan is approved. Its cost is not known but would be expected to be a function of staff costs and the efficiency of creating such an ordinance. Water conservation will never "be done". Through water conservation it is projected that the 6,600 afy water use for the interim period before full buildout (buildout is estimated to be 13,500 afy) will be reduced to 5,610 afy. Of this amount,

approximately 80 percent would be effluent flow to the MCWPCA wastewater treatment plant. This flow would then be treated and returned to the MCWD for use within the MCWD for landscaping and/or commercial/industrial use.

165-16. The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-2 will be implemented. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional water source discussion and 21-1 for information on responsibility, verification and safe yield monitoring.

165-17. The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-3 will be implemented. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amend text. The cost of mitigating seawater intrusion is a regional issue. Through the MCWRA, the seawater intrusion problem is being addressed. The issue of recharge, seawater intrusion and drafting is being addressed by the MCWRA in their current basin management plan. This plan includes a recharge program. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for a discussion of future potential water sources and their environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion of the constraints on future development vis-a-vis safe-yield water supply.

As it pertains to specific numeric goals of maximum withdrawal rates to be determined based on well levels, recharge rates, extraction quantities, rainfall, etc., this is a matter for the MCWRA to determine. However, safe yield from Fort Ord wells is addressed in Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-3 and its associated programs (C-3.1 and C-3.2).

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-43. Amend Policy C-3 to read as follows:

The City/County shall prevent further seawater intrusion associated with development of Fort Ord ~~to the extent feasible~~.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Page 4-163. Amend Policy C-3 to read as follows:

The City/County shall prevent further seawater intrusion associated with development of Fort Ord ~~to the extent feasible~~.

165-18. The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program C-3.1 will be implemented. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional water source discussion and 21-1 for information on responsibility, verification and safe yield monitoring.

165-19. The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program C-3.2 will be implemented. Because seawater intrusion is a regional problem, it requires a regional solution, which is the intent of program C-3.2. The MCWRA is currently developing its basin management plan which will address long range goals to stop seawater intrusion. This goal includes the use of reclaimed water by various area jurisdictions to offset potable water use.

165-20. The commenter states that performance standards are required as part of the EIR. Refer to 2.5-1 for the project mitigation monitoring program.

165-21. The commenter requests that agreements between jurisdictions be developed prior to certification of the EIR and approval of a Reuse Plan. The approach requested to be implemented is not reasonable because it is uncertain what the final outcome of the EIR and Reuse Plan will be.

165-22. The commenter states that the mitigations in the EIR are inadequate and states that the EIR misleads the reader into thinking that the programs and policies will be enacted. CEQA requires that a proposed project's potential environmental impacts be evaluated and if determined to be significant they must then be mitigated, except for those impacts that cannot be mitigated, in which case a statement of overriding consideration would be required. This is what the EIR provides. The variety of policies and programs the EIR were derived from the Reuse Plan because these policies and program are de facto mitigation measures for the variety of potential impacts. If policies and programs fall short of mitigating an impact, a "mitigation" is prescribed. This is also what the EIR provides. Policies, programs and mitigations will then become enforceable through resolution of FORA based on findings and evidence. FORA and the jurisdictions with control of Fort Ord will be liable for implementation of the programs, policies and mitigations. The EIR states (page 1-5) the following:

[...] "The Draft EIR has been prepared concurrently with the *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan* (released May, 1996), so as to maximize opportunities to build necessary environmental mitigations into the project planning process. New policies and programs have been developed for each resource element in order to alleviate potential impacts and make the proposed project as self-mitigating as possible. The policies and programs organized as amendments to local general plans serve as a separation of mitigation responsibilities by jurisdiction. FORA must adopt the Reuse Plan, including all policies and programs incorporated in it, in order to approve implementation of the proposed project. This assumes implementation of the policies and programs as a pre-condition of reuse and represents a commitment embodied in the certification of the EIR by FORA".

165-23. The commenter states that there would be a CEQA violation if long term water supply were not evaluated. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for a discussion of future water supplies and their potential impacts.

165-24. The commenter requests detailed analysis of future stormwater detention requirements and how it will augment future water supplies. As it pertains to how stormwater detention will augment groundwater supplies, future cisterns associated with some larger developments could offset the need for water (potable or reclaimed) or percolation ponds could be constructed at various locations (assuming ground conditions are conducive to percolation and construction costs are not prohibitive) which could recharge the groundwater.

At the program level of this EIR, the detailed information requested by the commenter is not necessary. Construction of future detention facilities is meant to augment existing efforts to recharge groundwater supplies. This approach would result in minor groundwater augmentation relative to the larger projects currently underway, such as the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project. Recharge potential was not considered in the water use balance for future Fort Ord development because of the lack of information as to its potential success. Nevertheless, it is included in the Reuse Plan to encourage efforts to obtain alternative sources of water. By itself recharge can only marginally and incrementally reduce seawater intrusion and is considered merely a part of a larger program to keep seawater where it is.

Future development would be encourage to implement the stormwater detention plan by incorporating detention facilities (e.g., cisterns and percolation ponds). The size and location would be based on geologic conditions on a particular development site. It may be that only a few developments could accommodate such a facility.

Furthermore, as it pertains to stormwater runoff quality, the EIR acknowledges there could be impacts to Monterey Bay and/or local streams associated with storm water runoff quality. The EIR includes policies and programs to address this potential impact (refer to section 4.5 of the EIR). There are existing performance standards associated with the regulatory programs which are the basis for the prescribed programs in the EIR. The regulatory programs include the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, the General Storm Discharge Permitting System and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972. The regulatory environment will assure that future storm water runoff will eliminate and/or minimize impacts.

165-25. The commenter states that there is inadequate long-term water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

165-26. The commenter states that more information is required to justify the conclusion that local water supplies are reduced to a less than significant impact. The EIR concludes that because a number of reasonable, new water supply sources have been identified to support the proposed project, including the siting of an on-

site desalination plant, and assuming adoption of the policies, programs, and mitigations identified, the increased demand for water is considered to be a less than significant impact. This conclusion is premised on FORA having the option to use desalination water to off-set potential loss of Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin water if use of such groundwater would exceed safe yield. In addition, FORA has the option to augment its water supply above and beyond the 6,600 afy from the MCWRA through assisting MCWRA in planning and funding new water sources, and/or obtaining water from an on-site facility or out of county facility as discussed in response to comment 8-5. The reader is directed to discussion of water sources in response to comment 8-5.

165-27. The commenter requests that the project water requirements be put into perspective with the other regional growth forecasts and projections of where the water supply for the county will be obtained. The first 6,600 afy of water for Fort Ord reuse will be provided based on an agreement with the MCWRA. This is discussed in response to comment 8-5. This water will be augmented with future water projects currently being considered, such as the Merritt Lake water storage facility. Desalination water and/or out of county water, as discussed in response to comment 8-5 is also a potential long-term source of water. If it is the case that the seawater intrusion problem cannot be controlled through use of groundwater or surface water sources, FORA has the option to obtain a future water source through desalination.

As it pertains to other regional growth forecasts, urban growth in the region represents approximately 10 to 15 percent of water extraction in the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, which indicates agriculture uses far more water than urban uses. Therefore, the supply of water is not so much a problem as is the current water rights which allow agriculture to continue to use water in a relatively wasteful manner (e.g., spray irrigation in the Salinas Valley when wind speeds are 25 mph) and in a manner which results in seawater intrusion. With minor adjustments in the manner water is used in the agricultural business, additional, though incremental, potable water supplies could be obtained for urban use. Seawater intrusion could also be diminished. Furthermore, the MCWRA's basin management plan currently being developed will address new methods to stop seawater intrusion.

165-28. The commenter states that the policies and programs cannot be used as mitigations because of the recent court decision - *Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project, Sierra Club, et al., v. County of Stanislaus and Diablo Grande Limited Partnership*. This case pertains to a general plan for a project in the San Joaquin Valley that did not discuss the environmental impacts associated with potential future water sources. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan Final Program EIR does contain a discussion of the potential impacts associated with potential future water sources. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

165-29. The commenter states that the mitigations for water use are mitigation measures until they are formally designated. Mitigations are required to be implemented as part of project approval and are incorporated into the project

through resolution by FORA. Deferring mitigation to the future is acceptable as discussed above in response to comment 165-9.

165-30. The commenter requests that an alternative be discussed that is based on minimizing environmental impacts. The “No Project” alternative meets this requirement. The reuse scenario under the No Project Alternative would result in the least development, and is, therefore, the environmentally superior alternative at a local level. This is based on the acreage of open space and habitat conservation in relation to development, projected population, and the level of construction for development and infrastructure.

Under the No Project Alternative, only 13% of total former Fort Ord property (or 3,800 acres) would be developed; this would include already-existing development and land remaining under the Army. Approximately 56% of the former Fort Ord would be left undeveloped for habitat management (15,648 acres), 5% of the land would have little or no development for parks and recreation (1,320 acres), and an additional 26% (7,200 acres) would be left undeveloped under Army caretaker status. As it pertains to transportation funding, refer to response to comment 21-1.

For additional information, refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

165-31. The commenter reiterates that the “No Project” alternative does not fulfill project objectives for economic enhancement and states the EIR does not provide a reasonable range of project alternatives. The “No Project” alternative should not be construed to lack economic benefits, because under the status quo (no reuse plan) there is going to be economic activity associated with the CSUMB, UCMBEST, Fritzsche Field, and other property metered out by the Army. However, the “No Project” alternative would not provide the economic benefits associated with a reuse plan. As it pertains to reasonable alternatives, refer to response to comment 27-3.

Changes to the EIR

Page 6-2. Remove the first sentence in the third full paragraph.

165-32. The commenter requests that a project alternative be included in the EIR which is based on existing groundwater resources. Refer to the discussion under the heading *Safe Yield Water Supply* in response to comment 8-5.

165-33. The commenter states that the EIR does not depict existing traffic conditions. The commenter is correct in that traffic conditions at the time the EIR was developed were not considered. The EIR discussed the issue of what the baseline conditions would be for discussion of the EIR. Refer to the section 1.2 of the Draft EIR. Also, the reader is referred to the discussion in the traffic and circulation section of the EIR (4.7.3, pages 4-72 and 73), where information on the traffic baseline information is explained.

165-34. The commenter states that the EIR does not identify who is responsible for implementation of mitigations. The EIR does state who is responsible for project mitigations in the summary matrix contained in Table 2.5-1 of the Draft EIR commencing on page 2-16. A footnote in this table to mitigation responsibility (#2) states that the "mitigation responsibilities apply only to those impacts which are considered significant or potentially significant before mitigation. As for the degree to which proposed measures would reduce impacts below a level of significance, without a more specific comment, a specific response cannot be provided. Regardless, CEQA requires that mitigations must be included that minimize impacts. Mitigations included in the EIR are known to reduce impacts.

165-35. The commenter states that the traffic model and the mitigations are not consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the State Implementation Plan. EIR Refer to response to comment 56-5.

165-36. The commenter states that the mitigation that would allow FORA to fund off-site roadways at their discretion is inadequate because options, priorities, financial needs, potential funding, etc. are not described. At the program level, the level of detail requested by the commenter is not necessary. It should be noted that the mitigation is above and beyond what is required by CEQA.

165-37. The commenter states that the discussion of emission credits is incorrect. Refer to response to comment 56-6.

165-38. The commenter states that quantification of emissions should be conducted for each roadway and the results included in the EIR. The detailed analysis requested by the commenter is not necessary for a program level EIR, as discussed in section 4.8.2 in the EIR (page 4-96). Impact analysis and implementation of mitigations by future projects at Fort Ord are assured through implementation of the existing standards of the AQMP, which are included in the discussion contained in the EIR. However, the EIR does provide a carbon monoxide model to determine the potential impacts to sensitive receptors as projected in the year 2015 (the last year for which transportation information is available). The conclusion was that no exceedance of the air standards would occur. Refer to the discussion on climate and air quality in section 5.1.8 of the Draft EIR.

165-39. The commenter states that specific mitigation measures and their effectiveness should be identified and a matrix showing how these measures would reduce emissions. This is not necessary as stated in response to comment 165-38.

165-40. The commenter would like to know who is responsible for mitigation implementation. This is discussed in the Summary section of the EIR as well as in the Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) discussion in response to comment 21-1.

165-41. The commenter requests that cumulative impacts need to be quantified and used in making a consistency determination for compliance with the existing AQMP. The level of detail included in the cumulative discussion of the EIR reflects

the requirements of CEQA pertaining to cumulative impact discussions. CEQA section 15130 states that the discussion of cumulative impacts need not provide as great a detail as is provided of the effects attributable to the project alone. Therefore, because the project alone is a reuse plan (read: general plan), the level of detail contained in the cumulative analysis of the EIR is adequate. Also, the cumulative projects are assumed to be consistent with the AMBAG population forecasts. Therefore, their combined emissions would be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan.

165-42. The commenter states that the mitigations are not made specific to the cities of Marina and Seaside. On the contrary, the language included is clear as it pertains to each jurisdiction's responsibility.

165-43. The commenter states that the UCMBEST Center impacts discussed in the EIR are inadequate. For a program level EIR, the impacts are adequately discussed. Providing a greater level of detail in a impact analysis (e.g., acreage of impervious surfacing associated with UCMBEST and the quantity of storm water runoff it would generate) would not change the nature of the mitigation. To provide more specific information at this time would be futile, because the analysis could only be "worst case". A change in the proposed project's description would negate the value of an analysis. Such is the case with UCMBEST. The master plan for this facility now projects approximately 4.4 million square feet of institutional/R&D instead of 5 to 7 million square feet. Nevertheless, the mitigations remain the same as it pertains to 4.4 million or 7 million square feet of institutional/R&D. In conclusion, the level of analysis requested by the commenter in the Reuse Plan would be futile and would not advance the requirements of CEQA.

165-44. The commenter states that the water discussion relative to the UCMBEST Center is inadequate. The water for this UC facility will be derived from the 6,600 afy allocation. Also, refer to response to comment 8-5.

165-45. The commenter states that the proposed buildout population exceeds the SB 899 mandate and if FORA uses a statement of overriding consideration to justify the significant negative impacts of the project this shall be challenged. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

165-46. The commenter states that if there is no evidence included in the EIR pertaining to economic recovery, then reference to economic recovery should be stricken from the EIR. The EIR is not responsible for determining the definition of economic recovery, because it is only mandated to determine the environmental impacts of the reuse plan.

165-47. The commenter states that a revised EIR should be provided which retains the intent of SB 899. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

165-48. The commenter states that economic data is needed to determine if economic recovery is justified. Refer to response to commenter letter 138-1, 142-1, 142-2 and 142-3 for a discussion on economic issues.

165-49. The commenter states that the EIR must include a discussion of a reasonable range of alternatives and states that both of the environmentally superior alternatives were rejected. As it pertains to alternatives in general, refer to response to comment 27-3. As it pertains to the environmentally superior alternatives being rejected, it is unclear what the commenter is saying. The environmentally superior alternatives were not rejected. They are presented to the decision makers as lower impact alternatives as required by CEQA.

165-50. The commenter states that the project is growth inducing and if used as a project alternative is a revised EIR, should be identified as such. The project is growth inducing as discussed in section 5.2 of the Draft EIR. As for an alternative, it is unclear what the commenter is implying.

165-51. The commenter requests additional data on seawater intrusion. This issue is addressed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of the EIR, the response to comment 8-5, and in the Development and Resource Management Plan discussion pertaining to safe yield water supply in response to comment 21-1.

165-52. The commenter requests additional information on safe yield water. Refer to response to comment 8-5 as it pertains to additional sources of water and 21-1 as it pertains to monitoring of safe yield water.

165-53. The commenter states that the EIR does not include a discussion of current water use data. The baseline conditions for the EIR analysis is 1991. Therefore, the EIR includes information for that year. Water use in 1991 was 4,700 af.

165-54. The commenter would like clarification on current water metering, water use and water line loss vis-a-vis the 6,600 afy. The current water use is at least 1,288 afy based on current wastewater flows to the treatment plant of .9 mgd (refer to response to comment 152-2).

165-55. This comment repeats the previous comment (#26). Refer to response to comment 165-26.

165-56. This comment repeats the previous comment (#24). Refer to response to comment 165-24.

165-57. This comment repeats the previous comment (#24). Refer to response to comment 165-24.

165-58. The commenter requests additional information on desalination. Refer to the Desalination discussion in response to comment 8-5.

165-59. The commenter would like more information on importing water to Fort Ord. Refer to Imported Water from Outside Monterey County and Imported Water From the Salinas Valley for a discussion of imported water and potential impacts in response to comment 8-5.

165-60. The commenter would like to know what are the groundwater policies that Alternatives 7 and 8 are inconsistent with. Refer to response to comment 97-1.

165-61. The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate and needs to be reissued as a revised Draft EIR. Upon completion of the Final PEIR it will not be considered an inadequate document. However, the comment is for the decision makers to consider.

Response to Letter 166

166-1. The commenter states that 72,000 people at buildout is too many people. The commenter has stated an opinion which the FORA Board shall consider before making a decision.

166-2. The commenter states that she has no desire to have the Monterey Peninsula as an extension of "Silicon Valley". The commenter is referring to text in the Reuse Plan concerning capturing economic activity from the "Silicon Valley" area. The commenter has stated an opinion which the FORA Board shall consider before making a decision.

166-3. The commenter believes the proposed residential densities are too high and would like to have them reduced to 4 units per acre. The commenter has stated an opinion which the FORA Board shall consider before making a decision.

Response to Letter 167

167-1. The commenter would like to know if a water constrained analysis is included in the discussed as part of the proposed project or alternatives. The Comprehensive Business Plan, Public Facilities Implementation Plan and the Public Services Plan are premised on a 6,600 afy water supply serving Fort Ord up to the year 2015. Therefore, the proposed project does identify a constrained water supply. Also, the Development and Resource Management Plan discussed in response to comment 21-1 correlates future development to the environmental constraints such as water and transportation infrastructure.

167-2. The commenter points out that the EIR identifies unmitigated significant impacts. This is correct.

167-3. The commenter states that the EIR must identify the "constrained scenario", vis-a-vis traffic and circulation, as the project's unavoidable traffic impacts. The EIR does identify the constrained scenario as an unavoidable impact on page 4-86 following the mitigation.

167-4. The commenter states that the project should be downsized to reduce adverse impacts associated with long-term buildout. FORA intends to control

buildout vis-a-vis the infrastructure constraints through the Development and Resource Management Plan discussed in response to comment 21-1. However, statements of overriding consideration as it pertains to unmitigated impacts would still be required to be implemented.

167-5. The commenter requests that a word substantially be removed from the EIR. This is a point pertaining to semantics and does not address a substantial issue. The EIR will not be changed.

167-6. The commenter states that the AMBAG 1994 population forecast for the year 2015 used in Table 5.2-1 is incorrect. Based on the most current AMBAG Regional Population and Employment Forecast (1994), the projected Fort Ord population is 66,612 in the year 2015, which includes 20,000 CSUMB students.

167-7. The commenter requests that reference to the jobs/housing balance be removed from the EIR because there is no mechanism to ensure that persons employed in the area also live there. The point of the discussion in the EIR on this subject of jobs/housing is that when there are no housing opportunities and only jobs in a geographic area (or few housing opportunities and mostly jobs), there will be heavy traffic flows in one direction in the morning and then the opposite direction in the evenings. This results in poor use of infrastructure.

Providing a more balanced jobs/housing ratio was one of the tenets of the Reuse Plan. Without the more balanced jobs/housing ratio larger capacity regional roadways would have been required to be constructed to serve Fort Ord. This would unnecessarily increase the cost of development at Fort Ord and create a situation where, due to higher infrastructure costs, marketing Fort Ord would be more difficult. Table E-3 of the Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study depicts the current Reuse Plan's daily trip distribution. This table indicates a relative balance between trips originating from Fort Ord and going out, and trips originating off-Fort Ord and traveling in to Fort Ord. Based on the 2015 modeling by TAMC, 41% of the daily person trips originating at within Fort Ord would stay within the boundaries. Additionally, 46% of the daily person trips destined for Fort Ord would originate within the boundaries. This results in a balance of daily trip origins of 160,161 and trip destinations of 143,055 which can be expected because of the balance of uses incorporated into the Draft Reuse Plan.

167-8. The commenter recommends that water conservation associated with landscaping be quantified and included in the EIR. Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-1, Program B-1.3, contained in the Conservation Element Policy states "the city/county shall adopt and enforce a water conservation ordinance which is as stringent or more stringent than Monterey County's ordinance, to reduce water demand and effluent generation". This program is one of the reasons the 6,600 afy water demand will be reduced to 5,610 afy. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on water use and conservation.

167-9. The commenter would like the EIR to include annual water usage of both existing and proposed golf courses. Within the 2015 time frame two additional

golf courses were determined to be possible. These would use 315 afy each of reclaimed water from the MCWD's reclaimed water distribution line (not yet constructed). In the interim period, if the two new golf courses are constructed before the MCWD's reclaimed water distribution line, the golf courses could use the a part of the 6,600 afy.

167-10. The commenter states that the transportation study is based on the TAMC model which is not based on the AMBAG model. At the time the EIR was prepared for the Reuse Plan the only certified transportation model to be used in Monterey County was TAMC's MCTAM model. The commenter now requests a comparison between the certified MCTAM model and an as yet uncertified AMBAG model. This comparison will not be provided. As it pertains to the comment about socioeconomic inputs used in the MCTAM model, the commenter should refer to the TAMC for the specific socioeconomic inputs.

167-11. The commenter requests clarification of the discussion on existing methodology used in the EIR to describe baseline conditions. The conditions applicable to the transportation baseline analysis are discussed on page 4-68 of the Draft EIR in the section titled Forecasting Methodology and on page 4-72 in the section titled Operating Conditions. Based on these discussions it is evident that the baseline conditions are based on modeling and extrapolations.

167-12. The commenter requests clarification of the discussion on existing traffic conditions reported in the EIR and states that without traffic count data for specific locations, existing conditions cannot be said to have been adequately documented as required by CEQA. The approach taken in the EIR to describe existing conditions is explained on page 4-68 of the Draft EIR in the section titled Forecasting Methodology. The commenter is aware that the baseline year for the EIR analysis is 1991. However, as explained in the EIR (4-72 and 4-73), 1993/94 information was used because it was more detailed and comprehensive. Where traffic data could not be obtained, the MCTAM model was used to interpolate conditions. Therefore, the EIR used the best available information.

167-13. Tables 4.7-2 and 4.7-3 were inadvertently mislabeled. Table 4.7-2 should read 4.7-3 and Table 4.7-3 should read 4.7-2.

167-14. The commenter requests that a misspelling be changed and that the AMBAG population and employment forecast of 1994 is missing from the bibliography.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-77. Under "POM Use Only" Scenario. Change "protected" to "projected"

Page 7-3. Section 7.3 Add the following to the Bibliography: 1994 AMBAG Population and Employment Forecast.

167-15. The commenter would like to know why the LOS for Highway 101 was omitted. The roadways included in the transportation model were directed by TAMC and may have included this highway. However, Highway 101 was excluded from discussion in the EIR because it was not determined to be impacted by Fort Ord reuse to a significant level.

167-16. The commenter points out that the LOS results are reported in Appendix B, not C. The commenter is correct.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-78. Amend the last sentence in the second full paragraph to read as follows:

“LOS results for the individual scenarios are presented in Appendix B C”.

167-17. The commenter would like to know if the Draft EIR modal split assumptions used for the traffic forecasts are documented, and if so where. The historical modal split is integral to the transportation study in the EIR, however it was not discussed in the Reuse Plan. Also, the transit, bicycle and pedestrian networks are not specifically modeled within the MCTAM model, however, assumptions regarding their use, based on historical choices, are built into the model. The model assumes that 98 percent of all trips are in an automobile.

167-18. The commenter states that the procedures by which the socioeconomic forecasts were coded to the Draft EIR forecast model travel zones should be documented so that AMBAG can determine whether the traffic forecasts used for this DEIR are consistent with AMBAG traffic forecasts for the same roadways, under various alternatives and years. TAMC staff consulted on the use and development of socioeconomic forecasts outside of the study area. This data was based on the 1994 AMBAG Population and Employment Forecast. Furthermore, the procedure used to develop the zonal forecast was reviewed by the FORA ITAC.

167-19. The commenter repeats comment 167-15.

167-20. The commenter would like to know how the Annual Average Daily Traffic on Highway 156 east of Castroville decreases without capacity improvements to this roadway. As the Draft EIR is written (see Table 4.7-2) this roadway would be widened from 2 lanes to 4 lanes.

167-21. The commenter states that Table 4.7-4 should include the “POM Use Only Scenario” so the reader can assess the validity of the report’s assumed redistribution of traffic which may result from capacity improvements planned for on-site and off-site roadways in the “Financially Constrained” or “Optimistic” scenarios. The POM scenario was used to identify the location and magnitude of regional deficiencies that would occur even without the civilian reuse of former Fort Ord. This scenario does not apply to the proposed project, but is relevant to the No Project Alternative discussed in Section 6.4.

167-22. The commenter states that the standard of significance for traffic and circulation impacts is unclear and requests that the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) standard of significance be used.

The EIR uses a single LOS standard of "D" for all roadways, not the multiple LOS standards of the County's Congestion Management Program (CMP). This approach is based on "leveling out" the multiple standards that exist in each of the Fort Ord jurisdictions. Refer to the following Table 4.7-3 (A).

167-23. The commenter requests a language change to the standard of significance. The standard is appropriate as written and does not require change.

167-24. The commenter states there is a typographical error in paragraph 4 on page 4-82. The typographical error was not found.

167-25. The commenter requests a language change. The language as currently written is correct because the future beyond 2015 can only be speculated.

167-26. The commenter requests clarification of the intent of the "Optimistic Financing Scenario" vis-a-vis CEQA. The "Optimistic Financing Scenario" is relevant to CEQA because the proposed project impacts various roadways which it cannot mitigate to a less than significant level because the impacted roadways are regional roadways. However, Fort Ord will pay its fair share to reduce impacts pertinent to its traffic volumes. Therefore, the discussion as presented in the EIR is correct and changes will not be made.

TABLE 4.7-3(A)
Regional Off-Site Roadway Facilities LOS and Impact Summary¹

Roadway	Segment	Existing LOS ²	CMP LOS Standard ³	Significant Impacts		Nexus ^{7 8}
				Cumulative Development without Project ^{4,5}	Project Only ⁶	
State Highway 1	State Highway 68 to Del Monte Blvd. (Seaside)	D	E	NO	NO	NO
	Del Monte Blvd. (Seaside) to State Highway 218	D	E	YES	NO	YES
	State Highway 218 to Fremont Blvd.	D	E	YES	YES	YES
	Fremont Blvd. to Main Gate	D	D	YES	NO	NO
	Main Gate to 12th Street	C	D	NO	NO	NO
	12th Street to S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd.)	C	D	NO	NO	NO
	S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd.) to Reservation Road	C	D	NO	NO	NO
	Reservation Road to N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd.)	C	D	NO	NO	NO
	N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd.) to State Highway 156	C	D	NO	NO	NO
	State Highway 156 to Santa Cruz County line	E	E	YES	YES	NO

State Highway 68	State Highway 1 to State Highway 218	F	E	YES	YES	NO
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio Road (Highway)	F	E	YES	YES	NO
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio Road (Freeway Bypass)	N/A	C	N/A	N/A	YES
	San Benancio Road to Reservation Road	B	E	NO	NO	NO
	Reservation Road to E. Blanco Road	B	C	NO	NO	NO
State Highway 156 ⁹	Hwy 1 to 0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd.	B	C	NO	NO	NO
	0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd. to US 101	E	E	YES	YES	NO
State Highway 183	US 101 to Davis Road	E	D	YES	NO	NO
	Davis Road to Espinosa Road	C	D	YES	NO	NO
	Espinosa Road to State Highway 156	D	E	YES	NO	NO
State Highway 218	State Highway 1 to Fremont Boulevard	D	D	NO	NO	NO
	Fremont Boulevard to North-South Road	B	D	NO	NO	NO
	North-South Road to Hwy 68	B	D	NO	YES	YES
Del Monte Boulevard	El Estero to Highway 1	F	D	YES	YES	NO
	State Highway 1 to Broadway Avenue	D	D	NO	NO	YES
	Broadway Avenue to Fremont Blvd	C	D	NO	NO	NO
	State Highway 1 (S. Marina) to Reservation Road	D	D	YES	NO	YES
	Reservation Road to State Highway 1 (N. Marina)	A	N/A	NO	NO	NO

Fremont Blvd	State Highway 1/State Highway 68 to Broadway Avenue	D	D	YES	NO	NO
	Broadway Avenue to State Highway 1	C	D	NO	NO	NO
Broadway Avenue	Del Monte Blvd to Noche Buena Street	C	N/A	NO	NO	NO
	Noche Buena Street to North-South Road	C	N/A	NO	NO	NO
Reservation Road	Hwy 1 to Del Monte Boulevard	B	D	NO	NO	NO
	Del Monte Boulevard to Crescent Ave	E	D	YES	NO	NO
	Crescent Ave to Imjin Road ¹⁰	B	D	NO	NO	NO
	Imjin Road to Blanco Road ¹⁰	N/A	D	NO	NO	YES
	Blanco Road to Inter-garrison Road ¹¹	A	D	NO	NO	NO
	Inter-garrison Road to Davis Road ¹²	A	D	NO	YES	NO
	Davis Road to State Highway 68	A	D	NO	NO	NO
Blanco Road	Reservation Road to Davis Road	E	E	YES	YES	YES
	Davis Road to State Highway 68	B	D	NO	NO	NO
Blanco Road/ Sanborn Rd	State Highway 68 to State US101	C	D	YES	NO	NO
Davis Road	Reservation Road to Blanco Road	A	D	NO	NO	NO (except bridge)
	Blanco Road to Rossi Street (Highway 183)	E	D	YES	NO	NO
	Rossi Street (Highway 183) to US 101	F	D	YES	NO	NO

- 1 This table indicates which roadway segments are expected to be significantly impacted by the proposed project based on the LOS significance criteria listed in Table 4.7-3 on page 4-79 of the Draft EIR.
- 2 The existing level of service is based on the MCTAM model and use of arterial LOS methodology discussed on page 4-73 of the Draft EIR
- 3 The Congestion Management Program (CMP) standards are discussed in greater detail in TAMC's March 1994 CMP.
- 4 "POM Use Only" scenario from the EIR was used to represent cumulative off-site projects (without the project) and assumes a level of road improvements based on TAMC committed off-base projects to the year 2015.
- 5 Difference between existing conditions and "POM Use Only" scenario reflects impact of cumulative development on the regional transportation system without project.
- 6 Difference between "POM Use Only" and "Optimistic Financing" reflects impact of project only.
- 7 There is an important note pertaining to a nexus. First, the amount contributed must be proportional to the share of the improvement's costs that is created by new development. The need for an improvement may be generated by the reuse of Fort Ord, by growth within the study area but outside Fort Ord, and by the desire to correct existing deficiencies. Second, development-related financing cannot be used when a large percentage of new trips start or end outside the assessment area and, therefore, would not be charged. Thus, improvements to major facilities serving a high percentage of inter-regional trips cannot be included in a development related fee program. Third, development related financing is difficult to mandate for operations and maintenance costs. These constraints greatly impact the amount that can be generated through such programs and how the funds may be used.
- 8 Based on a nexus determination, this amount reflects FORA's fair share amount. This amount is indicated in the Business and Operations Plan (Appendix B of the Reuse Plan), PFIP Table 1-3.
- 9 PFIP indicates a 68% contribution to fund this segment based on recommendations in the Comprehensive Business Plan. Based on a strict nexus analysis there is no nexus therefore there is no Fort Ord contribution to fair share funding.
- 10 PFIP identifies a segment from Fort Ord boundary to Imjin Road (project T-6) for improvement from 4 to 6 lanes.
- 11 PFIP identifies a new 4 lane arterial from Reservation Road to Inter-Garrison Road (Project T-7).
- 12 PFIP identifies a new 4 lane arterial from Inter-Garrison Road to Barloy Canyon Road (Project T-8).

Note: Because FORA only pays its fair share transportation costs full mitigation is not assured for regional roadways. However, the EIR allows FORA, through a prescribed mitigation on page 4-86 of the Draft EIR, to apply funding to all or selected off-site improvements.

Note: Increased volume from existing conditions to "Optimistic Financing" scenario reflects impact of cumulative development with project.

167-27. The commenter states that Program A-1.1 does not ensure a funding is in place prior to the impact. Refer to the DRMP in response to comment 21-1 for a discussion of a mechanism that addresses the concern.

167-28. The commenter states that Streets and Roads Policy A-1.2 is an ineffective mitigation because FORA does not have the authority to make financial contributions to off-site transportation improvements. FORA has the authority to work with TAMC to select the most critical roadways that could benefit from the amended policy.

167-29. The commenter states that Streets and Roads Program C-1.4 is an ineffective mitigation because there is no language that would require implementation of the mitigation prior to the impact. The DRMP addressed in response to comment 21-1 addresses this concern.

167-30. The commenter states that pedestrian and Bicycles Policy B-1 is an ineffective mitigation because there is no language that would require implementation of the mitigation prior to the impact. The DRMP addressed in response to comment 21-1 addresses this concern.

167-31. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should use principles of the emerging field of Conservation Biology and provide habitat corridor linkages. The field of Conservation Biology is not "an emerging field", it has been around for decades but has not been widely implemented. Besides the 15,000 acres of continuous habitat that has been set aside for open space and administered by the BLM, the various pieces of habitat management areas accommodated throughout Fort Ord in the Reuse Plan will be administered through the Habitat Management Plan (page 1-4), which addresses conservation through development of corridor linkages. Specific locations for such linkages should be addressed at the time development proposals are submitted to the Fort Ord jurisdictions.

167-32. The commenter states that Table 5.2-1 in the EIR contains incorrect AMBAG population forecast information. The EIR consultant disagrees with the commenter. The information used in the table is based on Summary Table 1 in the current 1994 AMBAG Population and Employment Forecast.

167-33. The commenter states the population statistics are incorrect in the EIR. The commenter states the population statistics are incorrect in the EIR. There is no disagreement between the basic population forecasts but the Reuse Plan defines a market capture area for the Monterey Peninsula that includes Fort Ord in order to generate a population characterization and employment growth and project capture rates that reflect Fort Ord's location in the Monterey Peninsula Economy. This designation of a "Monterey Peninsula" area is different from that referred to in the commenter's remarks.

167-34. The commenter states that the population forecast by FORA for Fort Ord did not historically reflect the availability of water, but future AMBAG forecasts will reflect the availability of water. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

167-35. The commenter requests clarification in the EIR.

Changes to the EIR

Page 5-13. Amend the second sentence in the second paragraph to read as follows:

“The location of the ~~CSUMB~~ and UCMBEST facilities in particular ...”

167-36. The commenter would like the EIR to state why FORA should adopt a plan for uses beyond 20 years. Another way to look at the issue the commenter raises is as follows. If the economy could absorb the entire base in ten years then the Reuse Plan would have been developed for that time frame instead of a 40-60 year time frame, thus the issue raised would be moot. However, the economy can only absorb small incremental parts at a time, therefore the Reuse Plan reflects this slower and more realistic scenario.

Regardless of this rhetorical preamble, the EIR is based on the EIS because of SB 1180, which mandates the EIR to tier off of the EIS. The EIS was prepared for the disposal and reuse of all Fort Ord, except the POM Annex and a military reserve area, which the Army is keeping. Therefore, because the EIS was developed for the entire base (except the POM and other military areas), the EIR must also be developed for the entire base. The option to leave out of the Reuse Plan a portion of existing developed military property was not an option.

167-37. The commenter requests language be removed from the EIR. The language will not be removed because it is appropriate.

167-38. The commenter states that Salinas should be included in the cumulative projects table in the EIR (Table 5.1-1). Salinas was not included because it was not in the immediate area of Fort Ord.

167-39. The commenter repeats comment 167-34.

167-40. The commenter repeats comment 167-34.

167-41. The commenter requests an amendment to the language in the text. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amend text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 5-10: Amend the next to the last sentence in the last paragraph to read as follows:

“Full buildout of the Reuse Plan would occur by 2055, over a 40 to 60 year period (i.e., ending sometime between 2035 and 2055) but small area regional employment and population forecasts cannot and have not been adopted by the metropolitan planning organization (AMBAG) so far in the future. As a result, cumulative impacts of the project have not been assessed beyond 2015, the last year for which current official population forecasts are available”. ...therefore interim projections for the Reuse Plan in the year 2015 are provided, as well as projections for buildout.

167-42. The commenter states that the multiplier effect of a civilian job is greater than its military counterpart and, therefore, should be reflected in the EIR. Refer to response to comment 1-2.

167-43. The commenter repeats comment 1. Refer to response to comment 1.

167-44. The commenter requests that the EIR include a table in the alternatives discussion that compares each alternative’s daily vehicle and person trips. The information presented in the EIR is adequate for the decision makers to base a decision on.

167-45. The commenter requests that the EIR be consistent with AMBAG’s “average vehicle occupancy”. All MCTAM model results reflect assumptions and data that was certified for use by TAMC’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Board.

167-46. Commenter requests that the word “Associated” in Table 7.4 be changed to “Association”. The Final PEIR is amended to reflect this comment.

Changes to the EIR

Table 7.4 List of Acronyms. Revise as follows:

Associated Association

Response to Letter 168

168-1. The commenter would like strong water conservation measures imposed on future construction. Refer to response to comment 167-8.

168-2. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan use the most recent California Department of Finance population figures for Monterey County. The population figures used in the analyses contained in the Reuse Plan, as well as the EIR, were the figures available at the time. It would not be appropriate to have to rerun on the analyses prepared for the Reuse Plan and the EIR merely to change the numbers slightly.

168-3. The commenter would like the sources cited in each of the tables in section 2.2 of the Reuse Plan to be revised. The references in the tables are appropriate to convey the information required. One change is made to clarify the source of the information.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-18. Amend the cited sources on Table 2.2-5 to remove Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments.

168-4. The commenter requests that "three county region" forecasts be amended to read "two county region" (Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties). The projections utilized for the preparation of the Reuse Plan are principally drawn from Monterey County-wide statistics or from the area designated as the Monterey Peninsula (that includes the former Fort Ord). The setting reference is an accurate reference to the three county area. The request by the commenter has no impact on the subsequent comparisons or conclusions. No changes is required.

168-5. The commenter requests that all table and text reference to AMBAG forecasts of employment to clarify if the jobs are based on "jobs for the region," or "regional employment." The later excludes out-commuters and work-at-homes. All of the employment projections utilized for the Reuse Plan consistently utilize projections of regional employment excluding out-commuters and work-at-homes. The commenter suggests that using the larger projections (including out-commuters and work-at-homes would result in a larger number for the region. (310,700 for the region in 1995 rather than the 268,900 cited in the Reuse Plan). The differences are noted, but the Reuse Plan consistently utilizes the projections net of out-commuters and work-at-homes. The comment is noted. Changes are incorporated into Volume to correct Table 2.2-5 and the accompanying discussion. Refer to response to comment 168-12.

168-6. The commenter requests that the AMBAG forecasts for population on page 2-15 of Volume I of the Reuse Plan include 20,000 CSUMB students. This has been amended. Refer to response to comment 1-4.

168-7. The commenter requests that text be taken out of Volume I. The commenter submits more recent data from the 1995 State Department of Finance which indicates that the AMBAG figure for 1995 is almost the same as the state figure (361,400). The commenter would also like to know why the Reuse Plan author assumed the relative accuracy of the state information versus AMBAG's. There is no significant difference between the two. No comment necessary.

168-8. The commenter requests that the text be amended to reflect AMBAG data. The changes the commenter suggests would result in an inaccurate representation of the projections. The Reuse Plan characterization of growth projections is the result of including Fort Ord in the Monterey Peninsula characterization. Refer to response to comment 168-4.

168-9. The commenter requests a different use of the Monterey Peninsula break-down of growth projections that would exclude Fort Ord. The suggested display of the information is not required nor would it reflect the significance, discussion or conclusions drawn from the projections. No change is required.

168-10. The commenter requests that the household forecast projections used in Volume 1 be cited. The source is cited as Department of Finance and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group. Refer to Table 2.2-4.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-16, Table 2.2-4. Add following note to the bottom of the table:

Note: These household forecast projects are not based on AMBAG projections which is no longer current since it extended only to 1996.

168-11. The commenter repeats comment 4. Refer to response to comment 168-4.

168-12. The commenter would like the Reuse Plan (Volume 1, page 2-17) to be amended so as to cite the source of an employment estimate used in the document. The source is cited at the beginning of the sentence but a clarification can be made to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-17. Amend the third sentence in the last paragraph as follows:

Based upon current 1994 figures from EDD, recent trends and known employment loss estimates due to the closure of Fort Ord, current total employment is estimated by SKMG at about 147,000 in the County.

168-13. The commenter requests that the source of information be identified and also state that the estimate differs from AMBAG's. The commenter notes that AMBAG subsequently estimated the current total employment in 1995 to be 155,342, rather than the 147,000 estimate made by SKMG. Refer to response to comment 168-12. The comment also notes that the total jobs lost during the 1990-to-1995 period to be 5,458, rather than the 13,000 indicated in the Reuse Plan.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume 1. page 2-17. Insert the following:

Based upon current 1994 figures from EDD, recent trends and known employment loss estimates due to the closure of Fort Ord, current total employment is estimated by SKMG at about 147,000 in the County. (AMBAG has subsequently estimated the 1995 total employment to be 155,342.) This reflects a net loss of nearly 13,000 jobs during the 1990-1995 period.

(Estimated to be 5,458 by the subsequent AMBAG projections.) Given that the closure of Fort Ord was estimated to precipitate a total loss of over 20,000 jobs, Monterey County has clearly experienced job gains in other sectors.

168-14. The commenter requests that the text be revised because of inaccuracies. Table 2.2-5 has a 142,200 employment forecast for 1995. This is an error. The forecast should be 147,000 to be consistent with the estimates prepared by SKMG on the best available information as described in the prior pages. The percentage annual increases should also be amended and the accompanying text amended.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume 1, Page, 2-18, revise Table 2.2-5, Employment Forecasts Monterey County, as follows:

add ("Excluding out-commuters and work-at-home jobs") to the Table Title

revise 1995 employment forecast: ~~142,200~~ 147,000

revise the percent annual increase for the 1990-1995 period: ~~-2.3%~~ to read -1.7%

revise the percent annual increase for the 1995-2015 period: ~~2.2%~~ to read 2.1%

revise the Sources to remove: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments.

Volume 1, page 2-18, first paragraph, amend to read as follows:

Between 1995 and 2015, AMBAG SKMG forecasts the creation of ~~over 79,000~~ nearly 75,000 net additional jobs for the ~~region-county~~ (excluding out-commuters and work-at-homes). This rate of growth would produce a net additional ~~4,000~~ 3,700 jobs annually and an average annual growth rate of ~~2.2~~ 2.1 percent. Such job growth would not only replace the approximately ~~20,000-21,000~~ 18,000 jobs lost as a result of the Fort Ord closure, but would add ~~58,000-59,000~~ 57,000 jobs.

168-15. The commenter requests that the text be revised because of inaccuracies. The projections should be modified.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume 1, page 2-18, last sentence. Amend the text as follows:

The successful redevelopment of the former Fort Ord will allow the Monterey Peninsula (including Fort Ord) to potentially capture between 25 and 35% of County employment growth, or between ~~20,000~~ 18,000 and ~~25,000~~ 26,000 jobs between 1995 and 2015.

168-16. The commenter requests that the AMBAG *Livable Communities Initiative for the Monterey Bay Region* be incorporated in the Reuse Plan and include its five principles. All of the attributes of the *Livable Communities Initiative for the Monterey Bay Region* are included in Volumes 1 and 2. For example, in Volume I, refer to the following sections: Community Design Vision (3.1), Land Use Concept (3.3), land Use Designations (3.4), Circulation Concept (3.5), Conservation (3.6), Open Space and the Recreation Concept section (3.6).

In addition, contained in Volume II are policies and programs that support the AMBAG *Livable Communities Initiative for the Monterey Bay Region* and its implementation document. Refer to the following elements: land use, circulation and conservation (air quality section). Therefore, because the elements of this initiative are included in the Reuse Plan, it will not be included separately in the Reuse Plan.

168-17. The commenter repeats comment 167-31. Refer to response to comment 167-31.

168-18. The commenter states the Reuse Plan does not go far enough to support bicycle facilities. The commenter is referred to the EIR, page 4-90, which provides the specific requirements to be implemented by future Fort Ord development, including nature, location and amount (as indicated in Figure 4.7-5). Future development will be required to be consistent with the policies and programs.

168-19. The commenter recommends that Policy C-1 (Volume II, page 4-112) be amended to include *Livable Communities Initiative for the Monterey Bay Region* policy #2. Refer to response to comment 168-16. There is no necessity to amend the policy referenced by the commenter.

168-20. The commenter recommends that Policy C-1.1 (Volume II, page 4-112) be amended to include *Livable Communities Initiative for the Monterey Bay Region* policy #4. Refer to response to comment 168-16. There is no necessity to amend the policy referenced by the commenter.

168-21. The commenter requests greater detail be provided regarding the bicycle network and revise the proposed bicycle network figure (4.2-6). Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text. As it pertains to the commenter's request for a revised figure showing where class I and II bike routes will be located, the commenter is referred to figures 4.3-1.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-90. Amend Program B-1.2 to read as follows:

Each jurisdiction shall review new development to provided bicycle system facilities consistent with the Reuse Plan and the Bicycle System Plan concurrently with development approval.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-116. Amend Program B-1.2 to read as follows:

Each jurisdiction shall review new development to provide bicycle system facilities consistent with the Reuse Plan and the Bicycle System Plan concurrently with development approval.

Volume II. Page 4-115. Figure 4.2-6. This figure will require amending to indicate which of the routes shown are "Arterial Bicycle Routes" referenced in the legend of that figure. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

[Start August 22, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 169

169-1. The commenter would like information on water resource jurisdictions. The comment is difficult to interpret. However, it is interpreted to mean that other water jurisdictions are somehow involved in Fort Ord redevelopment. This is not the case, except for the contractual agreement between the U.S. Army (i.e., FORA) and the MCWRA. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 170

170-1. The commenter would like more information in the EIR pertaining to a long-term water source vis-a-vis the recent Stanislaus natural Heritage Project, Sierra Club, et al., v. County of Stanislaus and Diablo Grande Limited Partnership case. The case referred to requires that the environmental impacts associated with proposed long-term water sources be discussed in an EIR. This discussion is provided in response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 171

171-1. The commenter requests additional information on water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 172

172-1. The commenter states that the proposed housing densities are too high. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 173

173-1. The commenter states the EIR does not provide alternative that foster informed decision making. Refer to response to comment 27-3.

173-2. The commenter states that the "No Project" alternative's population projection of 35,000 is misleading because in this alternative CSUMB is proposing as many as 25,000 students. The population of 35,000 includes CSUMB and is considered roughly approximate what could be at Fort Ord in the context of the "No Project" alternative.

173-3. The commenter would like an alternative discussion in the EIR which is based on a safe yield water supply only. Refer to the Safe Yield Water Supply in response to comment 8-5.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 174

174-1. The commenter states that the EIR is so general that it is inadequate and the public cannot make an informed decision. The commenter has stated a general opinion regarding the adequacy of the EIR. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 175

175-1. The commenter expressed an interest in a national cemetery at Fort Ord. Refer to response to comment 44-1.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 176

176-1. The commenter expresses concern regarding new jobs relative to the number of jobs associated with the former military economy exceeds the mandate of FORA. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

176-2. The commenter states that Silicon Valley is the target of all marketing programs. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

176-3. The commenter states that a new EIR must be prepared to reflect the real impacts of losing military jobs. There is no legal basis for the EIR to discuss only a project that replaces military jobs. Therefore a revised EIR based on this issue will not be prepared.

176-4. The commenter states that Fort Ord jurisdictions can ignore the Reuse Plan. This is not accurate. After a Fort Ord jurisdiction has adopted the Reuse Plan into its general plan, each jurisdiction must then have FORA review and approve the updated general plan. Any subsequent changes to the general plan during FORA's tenure requires review and approval by the FORA Board. Additional environmental analysis may be required for an amendment or amendments. FORA has the option to approve the amendment request. After FORA's tenure, amendments would be subject to each jurisdictions discretion only. However, again it would be subject to CEQA requirements for environmental analysis if the existing environmental information (e.g., the HMP and the Reuse Plan EIR, EIS, etc.) is inadequate.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 177

177-1. The commenter expresses his support of the Reuse plan. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

[End August 22, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 178

178-1. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan and EIR exceed the mandates of SB 899. Refer to response to comment 43-1, 55-4 and 138-1.

Response to Letter 179

179-1. The commenter requests information on the impacts of proposed future roadway construction projects. Refer to response to comment 56-4.

179-2. The commenter states that the EIR does not explain the traffic impacts if no off-site improvements occur and for this reason the EIR is inadequate. The “financially constrained” scenario discussed in the EIR is a hybrid between no funding and some funding. Therefore, this scenario partially answers the comment. If no off-site improvements are made, then it should be deducted from the “existing conditions” column in Table 4.7-3 of the EIR (page 4-79) that the LOS would be as bad or worse.

Response to Letter 180

180-1. The commenter requests economic data on base closure. Refer to response to comment 138-1.

Response to Letter 181

181-1. The commenter states that the EIR does not contain adequate information on waste treatment capacity. Refer to response to comment 82-8.

181-2. The commenter states the EIR alludes to the feasibility of using the East Garrison wastewater treatment facility. The East Garrison treatment plant is no longer operable and will be shut down permanently by the County of Monterey when it is conveyed to the county.

Response to Letter 182

182-1. The commenter states that veterans health care is a problem. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary. However, the issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

182-2. The commenter would like to know why students get priority over veterans. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary. However, the issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

182-3. The commenter would like to know what the FORA board will do to accommodate veterans. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary. However, the issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 183

183-1. The commenter requests additional information on water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

183-2. The commenter states that a flaw of the EIR is that it considers water and traffic projects as part of the project description, not mitigations. It is uncertain what the intent of the comment is. Therefore a response cannot be provided.

183-3. The commenter states that a particular policy is inadequate. The policy referenced (Hydrology and Water Quality Policy 1-B) is appropriate. Policies are intended to be broad in scope. However, the programs must be more specific, and they are.

183-4. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan would allow subdivision without a future water source. Subdivisions are not precluded from occurring within the restraints of the jurisdictions subject to available infrastructure and services. Through the Development and Resource Management Plan (refer to response to comment 21-1) development would be monitored based on an available water supply.

Response to Letter 184

184-1. The commenter is concerned with who is responsible for fire hazards. As stated in the Draft EIR (page 4-53), the current fire protection jurisdictions at Fort Ord include the U.S. Navy (under an interservice support agreement with the Army) and the Salinas Rural Fire Protection District under an "automatic aid agreement". In the future there would be a multi-jurisdictional approach to fire protection whereby the Salinas Rural Fire Protection District and the Fire Departments of Seaside and Marina would respond to fires in their respective jurisdictions, and through inter-agency agreements, would assist each other in larger conflagrations. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection would also assist in wildland fire under certain conditions. However, because adequate funding cannot be assured, there is a forecasted significant and unavoidable impact (Draft EIR; page 4-59).

Response to Letter 185

185-1. The commenter expresses a concern about landfill. There are no plans to dig up the landfill at this time.

Response to Letter 186

186-1. The commenter expresses concern over a broad range of issues, to include: water supply (refer to response to comment 8-5); traffic and circulation (refer to response to comment 56-4); wastewater treatment capacity (refer to response to comment 82-8); taxation of neighboring communities to finance infrastructure expansion (not part of the project description); and viewshed (refer to response to comment 68-2).

186-2. The commenter expresses concern about the political situation. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 187

187-1. The commenter commends the effort to develop the Reuse Plan. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 188

188-1. The commenter expresses a concern about water issues. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

188-2. The commenter expresses a concern about transportation issues. Refer to response to comment 56-4 for a discussion on future transportation impacts and 22-1 for transportation funding.

188-3. The commenter refers to Stanislaus natural Heritage Project, Sierra Club, et al., v. County of Stanislaus and Diablo Grande Limited Partnership. This case is addressed through response to comment 8-5 and 170-1.

188-4. The commenter requests that the EIR include a discussion of an alternative project based on available water at Fort Ord. The commenter is referring to the 6,600 acy contractual agreement between the U.S. Army and the MCWRA and a safe yield water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 189

189-1. The commenter would like to know what the CEQA requirements are for property surrounding Fort Ord. There are no Fort Ord CEQA matters which overlap onto adjacent properties. However, the EIR does contain a cumulative discussion of projects surrounding Fort Ord which the commenter may be interested in reviewing (EIR, page 5-1).

189-2. The commenter expresses that he would like his community to progress. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 190

190-1. The comment is a repeat of the commenter's previous comments 159 and 163. Refer to response to comment 159.

190-2. The commenter questions the need for the Highway 68 bypass and states the EIR does not contain a comprehensive planning study nor an in depth traffic analysis demand for such a major project. The EIR accommodates the bypass in the analysis and includes the bypass in the regional "optimistic financing scenario" funding component. The inclusion of this bypass is based on the TAMC regional transportation project list.

Response to Letter 191

191-1. The commenter is concerned with the potential visual impacts of a new hotel. The Reuse Plan is written such that the Fort Ord jurisdiction's Planning Areas and Districts, which make up the urban areas of Fort Ord, are limited in their ability to construct buildings higher than the height of "identified mature landscape height". Also, refer to response to comment 68-2.

191-2. The commenter states that Blanco Road needs to be 4 lanes and the Salinas bound traffic through Reservation Road needs to be stopped. Reservation Road is currently a major regional arterial and shall continue to be. Blanco Road will be expanded to four lanes as part of project development.

191-3. The commenter states that Vietnam Veterans of Monterey County will be "getting a chunk" of land on Fort Ord. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

191-4. The commenter states that there are inconsistencies and credibility issues with other jurisdictions. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

191-5. The commenter states that there are "white holes" that BLM will ask for. The "white holes" the reader is referring to are "holes" that would result in the plan if a population cap were imposed. If a cap were imposed, future development would be concentrated in certain areas leaving the remaining areas out of the plan. It is these "white holes" the commenter assumes would go to BLM.

Response to Letter 192

192-1. The commenter request that all FORA board members be present for all public hearings. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 193

193-1. The commenter warns that the economic projections of the Reuse Plan not be followed blindly and allowed to become self-fulfilling. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 194

194-1. The commenter expresses a concern on the availability of water and desalination in particular. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 195

195-1. The commenter expresses an interest in limiting the population at Fort Ord to what it was at the time of base closure because there would not be significant impacts. On the contrary, Fort Ord as a military base was integral to the regions negative environmental impacts, especially as it relates seawater intrusion. Furthermore, even if there were no population increase above that which existed in 1991 (this wouldn't be the case for reasons discussed in the "No Project" alternative section in the EIR), regional growth will still put pressure on infrastructure that must be addressed on a local and regional level.

195-2. The commenter would like to see a long range planning and management agency for the Monterey Peninsula. AMBAG is the closest to a regional planning agency we have.

Response to Letter 196

196-1. The commenter expresses a concern about the availability of a long-term water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

196-2. The commenter would like to know where the funding will come from for transportation improvements. The Comprehensive Business Plan contained in the Business and Operations Plan of the Reuse Plan (Appendix B of the Reuse Plan) identifies a nexus for FORA's fair share. In addition, the Development and Resource

Management Plan provides flexibility for FORA to allocate funding to build roadway improvements to the “on-site” and “off-site” network, as described in the Reuse Plan to serve development activities. FORA will also participate in a regional transportation financing mechanism to contribute to Fort Ord’s roadway improvement fair share for “regional” improvements. Based on the most current nexus analysis (JHK 1997). FORA will contribute to the improvements on the following regional links: Highway 1 in the jurisdictions of Seaside and Sand City, the Highway 68 Bypass and Highway 218 between North-South Road and Highway 68. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for the full text of the Development and Resource Management Plan and response to comment 22-1 for additional information on transportation issues.

Response to Letter 197

197-1. The commenter lists the primary issues that concern UC. The specific comments follow.

197-2. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan repeatedly misuses the word “comprise”.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-101. Amend the fourth paragraph to read as follows:

“The portions of UCMBEST in the County comprise ~~are comprised~~ of two major areas...”

197-3. The commenter states that numbering some of the tables in Volume I appear to be in error. Review of Volume I indicates that no error occurs.

197-4. The commenter states that the base closure date is 1991. Review of the Fort Ord Disposal and Reuse EIS and the 1994 Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan indicates that the official announcement for base closure was January 1990.

197-5. The commenter requests clarification of the text. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-2. Amend the last line in the next to the last paragraph to read as follows:

“...with: the City of Marina, the City of Seaside, Monterey County, University of California, California State University and the California Department of Parks and Recreation”.

197-6. The commenter states that reference to the LRA is incorrect.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I, Page 1-7. Delete the last sentence of the fourth paragraph as follows:

~~However, the LRA must also share any net proceeds from real estate transactions, after subtracting the costs of infrastructure improvements, with the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD).~~

197-7. The commenter states that the reader can incorrectly interpret that FORA has authority/jurisdiction over property conveyed to other state agencies.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I, Page 1-7. Amend the second to last sentence of the fourth paragraph as follows:

The ability to control these real property interests to benefit locally from any market transactions creates a powerful mechanism for local communities and institutions to proactively support economic development and job generating activities that replace the economic benefits to the local economy lost through the base closure process.

197-8. The commenter suggests different language be used in the text to add clarity. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I, Page 1-8. Amend the next to the last bullet at bottom of page to read as follows:

"The UC Natural Reserve System is adjacent to the UCMBEST Center (with 605 about 600 acres prime maritime chaparral habitat reserve in the Marina Municipal Airport area);"

197-9. The commenter states that the 85-86 percent public use area at Fort Ord which contains unexploded ordnance "hardly seem like a public use". Public lands can be managed to limit public access.

197-10. The commenter suggests different language be used in the text to add clarity. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I, Page 1-16. Amend the fourth line in the first paragraph to read as follows:

“...to see whether, under realistic assumptions ~~optimal conditions~~, the identified...”

197-11. The commenter request clarification of the text. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-18. Section 1.2.2. Amend the last line in the first paragraph to read as follows:

“The Elements of the Reuse Plan provide the specific provisions for each of the ~~three~~ land use jurisdictions with current responsibility for controlling development of the former Fort Ord lands: the City of Marina, the City of Seaside, Monterey County, University of California, California State University and the California Department of Parks and Recreation”.

197-12. The commenter suggests different language be used in the text to add clarity. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-7. Amend the first line in the first paragraph to read as follows:

“In conjunction with the UCMBEST Center ~~research center~~...”

197-13. The commenter request clarification of the text. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-10. Amend the third line of the last full paragraph to read as follows:

“... (2) the non-Peninsula communities, including the Salinas Valley.”

197-14. The commenter suggests different language be used in the text to add clarity. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-13. Amend the first line after the table to read as follows:

“... While EDD does not segregate ~~desegregate~~ ...”

197-15. The commenter states that the summary text and the table contain discrepancies.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-19. Amend the second bullet as follows:

The former Fort Ord stands to capture a total of 1,794,000 sq. ft. or 45% of demand for office and R&D space on the Monterey Peninsula, and an additional induced demand of ~~750,000~~ 925,000 sq. ft. of R&D from Santa Clara County firm demand.

Amend the third bullet as follows:

For housing, a capture of ~~6,520~~ 6,250 new homes at the former Fort Ord is projected....

197-16. The commenter states the bulleted statements of square footage do not appear to relate properly to the accompanying text. The square footage projections were verified for their accuracy and determined to be correct. The reader is alerted to read the text very carefully. However, on page 2-23, the word "annually" should have been included in each line, just as it was in the square footage projections on page 4-21. The clarity of the information can be improved by providing summary columns and total sq. ft. capture for Fort Ord with each set of bulleted items.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Pages 2-21 through 2-24. Amend the bulleted demand projections as follows:

Light Industrial/Business Park	County Totals
165,000 sq. ft. annually from 1996 to 2000	825,000
200,000 sq. ft. annually from 2001 to 2005	1,000,000
245,000 sq. ft. annually from 2006 to 2010	1,225,000
300,000 sq. ft. annually from 2011 to 2015	<u>1,500,000</u>
	4,550,000
206,250 sq. ft. between 1996 and 2000	
250,000 sq. ft. between 2001 and 2005	
306,250 sq. ft. between 2006 and 2010	
<u>375,000</u> sq. ft. between 2011 and 2015	
1,137,500 sq. ft. Total Fort Ord Capture	

Office and Research and Development	County Totals
150,000 sq. ft. annually from 1996 to 2000	750,000
191,000 sq. ft. annually from 2001 to 2005	955,000
244,000 sq. ft. annually from 2006 to 2010	1,220,000
312,000 sq. ft. annually from 2011 to 2015	1,560,000
	4,485,000 sq. ft.

300,000 sq ft. between 1996 and 2000

382,000 sq. ft. between 2001 and 2005

488,000 sq. ft. between 2006 and 2010

624,000 sq. ft. between 2011 and 2015

1,794,000 sq. ft. Total Fort Ord Capture

197-17. The commenter requests an amendment to the text as it pertains to lodging facilities. The text speaks to lodging facilities in general. There is no need to be specific one particular agency or jurisdiction.

197-18. The commenter requests an amendment to the text as it pertains to the EDC and FORA. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-37. Amend the last sentence in the first paragraph to read as follows.

"FORA ~~may~~ will be submitting an EDC application for the lands at the former Fort Ord ..."

197-19. The commenter would like changes in the "landscape setting" graphic on page 3-4.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA

separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-20. The commenter would like changes in the “mixed use villages” graphic on page 3-5.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-21. The commenter requests that the jurisdictions be indicated on the figure on page 3-11. This figure is for illustrative purposes only.

197-22. The commenter requests that the managed habitat on Fort Ord be acknowledged on page 3-19 in Volume I. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-19. Add the following to the paragraph:

The open space areas include the UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve, the Frog Pond, the Bureau of Land Management open space area, Fort Ord Dunes State Park and other units to be owned by the Monterey Peninsula College, and the California Native Plant Society.

197-23. The commenter requests an amendment to the text to reflect conditions at the Fritzsche Airfield. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-32. Amend the second and third sentence in the paragraph in the section titled Fritzsche Field Area to read as follows:

“It is dominated by a ~~3,000~~ 4,000-foot runway ... The visual landmark in this area is the red and white striped and checkered tower that is visible from Highway 1”.

197-24. The commenter requests that figure 3.2-5 be amended to including shading to indicate that parcels 8b and 8c are part of the UCMBEST Center and provide a separate shading for the UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve areas.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-25. The commenter states that figure 3.3-1 should include 'UCMBEST" in the graphic.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-26. The commenter requests that the "Planned Development Mixed Use" for UCMBEST Center lands reflect a longer list for "Permitted Range of Uses" to reflect their Master Plan.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Table 3.4-1, Permitted Range of Uses for Designated Land Uses, Pages 3-50 through 3-52. Amend the Planned Development Mix Use category to add the following Permitted Range of Uses:

business parks

light industrial development uses

office/research and development uses

visitor Serving, where designated

open space/recreation uses

For UCMBEST:

All of the Permitted Uses in the Planned Development Mixed Use Category (above) as well as all of the following additional uses:

Educationally Related Uses

Research and Development Uses, including:

-controlled production manufacturing facilities

- production, assembly, testing, and repair facilities
- warehousing and distribution facilities
- employee recreational, dining, meeting, and public assembly facilities
- screened open storage
- other uses deemed by UC to be sufficiently similar

Light Industrial/Service Commercial Uses related to:

- fabrication, manufacturing assembly, or materials processing facilities
- warehousing, storage, and wholesaling
- service uses

Experimental Agriculture

Special Amenity Uses subject to the approval by the City of Marina or County of Monterey Planning Director, and UC.

Interim Uses subject to the approval by the City of Marina or County of Monterey Planning Director and UC.

197-27. The commenter states that the hotel opportunity site on the north side of Reservation Road should not limit UC to developing such on the south side of Reservation Road instead.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

Volume I, Page 3-135. UCMBEST Projected Land Uses. Amend the summary of projected land uses to include the additional uses:

Visitor Serving Land Use. An alternate location for a 150 room hotel/conference center.

197-28. The commenter states that "UCMBEST" should be included in figure 3.2-5 as well as other modifications to this figure.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-29. The commenter requests an addition to the text pertaining to polygons 8b and 8c.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-37. Amend second sentence in the first full paragraph to read as follows:

“Approximately 605 600 acres of these lands ...”

Volume I. Page 3-37. Add the following to the end of the first full paragraph:

“Of the approximately 1,100 acres of land, 483 acres are known as the MBEST Center lands. Of these 483 acres, 437 acres are located in the vicinity of the Marina Municipal Airport. The remaining acreage (approximately fifty acres) of the 483 acres is located in Polygons 8b and 8c and is anticipated to be transferred to UC and become part of the UCMBEST Center in the near future”.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

197-30. The commenter requests an addition to the text. Refer to response to comment 197-29.

197-31. The commenter requests removal of part of the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-37. Remove last sentence in second paragraph under Marina Municipal Airport.

~~The University intends to negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding to guide development at UCMBEST and address the relationship between the two areas.~~

197-32. The commenter requests that Table 3.3-1 and the text preceding it be amended to list separately the summary land use capacity: Ultimate Development for UCMBEST.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-41, Development Capacity, second paragraph. Amend the last sentence as follows:

The table lists the various land uses, including UCMBEST, the CSUMB designation and area-wide rights-of-way and more specific categories for hotels, golf course, and the Fort Ord Dunes State Park.

Volume I. Page 3.42, Table 3.3-1. Amend Table to desegregate UCMBEST development capacity.

197-33. The commenter requests amendment to the text. Refer to response to comment 197-32.

197-34. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-43. Amend the last sentence to read as follows:

“This includes the expected potentially...”

197-35. The commenter requests an amendment to Table 3.4-1 to add “experimental agriculture” to the permitted range of uses. The commenter is referred to response to comment 197-26.

197-36. The commenter states that the extension of California Avenue (north of Reservation Road) should not be indicated on Figure 3.5-2 because it is currently under discussion with the City of Marina.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-37. The commenter would like a text amendment as it pertains to California Avenue extension.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-62. Remove the last sentence in the first paragraph and replace with the following discussion.

“The extension of California Avenue would require disturbance in prime habitat in a portion of the UC Natural Reserve System. This extension is not discussed or evaluated in the Habitat Management Plan (HMP) and if proposed to be constructed will require new environmental analysis and mitigation. The City of Marina and UC are currently discussing this matter.”

197-38. The commenter requests that the text be amended to include a discussion of the UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve. Refer to the following added discussion.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-86. Add the following section.

UC/Natural Reserve System Fort Ord Natural Reserve

The UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve consist of approximately 605 acres flanking the north and south side of Reservation Road. The UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve is in three sections, which includes the north reserve, south reserve and corridor reserve.

The north reserve is relatively isolated 408 acre area consisting of one large parcel. Vegetation consists primarily of well-developed maritime chaparral and coast live oak woodland, with incursions of coastal scrub and grasslands. The north reserve supports habitat for several special status plant and animal species. This reserve is currently being considered for an extension of California Avenue through the west corner. This will impact the reserve’s value as a habitat corridor unless proper mitigations are applied.

The south reserve is not as isolated as the north reserve and is an approximately 186 acre parcel on the south side of Reservation Road. It contains the same principal elements of maritime chaparral and oak woodland as the north reserve. It is smaller with a larger perimeter-to-area ratio, adjacent to a developed residential area and more accessible to human use and the resulting damage. Numerous dirt roads, trails and a utility easement traverse the reserve, forming large disturbed tracts in some sections. The FORA Reuse Plan proposes and extension of Blanco Road through a portion of this reserve. This will impact the reserve’s value as a habitat corridor unless proper mitigations are applied.

The corridor reserve is approximately 11 acres and is near the intersection of Reservation Road and Imjin Road. It is highly disturbed because of its proximity to residential development. The viability of this parcel as a functional ecological connection is uncertain, the remnant vegetation and potential habitats are characteristic of the area (primarily maritime chaparral) and restoration is feasible, as soil conditions are good.

197-39. The commenter requests a change to the Habitat Management Framework figure, 3.6-2 to add a designation for UC/NRS.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-40. The commenter requests that the text be amended to reflect that UC may not receive the landfill parcel (Polygon 8a).

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-89. Remove the second sentence in the first paragraph.

197-41. The commenter states that the language in the text pertaining to commercial recreation use on the landfill cap is incorrect. The current land use options for the landfill property include the golf course option. However, because of constraints associated with the recently installed landfill cap, a proposed golf course would also require re-engineering and reconstruction of the landfill cap to accommodate the characteristics of a golf course (Dave Eisen, pers. com., February 25, 1997). In other words, the Army installed a landfill cap that was not made to accommodate irrigated turf and other vegetation typically associated with golf courses (e.g., trees). Therefore, it is likely that the landfill portion of the site will be limited to equestrian use and open space use only, due to the potential costs of reconstructing the landfill cover. Even with open space, the landscape will be limited to grasses and small native shrub only, because to allow large plant with deep root characteristics will result in the break-up and degradation of the landfill cap. It should also be noted that a future golf course on the landfill site will require additional environmental analysis to determine the potential impacts of a golf course on a landfill cover.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-89. Remove the second sentence entirely and replace the third and fourth sentences of the first paragraph with the following:

“The Reuse Plan calls for a landfill cap and a layer of soil capable of sustaining native plant. The result will be to support an equestrian center and open space containing shallow rooted native plants that will not break-up and degrade the impervious cap”.

197-42. The commenter requests that UC be included in Figure 3.6-2 as is CSUMB. Review of this figure indicates that CSUMB is not indicated on the figure.

197-43. The commenter requests that the Oak Woodland Reserve Areas identified in Figure 3.6-2 should be appropriately referenced in the text and policies cross-referenced.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-89, following the "Other Public Open Space / Habitat Management Lands. Insert the following section:

Oak Woodland Protection

The Oak Woodlands at Fort Ord represent an outstanding environmental asset. Much of this resource is located in lands that have been set aside for Habitat Management. A significant amount of these oak woodlands, however, are located in polygons that are designated for development. It is an objective of the Reuse Plan to accommodate the development programs on these polygons while protecting to the greatest extent possible the oak woodland resource.

"Development Character and Design Objectives" are identified for these polygons in the following section 3.7 Planning Areas and Districts. In addition, policies and programs to encourage the preservation and enhancement of oak woodland elements in the natural and build environment are included in Volume II of the Reuse Plan. (See Section 4.4.3 Biological Resources.)

197-44. The commenter requests that the table be amended.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-98. Table 3.3-1. Change all references to "MBEST Cooperative Planning District" with "UCMBEST Center".

197-45. The commenter requests that the table be amended.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-104. Table 3.8-1. Change all references to "MBEST Cooperative Planning District" with "UCMBEST Center".

197-46. The commenter requests that Figure 3.8-1 be amended.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA

separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-47. The commenter requests amendments to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-100. Change section 3.7.2 title from "University of California/UCMBEST Cooperative Planning Districts" to "UCMBEST Center Planning Districts", and replace the first paragraph in this section with the following text:

"The UCMBEST Center and UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve area located in the City of Marina and in Monterey County. The UCMBEST Center and UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve will total approximately 1,087 acres upon completion of anticipated land transfers from the U.S. Army. Current planning for FORA projects 5.0 million square feet to represent the ultimate development capacity for the UCMBEST Center. An additional amount of square footage are eventually expected to be associated with the future development of Polygons 8b and 8c. However, these polygons have not been master planned by UC and therefore are not included in presentations of square footage or other development characteristics".

197-48. The commenter reiterates what is written in the text and states that the 5.0 million square feet slightly exceeds the UC projections of 4.4 million square feet.

197-49. The commenter requests that the text be amended.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-101. Remove the next to the last sentence in the paragraph under the section titled Current University of California Planning and amend the last sentence in this same paragraph to read as follows:

"The current mix of uses and intensity is consistent with the UCMBEST Center Master Plan".

197-50. The commenter states the text should be amended to include Polygons 8b and 8c.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-113. Add the following sentence to paragraph under the section titled University Office park/R&D District:

"Polygons 8b and 8c have been screened to be acquired by UC and will be integral to the UCMBEST Center".

197-51. The commenter states that the landfill site discussion is incorrect.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-133. Amend first paragraph, item #2 as follows:

“... the former land fill site that is expected to may be conveyed to the University of California for the purposes of habitat protection and management ...”

197-52. The commenter states that the text is incorrect.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-101. Amend reference to “267” acres in third paragraph to read “272”.

Volume I. Page 3-130. Table 3.10-1. Amend reference to “267” acres in third column to read “272”.

Volume I. Page 3-135. Amend reference to “267” acres in second paragraph to read “272”.

197-53. The commenter requests that the report make it clear to the reader where FORA authority is limited with respect to UC, CSU, State Parks, other state agencies, and federal agencies. FORA recognizes that the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), State Parks, local school districts and other state and federal agencies have certain land use authority, independent from FORA. In general, UC, CSU, and local school districts can act on land use matters independently, if they are developing school and/or educational facilities. The US Army and the State Parks Department have independent land use authority. Other state or federal agencies may or may not be exempt from local or regional authority. We suggest the following change to the Reuse Plan to clarify this relationship.

Which change implies that UC, CSU, MPC, Monterey Peninsula Unified School District (MPUSD), the Army, MCWRA, TAMC, and the State Parks Department are not required to obtain consistency determinations from the FORA Board on general plan and zoning matters. However, no change is made to the “Procedure for Appeals and Review of Development Entitlements” because this procedure is governed by local jurisdiction land use entitlements. The authority or limitations of UC, CSU, State Parks and other local, state and federal agencies is already dictated by existing law.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I, Page 3-156, Procedure for Consistency Determinations, #1. Add a new second sentence as follows:

1. Each member agency shall submit all legislative land use decisions, affecting property within the jurisdiction of FORA, to the FORA Executive

Officer for review and processing. Ex-Officio nonvoting members of the FORA Board and the State Parks Department are exempt from this procedure. For the purpose of this procedure, the following definitions apply:

197-54. The commenter requests that all UCMBEST lands (excluding the NRS parcels) be permitted a range of uses larger than that identified in the Planned Mixed Use District. The commenter is referred to response to comment 197-26.

197-55. The commenter requests amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-11. Amend the last sentence in the first paragraph to read as follows;

“The remainder of the site is subject of an economic development public benefit conveyance” request by the University of California for the Monterey Bay Business Education, Science and Technology Center and the UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve”.

197-56. The commenter requests amendment to the text. The response to comment 197-55 addresses this comment.


197-57. The commenter asks that modifications to the HMP need to be appropriately referenced or reprinted in Volume II. Modifications to the February, 1939 HMP have been made by the Army to reflect current disposal and reuse boundaries and revised land transfer arrangements in certain areas of the former base. The modifications are summarized in an agreement for the revised HMP signed in April, 1996 by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Army, the Bureau of Land Management, the University of California and FORA. Attached is the revised HMP map dated November, 1996.

197-58. The commenter states there is a discrepancy in the text as it pertains to Blanco Road. Blanco Road is currently 2 lanes and is proposed to be expanded to 4 lanes. The existing text and graphics support this.

197-59. The commenter suggests that fewer parking lanes on urban streets be provided to reduce the potential conflicts with bicycles and reduce the overall amount of impervious surfacing and costs associated with maintenance.

Policy Consideration

Reducing roadway width will reduce impervious surfacing, reduce drainage system capacity requirements, reduce pollutant associated with impervious surfacing, reduce roadway maintenance costs, and potentially provide an incentive to use alternative modes of transportation. This is a matter for ITAC and the FORA Board to consider.



**Figure S-1
Habitat Management Plan Map for
Former Fort Ord (November 1996)**

197-60. The commenter suggests a change to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-107. Amend Program D-1.2 to read as follows:

“Each jurisdiction shall provide adequate parking in urban areas for persons with disabilities, either as on-street parking on urban roadways or as on-site parking”.

197-61. The commenter suggests a change to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-180. Amend reference to “Table 4.2-2” at the top of the page to “Table 4.4-2”.

197-62. The commenter requests additional information be included in the text. The report referenced was apparently not used in preparation of the Reuse Plan.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-217. Add the following reference to the list of archaeological references in the first paragraph:

197-63. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-242. Amend Noise Policy B-9 to state “County” not “City”.

197-64. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-264. Amend reference to “UCB” in last line of Program A-2.1 discussion to “UBC”.

197-65. The commenter states that the HMP Implementing and Management Agreement Exhibit C incorrectly shows UCNRS is responsible for parcel SR3. The change needs to be made in Volume II of the Reuse Plan as well as the HMP Implementing/Management Agreement.

The HMP implementation/management agreement is included as appendix C in Volume II of the Reuse Plan as a draft. Changes to this agreement that would result

in different management responsibilities for the landfill area will be incorporated as the HMP implementation/management agreement is finalized. Changes in the

197-66. The commenter requests clarification of how the Habitat Management Costs are derived and funded. The Public Facilities Financing Plan, in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan funds the Capital Improvements related to Habitat Management base wide, allocating the costs to the residential development on the basis of a DUE (Dwelling Unit Equivalent) Factor.

The Capital Costs are described in detail in section PFIP 1.7 and are displayed by polygon and time period on the spread sheets beginning on Pages PFIP 1-41 through PFIP 1-44. The Total Capital Costs is estimated to be \$668,000.

The DUE factors are described generically in section 5.4.6.2. Page PFIP 5-15. The detailed discussion of the Habitat Management Capital costs begins in section 5.5.3.4 beginning on page 5-27.

The habitat management program is of Base-wide significance and provides a benefit throughout the territory within Fort Ord.

197-67. The commenter requests that the ex-officio members of the FORA Board be identified at the beginning of the Comprehensive Business Plan.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Comprehensive Business Plan, Page 1-3. Following the first paragraph, insert the following:

The following shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members of the board:

- a) A representative appointed by the Monterey Peninsula Community College
- b) A representative appointed by the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District
- c) A representative designated by the Member of Congress from the 17th Congressional District
- d) A representative designated by the Senator from the 15th Senate District
- e) A representative designated by the Assembly Member from the 27th Assembly District
- f) A representative designated by the United States Army
- g) A representative designated by the California State University at Monterey Bay

h) A representative designated by the University of California at Santa Cruz Research Center at Fort Ord

i) A representative designated by the Monterey County Water Resources Agency

j) A representative designated by the Transportation Agency of Monterey County

197-68. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page 1-4. Add the following sentence to the first paragraph.

“As allowed by SB 900, UC and CSU have the ability to acquire lands through an Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) as LRAs”.

197-69. The commenter requests that Exhibit 1 of the Comprehensive Business Plan be amended to clarify UC’s police responsibilities and to identify responsibilities for Storm Water Collection and Water Supply and Distribution.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page 1-7. Amend Exhibit 1A to incorporate additional designations.

197-70. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should specifically identify ways to expedite clean-up of contaminated areas. The U.S. Army or its designee has already prepared a clean-up plan and is currently cleaning-up contaminated areas.

197-71. The commenter objects to the language used in the text. The language in the text is appropriate.

197-72. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-1. Change footnote reference from “University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC)” to “UCMBEST Center”.

197-73. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-2. Amend discussion under item 4 to read as follows:

“The Monterey Bay Research crescent is a rich resource of innovation and technologies available from the numerous research and educational

institutions (a total of 20 have been identified to date). The research crescent is emerging as a leader in disciplines with applications in diverse markets such as: environmental technologies and applied instrumentation; biotechnology, especially in agriculture and marine applications; information science and engineering; education research (K12 to lifelong learning) and multimedia applications to both education and entertainment; and language instruction. The UCMBEST Center will draw upon and link the talents of the regional institutions to each other, to public and private sector entities that will relocate to or participate in the newly formed UCMBEST Center at Fort Ord, and to national and international regions and institutions. The UCMBEST Center is planned to be a place of innovation and development that will help to position the Monterey Bay region and Central California competitively in the global economy of the coming decades”.

197-74. Response to comment 197-73 negates this comment.

197-75. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-3. Remove the first and second sentence on this page as follows:

~~Local governments in California continue to labor under tremendous fiscal constraints due to Proposition 13 and the continuing general withdrawal of state financial support to local government. Attitudes on the part of the educational institutions that ignore this reality are counter productive. These constraints may limit the practical benefits of redevelopment to some extent.~~

197-76. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-3. Add to the last sentence in the first paragraph the following:

“... that showed initial basewide assessments to be prohibitive to UCMBEST Center success”.

197-77. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. The interpretation by the commenter is incorrect.

197-78. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-3. Amend reference to "Preliminary UCMBEST Business Plan" at the end of the first paragraph to "Baseline Operations Plan and Financial Analysis".

Appendix B. Page II-14. Amend reference to the "initial operations plan" in the second sentence of the third paragraph to read "Baseline Operations Plan and Financial Analysis".

197-79. The commenter states that light industrial properties rarely sell as high as \$6.50 per square foot. The text is not inconsistent with the comment.

197-80. The commenter makes a comment about the text. No response or changes to the text is required.

197-81. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. The statement made in the text was not intended to imply that UCMBEST Center would not create new economic growth.

197-82. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-14, third paragraph. Amend the second to last sentence as follows:

"In other words, the capital costs of infrastructure, particularly offsite, basewide infrastructure, were estimated to be more than twice the land value implied by the land uses in the plan."

197-83. The commenter makes a comment about the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-15, Energy Supply Systems. Add the following to the end of the paragraph:

"It is important to place emphasis on improving the electrical power grid to increase stability. For example, attracting large scale R&D users could require upgrades to create a "dual" system."

197-84. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-16. Remove the second sentence of the first full paragraph.

197-85. The commenter would like to know if the demolition costs are included in the feasibility equations and state how they will be paid for. The demolition costs are considered a base-wide cost in the Comprehensive Business Plan. The commenter is referred to response to comment 7-1 for clarification of the treatment of demolition costs.

197-86. The commenter would like to know why the total burden of development per acre is higher for the MBEST center. The total burden reflects the proportion of the industrial/commercial program that is concentrated within UCMBEST and the judgments regarding the fee burden that can be carried by the various different land uses.

197-87. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. This is a repetition of comment 197-69. The commenter is referred to that response.

197-88. The commenter requests an amendment to the text regarding marketing strategy. The commenters concerns are addressed in section B6, page III-4. No changes are necessary.

197-89. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. Refer to the following Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page III-3. Reference to "Monterey Crescent" should read "Monterey Bay Crescent".

197-90. The commenter provides an opinion regarding a market recommendation. The recommendation will be considered by FORA.

197-91. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. Refer to the following Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page III-14. Change reference to "MBEST Cooperative Planning District" in the third line of the paragraph under the section titled UCMBEST Center, to "UCMBEST Center".

197-92. The commenter requests that the text be amended.

Change to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page III-14, UCMBEST Center. Replace the existing paragraph with a description to be provided by UCSC.

197-93. The commenter requests an amendment to Figure 3.3-1. Refer to comment 197-27.

197-94. The commenter requests that the text be amended to treat UCMBEST in a way similar to CSUMB. The Comprehensive Business Plan integrates financial aspects of Reuse. In this regard, UCMBEST and CSUMB have many significant distinctions, since CSUMB is principally an educational institution without revenue generating uses. UCMBEST's 5 million sq feet of development, by contrast, is expected to have a significant private sector component that results in a different financial role at Fort Ord.

197-95. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. The updated square footage forecast is conveyed to FORA through this document.

Policy Consideration

FORA should consider whether to revise the Draft Reuse Plan to reflect a reduction in buildout capacity for UCMBEST provided by UC, reducing the draft program from 5,022,631 sq ft and 150 room hotel to 4,416,697 sq. ft. and a 150 room hotel.

197-96. The commenter cannot verify numbers in the text and would like assistance. Refer to response to comment 7-2.

197-97. The commenter states that per acre costs for UC are contradictory. The burden of financing public improvements for UCMBEST is indicated to be \$58,693 per acre for base-wide facilities, and \$6,204 per acre for local facilities totaling \$64,897 as indicated in the Comprehensive Business Plan. (Refer also to the burden analysis summarized on Table PFIP 4-1, page PFIP 4-6.) As noted on page IV-23, these costs are substantially below those indicated in the PFIP infrastructure cost analysis, which would have resulted in a negative land value and effectively precluded development. The differences reflect the public financing strategy that shifts costs to residential development to carry a higher burden than a strict nexus would indicate.

197-98. The commenter requests that the text pertaining to developer fees from UC to FORA be amended to clarify assumptions regarding land sales. Subsequent drafts of the Comprehensive Business Plan shall make this clearer.

197-99. The commenter provides the opinion that the operating costs in the text are excessive. The costs are related to the described role for FORA. To the degree these anticipated costs can be absorbed by the land use jurisdictions and FORA's responsibilities streamlined, this cost would be expected to decline. These refinements to the responsibilities and costs are part of on-going discussions. The Comprehensive Business Plan reflects a complete picture by which to gauge alternative financing choices or sharing of responsibilities.

197-100. The commenter points out a spelling error in the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page IV-26. last paragraph. Amend the first sentence to insert:

"..\$20.0 million during the 20-year development period..."

197-101. The commenter would like to know if the figure includes funding for Highway 156. Yes, it includes an extra \$16 million for Highway 156. Refer to response to comment 7-2.

197-102. The commenter requests that the Mello-Roos fees in the Comprehensive Business Plan be clearly delineated for infrastructure capital and maintenance only. Subsequent drafts of the Comprehensive Business Plan will address this concern.

197-103. The commenter states that the statement in the PFIP that all property taxes will be needed to pay for on-going services, thereby precluding the use of the Tax Increment Financing, conflicts with previous comments in the Reuse Plan and eliminates a valuable development tool. The comment is noted and the refinements to the Comprehensive Business Plan will can address the use of Redevelopment.

197-104. The commenter requests an amendment to the text to clarify how UC's NRS lands (as part of the Habitat management capital costs fees are calculated.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page PFIP 1-18. Clarify the habitat management assumptions in the tables and add the following sentence after the first full sentence on the page:

"UC is one agency whose HMP costs will not be financed by a uniform benefit assessment. UC accepted the 605 acres of habitat land based on the understanding that they would manage it at their own expense".

197-105. The commenter requests clarification of the information in the text. Reservation Road is proposed to be widened to six lanes with the Blanco Road extension.

197-106. The commenter states that the PFIP indicates the Blanco Road extension will be built in the 2001 through 2005 period, yet other portions of the document indicate development of this road segment would occur later. The commenter suggests an alternative phasing of improvements between Reservation Road and Blanco Road. Updates to the CIP can more effectively address such alternative phasing strategies. Comment is noted.

197-107. The commenter request a modification of Figure 1-3.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from

commenters of requests for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-108. The commenter points out that the PFIP includes a desalination plant in the later phase of development yet there is no clear direction at this time that this plant should be constructed. The financing assumptions are meant to anticipate the costs of potential augmentation of the water supply. The costs for the desalination facility are a surrogate for that approach.

197-109. The commenter points out a discrepancy between the Reuse Plan and the FORIS study's UCMBEST water demand and demand basis for wastewater flow. At one time, UC staff submitted the view that employee density at the MBEST Center would be less than conventional Office/R&D because of prototype experience at the UCSC campus. The reduction in water demand from .00012 to .0001 was an effort to reflect this information. The corresponding "Water Demand Basis of Wastewater Flow" on page 2-8 of the PFIP should read .16 mgd not .14 mgd

197-110. The commenter states that the summary cost screen for all capital improvements needs to reflect the reallocation resulting from imposition of a one-time Mello-Roos fee. This is not the function of the table. The table is a calculation of the nexus-based cost. Refer to response to comment 197-97.

197-111. The commenter requests clarification of the information in the text. Reservation Road is proposed to be widened to six lanes with the Blanco Road extension.

197-112. The commenter requests that discrepancies in the text pertaining to the Blanco Road extension be amended. Blanco Road extension is proposed to be completed by 2004, . This is stated in the PFIP, pages 1-32 and page 3-15. Figure PFIP 1-3 does not indicate this staged improvement.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B, PFIP, Figure PFIP 1-3. Add the Blanco Road Extension (project T-40) to the figure.

197-113. The commenter repeats statement regarding financing the desalination plant. Refer to comment 197-108.

197-114. The commenter requests that BLM, State Parks and UC be parenthetically referenced as agencies that carry their own habitat management costs in Table PFIP 3-1 (page 3-24).

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to Reuse Plan and EIR tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of

requests for changes to tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

197-115. The commenter requests an amendment to the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page PFIP 3-32. Change "Airport area" in last sentence in next to the last paragraph to "the UCMBEST Center, Marina Municipal Airport and the Marina Business Park."

197-116. The commenter requests clarification of language pertaining to conveyance of the water supply system. The issue is moot because the water system has been conveyed to the Marina Coast Water District.

197-117. The commenter requests clarification of the text pertaining to a desalination plant. Refer to comment 197-108.

197-118. The commenter requests clarification of the text pertaining to a desalination plant. Refer to comment 197-108

197-119. The commenter would like the Historic Allocations plan to state that since the MBEST Center had very little water use historically, this option would prevent development of the UCMBEST Center and foreclose the economic benefits that would otherwise accrue from it. While the comment is accurate in respect to the UCMBEST Center development under an historic water allocation plan, a similar comment is also applicable to any number of other polygons as well. In the general sense, this fact is reflected on page PFIP 3-56 which included the bulleted point that the historic use allocation scenario "favors past land utilization" while the future use allocation scenario reflects planned future activity over a new service area. Thus the comparative situation is addressed without specific citation of UCMBEST Center as a case in point.

197-120. The commenter would like a change the text on figure PFIP 3-4. This is the same comment as 197-119. Comment noted. As was addressed in response to comment 197-119, the water allocation factors cited on page PFIP 3-67 are generic rather than polygon specific. However, the comment is correct that a water allocation based on historic use would foreclose UC MBEST development. This fact is reflected in Table PFIP 3-14 which clearly indicates that the historic use allocation scenario does not meet either CSUMB or MBEST needs.

197-121. The commenter would like a footnote added. Comment noted. Refer to response to comment 197-119.

197-122. The commenter would like the PFIP to summarize outstanding policy issues. Comment noted.

197-123. The commenter would like the PFIP to state when the special tax will begin to be collected. The accompanying text states on page PFIP 5-5 that the one-time special tax is collected at the time a building permit is issued.

197-124. The commenter requests an amendment to the Public Services Plan. Since UCMBEST is not an "assumed provider" of the public services listed, there is no reason for inclusion.

197-125. The commenter requests verification of the text. Comment noted. The statement that a joint powers agency (JPA) would be a practical means to achieve a single unified agency with responsibility for water supply represented an "emerging consensus" as of the May 19, 1996 date of the public services plan. Whether or not that consensus exists today is beyond the scope of the EIR.

197-126. The commenter requests changes be made to tables 4-9 through 4-12 in the Public Services plan.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to Reuse Plan and EIR tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to tables will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

Response to Letter 198

198-1. The commenter requests that the EIR include discussion of the expected traffic impact on Davis Road. The impact on Davis Road has been determined and the result is to widen Davis Road to four lanes north of Blanco Road and construct a new bridge to replace the current bridge on Davis Road south of Blanco Road that is out of the floodplain. Fort Ord is responsible for approximately 60 percent of the Davis Road widening project and is responsible for approximately 40 percent of the bridge replacement project.

198-2. The commenter states that infrastructure development should occur concurrently with development projects. The intent of FORA is to assure that this occurs and to achieve this goal a growth management program has been crafted which is located in response to comment 21-1 and 22-1.

198-3. The commenter states that the EIR's forecast for transportation infrastructure is based on historical transport mode splits. Transit, bicycle and pedestrian networks are not explicitly modeled within the MCTAM, however assumptions regarding the use of these modes, based on historical mode choice, are built into the model.

Enhancements to include direct consideration of alternative modes was not possible for this study. Thus, the travel demand forecasts prepared for this study are based on relatively low levels of alternative mode use. In this manner, the resulting forecasts should be considered “auto-oriented” or “worst case” with respect to identifying future roadway improvement needs. The commenter also states that traffic impacts can be significantly reduced through a comprehensive traffic demand management program. Based on historical mode splits, it is highly unlikely given the current interest in traveling in vehicles (98 percent of trips) that a comprehensive traffic demand management program implemented by the Reuse Plan will “significantly reduce” impacts. However, it is recognized that impacts can be incrementally reduced (but not to a less-than-significant level on the regional roadway system) with a comprehensive traffic demand management program.

198-4. The commenter recommends that the EIR include scenarios with different mixes of conventional and alternative transportation modes. The additional analysis, though it would be beneficial, is not part of the project scope of work.

198-5. The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate a scenario where future development does not aggravate seawater intrusion. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

198-6. The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate an additional scenario where future development uses only the 6,600 afy. The 2015 scenario, which is the subject of the Business and Operations Plan, is pegged to the 6,600 afy. through implementation of the Development and Resource Management Plan that addresses seawater intrusion. Refer to response to comments 8-5 and 21-1.

198-7. The commenter would like additional information on future water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

198-8. The commenter would like to know if the agreement between the Army and the MCWRA would allow the use of the 6,600 afy anywhere on Fort Ord. The water may be used anywhere on Fort Ord per the agreement.

198-9. The commenter states that storm water runoff impacts were not analyzed in the Reuse Plan, therefore it cannot be determined if the policies and programs used as mitigation measures are sufficient. Refer to response to comment 165-24.

198-10. The commenter expresses concern of the general nature of a storm water runoff program. Refer to response to comment 198-10.

198-11. The commenter requests that the letter of comment on the Reuse Plan’s Notice of Preparation submitted to FORA by Salinas be responded to. The Salinas letter identifies the following issues:

Transportation

1. Timing of transportation improvements. The Public Facilities Implementation Plan identifies what improvements and during what five-year phase improvements will occur (subject to change based on economic conditions). Also, refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion of the transportation monitoring program.
2. Transportation mode scenarios analyses. The 10% and 20% mode shift scenarios are not required to be prepared for this EIR. However, the commenter touches upon an important point. The transportation study used in the Reuse Plan used an historical modal split, however this element of the model was not discussed in the Reuse Plan. Also, the transit, bicycle and pedestrian networks are not specifically modeled within the MCTAM model, however, assumptions regarding their use, based on historical choices, are built into the model. The model assumes that 98 percent of all trips are in an automobile. In this manner, the resulting forecasts may be considered "auto-oriented" or "worst case" with respect to identifying future roadway improvement needs. This approach leads to mitigating impacts with more roadways. Funds are then collected by agencies and allocated to the roadway "improvement" projects identified as mitigations. The possibility of using these funds for another type of transportation system becomes remote or impossible. The current universal method used to forecast transportation problems and solve them, under these conditions, can then be construed as "self-fulfilling". In an environment such as this, implementing "change" in the way we travel may be difficult or impossible.

Water Use/Supply

1. Alternative growth scenario based on on-site water resources and a safe yield water supply. There is no basis for discussion of future development based on on-site resources only. However, as it pertains to seawater intrusion or a "safe yield" water supply. The Development and Resource Management Plan discussed in response to comment 21-1 addresses this issue. The commenter is also referred to response to comment 8-5 for of future water sources.
2. Alternative growth scenario based on 5,500 afy. The commenter is referred to response to comment 8-5 for a discussion of future sources of water and their potential impacts.
3. Line loss as a source of recharge. The EIR assumes no recharge associated with line loss because it is the intent of FORA to eliminate line loss.
4. Use of the 6,600 afy. The entire 6,600 afy will be used on Fort Ord property.

Storm Water Runoff

1. Quantify runoff from future development. The EIR does not quantify the amount of future runoff. Refer to response to comment 165-24.
2. Storm water runoff quality. Refer to response to comment 165-24.

Response to Letter 199

199-1. The commenter states that the EIR does not provide alternative solutions to address the impacts of water, traffic and wastewater. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to traffic, the EIR identifies two primary impacts, those associated with on-site impacts and those associated with off-site impacts. The on-site impacts are fully mitigated. However, the off-site impacts are identified in the EIR to be unavoidable and significant impacts. Refer to the Traffic and Circulation discussion in the EIR and refer to response to comments 22-1 and 56-4. As it pertains to waste water, refer to response to comment 82-8.

199-2. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should replace only what was lost as a result of the population and economic impacts of the former military base. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

Response to Letter 200

200-1. The commenter states that buildout of the proposed project would result in significant environmental impacts associated with traffic, water and scenic highways. As it pertains to traffic, the EIR identifies two primary impacts, those associated with on-site impacts and those associated with off-site impacts. The on-site impacts are fully mitigated. However, the off-site impacts are identified in the EIR to be unavoidable and significant impacts. Refer to the Traffic and Circulation discussion in the EIR and refer to response to comments 22-1 and 56-4. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to scenic highways, the EIR adequately discusses and mitigates the Highway 1 scenic corridor the commenter alludes to.

200-2. The commenter would like an alternative discussion to be included in the EIR which reflects a reuse scenario with reduced density that can be served by concurrent infrastructure. The reduced density alternative is the "No Project" alternative. This is discussed in section 6 of the Draft EIR. As it pertains to buildout that can be served by concurrent infrastructure, the Reuse Plan (Volume I; page 3-151 - Section 3.11.4 - *FORA's Growth Management Principles and Approach*) addressed this issue. However, it has been reinforced with preparation of a Development and Resource Management Plan which is presented in response to comment 21-1.

200-3. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should set the level of economic activity at the former Fort Ord to the level that existed at that the time of base closure and the rate of development should be tied to the ability to fund

infrastructure and minimize infrastructure costs. As it pertains to replacing the jobs lost, refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4. As it pertains to correlating future development to the ability to fund infrastructure costs, this is addressed in the Business and Operations Plan and FORA's *Growth Management Principles and Approach* and through the Development and Resource Management Plan included in response to comment 21-1.

Policy Consideration

The FORA Board should consider whether to limit economic development to replacing the 18,227 jobs that existed at the former Fort Ord at the time of base closure.

200-4. The commenter states that the population in 2015 should be no more than approximately 31,500 people. There is no legal requirement that the population at Fort Ord be limited. However, resource constraints could restrict population. Refer to the Development and Resource Management Plan included in response to comment 21-1.

Policy Consideration

The FORA Board should consider whether to limit the population to the same population that was on the Base when Fort Ord was a full military installation.

200-5. The commenter would like the EIR to recommend that the assumptions for implementing Fort Ord infrastructure improvements be clearly listed in the Final Reuse Plan. It appears the commenter is requesting information that would summarize the financial assumptions in Appendix B: Business and Operations Plan. The Comprehensive Business Plan provides the broadest overview of the financial assumptions used in the infrastructure financing approach and the references to the detail in the PFIP. The PFIP provides the clearest discussion on the assumptions and rationale of the individual financing components. Refer to response to comment 7-2 for revisions and corrections that are incorporated in the Draft Comprehensive Business Plan. With respect to financing refinements, refer also to response to comments 9-4, 57-1, 60-78, and 165-5.

200-6. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include infrastructure funding mechanisms that will assure infrastructure development that is concurrent with new development. The Reuse Plan (Volume I; page 3-151 - Section 3.11.4 - *FORA's Growth Management Principles and Approach*) addressed this issue and has been reinforced with preparation of a Development and Resource Management Plan which is presented in response to comment 21-1.

200-7. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan develop funding mechanisms treating base wide infrastructure (Transportation, water, sewer, drainage) projects as single projects to mitigate impacts. FORA and the land use jurisdictions will need to retain financing flexibility

to respond to a wide range of future conditions. CEQA requires that specific impacts require specific mitigations but does not require a financing plan to be directly linked to a mitigation program.

200-8. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a policy requiring each jurisdiction to develop more detailed allocations of infrastructure costs for each planning area and then require coordinated infrastructure development programs per planning area linked to base wide infrastructure. Such an approach would limit the flexibility to respond to development opportunities and market forces that are part of the implementation principles. The mechanism for managing the financing of infrastructure is the CIP. Refer also to response to comment 21-1.

200-9. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a program managing traffic related to available capacity of roads and transit systems. The Reuse Plan (Volume I; page 3-151 - Section 3.11.4 - *FORA's Growth Management Principles and Approach*) addressed this issue and has been augmented with preparation of a Development and Resource Management Plan which is presented in response to comment 21-1.

200-10. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a program identifying how transit service to Fort Ord will be funded. The funding of capital improvements, (park and ride lots and buses) is included in the PSP. Funding of transit operations and maintenance is the responsibility of the MST. Refer to response to comment 154-2.

200-11. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include FORA's policy for paying its fair share of regional highway expansion, including Highways 1, 101, 68 and 156. The Draft EIR, as written, requires FORA to pay its fair share improvements to Highways 1 and 68. Because there was no nexus, Highways 101 and 156 are not on the Fort Ord fair share funding list. The premise of a nexus analysis is to identify the "fair share" of each proposed improvement that could be allocated to future development. The basis for Highways 101 and 156 not being funded through a nexus determination of Fort Ord impacts is because development-related financing cannot be used when a large percentage of new trips start or end outside the assessment area. Thus, improvements to major facilities serving a high percentage of inter-regional trips cannot be included in a development-related fee program. Refer to comment 22-1.

200-12. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a policy that the ultimate development pattern at Fort Ord reflect AMBAG's "Livable Communities Initiative". Refer to response to comment 168-16.

200-13. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a water allocation and monitoring program for 6,600 afy. A Development and Resource Management Plan has been developed and is included in response to comment 21-1.

200-14. The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a policy that new water sources come from a variety of sources. The EIR addresses this issue and refer to responses to comment 8-5 and 21-1.

200-15. The commenter would like the Final EIR to recommend a program requiring Fort Ord jurisdictions to adopt specific design guidelines for development affecting the Highway 1 and Highway 68 scenic corridors. As it pertains to Highway 1, refer to response comments 1-1 and 68-2. Fort Ord reuse in the area of South Boundary Road has the potential to impact Highway 68. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 142. Add the following to the last sentence in Objective 2 pertaining to Visitor Serving Hotel and Golf Course District in the South Gate Planning Area:

“... and to not significantly impact the view from scenic Highway 68”.

Volume I. Page 142. Add the following to the last sentence in Objective 2 pertaining to Office Park/R&D District in the South Gate Planning Area:

“... and to not significantly impact the view from scenic Highway 68”.

Volume I. Page 143. Add the following to the last sentence in Objective 2 pertaining to Office Park/R&D District in the York Road Planning Area:

“... and to not significantly impact the view from scenic Highway 68”.

200-16. The commenter requests that the EIR include a discussion of the plan policies and programs enforcement and appeal procedures. The reader is referred to the discussion of this issue commencing on page 3-155 of the Reuse Plan, Volume I. Refer also to response to comment 21-1 for required findings for project approval by the land use jurisdictions and FORA.

200-17. The commenter requests that the Final EIR recommend that FORA will monitor and annually review the Reuse Plan implementation, particularly its CIP, and that the Reuse Plan be regularly updated at least every 5 year. As described in the Development and Resource Management Plan, the CIP would be updated annually and the jurisdictional water allocation would be updated every 5 years. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for this discussion. As it pertains to updating the plan every 5 years (except for housing elements), there is no requirement (CEQA or otherwise) that requires updating every 5 years. However, there is the requirement that a reuse plan or a general plan be updated whenever a plan becomes outdated or unusable due to the changing conditions of a community. Most communities update all or portions of their plans within 15 years. The sunset provisions for FORA in SB 899 provide that FORA will cease to operate by 2014 or when 80% of redevelopment is reached.

Policy Consideration

FORA should consider whether a specific reuse plan update schedule be adopted.

Response to Letter 201

201-1. The commenter expresses an opinion which does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 202

202-1. The commenter would like a national cemetery. Refer to response to comment 44-1.

Response to Letter 203

203-1. The commenter expresses his concern about the "conceptual" discussion in the Reuse Plan as it pertains to Seaside. Refer to response to comment letter 1-10.

203-2. The commenter would like FORA authority to respect the autonomy of local jurisdictions. The commenter does not address directly the content of the Reuse Plan or DEIR. A role for FORA is recommended in the Comprehensive Business Plan in Appendix B which is consistent with SB 899. The financial model based on that role for FORA provides a benchmark by which to assess alternative financing approaches for infrastructure, demolition, and other basewide considerations. The role for FORA in the implementation of the Reuse Plan is an important policy area for the Board to consider.

Policy Consideration

The role for FORA in the implementation of the Reuse Plan is an important policy area for the Board to consider.

203-3. The commenter would like FORA to address the upfront cost issues. The Comprehensive Business Plan identifies management costs associated with the implementation of Fort Ord. Some of these costs are allocated to FORA staff in the draft Comprehensive Business Plan. Other costs are anticipated to be covered by the general fund for the land use jurisdictions (e.g. community planning services). The financial model incorporates costs in both areas. The commenter is correct to assume that if FORA's operational costs are reduced for FORA, a corresponding burden will fall to the land use jurisdictions. Any final financing plan adopted by FORA's Board should take into account these costs.

Forecasted capital costs are documented in the CIP. It is anticipated that these costs will be refined annually in the CIP update required in the Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

203-4. The commenter states the PFIP does not include the costs of annual operations. The recommended financing for annual operations for the base-wide capital projects is summarized in Table PFIP 1-2 on page PFIP 1-22 of Appendix B. Not all costs are borne directly by base-wide assessments. Other costs borne by the land use jurisdictions as a result of the redevelopment of Fort Ord is included in the Public Services Plan, which provides a fiscal assessment of development for Seaside, Marina, Monterey County, and the Salinas Rural Fire District. Based on the unit costs available during the preparation of the Public Services Plan, a net fiscal surplus or deficit is forecasted for each jurisdiction. This fiscal analysis is graphically summarized for the 20-year period to 2015 on Figure 1-1, page 4 of the PSP. The Comprehensive Business Plan has taken into account the fiscal burden of each jurisdiction by allocating \$20,000,000 to funding of the shortfall for local services. (See Exhibit 13, "Preliminary Financial Summary" in the Comprehensive Business Plan.) As illustrated in the financing plan in the PFIP and the Comprehensive Business Plan the financing parameters are challenging. In addition, the refinement of the financial models does not reveal all of the cash flow difficulties that the jurisdictions can expect. It is anticipated that FORA will continue to refine its comprehensive Business model to optimize the objectives of the member jurisdictions.

203-5. The commenter states that the PFIP assumes CSUMB and UCSC will pay their fair share of capital costs. The financial model does assume CSUMB and UC will contribute to the infrastructure costs. The development fees that are used in the financial model, do however, shift the financing burden from jobs producing uses to residential uses. Different assumptions about the contribution of CSUMB or UC will have an impact on a number of financing parameters in the model.

203-6. The commenter questions whether FORA should commit funds to off-base regional roadways when other public or private agencies to benefit from roadway improvements have not committed to similar funding mechanism. Comment noted. The basis for the fair share calculation for on-site, off-site, and regional roadways is based on a nexus calculation detailed in the PFIP. This nexus is the basis for establishing fair share financing responsibilities for Fort Ord.

203-7. The commenter would like the Business and Operations Plan to reflect that lands to be directly conveyed to Seaside through a conveyance mechanism (the proposed hotel site and the Hayes Housing site) outside the purview of SB 899 and SB 1600 do not require any of the proceeds to be provided to FORA. The Draft Comprehensive Business Plan (CBP) does provide for the land sales from the hotel site and the Hayes Housing site to be treated as all other land sales that are part of the proposed FORA-initiated EDC. This reflects the current status of these properties during the drafting of the Draft CBP. Refinements to the Business Plan are anticipated to refine the information base and select a financing approach. The

treatment of the hotel site (within the existing golf courses) and the Hayes Housing site will be modified in subsequent Business Plans, as appropriate, based on the ownership of these properties. Refer also to response to comments 9-13, 57-1, and 60-78.

203-8. The commenter would like the Business and Operations Plan to be updated to reflect that the Army will transfer ownership of the two existing golf courses to Seaside. The Plan is currently being updated to reflect current conditions in anticipation of the economic development conveyance process currently underway. Also, refer to response to comment 7-2.

203-9. The commenter states that the level of specificity in the Reuse Plan is excessive. The level of specificity contained in the Reuse Plan was dictated by SB 899 which required the Reuse Plan to contain a land use, transportation, conservation, recreation and a five-year capital improvement program. As it pertains to lot size, the lot sizes were used to determine the number of units that could be developed based on acreages. The commenter is correct in stating that the lots sizes are more appropriately address in zoning and subdivision ordinances.

203-10. The commenter identifies an example in the text in the Reuse Plan pertaining to future development as an example which allows the flexibility the land use jurisdictions wish to retain in order to respond to and capitalize on opportunities as they arise. This is a policy consideration for the FORA BOARD.

Policy Consideration

The City of Seaside is requesting more broad language which would allow the city to respond to and capitalize on development opportunities as they arise. There are land use and CEQA implications to this request. For example, the replacement of residential land use densities with lower densities, could potentially reduce the viability of an integrated transit system and rail system, decrease internal traffic on the existing Fort Ord road system, and increase traffic flows on regional roadways. This scenario was not considered in the traffic model prepared for the EIR. The traffic model is instead premised on the densities discussed in the Reuse Plan under consideration. To change densities could require new traffic analysis. Furthermore, with fewer residential units on Fort Ord there would be a different jobs/housing balance scenario where less traffic occurs on Fort Ord internal roadways, but more traffic on the regional roadway system. A greater number of vehicles on, for example, Blanco Road and Highway 68, would increase these roadways congestion beyond that evaluated and projected in the transportation model. A significant change in the residential land use densities may require funding for a new transportation model analysis and its accompanying report.

203-11. The commenter discusses the residential density issue pertaining to Bostrom Park. The Reuse Plan does permit the flexibility described in the comment to locate development up to the maximum development intensity in the land use map up to an aggregate total of housing units provided in the projected

development capacity for the Seaside. This concept is reinforced in the general note to table 3.9-1 in italics: *"The 'Land Use Capacity' is a projected development yield based on anticipated market absorption, land characteristics, and community vision. The capacities indicated are intended to provide a general guide to assist in land resource management and infrastructure commitments and financing. The precise mix of uses is expected to vary in response to market conditions and FORA actions. The aggregate totals provide a 'not-to-exceed envelope' of development within the former Fort Ord."*

To clarify the Reuse Plan Framework, the New Golf Course Community District should be amended to separate more individual subareas within the district by adding the Brostrom Park area. It is still the intention of the Reuse Plan, however, to retain flexibility for the land use jurisdiction to reallocate the total development capacity within this district in order to respond to market demands. The Reuse Plan anticipates a reallocation so long as the number of units in the district do not exceed the range established in the Framework and the SFD land use designation does not exceed the permitted development range of 5 to 10 units per acre nor the MFD land use designation exceed the permitted 10 to 20 units per acre.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-32. Amend the Residential Communities text, third paragraph, as follows:

The Thorsen housing area (Sun Bay Apartments) has been developed as a 291-unit 297-unit, multi-family project with a swimming pool, full service health club, and child care facilities. The Sun Bay Apartments are leased and occupied, 50 of the 297 units have been and continue to be used exclusively for transient occupancy of less than 30 days. The project has been planned to be increased with the addition of at least 64 units that would be placed on the undeveloped portion of the site. The adjacent Brostrom Park area includes 220 units of mobile homes on an existing land lease.

Volume I. Page 3-121. Amend Table 3.9-1, City of Seaside Land Development Intensity Summary Table, to correct and clarify the projected development capacity for the New Golf Course Community District. Revise the 531 acre housing category to separate out the approximately 70 acre Brostrom Park site and reallocate the housing units as follows:

SFD: 461 acres housing; 2,304 DU's; 5.0 units/acre

MFD: 70 acres housing (Brostrom Park); 700 DU's; 10 units/acre

MFD: 24 acres housing (Sun Bay Apts); 297 existing + 64 new DU's; 15 units/acre

Volume I. Page 3-125. Amend the text in the New Golf Course Community District, Projected Land Uses, Residential Land Use, as follows:

The residential land use is projected to total 3,365 DU's within the district. This includes approximately 3000 2304 units on 531 461 acres at an average density of 5.6 5.0 Du/Ac. In addition, the 291 297 existing units at Sun Bay are located on approximately 24 acres. The Sun Bay apartment complex includes a swimming pool, full service health club and child care facilities. Fifty of the 297 units have been and continue to be used exclusively for transient occupancy of less than 30 days. The site has long been planned to be developed with at least 64 new units. At a total of 361 units on the 24 acre site, the average density for Sun Bay will be 15.0 Du/Ac. -at an average density of 8.6 Du/Ac. The Brostrom Park area (currently developed with 220 mobile homes) is projected to be redeveloped. The approximately 70 acre site is projected to hold 700 units at an average of 10 Du/Ac. The District is designated medium density and high density residential. A reallocation of the total number of units not to exceed 3,365 within this district may be desirable in response to market demand.

Volume II. Page 4-35. Amend the Seaside Residential Program C-1.2, as follows:

Program C-1.2: The City of Seaside shall zone and consider development of a golf course community in the New Golf Course Community District totaling 3,365 units. The district includes including the existing 219-unit 297-unit Sun Bay apartment complex on Coe Road and 3,359 3,068 new housing units within the remainder of this District...

203-12. The commenter states that Seaside should play more than a supporting role in developing design guidelines. The General Development Character and Design Objectives contained in sections 3.8 (Marina), 3.9 (Seaside) and 3.10 (Monterey County) are written to provide the local jurisdictions flexibility in the preparation and implementation of design guidelines. However, in order to address concerns regarding the adequacy of policies and programs to mitigate visual impacts per the requirements of CEQA, it is necessary to amend the language in each jurisdiction's General Development Character and Design Objectives discussion to provide adequate performance criteria. For this reason the Reuse Plan is amended to replace "... is encouraged to" to read "... shall". Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

To the extent that CSUMB and UC develop projects that are used for an "educationally related or research-oriented purpose," they are exempt from the mandatory provisions of the Reuse Plan and their project approval process will need to follow their own master planning and environmental review procedures as set forth in the California Codes. Refer to discussion of the Fort Ord Reuse Authority, Volume 1 of the Reuse Plan, page 2-2.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Pages 3-103 to 3-146. Amend all General Development Character and Design Objectives introduction to read "~~...is encouraged to~~" "... shall implement the following":

Response to Letter 204

204-1. The commenter states that if Fort Ord is severely restricted from developing the pressures for growth will occur elsewhere. Refer to response to comment 43-1. Also, due to the anticipated availability of lower cost housing in the Salinas Valley, there is the possibility that a percentage of future employees at Fort Ord will elect to commute to the Salinas Valley cities for lower cost housing.

204-2. The commenter would like FORA not to reduce the long-term plan to a 20-year plan because it would increase the annual growth rate of the plan by 250 percent, which would create economic difficulties. The commenter assumes that eliminating planning beyond the 20 year horizon would result in consolidating full-buildout (40-60 years of economic activity) into a 20 year time frame. It is unlikely that the realities of the market would function in such a manner.

204-3. The commenter states the City of Marina has determined that the costs of providing municipal services on the base will lead to unavoidable environmental impacts. The EIR concludes the same.

204-4. The commenter would like better opportunities for lower density single family residential development. The land use designations in the Reuse Plan would not preclude the City from providing residential development at lower densities.

204-5. The commenter states the Reuse Plan is too restrictive, too precise and not general enough and will result in severely limiting future flexibility which may be necessary. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response. However, the Reuse Plan does provide substantial flexibility. The "projected land uses" referred to establish a representation of the development capacity that is summarized in Table 3.8-1. As noted in Table 3.8-1 which establishes a "not-to-exceed envelope" for development capacity within the city. Refer to response to comment 203-11. The FORA Board should consider whether the Reuse Plan should have greater flexibility.

Policy Consideration

The City of Marina is requesting more flexibility as it pertains to future development.

204-6. The commenter would like the Reuse Plan modified to reflect that most of the existing 1,522 units designated "Medium Density Residential" in the Reuse Plan (Polygon 4) are attached.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I, Table 3.4-1, page 3-50, amend the description of Medium Density Residential (SFD) to remove the following sentence:

~~It is recommended that no more than 25% of all units within a Medium Density District may consist of attached housing.~~

204-7. The commenter questions the accuracy of the traffic model analysis and believes the need for a Blanco Road extension will be sooner. As stated in the EIR (page 4-73), the 1993/94 year was used because of the need to use more detailed and comprehensive information than the 1991 information contained in the Final EIS. As stated in the EIR, from 1991 to 1993/94, activity at Fort Ord was significantly reduced, resulting in similar reductions in traffic volumes on on-site roadways and Fort Ord-related volumes on regional roadways off the base. During this period, however, regional traffic volumes grew, with the net impact being that the traffic volumes observed in 1993/94, overall, varied only slightly from those observed in 1991. According to *the Traffic Volumes on California State Highways* manual produced by CalTrans, volumes on Highway 1 directly adjacent to Fort Ord decreased from 1991 to 1993/94, but increased slightly on most other state highway segments. Based on this finding, it is assumed that the assessment of project impacts is not affected by the use of differing base year for traffic analysis. Therefore, the traffic volumes at the intersection of Blanco Road and Reservation Road are considered to be greater and would not significantly change the conclusions of the model. Refer also to response to comment 197-112.

As for the MBEST/Airport property being developed at a much later date "than will actually happen", the commenter must keep in mind that the forecast for development at that particular location is based on real estate trends and market demand and the ability of UC to obtain funding and interest in its property. What will "actually happen" will be determined as time goes by. Currently, the UCMBEST Master Plan projects a buildout of 4.4 million square feet, not the range of 5 to 7 million as stated in the Reuse Plan.

204-8. The commenter requests flexibility in developing design guidelines. Refer to response to comment 203-12.

204-9. The commenter discusses the community design vision issue. Refer to response to comment 1-9.

204-10. The commenter says the Draft Plan is overly ambitious in terms of the extent of its goals and policies and may limit flexibility in implementation of the Plan. The policies and programs of the Reuse Plan may appear more extensive than they in fact are because they have been prepared for three jurisdictions, not just one.

The number of policies and programs is in proportion to the number elements covered: land use; circulation, recreation and open space, conservation, and safety. They fill a policy and program vacuum within each of the jurisdictions for the lands at the former Fort Ord. And, they represent the primary mechanism for mitigation of environmental impacts potentially associated with redevelopment of Fort Ord. The division of costs between FORA and the local jurisdictions will be determined at a future date by the FORA Board. Refer also to response to comment 204-5.

204-11. The commenter repeats a request for greater flexibility. Refer to response to comment 204-10 and 204-5. In addition, this issue of greater flexibility will be subject to further FORA Board policy consideration.

204-12. The commenter would like the text to indicate that square footage for development can be moved around the base. The commenter is referred to the text on page 3-41, that introduces the Development Capacity and cites Table 3.3-1. The third paragraph (and highlighted in italics in the margins) provides the precise language he is seeking.

204-13. The commenter would like more flexibility in the Reuse Plan so that "market reality" and the demands of "economic forces" can proceed to redevelop Fort Ord. Refer to response to comment 204-10 and 204-5.

Policy Consideration

The City of Marina is requesting that "market reality" and the demands of "economic forces" prevail in the future development of Fort Ord and the Reuse Plan be implemented in a flexible way that does not become an impediment to development.

204-14. The commenter states that AMBAG's Livable Communities Initiative should be recognized as a reference document and should not be considered as a policy document constraining the reuse plan.

Though AMBAG's Livable Communities Initiative is not required to be incorporated into local plans, it is not merely a "reference" document. The document has stature and meaning in the context of urban planning, transportation planning, air quality, reduction in agricultural land lost to urban development, etc. The Livable Communities Initiative, along with its implementation document entitled "Creating Transportation Choices Through Zoning", were endorsed by the AMBAG Board, which includes the City of Marina. The AMBAG Board distributed the documents to agencies, cities and counties throughout the region and recommended that the principles, and practices contained in these documents be considered for inclusion into all general plan and other similar documents, such as the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The Reuse Plan currently contains elements of the Livable Communities Initiative as discussed in response to comment 168-16.

Policy Consideration

The City of Marina is requesting that the AMBAG's *Livable Communities Initiative* document be recognized as a reference document and should not be considered as a policy document constraining the reuse plan.

204-15. The commenter requests that a figure be amended to show a 20 acre recreational conveyance to the City in polygon 2b. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to Reuse Plan and EIR graphics will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

204-16. The commenter states the Reuse Plan is too restrictive as it pertains to Recreation policies and requests a change to one of the programs. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-66. Section 4.1.4 Recreation/Open Space Land Use. Program D-1.5. Amend text to read as follows:

The City of Marina shall consider supporting ~~work with and support~~ the State Department of Parks and Recreation to develop a State Park entry and information center at the 8th Street Bridge.

204-17. The commenter states the Reuse Plan should further address the need for improvement to Highway 1. It is not certain what the commenter is referring to exactly. However, funding for future Highway 1 expansion in the segment from State Highway 218 to Del Monte would be paid in part by future Fort Ord development. The fair share nexus is 32 percent of its costs. The remainder would come from future development within the "impact study area". Refer to response to comment 57-6 and 59-8 for a clarification of the PFIP. Also refer to response to comment 21-1 for the Development and Resource Management Plan mitigation that identifies transportation financing policies for FORA.

204-18. The commenter states that the EIR should evaluate the impact associated with Marina not providing public safety services at Fort Ord. The impact of reuse on the city's public service has been discussed in the EIR. Refer to section 4.6 of the EIR.

204-19. The commenter states that the identification of "gateways" discussed in the Reuse Plan is too specific. The commenter also states that landscape features need to be more generally discussed and flexibility provided, if not then the EIR

must include a discussion of the economic viability of the installation and maintenance of such "gateway" features. It is not clear what the commenter refers to as "too detailed". The Reuse Plan provides on page 3-8 in Design Principle 6, that regional urban design guidelines be developed as a separate implementation action to govern the visual quality of the Highway 1 Scenic Corridor. The designated gateways are the two freeway interchanges at the "Main Gate" and at 12th. Refer to response to comment 203-12.

204-20. The commenter requests clarification to the population numbers used in Table 2.2-1 in Volume I of the Reuse Plan to refer to the unincorporated areas of Monterey Peninsula. The population statistics are not disaggregated on an annual basis in the manner the commenter requests. The additional population component will not affect the conclusions on which the Reuse Plan is based. For clarification purposes, however, the table will be footnoted to identify the population component identified in the comment.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-11. Table 2.2-1, amend the table to add footnote (2) to the "Subtotal Monterey Peninsula:" heading, as follows:

2. Subtotal does not include the unincorporated areas of the county on the Monterey Peninsula, including Carmel Valley and Pebble Beach.

204-21. The commenter states that the "Marina Town Center" illustrative is not representative of any recognized planning process. The illustrative drawing is a representation of the level of development and intensity and mix of uses that the Reuse Plan permits. As such, the illustrative drawing serves as an informative depiction of the level of urbanization implied by the text, tables, policies, and programs in the Reuse Plan.

204-22. The commenter states that figures erroneously depict Marina and the Armstrong Ranch. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to Reuse Plan and EIR graphics will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters of requests for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA separately. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

204-23. The commenter would like to know if there is any discussion provided relative to a comparison between vehicle trips when the lands were used by the Army prior to 1991, compared to reuse. There is no such comparison because the traffic analysis is based on the year of base closure. The Reuse Plan is limited to the

1993/94 traffic conditions. This is explained in section 4.7.3 of the EIR (pages 4-72 and 4-73).

204-24. The commenter states that the jurisdictional boundary descriptions for the cities of Marina and Seaside are incorrectly referenced in the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend volume 1, page 3-79, fourth paragraph, to remove the second sentence:

~~"This heavily urbanized area stretches from the city boundaries of Marina in the north to the boundaries of Seaside in the south."~~

Amend volume 1, page 3-83, second paragraph, third sentence, as follows:

"It forms a spine along which the new communities neighborhoods can grow, and creates a setting for the new CSUMB campus, ~~and becomes a buffer between the cities of Seaside and Marina.~~"

204-25. The commenter questions the accuracy of the depiction of Polygon 2a as a HMP Reserve and/or Corridor in Figure 3.6-2 contained in Volume I. Polygon 2a is incorrectly depicted in this figure. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Though no changes to Reuse Plan and EIR graphics will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

204-26. The commenter states that the reference to the City of Marina General Plan should be to its 1983 update. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Page 4-125. Amend note #2 in Table 4.3-1 to read as follows:

"Source: City of Marina General Plan, Quad Consultants, 1983 1993".

204-27. The commenter states that the discussion of community parks should include the potential to provide neighborhood-serving facilities as well. The commenter suggests designating the parks in polygon 4 and polygon 2B as "Community/Neighborhood Parks"

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-124. Section 4.3 Recreation and Open Space Element. Community Parks. Amend first paragraph by adding the following sentence:

"Community parks may also include the facilities that are typically provided in neighborhood parks."

Volume II. Page 4-127. Amend Table 4.3-3, "Fort Ord - 2015 park program for all jurisdictions," as follows:

Name	Type	Total Size (acres)
Park in polygon 4	<u>Community</u> /Neighborhood Park	10 <u>20</u>

Response to Letter 205

205-1. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan cannot satisfy everyone. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

205-2. The commenter expresses and opinion about FORA. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

205-3. The commenter expresses and opinion about FORA. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 206

206-1. The commenter (the State Lands Commission) expresses pleasure with the Fort Ord Dunes State Park and would be pleased to consider a lease of properties under its jurisdiction to a public agency for these purposes. Comment noted.

206-2. The commenter states that the current unsafe condition of stormwater outfalls need to be corrected or removed. If corrected or new outfall facilities are installed, they must be consistent with the Stormwater Management Policy in the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Master Plan, which states the Fort Ord jurisdictions shall work closely with the CDPD to develop and implement a plan for stormwater disposal that will allow for the removal of the ocean outfall structures and end the direct discharge of stormwater into the marine environment. The program must be consistent with State Park goals to maintain the open space character of the dunes, restore natural land forms and restore habitat values. Also, refer to the PFIP in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan (page 3-32) for a discussion of pipe removal and page PFIP 1-45 for the sources of funding for the removal of the pipes. More detailed analysis indicating methods of debris removal and transportation routes to be used by heavy equipment will be required at a future date. Also, to response to

comments 248-3 and 248-9 addresses a request to amend the EIR and Reuse Plan in regards to the outfall pipe replacement.

206-3. The commenter notes that the transfer of properties will be preceded by complete remediation for hazardous substances. The Army is currently in the process of removing hazardous substances from the beaches. The primary substance is lead contamination from the ranges. Refer to response to comment 55-8.

Response to Letter 207

207-1. The commenter has questions about inconsistencies between the Infrastructure Study and the Draft Reuse Plan. CERL estimates that approximately \$25 million in transportation improvement project costs (to be financed by FORA) are contained in The Business Plan that are unaccounted for in the Reuse Plan. The commenter requests that FORA clarify the elements in advance of the EDC application. The concerns raised by the commenter do not arise out of inconsistencies but out of a misunderstanding on the part of the commenter of the role and purposes of the framework plan (Volume I) and the General Plan Elements (Volume II). For specific responses, refer to response to comments 207-2 through 207-7. For refinements and clarification to the Comprehensive Business Plan, also refer to response to comment 7-2.

207-2. The commenter notes that the Reuse Plan proposed regional (transportation) improvements are not the same as those included in the FORIS report. Comment noted.

207-3 The commenter takes exception to differences between the Reuse Plan Volumes 1 and 2 and the project listing in the PFIP of Appendix B. The commenter is confused about the role and purpose of the Reuse Plan framework (Volume I) and the General Plan Elements (Volume II) of the Reuse Plan. These documents lay out the long term vision and general policies and programs for the land use jurisdictions to implement that vision. This level of detail and flexibility is consistent with California General Plan Law and SB 899. In addition, the Reuse Plan identifies the ROW's for a roadway network that will not be entirely constructed by 2015, the period modeled in the Business Plan. These differences are not inconsistencies as the commenter suggests.

The Business Plan and PFIP, by contrast, is a very specific modeling representation of a growth and financing strategy. The Business Plan is not the same as the broad framework. It is meant to be consistent with the framework and general plan policies and programs. It is not meant to be precisely the same or the flexibility and broad purposes of the Reuse Plan would be too constrained and not responsive to the forces and development phasing that can ultimately emerge during implementation of the Reuse Plan.

207-4. The commenter requests clarification on the basis of the nexus analysis, and roadway financing assumptions in the Business Plan. The nexus analysis, detailed in the PFIP in Appendix B is the proportion of roadway costs for the entire regional roadway model that are attributable to development at Fort Ord during the 2015 period. How that nexus share is paid for by FORA will depend on policies and actions beyond FORA's jurisdictional responsibility. The Reuse Plan, therefore, posits an optimistic financing scenario and a constrained financing scenario for the decision makers. The flexibility provided for in the Reuse Plan is further defined in response to comment 21-1, which lays out four transportation financing programs in the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP).

The commenter is confused by the general plan policy language in Volume II which seems to indicate a different set of financing assumptions than are proposed in the PFIP and Comprehensive Business Plan. Volume II is tailored to three land use jurisdictions and the policies are drafted to define each jurisdiction's responsibilities. No matter what the particular financing strategies employed, the individual jurisdictions policies and programs will be appropriate.

207-5. The commenter asks for clarification on the planned improvements to Inter-Garrison Road/8th Street. The commenter accurately reads the intent of the plan to "de-emphasize" the traffic carrying role of this link. The objective, however, is not as the commenter infers that the major future development parcels would, in effect, be restricted from efficient access. The objective of the Reuse Plan is to limit the overall width of the arterial ROW in order to promote pedestrian links between the Marina Village planning area and the adjacent CSUMB campus. This objective is not inconsistent with the planned improvements or network requirements. Nor is the specific project improvements modeled for the 2015 scenario inconsistent with the land use and circulation plans.

207-6. The commenter's request makes no sense in light of the commenter's confusion among the role of the various documents.

207-7. The commenter provides a reconciliation chart to compare the Business Plan assumptions (Appendix B of the Reuse Plan) with the Reuse Volumes 1 and 2. The Commenter is referred to response to comment 21-1 for a description of the commitments to roadway funding during the 2015 period and the intention of FORA to pay its fair share of on-site, off-site, and regional links. The commenter is referred specifically to program 3.11.5.3 (c) which outlines FORA's intentions if TAMC does not implement a regional transportation financing mechanism.

TAMC has also provided an updated regional transportation model run based on some different staging of improvements off of Fort Ord (principally the West Bypass in Salinas) that produced for the region a more cost effective transportation management program for the 2015 period. These results are reported in the Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study (JHK 1997). TAMC has prepared, on the basis of the new model run a validation of the nexus analysis included in FORA's PFIP. Refer to response to comment 22-1.

Specific responses to comments in the reconciliation chart are provided below by roadway link.

T-1: The Business Plan finds a nexus of \$18,050,000 which is a 10.2% share of the cost of constructing a new 4-lane **by-pass** through Fort Ord. These improvements would not be within the same ROW of the existing 4-lane Hwy 68. Refer to the land use and circulation figures.

T-2-r: The Business Plan funds 100% of Hwy 156 in order to make Research and Development (critical to UCMBEST in particular) more attractive to industries located in Silicon Valley. The rationale for this funding is linked to marketing objectives, rather than strict traffic nexus. Refer to discussion of "Current Real Estate Market Conditions and Future Demand beginning on page II-6 of the Comprehensive Business Plan. Fort Ord's nexus share of this regional link is about 14.7% but this link is not amenable to financing by developer's fees because of the large amount of through trips.

T-3: Refer to response to comment 154-2.

US 101: Refer to response to comment 167-15.

HWY 183: Development at Fort Ord does not meet the nexus criteria for this regionally planned improvement. The CIP does not include financing for this roadway segment.

T-4: Bridge is required to bring roadbed out of floodway; traffic volumes permit the road widening to be postponed.

T-5.1: Comment is correct. The improvements on Blanco were extended by .4 miles due to Level of Service / # lanes revision from TAMC.

HWY 1: Refer to response to comments 22-1 and 59-8.

T-9: Question as to location. T-9 is in the City of Monterey on Del Monte Boulevard between Sloat and Camino Aguajito. It should be noted that the City of Monterey has requested transfer of this funding to support of Transit in the same corridor.

T-16-2: Monterey Road connects to North-South Road via a short section of 6th Division Circle which is considered an extension of Monterey Road.

T-39: Comment is inaccurate.

T-17-4: Refer to response to comment 207-5.

T-38: The T-16 improvement list represent limited upgrades so that roadways can continue in service until major improvements are called for.

Since the T-38 rebuilding of Inter-Garrison Road is not programmed until after 2010, the T-16 listing constitutes a short term fix so that the roadway remains serviceable until upgrading.

T-16.4: Refer to response to comment 207-5.

T-31: Refer to response to comment 207-5.

T-32: Refer to response to comment 207-5.

T-17.5: Comment is correct. The T-17.5 improvement will be eliminated from the projects list prior to EDC Application submittal.

T-37: The answer to T-38 above concerning Inter-Garrison Road is also applicable to T-37 on Eucalyptus Road.

T-16.7: Comment is correct. A 500' reduction from 5400 linear feet (L.F.) to 4900 L.F. will be reported in a revised projects list prior to EDC Application submittal.

T-18.2: Refer to response to comment 207-3.

T-18.4: Comment is not correct. The distance from Coe Avenue to South Boundary Road is 11,100 L.F., and does not overlap with the South Gateway which extends between South Boundary Road and Hwy. 218.

T-33: Refer to T-16.7 above.

T-34: Comment is not correct. Refer to T-18.4 above.

T-16-12: Comment is correct. The northern terminus of the T-16.12 improvement is Inter-Garrison Road.

T-16-13: Comment is partially correct in that it is via a newly constructed extension of Lightfighter Drive that Col. Durham Road reaches North-South Road.

T-17.1: Comment is correct. The facility designation is accurately stated as Imjin Road from Reservation Road to 12th Street and 12th Street from Imjin Road to California Avenue.

T-18.1: Comment is correct. The "overlap" between T-18.1 and T-26 has been taken into account by reducing the unit cost of improvement for T-26 by \$100/L.F. which corresponds to the unit cost of T-18.1

T-26: Refer to comment regarding T-18.1, above.

T-18-3: Because of the Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) site conveyance, 12th Street is realigned south of MPC so as not to split the

campus. At the point of intersection with 2nd Avenue, the new 12th Street is essentially as far south as 11th Street which is so reported in the project listing.

T-19: Reuse Plan attempts to balance traffic between the Main Gate and the 12th Street Gate, it does not seek to reduce demand.

T-22: No, this project does not include rail improvements.

Response to Letter 208

208-1. The commenter would like the project to be downsized. The comment shall be considered by the FORA Board.

Policy Consideration

The FORA Board shall consider the downsizing of the Fort Ord project.

208-2. The commenter requests that a revised EIR be prepared for a project based on existing infrastructure. The EIR provides a discussion of this scenario in the "No Project" alternatives discussion of the EIR (Section 6).

Response to Letter 209

209-1. The commenter expresses an opinion that growth is not necessarily good. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

209-2. The commenter would like to know where the information is pertaining to existing housing, unemployment and labor skills available and would like to know what kind of jobs would be generated. A discussion of existing housing and employment is contained in the Socioeconomics section of the Draft EIR, commencing on page 4-20. As for the types of jobs to be created by reuse, this is discussed in the EIR commencing on page 4-25. New development would be expected to provide employment opportunities for those who are unemployed and who wish to work. Also, refer to response to comment 9-2.

209-3. The commenter would like to know how the EIR proposes to solve the problems of wastewater disposal, road expansion and desalination or other water source conservation or development. These issues are addressed in the EIR. Therefore, the commenter is referred to the EIR's discussions on these issues. In addition, the commenter is referred to supplemental discussion of these issues in response to comment 8-5 and 167-8 (water), response to comment 82-8 (wastewater), and response to comments 22-1 and 154-28. Also, response to comment 21-1

contains the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP) which discusses reuse in the context of infrastructure constraints.

209-4 The commenter submits an opinion. Comment noted.

209-5. The commenter submits a recommendation to FORA pertaining to developing a reuse plan. Comment noted.

209-6. The commenter states that the proposed project would have a variety of environmental impacts. Comment noted.

Response to Letter 210

210-1. The commenter provides general comments which summarize the following specific comments. No response necessary.

210-2. The commenter states that the language in the Reuse Plan (Vol. I) pertaining to the Prunedale Bypass is incorrect because the bypass is not assured to be completed until additional local funding sources become available, and because of this situation the text and all model runs conducted as part of the Reuse Plan should reflect the current transportation capacities only. The model results reflect the Prunedale Bypass being funded by 2015. This Bypass is the highest priority non-funded project per TAMC's RTP. TAMC has assessed that the local Monterey County matching funds in conjunction with State "dedicated" funds would result in complete funding by 2015.

210-3. The commenter would like to know if the section of Hwy 101 north of Hwy 156 or Hwy 156 itself, or any other CMP segment/intersections expected to be significantly impacted by cumulative development if the Prunedale Bypass is not built by 2015. Yes.

210-4. The commenter would like to know if the Prunedale Bypass is listed as a mitigation measure for the CMP segments/intersections expected to be significantly impacted by cumulative development. The Bypass is not included as a mitigation in the EIR and therefore is not funded, but it is expected to be funded by other sources.

210-5 The commenter would like to know if the improvements to Davis Road are intended to be completed by 2015, if not then the traffic model must be rerun to reflect traffic and circulation conditions during the winter months. The PFIP does not include the widening of Davis Road by 2015. It does include a new bridge on Davis Road by 2010. Therefore, a new model run would not be necessary.

210-6. The commenter states that TAMC does not use the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) as stated in the EIR and the reuse plan. The commenter is correct. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-66. Amend the first three full sentences from the top of the page to read as follows:

“The Congestion Management Program (CMP) uses the intersection level of service methodology from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) to determine which signalized roadway section requires deficiency plans. The FDOT arterial LOS methodology is used by the CMP to forecast future LOS using MCTAM model outputs and assess the cumulative impacts of forecasted development on the regional transportation system. To convert daily traffic volume to an LOS grade, the methodology described in the Florida Department of Transportation’s (FDOT) Level of Service Standards and Guidelines Manual (August 1995) was used. The FDOT methodology is derived from the methods contained in the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), and result in a range of daily volumes that correspond to each LOS grade. This methodology is the same as the one used by the Monterey County Congestion Management Agency (CMA) to prepare their Congestion Management Program (CMP)”.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 85. Amend the last three sentences of the second paragraph under the section entitled *LOS Methodology* to read as follows:

“The Congestion Management Program (CMP) uses the intersection level of service methodology from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) to determine which signalized roadway section requires deficiency plans. The FDOT arterial LOS methodology is used by the CMP to forecast future LOS using MCTAM model outputs and assess the cumulative impacts of forecasted development on the regional transportation system. To convert daily traffic volume to an LOS grade, the methodology described in the Florida Department of Transportation’s (FDOT) Level of Service Standards and Guidelines Manual (August 1995) was used. The FDOT methodology is derived from the methods contained in the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), and result in a range of daily volumes that correspond to each LOS grade. This methodology is the same as the one used by the Monterey County Congestion Management Agency (CMA) to prepare their Congestion Management Program (CMP)”.

210-7. The commenter states that the text does not adequately convey what the off-site traffic impacts are. Refer to response to comment 167-22

210-8. The commenter states that on-site roads do not meet TAMC LOS standards listed in the CMP or RTP. The CMP does not apply to Fort Ord, but would be expected to at some future date when the CMP is revised. Furthermore, the County’s LOS standard is based on the CMP, not the RTP. For Fort Ord roads, the

LOS is determined to be LOS "D". Also, refer to response to comment 167-22 for a revised discussion (in table format) of "off-site" and "regional" roadways.

210-9. The commenter states that without substantial evidence for traffic conditions beyond 2015, there cannot be a statement of overriding conditions because such conditions require substantial evidence. There was no choice other than to conclude that impacts beyond the Reuse Plan extends beyond the year 2015 and because empirical data is not available beyond 2015. Therefore, the conclusion contained in the EIR pertaining to impacts beyond 2015 is appropriate for the situation.

210-10. The commenter states that a particular policy cannot be a mitigation unless it specifies feasible mitigation measures that are tied to performance standards. Refer to response to comment 22-1 with respect to environmentally and financially feasible mitigation measures and refer to response to comment 21-1 for with respect to standards.

210-11. The commenter states that a transit policy directing jurisdictions to promote transportation demand management should be included. The Reuse Plan and EIR contain such a policy (Transportation and Demand Management Policy A-1).

210-12. The commenter states that each jurisdiction should work with MST in developing funding mechanism for operations and maintenance (O&M) because without this funding MST would be required to cut service from other areas in order to serve Fort Ord. The commenter also requests that impacts to transit as a result of traffic congestion should also be discussed in the EIR. FORA provides fair-share funding for projects and provides land uses which promote the use of alternative modes of transportation. The transportation model uses historical mode splits as provided in the TAMC modeling parameters. Therefore, the transportation analysis reflects a worst case scenario and not an optimistic transit use that exceeds 2 percent. A discussion of transit headway slowing down does not constitute a significant environmental impact per CEQA.

New development is not required to provide funding for O&M of a public agency. Refer to response to comment 154-2 and 154-3 for additional information on funding.

210-13. The commenter states that operations and maintenance costs of the fixed guideway/rail service to serve the Fort Ord must be identified. The Reuse Plan identified and planned for right-of-way at Fort Ord for an opportunity for future rail. The Reuse Plan did not attempt to identify rail costs, funding or implementation steps because in the 2015 period, bus service is the more cost-effective, flexible and viable way of providing transit within Fort Ord. This is discussed in the Draft "Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study" (JHK 1997). However, FORA will be paying its fair share for construction of a new intermodal center and park and ride lots as indicated in the PFIP (Table PFIP 1-3, page PFIP 1-31). FORA will not be funding capital or O&M for rail service. Rail service would

be an opportunity at a later date with other sources of funding. Refer to response to comment 154-2 for additional information on non-rail transit funding.

210-14. The commenter states that a program should be included in the Reuse Plan that requires each jurisdiction to implement the Reuse Plan's bicycle standards. The Reuse Plan does this. Refer to Program B-1.1 on page 4-116.

210-15. The commenter would like to know if the Fort Ord jurisdictions are legally bound to include a traffic ordinance fee consistent with the PFIP and include this policy in their general plans. Each jurisdiction with lands at Fort Ord will be required to amend their general plans to include the policies and programs of the Reuse Plan. Thereafter, each jurisdiction will be required to implement the mitigations prescribed in the EIR, which will most likely occur through an ordinance. Though an ordinance is a common approach, an alternative would be through agreement or agreements between FORA and each jurisdiction on how to charge fees or implement specific measures relating to capital improvements including transportation. The DRMP provides a mechanism for implementation of mitigations. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for the DRMP.

210-16. The commenter states the combined effect of revising the land use plan, implementing paid parking, funding both rail and bus service and designing accessible neighborhoods for bikes, pedestrian, vanpools, buses and rail will reduce significant impacts. The EIR contains policies and programs that serve as mitigation for impacts to the regional transportation infrastructure. However, because the alternative modes historically and currently represent only two percent of all trips, their combined effect as a mitigation will not reduce the impacts to the regional transportation infrastructure to a less than significant level. As for FORA's commitment to fund the programs and policies in the EIR, FORA will do this through the DRMP discussed in response to comment 21-1.

210-17. The commenter states the EIR must use LOS standards contained in the CMP, must evaluate alternative modes of transportation, must investigate multimodal alternatives for improving the LOS, and states that alternative forms of transportation must be funded because it is beyond the region's ability to fund.

The transportation related standard of significance used in the EIR was based on an LOS "D". This has been corrected in the Final Program EIR so that the CMP's multiple LOS standards for County roadways are used. Refer to response to comment 167-22. As it pertains to the EIR providing a discussion of alternative modes of transportation, the EIR contains a discussion of transit services and pedestrian and bicycle networks. The Reuse Plan (Volume II), also contains discussion on transportation demand management (TDM). The policy and programs pertaining to TDM are included as mitigation in the Draft EIR (page 4-85).

As it pertains to the evaluation of land uses vis-a-vis transportation, the Reuse Plan provides an extensive discussion on land use and air quality issues and their linkage. The tenet of this linkage is to make transit as viable as possible through higher density, integrated street patterns and mixed uses that encourage people to

walk when they need services. The Reuse Plan and the EIR refer to the Air Resources Board's (ARB) document *The Land Use - Air Quality Linkage, How Land Use and Transportation Affect Air Quality*. This document is included in Appendix F of this Final Program EIR document. It is recommended that all commenters and public agency planning staff of all jurisdiction read this ARB document and base land use recommendations and decisions based on its recommendations.

As it pertains to funding alternative transportation, through the Reuse Plan there will be funding for capital facilities at Fort Ord to include the purchase of 15 new buses, a transit center and park and ride lots. Refer to response to comment 22-1 and 154-2 for additional discussion on transportation funding. Response to comment 21-1 contains the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP), which outlines how FORA and the jurisdictions will implement infrastructure improvements.

210-18. The commenter states that imposing policies and programs on a project does not constitute a mitigation unless there is an implementing mechanism in place that activates the policies and programs and the commenter states that ordinances and regulations should be identified that are assumed to mitigate the cumulative transportation impacts.

Policies under California Planning and Zoning law "is the law". The programs are the implementation mechanisms to enforce the law. In the Reuse Plan we use policies and programs as mitigations.

The regional transportation impacts that are the result of existing conditions and anticipated cumulative conditions are a regional issue that reuse of Fort Ord will help mitigate through payment of its fair-share. However, there remains a funding gap which is ultimately the responsibility of the county to resolve. The DRMP will be the mechanism to enforce the policies and programs of the Reuse Plan. Through this mechanism the policies and programs that are used in the EIR will be assured to be implemented. Refer to response to comment 21-1 where the DRMP is first introduced.

210-19. The commenter would like to know which implementation measure in the Reuse Plan establishes the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District and which mitigation measure requires its funds. The Mello-Roos is recommended only and is not required to be used. As it pertains to funding transit, it is expected that the current sources of funding for transit O&M will be derived from a combination of sources including federal Section 9 funds, State Transit Assistance (STA) and Transit Development Act (TDA) funds, and farebox revenues. Refer to response to comment 154-2 pertaining to CEQA and transit O&M.

210-20. The commenter would like to know if CSUMB and UC are required to pay special taxes. The Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFIP 5) and the comprehensive business Plan for FORA are based on contributions by CSUMB and UC. UC's contributions are related to the role of UCMBEST which will be principally built by the private sector. The recommended financing plan

incorporates a fee structure that provides a subsidy of the jobs-producing land uses at UCMBEST, paid for by the development of new housing at Fort Ord. CSUMB's contributions are based on a nexus related based analyses. If CSUMB contributes less than the nexus share, the financing plan will need to be adjusted to compensate for the loss of revenue.

210-21. The commenter would like to know if the Mello-Roos fees will be used to cover transit O&M costs. Refer to response to comment 210-19.

210-22. The commenter states that transit system's O&M must be funded if transit is proposed as a mitigation measure and without funding for O&M, transit will be ineffective as a mitigation. Fort Ord Reuse will pay for new capital facilities associated with transit services. Also, refer to response to comment 154-2 for additional information on transit O&M and CEQA.

210-23. The commenter would like to know when transportation mitigations will be implemented. The PFIP (Table PFIP 1-3) identifies the time frame for the construction of new transportation facilities. Through the *Development and Resources Management Plan* (DRMP), the mechanism is in place for FORA and the Fort Ord jurisdictions to proceed with future development with the assurance that funding, construction of new infrastructure facilities and new development will occur in unison. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for the specifics of the DRMP.

210-24. The commenter would like to know if there is a timing standard for transit service improvements. The PFIP identifies the time frame for the various transit facilities. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

210-25. The commenter states that the text is incorrect. The commenter has misunderstood the text. The proposed project does not result in a transit center in coastal habitat.

210-26. The commenter states that the impacts of each road and transit route must be identified and their mitigation costs and funding sources defined. Refer to response to comment 167-22 for a road by road description of impacts. As for impacts to transit routes, there are no significant environmental impacts projected associated with future development impacts. As it pertains to mitigation costs associated with new road construction, this is discussed in the Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP). The timing of improvements is also explained in the PFIP (Table PFIP 1-3). As it pertains to funding sources, FORA will pay its fair-share.

210-27. The commenter would like the mitigation monitoring program to be amended to include additional information. The specific roads to the improved through FORA funding are listed in the PFIP in Table 1-3. As it pertains to who and when the transportation improvements will occur, the commenter is referred to response to comment 21-1 which contains the DRMP and the PFIP. As it pertains to funding sources, transportation impact fees will be derived from future

development. The Public Services Plan contained in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan provides detail on financing.

210-28. The commenter states the mitigation monitoring program does not convey which roadways will be significantly impacted and does not convey what the resulting LOS will be. Refer to response to comment 167-22.

210-29. The commenter states that no mitigation is proposed to pay for maintaining existing transit levels of service. The project is required to fund capital improvement costs only. This includes 15 buses, intermodal transit and park and ride lots. Refer to response to comment 154-2 for a discussion of transit impacts.

210-30. The commenter states that there is no mitigation proposed to reimburse MST for lost fares as a result of a system wide slow-down in schedule speed of the bus system. This comment relates to an MST operations issue and has not been determined to be linked to a physical impact to the environment. Therefore, it is not discussed in the EIR. Refer to response to comment 154-24.

210-31. The commenter states that the EIR should use the CMP LOS standards, and it should be indicated which roadway sections are not expected to meet the LOS standards in both the 2005 and 2015 time frame, as well as the full buildout time frame. TAMC and the FORA transportation consultant conferred on the modeling and determined that the 2015 year would be modeled only. As it pertains to modeling full buildout this would be futile because it would only provide information with a margin of error so great that it would be worthless information. Therefore, modeling beyond the 2015 time frame would not further the interests of CEQA. Refer to response to comment 167-22 for a revised discussion of the regional off-site roadway facility's LOS based on CMP LOS standards.

210-32. The commenter requests clarification of the text pertaining to Highway 68. The Reuse of Fort Ord will provide funding to the Highway 68 Bypass only. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text. This was accommodated in the PFIP and the most current Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study (JHK 1997).

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-77. Amend the third to the last sentence to read as follows:

“Off-site improvements included widening of ~~State Highway 68~~ ...”

210-33. The commenter requests additional traffic information. Refer to response to comment 167-22 for a revised discussion of roadway LOS based on the CMP LOS standards.

210-34. The commenter would like to know what percentage of the cumulative transportation impacts for each regional road section is expected to be significantly impacted. Refer to response to comment 167-22.

210-35. The commenter would like to know which of the roadway improvement projects are mitigation measure and to what degree LOS is improved. Refer to response to comment 167-22.

210-36. The commenter would like to know which transit corridors will require new service, additional service or frequencies due to traffic congestion and what will be the cost of additional service. The EIR is not the correct venue to discuss an issue that has no link to a physical impact to the environment.

210-37. The commenter requests detailed information on the MCTAM model adjustments. As it pertains to mode split, the historical mode choice (98 percent of trips are in vehicles) is used because that was what was agreed upon by TAMC staff. The traffic model parameters (i.e., mode choice, trip chaining, pass-by trips) was not modified from the TAMC model documentation (i.e., no post-processing adjustments were made). Refer to response to comment 154-24 and 198-3 for additional information.

210-38. The commenter requests clarification of the model run pertaining to Blanco and Davis Roads vis-a-vis closure of Davis Road during the winter months due to flooding that occurs on that roadway. Refer to response to comment 210-5.

210-39. The commenter states that widening of Blanco Road and Davis Road is not in the RTP adopted by TAMC nor is the new bridge on Davis Road in the RTP or county CIP. This condition is acknowledged. However, regardless of this, CEQA requires that a project's impacts must be identified and mitigated when significant. The improvements to Blanco Road and Davis Road are incorporated as part of the project.

210-40. The commenter requests that the travel times and the degree of LOS F should be indicated per the standards of CalTrans. The level of information requested by the commenter is not necessary to convey what the impacts will be on regional and local roadways.

210-41. The commenter requests additional traffic information on the optimistically financed scenario. Refer to response to comment 167-22.

210-42. The commenter provides a list of additional information that should be included in the EIR.

- As it pertains to O&M funding, refer to response to comment 154-2.
- As it pertains to FORA providing a transit operations plan, such a plan is relevant to the reuse of Fort Ord but the Reuse Plan is not the appropriate venue for this document nor is FORA required to develop such a plan. Such a plan would be entirely speculative at this time and would be futile, because it is not known precisely at this time where and when development will occur. Such a plan prepared by any agency at this time would not advance the interests of CEQA.

- As it pertains to pedestrian and transit standards, the Reuse Plan adequately covers this issue at an appropriate level of detail. Refer to section 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 of Volume I of the Reuse Plan.
- As it pertains to parking and access regulations, this is adequately discussed in the Reuse Plan's Circulation Element (Volume II).
- As it pertains to supportive ordinances to ensure effective transit, bicycling, walking, car pooling, rail and bus modes within new land uses, the Reuse Plan also adequately covers these. All of these elements have been addressed at an appropriate level of detail and assure a standard of quality will be implemented in future development. Refer to the Community Design Vision and the Circulation Concept sections in Volume I, the land use and circulation elements in Volume II, and, lastly, the air quality section of the conservation element in Volume II.
- As it pertains to funding marketing, promotion and fare levels that will shift auto trips into alternative modes, FORA cannot be responsible for a public agencies O&M costs. Refer to response to comment 154-2 and 154-3.
- As it pertains to a monitoring program relative to transportation mitigations, refer to the DRMP discussion, section 3.11.5.3 contained in response to comment 21-1.

210-43. The commenter states that FORA must balance development with environmental impacts and would like clarification as to how FORA will achieve a balance in light of uncertain public revenues. Economic recovery at Fort Ord requires planned phased incremental improvements to infrastructure commensurate with development, whereby development does not exceed infrastructure's capacity constraints. It is a balance which FORA is committed to through the DRMP.

210-44. The commenter would like to know which optimistically financed roadway is a mitigation. Refer to response to comment 167-22.

210-45. The commenter would like to know if the roadway improvements in the optimistically financed scenario are mitigations for cumulative impacts or proposed Reuse Plan impacts for 2015 and the buildout time frame. As used in the EIR "cumulative impacts" and the year 2015 conditions are the same. Refer to page 5-6 of the EIR, section 5.1.7 for a discussion of cumulative traffic impacts. Also, the EIR traffic and circulation section states on page 4-82 (third bullet statement) that "transportation impacts at full buildout are assumed to be similar to, or worse than, those projected for the year 2015, as a conservative worst-case estimate in the absence of definitive data". The basis for this conclusion, as stated in the EIR (fourth full paragraph on page 4-68), is a "qualitative extrapolation" of the year 2015 traffic model results.

210-46. The commenter would like to know how FORA will be able to certify that the project's economic recovery goals are not met without quantifying the fiscal

impacts of closure and each reuse alternative. The projects' economic recovery goals are not based on fiscal impacts alone. One of the primary economic recovery goals was job recovery. Fiscal impacts were evaluated and integrated into the development of the Reuse Plan and continue to be updated as FORA develops an EDC with the Army.

210-47. The commenter would like additional transportation information. As it pertains to Highway 1 improvements, FORA will pay its fair-share for expanding the capacity of Highway 1 through Seaside and Sand City to six-lanes. As it pertains to modal share and transit as a mitigation, the traffic model assumes the historical split. Therefore, transit is forecasted to only provide a negligible reduction in transportation impacts in the future. As it pertains to Highway 68, FORA will not fund widening the existing Highway 68, but will fund its fair-share of the Highway 68 Bypass as indicated in PFIP Table PFIP 1-3.

210-48. The commenter would like the standard of significance used in the traffic and circulation discussion to be amended. Refer to response to comment 167-22 for a revised impact analysis and standards that reflect the CMP.

210-49. TAMC requests that the Final Program EIR be available for their review before the plan is approved or the EIR certified. FORA will provide adequate time for agency review.

210-50. The commenter states that FORA is subject to CEQA Section 15130. FORA is aware that future development is subject to CEQA review.

210-51. The commenter would like the EIR to identify which roadway sections will be significantly impacted by the project and cumulative development and whether proposed mitigations bring the LOS up to CMP standards. Refer to response to comment 167-22 for a revised transportation impact analysis. The commenter also states that impacts and mitigations applicable to transit must also be discussed. Refer to response to comment 154-24.

210-52. The commenter lists methods that can be used to reduce significant impacts of the proposed project on regional roadways and also states that it would not suffice or be acceptable to TAMC for FORA to prepare findings pertaining to statements of overriding consideration, which concludes that other agencies will be responsible for regional roadways. The commenter also lists land use methods which FORA can implement that will reduce impacts to regional roadways. FORA proposes a Reuse Plan that integrates the methods listed. Comment acknowledged.

210-53. The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations. Refer to response to comment 167-22.

210-54. The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations. Refer to response to comment 167-22.

- 210-55. The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations. Refer to response to comment 167-22.
- 210-56. The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations. Refer to response to comment 167-22.
- 210-57. The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations. Refer to response to comment 167-22.
- 210-58. The commenter requests clarification on the transit impacts and mitigations. FORA has provided the necessary funding to allow MST to operate at Fort Ord, except for O&M funding which FORA will not provide. Also, refer to response to comment 154-2, 154-24 and 198-3.
- 210-59. The commenter would like information on transportation improvement funding. The PFIP provides this information, as well as the Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study (JHK 1997) and the DRMP contained in response to comment 21-1.
- 210-60. The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations. Refer to response to comment 167-22.
- 210-61. The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations. Refer to response to comment 210-12.
- 210-62. The commenter states that FORA has an obligation to fund its fair-share impacts on regional roadways. FORA concurs and addresses this issue in the PFIP, as well as the Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study (JHK 1997) and the DRMP contained in response to comment 21-1.
- 210-63. The Florida Department of Transportation methodology is consistent with the HCM planning method. Intersections were not evaluated. Arterial LOS analysis was used instead, which included consideration for signalization parameters.

Response to Letter 211

- 211-1. The commenter provides information and clarification on subject of the McKinney Act. The FORA Board will consider this information. Refer to response to comment 213-57.
- 211-2. The commenter reiterates CEQA section 15131 pertaining to social and economic issues. The Reuse Plan and EIR adequately discuss social and economic issues. Changes to the text in these documents is not warranted. However, the information provided by the commenter will be reviewed and considered by the FORA Board prior to making a decision on the EIR certification and approval of the Reuse Plan.

211-3. The commenter discusses the Operations Plan. The Business and Operations Plan adequately discusses the subject of affordable housing.

Policy Considerations

The FORA Board should consider whether to include an Enterprise or Empowerment Zone(s) and consider adding policies that integrate the concepts of community policing.

211-4. The commenter states that the Fort Ord communities must not use proposed policies to eliminate land uses which serve low income individuals. Comment acknowledged.

211-5. The commenter requests that Objective F on page 4-27 of the Reuse Plan (Volume II) should be reworded.

Policy Considerations

FORA may want to amend Objective F to read as follows: "The City of Marina shall proactively work with the Coalition of Homeless Service Providers and its member agencies to provided housing and related services to the homeless populations which the agencies serve, to successfully integrate such programs into Fort Ord, especially the city's 12th Street and Abrams Housing areas".

211-6. The commenter requests that Program F-1.2 on page 4-32 of the Reuse Plan (Volume II) should be reworded.

Policy Considerations

FORA may want to amend Program F-1.2 to read as follows: "The city shall offer technical assistance and work in a proactive manner to integrate in the fastest manner possible programs which have been approved under Title V of the McKinney Act, into the community"

211-7. The commenter states that Program F-1.3 is erroneous. The commenter is correct. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Volume II. Page 4-32. Omit Program F-1.3.

211-8. The commenter requests that Program G-1.1 be amend. Refer to the following policy consideration.

Policy Consideration

Volume II. Page 4-32. Consider amending Program G-1.1 to read as follows:

“The development of affordable housing through the use of density bonuses, and inclusionary zoning to encourage flexibility in household size and composition shall be used”.

211-9. The commenter reiterates state housing requirements pertaining to housing elements and recommends a new policy or program. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-32. Add the following program .

“Program F-1.4: All properties under Title V of the McKinney Act shall be considered to be legal non-conforming uses, and shall be subject to an inspection by the building inspector subject to Health and Safety Codes”.

211-10. The commenter would like Seaside’s policies and programs to reflect the above amendments made to the City of Marina policies and programs above. Refer to the following policy consideration.

Policy Consideration

Volume II. Page 4-38. Consider amending Program G-1.1 to read as follows:

“The development of affordable housing through the use of density bonuses, and inclusionary zoning to encourage flexibility in household size and composition shall be used”.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-42. Add the following program .

“Program F-1.4: All properties under Title V of the McKinney Act shall be considered to be legal non-conforming uses, and shall be subject to an inspection by the building inspector subject to Health and Safety Codes”.

The commenter requests that Objective F on page 4-37 of the Reuse Plan (Volume II) should be reworded. Refer to the following policy consideration.

Policy Considerations

FORA may want to amend Objective F to read as follows: “The City of Seaside shall proactively work with the Coalition of Homeless Service Providers and its member agencies to provide housing and related services to the homeless populations which the agencies serve, to successfully integrate such programs into Fort Ord, especially the city’s 12th Street and Abrams Housing areas”.

The commenter requests that Program F-1.2 on page 4-38 of the Reuse Plan (Volume II) should be reworded.

Policy Considerations

FORA may want to amend Program F-1.2 to read as follows: "The city shall offer technical assistance and work in a proactive manner to integrate in the fastest manner possible programs which have been approved under Title V of the McKinney Act, into the community"

211-11. The commenter would like Seaside to rebuild ten transitional housing units. Comment noted. FORA should consider if this request requires policy or program amendments.

Policy Considerations

It is recommended that ten new McKinney Act units be integrated into new development at Fort Ord in the City of Seaside.

211-12. The commenter would like the Reuse Plan relevant to Seaside be amended as reflected in response to comments 211- 4 through 211- 9. Response to comment 211-10 incorporates these policy and program considerations.

211-13. The commenter requests that a table be included in the Reuse Plan to document the status of the McKinney Act transfers. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

211-14. The commenter discusses the McKinney Act property conveyed to the Children's Services International daycare center proposed at the corner of 12th Street and 4th Avenue, and the potential impact a future right-of-way dedication for 4th Avenue would have on this facility. Fourth Avenue is proposed to be an undivided local road that will provide access to the Patton Park community. Final plans for the ROW's are not currently available. The exact alignment is currently being refined by FORA as part of the preparation of an EDC application. The boundaries of the ROW will be assessed by the Army through its parcel survey work for the conveyances. In addition, at some future date, FORA staff, in conjunction with Marina staff, should re-evaluate the necessity for the alignment and/or its dimensions. Future site specific environmental analysis will be required for this roadway to address issues such as noise impacts on sensitive receptors.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-36. Add the following new table.

TABLE 2.4-1
Status of McKinney Act Conveyances

<u>PROPERTIES ACCESSED</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>FUNDING ACQUIRED</u>	<u>NUMBER OF JOBS</u>
<u>Child Development Center</u>	<u>Children's Services International</u>	<u>\$1,200,000 (\$483,165 Pending)</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>56 Housing Units - Abrams</u>	<u>Housing Authority of Monterey County</u>	<u>\$1,185,000</u>	<u>3 on-site jobs and construction related jobs</u>
<u>13 Housing Units - Abrams</u>	<u>Interim Inc.</u>	<u>\$800,000</u>	<u>3 on-site jobs and construction related jobs</u>
<u>9 Housing Units</u>	<u>Peninsula Outreach</u>	<u>\$450,000</u>	<u>1 on site job and construction related jobs</u>
<u>23 Housing Units - Abrams</u>	<u>Shelter Plus</u>	<u>(\$470,000 Pending)</u>	<u>3 on-site jobs and construction related jobs</u>

Source: Coalition of Homeless Services Providers

Response to Letter 212

212-1. The commenter would like to know if there is something that could slow down development at Fort Ord. The reuse of Fort Ord as proposed would result in a population of approximately 72,000 in approximately the year 2055. In the interim, in the year 2015, the population is projected at approximately 37,370. Water use for the interim period is projected to be 6,600 afy, with full buildout water use established at approximately 13,500, of which 10,500 would be potable. Refer to response to comments, 8-5, and 21-1.

212-2. The commenter hits on a number of environmental issues. As it pertains to impacts on the Monterey Bay, the Reuse Plan EIR discusses these issues from a water and transportation perspective as well as cumulatively. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to traffic, refer to the transportation section in the EIR, as well as response to comments 21-1 for a discussion of implementation timing for infrastructure improvements; response to comment 22-1 for a discussion of Fort Ord's fair-share funding of transportation projects; response to comment 56-4 for a discussion of the impacts associated with future roadway construction; and, response to comment 167-22 for a revised roadway impact analysis.

Response to Letter 213

- 213-1. The commenter summarizes the comments.
- 213-2. The commenter states the Table of Contents in the EIR incorrectly references the starting page for section 4.10. The commenter is correct.
- 213-3. The commenter points out erroneous information in the EIR regarding the Final SEIS. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 1-2. Amend the first sentence to read as follows:

"A FORA Interim Reuse Plan was presented and analyzed in the Army's Final SEIS Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) ..."

- 213-4. The commenter states that the programmatic EIR approach should expedite FORA's preparation of project-specific documents through the use of tiering. The commenter reiterates what is in the EIR. No response necessary.
- 213-5. The commenter states the acreage of Fort Ord is 27,879 if you count the railroad right-of-way, or 52 acres less if you do not. The acreage used in the EIR is based on recent aerial surveys prepared by the Army. This information will be updated.
- 213-6. The commenter states the acreage for the POM Annex should be 805 acres. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text (Note: no other reference to 782 acres could be found in the EIR):

Changes to the EIR

Page 3-4. Amend the third sentence in the second full paragraph to read as follows:

"... approximately 805 ~~782~~ acres would stay under ..."

213-7. The commenter states the EIR should be amended to be based on the present boundaries of the POM Annex and be compatible with lands that have been screened for transfer.

Policy Consideration

The Army is requesting that the EIR text be rewritten and figures and table be changed to reflect the current POM boundaries.

213-8. The commenter states that Figure 3.2-1 contains incorrect information.

Changes to the EIR

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

213-9. The commenter states that the 18 percent figure used in the EIR to describe disturbed area on Fort Ord needs to be verified with the Army, because the Army's estimate is approximately 25 percent for the total area disturbed. The 18 percent figure is considered to be accurate.

213-10. The commenter would like the EIR to include a discussion of the incompatibilities of the proposed reconfiguration of the POM Annex, such as the location of replacement Army facilities (e.g., the fire station and Burger King) and the land use conflicts between existing Army residential areas, other sensitive Army land uses and adjacent private land uses.

If the POM Annexed is moved to the east side of North-South Road the fire department and Burger King will not be relocated, so there is no issue in this regard. As it pertains to other existing Army residential areas (i.e., Marshall Park and Fitch Park), they exist and would not be impacted in any way by the Reuse Plan. As it pertains to "other sensitive Army land uses", there is a reserve center at the Imjin Gate which consists of a collection of heavy equipment behind fencing. This is considered to be a compatible land use with the adjacent proposed habitat reserve, habitat management area and housing. Another military enclave (Polygon 19b) would contain the POM Annex motor pool. This considered to be a compatible land use with the adjacent proposed CSUMB and business park.

213-11. The commenter requests clarification regarding use of the landfill site. Refer to response to comment 197-41.

213-12. The commenter would like additional discussion on the potential impacts future land use would have on the landfill cap. The level of analysis requested by the commenter is not necessary at this time. However, when plans are

submitted for a particular use at the former land fill site, an evaluation of the proposed land use's impact on the structural integrity of the landfill cap will be required. This information would most likely be included in a supplement EIR or an initial study specific to future use at the landfill site.

213-13. The commenter clarifies the Army/MCWRA contract. The commenter is correct.

213-14. The commenter clarifies the Army/MCWRA contract. The contract states that the Army can use 6,600 afy of water until a replacement water supply is provided by the MCWRA. If the water is not replaced, the contract will allow continued use of the existing water supply. Therefore, the contract agreement provides replacement not a specific date where use is halted. However, water use is limited by a safe-yield supply.

213-15. The commenter would like a discussion pertaining to water use and coastal dependent land uses having water use priority. The commenter is referring to a letter of agreement that is included in the document cited by the commenter. This letter addresses water availability, traffic congestion and visual resources. As it pertains to water, new and existing development at Fort Ord (i.e., UC, CSUMB and POM) will be capped at 6,600 afy, unless a new source of water is obtained. As it pertains to traffic congestion, the Draft EIR mitigates impacts to the greatest extent feasible. As it pertains to visual resources, policies and programs are in place to protect the proposed designated scenic corridor of Highway 1.

213-16. The commenter provides comment on the water discussion in the EIR. The commenter is referred to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on water.

213-17. The commenter states the golf courses belong to the Army. This is no longer the case. Seaside is now the owner.

213-18. The commenters states there are other more recent sources of information pertaining to UXO or toxic clean-ups at Fort Ord. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-63. Amend the next to the last full sentence on the page to read as follows:

"The results of the process are described in the *Basewide RI/FS* (Harding Lawson Associates 1994) and the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District 1996).

213-19. The commenter has a preference for different language as it pertains to UXO. Comment noted. No change to the EIR is warranted. The commenter also states that the Army does not consider UXO (now called Ordnance and Explosives (OE)) to be a hazardous waste or substance requiring a Comprehensive

Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) response action. Nevertheless, the Army has determined that it will conduct a voluntary CERCLA removal action to address OE at the former military base in an effort to expedite the cleanup and transfer. An example of this is the removal of OE and physical remnants from previous training areas before land transfer. Furthermore, FORA and the public will have an opportunity to review and comment on the Army's proposals for ordinance cleanup in Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) reports. Also, refer to response to comment 32-1.

As it pertains to ownership of BLM land, refer to the Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR


Page 4-64. Replace the next to the last sentence in the first paragraph under impact #5 with the following:

"Portions of the land have been temporarily permitted to BLM pending transfer for habitat management use. The Site Use Management Plan describes the concepts for use of the inland range portion of the property to be transferred to BLM. Some of the area will have access restrictions due to ordinance."

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

213-20. As it pertains to a revised unexploded ordnance figure. Refer to the latest figure on the following page.

213-21. The commenter states that as it pertains to future road construction on Fort Ord, funding mechanism which do not include the Army should be seriously considered. The commenter is correct. FORA recognizes that the Army or any successor to the Army which controls the POM Annex is not legally obligated to participate in any regional transportation funding mechanism. FORA recognizes that improvements to any roads running through the POM Annex will be subject of future negotiations regarding funding, roadway size and any other matters related to the POM Annex.



EXPLANATION

- Installation Boundary
- MRA Boundary
- Railroad
- ① State Highway
- Site Location

FAAF	Fritzsche Army Airfield	TS	Training Site
FRC	Fort Ord Range Control	OWR	Oil Well Road
HFA/CSU	Human Factors Applications/ California State University		
LOR 2	Lookout Ridge 2		
LS BT	Laguna Seca Bus Turn-around		
LS OS	Laguna Seca Open Spaces		
LS T11	Laguna Seca Turn 11		

**Former Fort Ord
Previously Identified
Known/Potential OE
Sites, Location Map**

Note 1: Inland Training Ranges include all sites identified outside of MRA.
 Note 2: This map is intended as a reference to site locations, and is not intended to portray actual site boundaries.
 Note 3: Site 27 includes 25 training sites, of which only TS24 and TS25 are illustrated on this figure.

Figure 2.1-2

213-22. The commenter states that as it pertains to future construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities on Fort Ord, funding mechanism which do not include the Army should be seriously considered. Refer to response to comment 213-21.

213-23. The commenter requests additional information on air quality impacts. The level of detail requested by the commenter would require a specific project. Because there cannot be specific projects reviewed by the Fort Ord jurisdictions until the Fort Ord jurisdictions have amended their general plans and have them approved by FORA, there cannot be a quantification of impacts to the level requested by the commenter.

As stated in the MBUAPCD's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (page 7-24), "the air quality analysis for a program EIR will be less detailed than a project EIR because the effects cannot be predicted with the same level of accuracy" [as compared to an analysis on a specific project]. The MBUAPCD Guidelines also state "A program EIR characterizes the overall program by analyzing the cumulative effects of the elements that comprise the project". The Guidelines also state the EIR "should defer any unknown impacts for subsequent EIRs" and "... should focus on the project's cumulative air quality impact on regional ozone and its localized impact on carbon monoxide levels". The Draft EIR for the Reuse Plan has addressed the requirements of the MBUAPCD, therefore the EIR adequately addresses the environmental impacts.

Also, the proposed project is consistent with the most recent AMBAG population and employment forecast. The Reuse Plan is consistent with local plans vis-a-vis the proposed Reuse Plan's 2015 population (currently estimated to be 37,370) being less than the AMBAG forecast (66,612) for the year 2015.

213-24. The commenter would like the text pertaining to habitat amended. The text is adequate as written. No changes to the EIR are warranted.

213-25. The commenter would like additional animal species included in the discussion. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR.

Page 4-115. Amend the last line in the fifth paragraph to read as follows:

"..deer mice, gray fox, red-tailed hawk, red-shouldered hawk, American kestrel, loggerhead shrike, red foxes and other species occur in the disturbed dune".

213-26. The commenter would like additional animal species included in the discussion. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR.

Page 4-116. Add the following sentence to the last line on the page:

“The black legless lizard has also been discovered during unexploded ordnance removal activities”.

213-27. The commenter would like the text pertaining to riparian communities to be amended. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-117. Amend the next to the last line on page to read as follows:

“... occur in riparian communities include red-legged frog, Pacific tree frog, California slender salamander, ... ”

213-28. The commenter states that the USFWS has eliminated the candidate categories C1, C2 and replaced it with C. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-119. Amend the second bullet statement to read as follows:

“Plants or animals that are Category “C” candidates for possible future listing ...”

213-29. The commenter would like a table updated. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

213-30. The commenter points out a typographical mistake. “HPM” should read “HMP”. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-126. Amend the seventh bullet statement to read as follows:

“... and specifically with the approved HMP HPM;”

213-31. The commenter states the EIR unnecessarily exceeds the requirements of the HMP. The EIR consultant does not agree with the commenter. The HMP is

very broad in its assessment of each parcel of land, therefore the EIR language is appropriate and future construction on Fort Ord will be required to assess the impacts of development. As for Polygon 5c, because the property is in Marina's jurisdiction, it is ultimately their responsibility to assure that fencing is installed.

213-32. The commenter states that buckwheat habitat in the coastal dunes cannot be disturbed in increments greater than 10 percent at a time because to remove more than 10 percent may reduce the wildlife population of Smith's blue butterfly to below self-sustaining levels. Mitigation to reflect this situation is not required because the HMP already requires this.

213-33. The commenter does not agree with the EIR's conclusion that the public services cumulative impacts are less than significant. The EIR consultant believes the conclusion in the EIR to be correct. No changes to the EIR text are warranted.

213-34. The commenter states the information contained in section 6 of the EIR is outdated and new information from the Army should be used. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Section 6. Amend the land use mixes for Alternatives 6R (page 6-3), 7 (page 6-8) and 8 (page 6-12) as follows:

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Alternative 6R</u>	<u>Alternative 7</u>	<u>Alternative 8</u>
Habitat Management	63%	62%	61%
Educational/Institutional	5%	7%	6%
Retail	0%	0%	0%
Business/Planned Development/Industrial	13%	12%	12%
Residential	6%	6%	6%
Parks and Rec.	4%	5%	6%
Agribusiness	3%	3%	3%
Other (ROW; POM Annex)	6%	4%	4%
Visitor Serving	0%	1%	1%
No Proposed Use	0%	0%	0%

213-35. The commenter states that Figure 6.4-1 is incorrect. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below.

Changes to the EIR

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

213-36. The commenter states the information regarding the golf course is incorrect. Because the golf course has been conveyed to Seaside the text is correct. However, as it pertains to the Hayes housing area, this area has not been conveyed to Seaside at the time of this writing.

213-37. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-3. Amend line 8 in the paragraph titled "Appendix B" as follows:

"... defined by the ~~BRAC~~ Federal statute and regulations".

213-38. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-6. Amend the last line on page to read as follows:

"... that govern military base closures and land disposal".

213-39. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comment 197-6.

213-40. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-7. Amend the line prior to the last bullet statement on the page to read as follows:

"At the former Fort Ord, major conveyances by the Department of the Army consist of:"

213-41. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. The commenter also requests that the total acreage for Fort Ord used in the Reuse Plan be revised to reflect the final survey by the Army. The acreage is 27,879.4 acres counting 52 acres for the railroad Right of Way (ROW) owned by Southern Pacific. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics and tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics and tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-8. Amend the first sentence in the paragraph titled "NEPA/CEQA Compliance" as follows:

"In compliance with the ~~National Environmental Protection Act~~ and the California Environmental Quality Act, FORA will be the Lead Agency in

preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the closed Federal military facility at Fort Ord”.

Volumes I and II. Amend references to total acreage for Fort Ord as follows:

“...27,964” to “27,879.4...”

213-42. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-8. Replace the first paragraph under “Habitat Management Plan”, with the following:

“The Habitat Management Plan (HMP) is a requirement of the Final Biological Opinion of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the Army’s Biological Assessment for the disposal and reuse of Fort Ord. The HMP is an agreement between the Army and USFWS. The organizations who are to manage habitat reserves and habitat corridors enter into agreements with the Army for the transfer of the property and for implementation of the HMP requirements that apply to the land transferred to them. These agencies are referred to as concurring agencies in the HMP. There are presently eight concurring agencies with habitat management responsibilities in the HMP:

- _____ Bureau of Land Management.
- _____ California Department of Parks and Recreation.
- _____ California Department of Transportation.
- _____ City of Marina.
- _____ University of California.
- _____ Monterey County.
- _____ FORA, and
- _____ Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District.

The HMP contains several “Development with Reserve Areas” where there are habitat reserve requirements that apply to a portion of a larger area, such as polygons 8a and 11b. The HMP does not apply to the organizations receiving lands that are not HMP reserves or corridors. The HMP does not specify management goals for the development areas of Fort Ord and the recipients of these areas are not required to follow management guidelines in their HMP.”

213-43. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-9. Amend line 4 in the next to the last paragraph to read as follows:

“...reuse project chosen among the 1990 1991 round of base closures...”

213-44. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-12. Add the following institution to the list at the top of page:

“Monterey Peninsula College District”

213-45. Commenter recommends that at the end of the public review period, the Army and FORA staff compute the latest acreage totals for PBCs, EDCs and federal transfers and other transfers and also compute revised usage percentages so the most accurate figures available are used based on the latest digitized information. Comment noted. Refer to response to comment 213-34.

213-46. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-14. Amend the first sentence in “Planning Areas and Districts”, to read as follows:

“Planning Area and Districts within ~~each of~~ the County of Monterey and cities that have corporate limits within the former Fort Ord ~~jurisdictions~~ are designated...”

213-46. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 1-15. Amend the first sentence in “Reuse Plan Implementation” to read as follows:

“The strategies for economic recovery from the ~~realignment~~ redevelopment of the former Fort Ord...”

213-47

and 48. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-7. Amend the first paragraph in "POM Annex Support for Military" to read as follows:

"The Defense Language Institute (DLI), Fort Hunter Liggett (FHL) and the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) will all remain on active status in the area. Fort Hunter Liggett (FHL) was closed as an active installation under BRAC 95...provide direct support to the economy through military payrolls..."

213-49. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-7. Amend the last two sentences in the paragraph in "POM Annex Support for Military" to read as follows:

"The final footprint of the POM Annex had not been established at the time of this report's preparation was approved by the Army on August 24, 1994. Several innovative proposals for lease back facilities in cooperation with the local governments and the elimination or reconfiguration of the POM Annex are under consideration by FORA and the City of Seaside at the time of this writing."

213-50. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-7. Amend paragraph 5 in "Parks, Recreation, and Open Space", fifth sentence, to read as follows:

"The change in status of the former Fort Ord presents an additional opportunity to protect environmental resources".

213-51. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-26. Amend the last line, as follows:

...~~Creston~~ Preston...

213-52. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-27. Amend the first paragraph, second sentence, as follows:

"Since conveyance of these units by the U.S. Army is still in the ~~distant~~ future, the most probable immediate reuse would be to refurbish the units and operate them as rental units under an agreement with the U.S. Army".

213-53. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-35. Amend title to section 2.4.1 to read as follows:

"2.4.1 Base Closure Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Realignment Commission (~~BRAC~~)..."

Volume I. Page 2-35. Amend section 2.4.1, second paragraph, as follows:

"In 1990, Congress enacted the Defense Base Closure and Realignment and Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission (~~BRAC~~) be reconstituted..."

Volume I. Page 2-35. Amend section 2.4.1, fifth paragraph, as follows:

"Fort Ord was included in the 1991 round of military installations listed for closure by the BRAC Commission."

213-54. Commenter requests a text change to clarify and correct Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-35. Amend section 2.4.1 to delete the first paragraph, as follows:

"~~In 1988, Congress.....recommendations for closure.~~"

213-55. Commenter requests a text change to clarify and correct Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-35. Amend section 2.4.1 to correct the first sentence of the fourth paragraph, as follows:

"Once the President approves the BRAC's Commission's recommendations, Congress has 45 legislative days to reject the entire list.. "

213-56. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-36. Replace the first paragraph in "Public Benefit Conveyances" paragraph as follows:

"Through the base closure process, State and local government agencies as well as non-profit institutions which serve a specific public purpose can receive property at no cost or at a discounted price through the Public Benefit Conveyance (PBC) process. All entities who want to be considered for a PBC must submit a "Letter of Interest" to notify the Army with a copy to the appropriate Federal agency sponsor (in the case of McKinney Act interest, copy to Health and Human Services). In the event two Federal agency sponsors request the same parcel, the Army will make the ultimate decision as to which agency receives the parcel. This decision will be made with input from FORA. At the former Fort Ord, a total of 34 PCBs were filed, of which 11 were McKinney Act requesters."

213-57. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan, because it is no longer correct. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-36. Delete the last sentence in "Economic Development Conveyance" as follows:

~~"However, the LRA must also share any net proceeds from real estate transactions, after subtracting the costs of infrastructure improvements, with DoD."~~

213-58. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. The suggested language, however, would not account for other EDCs. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-36. Amend the last sentence in the first paragraph to read as follows:

"FORA ~~will~~ may submit an EDC application for the lands at the former Fort Ord that have not already been conveyed or are not subject to an approved PBC application, or McKinney Act."

213-59. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-37. Replace the sentence following the list of bullet statements with the following:

"FORA is in the process of resolution of multiple requests for 250 additional acres screening 11 public benefit conveyance requests received in compliance with the McKinney Act".

213-60. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-37. Amend the last sentence to read as follows:

"This ROD ~~will dictate~~ is the result of the Army's NEPA review".

213-61. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-38. Amend the first paragraph to read as follows:

"In compliance with ~~the National Environmental Protection Act and the California Environmental Quality Act...~~"

213-62. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-39. Amend the note in the margin to read as follows:

"Cleanup: Successful reuse of the former Fort Ord requires the Army to clean up each parcel on the base to the level required for its intended use as designated by this document, unless that use is in conflict with other statutes, regulations, or commitments."

213-63. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan to add a label on the illustrative plan indicating that the New Guest Lodge and lands west of Highway 1 will be a state park. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

213-64. Commenter suggest the illustrative figure is not consistent with current ongoing screening. The illustrative provides an image of a long-range view of a mix of uses appropriate to the University Village. Comment noted.

213-65. Commenter asks who is the developer to underwrite costs? Capital? for new residential neighborhoods. It is premature to identify a particular developer in the Reuse Plan.

213-66. Commenter notes that the parcel size for the visitor's center is 11.25 acres. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-38. Amend the third paragraph to read as follows:

“Approximately 14 11.25 acres ...”

213-67. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-38. Amend the first sentence in “BLM Land Management” to read as follows:

~~BLM Land Management~~

The Federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has signed a Memorandum of Understanding to become the responsible Federal agency, own, and manage the nearly 15,000 acres...”

213-68. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-43. Amend the second paragraph in "POM Annex" to read as follows:

"Three percent of the lands are reserved being retained by the Army for the housing needs for the Presidio of Monterey (POM) ..."

213-69. Commenter requests a revisions to the graphics to update boundaries on maps in the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics and tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics and tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

213-70. Commenter notes that the "best guess of land to be managed by BLM is 14,023 acres and more accurate information will be available later. Comment noted.

213-71. Commenter asks for clarification of the differences between the anticipated water supply LOS standard and wastewater LOS standard. There is some loss in volume between potable and wastewater flows due to irrigation, evaporation and transfer but, in general, 80% to 90% of potable water is reflected in wastewater flows (excepting some industrial processes.) Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-152. Amend Table 3.11-1 to read as follows:

"Wastewater: Reference to 175 gpd average should read 215 gpd."

213-72. The commenter asks if any detailed development plans have been prepared for the relocation of POM Annex housing to polygon 20c. The Reuse Plan is a general plan level description of the land use designations. Subsequent, more detailed, development plans would be required to address the commenter's concerns about the timing or financing of the replacement housing and the impacts to the fire station and Burger King.

213-73. The commenter requests a time line for reuse that takes into account the outcome of the Army's current "Excess II" screening process. This level of analysis is not necessary to define the land use provisions of the Reuse Plan.

213-74. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume II of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-101. Amend the second paragraph, eliminate heading as follows:

~~"State Highway 1-"~~

213-75. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume II of the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-102. Amend the second sentence in paragraph two in "4.2.2.4 Objectives" to read as follows:

~~"The operating analysis presented above identified those roadway facilities forecast to operate at deficient service levels in 2015 (see Table 4.2-3 4.2-2). This analysis also resulted in the identification of roadway improvements needed to achieve or maintain acceptable service levels. A listing of these improvements was provided with varying levels of relationship to the reuse of the former Fort Ord...With respect to the former Fort Ord (State Highway 1, Reservation Road, Del Monte Boulevard, Fremont Boulevard), those that connect to Salinas (State Highway 68, Blanco Road, Davis Road), and those to the north that provide connections to Santa Cruz and the Bay Area (State Highway 1, State Highway 156, U.S. 101)".~~

Volume II. Page 4-96. Amend the last paragraph to read as follows:

~~"Forecasted volumes and service levels for key off-site Regional (off-site) roadway segments...A summary of the specific regional and on-site improvements contained in each scenario is provide in Table 4.2-4 4.7-2 in the DEIR".~~

213-76. The commenter notes that the landfill cap design has been completed per the Army's program requirements. Design modifications suggested in program E-2.3, page 4-143 of Volume II, would need to be carried out with the new landowner. Refer to the following policy consideration.

Policy Consideration

The FORA Board shall consider whether to change the draft program E-2.3 reproduced below:

Program E-2.3: Monterey County shall designate a team of staff planners, landscape architects, engineers, and other qualified professionals to work with the Army through the BRAC process to ensure landfill cap design is adequate for proposed uses, including such parameters as depth of cap, final landforms, and visual attractiveness.

213-77. Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Appendix B to the Reuse Plan, the Business and Operations Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Appendix B. Page II-1. Amend the last paragraph and footnote of the Comprehensive Business Plan to read as follows:

“Seven Eight outstanding ...”

213-78. The commenter states (the “Army”) that they shall fund their own infrastructure improvements per the agreements governing transfer of the infrastructure system. Comment noted.

213-79. The commenter states that future water use will require negotiations between the purveyor/agencies and MCWRA. Comment noted.

213-80. The commenter states that the EIR’s percentage for various land uses under alternatives 6R, 7 and 8 are different from those in the SEIS. The SEIS came out after the Reuse Plan and EIR. However, the SEIS information is included in response to comment 213-34.

213-81. The commenter states that the EIR and SEIS do not correspond as it relates to the landfill site (Polygon 8a). The SEIS should correspond with the EIR.

213-82. The commenter states that Polygon 17b in the Reuse Plan and EIR contains an area designated “Public Facility/Institutional”. This is contrary to what the HMP designates for the same area, which is “habitat corridor”. The Public Facility/Institutional (i.e., youth camp, campground) designation for this polygon does not conflict with the HMP, because it is intended that future use would be subject to the conditions discussed in the HMP for this parcel.

213-83. The commenter states the number of dwelling units for Alternatives 7, 7R and 8 discussed in the SEIS are exceeded by the Reuse Plan. Comment noted.

[Start September 13, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Public Hearing Comment 214

214-1. The commenter spoke of UXO and toxics. Refer to response to comments 8-1, 32-1, 55-8, and 136-6.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 215

215-1. Commenter supports the Reuse Plan. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 216

216-1. The commenter spoke of UXO. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 217

217-1. The commenter would like to see a revised EIR and a specific plan. The Final Program EIR can be construed as a revised EIR because it incorporates all the information derived from the public review period. No specific plan will be prepared as part of the Reuse Plan.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 218

218-1. The commenter discusses the DEIR and the size of the plan. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response.

Response to Public Hearing Comment 219

219-1. The commenter would like a cemetery. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary. However, the issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

[End September 13, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 220

220-1. The commenter asserts the Reuse Plan is a Specific Plan. The commenter also discusses Government Code Section 65451 pertaining to specific plans. The Reuse Plan is not a specific plan and is not subject to the Government Code section.

220-2. The commenter discusses the *Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project, Sierra Club, et al., v. County of Stanislaus and Diablo Grande Limited Partnership*.. Refer to response to comment 165-28.

220-3. The commenter states the Draft EIR fails to discuss the impacts of new and/or expanded wastewater treatment. Refer to response to comment 82-8.

220-4. The commenter states the Draft EIR fails to discuss the impacts of on- or off-base transportation impacts. Refer to response to comment 56-4.

220-5. The commenter requests that the safe yield project alternative be discussed in the Final EIR. The proposed project is subject to a safe yield water source whereby seawater intrusion is in abeyance. Refer to response to comment 8-5 and 21-1.

Response to Letter 221

221-1. The commenter would like stronger housing language incorporated in the Reuse Plan that will benefit the homeless. Refer to responses to comments 155-22, 155-24, and 211-4 through 211-12.

Response to Letter 222

222-1. The commenter provides a rhetorical summary of his concerns pertaining to Fort Ord. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 223

223-1. The commenter states that the Monterey County Farm Bureau is against a "Westside Bypass" and any proposed roadway which would eliminate productive farmlands. The "Westside Bypass" is an identified facility in the TAMC's regional network. The facility is not expected to be required under the current transportation modeling for the 20 year forecasting period and no funding source has been identified for the facility (JHK, January 6, 1997). The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

223-2. The commenter states the BLM lands on Fort Ord should be used for future public benefit needs such as a new Highway 68 Bypass. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

223-3. The commenter discusses funding of roadway improvements. Refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion of Fort Ord's fair share funding and response to comment 21-1 for a discussion of implementation timing.

223-4. The commenter addresses low-income housing. The Reuse Plan does address low-income housing. Refer to policy F-1 and its associated programs for all Fort Ord jurisdictions in Volume II of the Reuse Plan. There are currently a number of units at Fort Ord that are subject to McKinney Act conveyance. Also, refer to the responses to comment letter 211.

223-5. The commenter discusses water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

223-6. The commenter is requesting that an economic impact analysis be prepared by FORA relative to the reuse of Fort Ord. The Reuse Plan is consistent with AMBAG population and employment projections for the forecasting period through 2015. The detailed economic impact analyses requested is not required by CEQA. However, the Reuse Plan is premised on a marketing study included in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 224

224-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the project. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 225

225-1. The commenter would like a new EIR that is based on a safe yield water supply and contains full disclosure of all the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 226

226-1. The commenter states that strong water conservation measures and "insitu locations" of storm water will reduce water demand. FORA considers conservation to reduce the 6,600 afy water demand to 5,610 afy. This reflects an approximately 15 percent realistic conservation effort. The Reuse Plan has taken a conservative approach to projected net water use. The Reuse Plan's projections do not include supplies available through storm water cisterns or detention because of the speculative nature of the potential contribution from such sources. The DRMP, however, promotes the development of such facilities within development projects. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

226-2. The commenter provides recommendations to enhance understanding of the amount of water that is precipitation and falls on Fort Ord. Comment acknowledged. No response necessary.

226-3. The commenter believes that more conservation of water can be had with sufficient surface water storage and reservoirs. The MCWRA, in conjunction with the MRWPCA and the MCWD, are working together to address new water sources, including reclaimed water. The Reuse Plan also includes policies and programs pertaining to this. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

226-4. The commenter would like to know why only three jurisdictions are involved. The Reuse Plan is for Fort Ord only and there are currently only 3 jurisdictions (Marina, Seaside and Monterey County).

226-5. The commenter believes that privatizing the water utilities is appropriate. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. However, the issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 227

227-1. The commenter does not want the extension of California Avenue. Refer to response to comment 197-36 and 197-37. The issue raised must also be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 228

228-1. The commenter is concerned with the population, water and other resources. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to population, the concern is conveyed to the FORA Board for their consideration.

Response to Letter 229

229-1. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

Response to Letter 230

230-1. The commenter states that the increase in population at Fort Ord is contradictory to SB 899's objective to enhance the quality of the environment. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

230-2. The commenter would like to know where the water is coming from. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

230-3. The commenter would like to know why we need 45,000 new jobs. The number of jobs is based on long term development at Fort Ord and represents a balance with new housing. Refer to response to comment 73-6, 155-9 and 167-7.

230-4. The commenter would like a revised EIR recirculated. It is the EIR consultant's position that with the additional information contained in this Final Program EIR that it is not necessary to recirculate the Draft EIR.

Response to Letter 231

231-1. The commenter would like to know what is the typical water use for a golf course. Most golf courses in the area will use 160 afy.

231-2. The commenter would like to have a by land use type break down of projected water use. The information requested is detailed in the PFIP, page PFIP-2-7.

231-3. The commenter would like an in-depth study of Fort Ord's hydrology. The level of detail requested is more appropriate at a project level analysis. Such analysis would occur associated with future projects, but will also occur associated with the safe-yield determination of the water supply.

231-4. The commenter would like information on historical water use. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

231-5. The commenter would like to know the status of the water delivery system. It is an old system and at least 10 percent of the flow leaks out. The system will be upgraded as funds are available.

231-6. The commenter requests economic statistics on local communities to indicate how they have been impacted economically by the base closure. Refer to response to comment 102-1. Refer to response to commenter letter 43-1 and 55-4 for additional information on SB 899.

231-7. The commenter indicates a concern with water and sea water intrusion. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development.

231-8. The commenter would like the EIR to include an alternative that uses safe yield water only. Through the Development and Resource Management Plan, future development at Fort Ord will be limited to a safe yield water use only. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

Response to Letter 232

232-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that addresses a smaller scope. The Draft EIR contains a discussion of the "No Project" alternative and other alternatives which addresses the commenters concern.

231-2. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

232-3. The commenter states an opinion on the project. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 233

233-1. The commenter states an opinion on the project. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 234

234-1. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

234-2. The commenter discusses general impacts of the project. It is hoped that through the Draft EIR and the Final Program EIR that all the necessary issues and impacts will have been thoroughly discussed and significant impacts mitigated as required by CEQA. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional discussion of water resources

234-3. The commenter indicates a concern with water issues. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development.

Response to Letter 235

235-1. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR. Refer to response to comment 102-1.

235-2. The commenter indicates a concern with water and sea water intrusion. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development.

235-3. The commenter indicates a concern with funding of transportation projects. Fort Ord was not and will not be the cause for the expenditure of 800 million dollars. However, the Reuse Plan and EIR did discuss Fort Ord paying approximately 136 million dollars for its fair-share payment of transportation impact fees. Refer to response to comment 22-1 for clarification on this issue.

235-4. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 236

236-1. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR. Refer to response to comment 102-1.

236-2. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 237

237-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 67-1 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 238

238-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 67-1 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

238-2. The commenter indicates a concern with waste treatment. Refer to response to comment 82-8.

Response to Letter 239

239-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 67-1 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 240

240-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 67-1 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 241

241-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 67-1 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 and for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 242

242-1. The commenter addresses the SB 899 goals and questions why the Reuse Plan exceeds the goals with a greater population, greater economic activity, etc. Refer to response to comment 43-1, 55-4 and 102-1 pertaining to SB 899.

242-2. The commenter requests that the EIR contain an alternative that addresses the intent of SB 899 only. FORA does not interpret SB 899 to mean that redevelopment of the former Fort Ord can not exceed the economic activity, population, etc. associated with the Army's activities prior to closure. Therefore, the request that an alternative be provided in the EIR that addresses conditions as they were in 1991 will not be provided. Furthermore, an alternatives discussion as requested would require creating "white holes" at Fort Ord (fundamentally vacant land with military structures on them) which would require security at someone's expense, perhaps the Army's, or perhaps a local jurisdiction's.

However, it should be understood that the "No Project" alternative discussed in the EIR correlates the most with the alternative the commenter requests. The "No Project" alternative is the perpetuation of the "status quo", whereby future reuse occurs without FORA's leadership. Please refer to the "No Project" alternatives discussion in section 6 of the EIR for additional information.

242-3. The commenter addresses the program EIR approach used in conjunction with the Reuse Plan and states the benefits expected to be derived from a program EIR are not materialized in the Reuse Plan EIR, because the alternatives analysis are not fully developed. The commenter continues by stating that without properly developed alternatives, the potential to influence the outcome of the Reuse Plan cannot be provided, as required by CEQA. The comment is an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. The EIR consultant concludes that with the response to comments on 360+ letters contained herein, the Final Program EIR adequately conveys the necessary information on all environmental impacts associated with the reuse of Fort Ord.

242-4. The commenter raises four issues pertaining to transportation system constraints where a regional, state or federal funding source or sources are not forthcoming.

a) The possibility for uneven growth restraints within the Reuse Plan area as a result of roadway capacity constraints are not expected due to the financing flexibility that FORA will retain on Fort Ord. The primary public policy instrument to achieve the necessary match between infrastructure requirements and development is the CIP which will be annually updated. Refer to the provisions for financing fair share transportation improvements described in the DRMP in response to comment 21-1.

b) The possibility for uneven growth characteristics among residential versus commercial/industrial land uses within the Reuse Plan area is not expected to be a critical factor. There are checks and balances built into the existing mix of uses and infrastructure financing. Housing development generates the fees necessary to build the roadway requirements that serve both the residential and

jobs-producing programs. With adequate roadways, Fort Ord is expected to emerge as a competitive location for industrial and commercial uses. The DRMP limits the overall development of both the housing and jobs-producing program to a mix that can be expected to finance the necessary improvements. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

c) Road deficiencies on Fort Ord are not expected to be a significant issue because of full funding for roadways. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

d) The Reuse Plan would expect to be fiscally balanced if residential and commercial development are carefully developed and FORA retains a role in allocating revenue from fees and land sales to funding of the shortfall for local services. Refer to the revised Exhibit 13 in response to comment 7-2. This approach is not required, however. Alternative business plans that do not rely on this role for FORA will depend on the outcome of EDC negotiations with the Army to achieve a fiscal balance within each of the land use jurisdictions..

242-5. The commenter would like information on Highway 1. The Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study prepared in January 1997 (JHK 1997) includes the widening of Highway 1 in the Seaside/Sand City area. This was not indicated in the Draft EIR. However, since the Draft EIR was circulated Highway 1 through Sand City and Seaside has been included in the FORA funding program for future roadway infrastructure improvement (JHK 1997). Also, as it pertains to Highway 1 north of Highway 156, Fort Ord will add traffic in either the constrained or optimistic financial scenarios. However, in the optimistic scenario for this segment of Highway 1 the volumes will increase because full funding of this segment is expected to attract traffic to this roadway that would otherwise be traveling other local roads (e.g., Pajaro Road, Hall Road, San Miguel Canyon Road, Dolan Road and Elkhorn Road).

242-6. The commenter requests that development at Fort Ord be limited to a level that does not exceed road capacity for which full funding is secured and which avoids the significant impact of further drops in the level of service beyond those projected without Fort Ord. FORA acknowledges that reuse will result in worsening of the levels of service on various roadways. FORA will use a statement of overriding consideration for its impacts. It is important to point out that without the Reuse Plan, a worsening of the levels of service will occur on area roadways because of continuous regional growth and Fort Ord will continue to develop as described in the "No Project" alternative discussed in Section 6 of the Draft EIR.

242-7. The commenter states that many intersections and east/west routes are identified in the EIR to be in need of upgrading, but the relative merits of the options are not discussed, thus, the commenter contends, the decision makers do not have adequate information on which to base an informed decision on. The commenter does not indicate what intersections or east/west routes. However, the EIR does identify insufficient roadway capacity in Table 4.7-3 of the EIR (also, refer to response to comment 167-22 for a revised LOS table for the same roadways evaluated in Table 4.7-3). Combined with the PFIP's list of "on-site", "off-site" and

“regional” road projects, the roadways that will be funded in whole or in part is evident. Therefore, there is no doubt or speculation as to what “on-site”, “off-site” and “regional” road projects will be funded.

242-8. The commenter would like information on the environmental impacts of future sources of water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

242-9. The commenter would like to know what are the impacts of salt water intrusion and what would happen if the state adjudicates Monterey County’s water supply. Adjudication would be expected to reduce all jurisdiction’s “take” of groundwater from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, thus leaving fewer opportunities for development until the seawater intrusion problem is resolved. As it pertains to salt water intrusion into the aquifer, this results in a contaminated and unusable aquifer. This causes those pumping water to go further inland to get fresh water or drill deeper in place. Without controls on water use the seawater intrusion problem is compounded. There are no engineering constraints to stopping and/or reversing seawater intrusion. However, politics and funding will determine if seawater is pushed back to a historical level or merely stopped in place. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on water.

242-10. The commenter would like to know how vulnerable water infrastructure would be if a natural disaster would occur and if an interruption were to occur would Fort Ord development compete with current users of water supplies in the MPWMD. Infrastructure, whether water or hospitals, are required to be constructed according to the requirements of state law pertaining to the particular type of structure (i.e., the Uniform Building Code). Regardless, any structure can be “upset” by a natural catastrophe and services interrupted until the structure is fixed. In the event water is interrupted there could be the need for MPWMD water, as well as MCWD and the MCWRA.

242-11. The commenter applauds the design elements and principles evident in the Reuse Plan. The Reuse Plan is premised on creating pedestrian scales, higher densities, and mixed uses which will enhance the opportunity for people to associate and conduct their daily affairs with minimal reliance on the automobile.

242-12. The commenter is concerned about views from Highway 1. It cannot be determined what the exact height of future structures will be. However, constraints are included in the Reuse Plan. Refer to the “General Development Character and Design Objectives.” The Objectives, together with the provisions for preparing Regional Design Guidelines are adequate to mitigate visual impacts. Refer to response to comment 203-12. As it pertains to the seeming contradictory language in the Reuse Plan, being visible is not necessarily equivalent to a visual impact. The concerns expressed by the commenter will be addressed when the design guidelines for development adjacent to the Highway One Scenic Corridor are prepared. The Reuse Plan establishes the regional significance of views along this corridor.

242-13. The commenter would like clarification of language contained in the Reuse Plan pertaining to limiting future building height within the Highway 1 scenic corridor. The commenter proposes the specific criteria of "striving for filtered views of attractive development that are less than the height of the trees used." The standards included in the Reuse Plan adequately mitigate both regional and on-site visual impacts. Also, refer to response to comment 203-12.

242-14. The commenter would like a floor-area-ratio (FAR) that would allow for more compact development in the commercial, industrial and manufacturing categories. The commenter would also like clarification on whether the FAR discussed in the Reuse Plan is net or gross. The development intensities included in the Reuse Plan are consistent with the real estate market and the community vision expressed in the Framework Plan, Volume. The FAR is applied to development acreage indicated in the "Land Development Intensity Summary Tables. Refer to Tables 3.8-1, 3.9-1, and 3.10-1.

242-15. The commenter would like to know why there is no significant open space breaks between Seaside and Marina. "Significant open space breaks" is subjective. Review of the Proposed Project Land Use Concept map (Figure 3.2-1 in the Draft EIR) indicates the following open space within the developed corridor between Seaside and Marina (from south to north): two golf courses; a park flanking the main entrance to Fort Ord; CSUMB open space areas within their master planned facility; open space surrounding the existing Silas B. Hayes hospital site; the landfill site; and a park flanking California Road south of the Patton Park residential area. Flanking the proposed urbanized area on the west is the new Fort Ord Dunes State Park (885 acres). To the east and north are the habitat management areas associated with UC and BLM. Therefore, there appears to be adequate open space.

242-16. The commenter would like to know if the economic/market analysis included economic multipliers for secondary jobs created in the region and would like to know if Fort Ord growth will reduce the growth of housing and employment for other cities on the Peninsula. The jobs indicated within the Fort Ord total jobs based on the permitted development intensity. The development at Fort Ord, anticipated within the 2015 period is less than the AMBAG projections based on employment growth and other population increase characteristics forecasted for the peninsula (including Fort Ord). AMBAG's population forecasts for the region take into account economic multipliers of primary employment growth. The comparison to AMBAG's employment and population forecasts is included in the Draft EIR in Table 5.2-1. Growth inducing impacts are discussed in section 5.2 of the Draft EIR. Development at Fort Ord is expected to compete with other communities on the Peninsula and in the north county area.

242-17. The commenter would like to know if the labor market will be able to absorb the anticipated activities and if not has the economic/market analysis accounted for new workers attracted to the region. The commenter would also like to know what the impacts will be associated with construction. The construction industry is included in AMBAG's employment forecasts. The rate of growth

anticipated at Fort Ord is expected to be consistent with the regional projections that take this labor supply into account.

As it pertains to the impacts associated with construction, workers would come from a large region and they would be expected to use local and regional roads, however, their impact on these road will be insignificant. There are temporary insignificant construction impacts that would occur. For example, as would be expected whenever repaving a section of road, slow-downs in the traffic flows may occur. Temporary dust emissions associated with a particular project would also be expected. However, this type of impact is normally addressed at the project level and not a regional level. Refer to the air quality section in the EIR.

242-18. The commenter states that a mitigation monitoring program will be a powerful tool to minimize impacts on the region. FORA has addressed this issue with a Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP). Refer to response to comment 21-1.

242-19. The commenter states that there are no programs to assure that projects are not approved without a fully developed water supply. The DRMP addresses this issue. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the DRMP.

242-20. The commenter would like information on how fees will be collected and infrastructure developed simultaneous to new development. This is discussed in response to comment 9-4, 21-1 and 57-1.

242-21. The commenter would like a stronger EIR.

a) As it pertains to identifying project alternatives that mitigate impacts, the commenter is referred to the alternatives section 6 of the EIR (page 6-2), which identifies the "No Project" alternative as the environmentally superior alternative. The alternatives discussion also concluded that Alternative 6R is the "additional environmental superior alternate" [to the "No Project" alternative].

b) As it pertains to evaluating alternate choices for unresolved issues, the water discussion has been significantly expanded in the response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to design issues, the Final EIR addresses this issue by including more stringent language. Refer to response to comment 203-12.

c) As it pertains to using plan objectives with "teeth", a review of the Reuse Plan indicates that policies use language that could be construed as having no "teeth". However, it is not the objective or the policy that must be implemented. It is the program and the programs are specific regarding who, what, when, where and how. Where they have been determined not to be specific enough to work as a mitigation in response to comments received on the Draft EIR, the programs have subsequently been modified. Therefore, the EIR adequately mitigates impacts with programs. Where policies and programs do not adequately address an impact, the EIR incorporates new mitigations to augment the programs.

For infrastructure and phasing plans, refer to the Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) in response to comment 21-1. The additional mitigation provided in the DRMP is adequate to mitigate potential environmental impacts pertaining to transportation and water infrastructure. For impact fees and revenue sharing plans, refer to response to comments 9-13, 57-1, and 60-78.

FORA will continue to refine its policies regarding the financing tools, fees, and revenue sharing. For design guidelines and watershed guidelines, refer to the "General Development Character and Design Objectives" (Section 3.10 of Volume I of the Reuse Plan). The Objectives, together with the provisions for preparing Regional Design Guidelines are adequate to mitigate visual impacts. Refer to response to comment 203-12 for changes to the language in the Reuse Plan.

d) As it pertains to including an implementation tool, refer to the discussion of the DRMP in response to comment 21-1.

Response to Letter 243

243-1. The commenter is concerned with the size of the project and the apparent lack of water to serve the project. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for a discussion on water issues. As for the size of the project, the FORA Board has the option to select an alternative that will result in a smaller population associated with the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 244

244-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development. A revised EIR will not be recirculated. All environmental issues presented during the public review period have been addressed in this Final Program EIR.

Response to Letter 245

245-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR to be circulated and additional discussion on the issues of seawater intrusion, height limits and unexploded ordnance (UXO). The issue of height limits is critical as it pertains to the Highway 1 scenic corridor. This has been adequately addressed in the Reuse Plan and the EIR. As it pertains to seawater intrusion, refer to response to comment 8-5. The EIR adequately discusses the UXO issue and identifies the issue after implementation of mitigation (i.e., Army and involved agencies shall ensure clean-up) to be less than significant.

Response to Letter 246

246-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development. A revised EIR will not be recirculated. All environmental issues presented during the public review period have been addressed in this Final Program EIR.

Response to Letter 247

247.1- The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 248

248-1. The commenter lists concerns regarding coastal resources:

1) stormwater pollution is adequately addressed in both the Reuse Plan and the EIR. The project is required to implement federal stormwater quality standards associated with the NPDES. Refer to the Reuse Plan (Volume II, section 4.4.2) and the EIR (section 4.5);

2) water supply, including a desalination plant, is discussed in greater detail in response to comment 8-5;

3) there are no known conflicts with the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary management goals. It is the intent of FORA, through implementation of its policies and programs, and implementation of established federal and state laws governing land uses on and or adjacent to , or could impact coastal resources, to create development (i.e., stormwater facilities and/or a desalination plant) solutions acceptable to ocean and coastal protection agencies and organizations; and

4) a failure of a sewer pump station west of Highway 1 will be addressed by the California Department of Park and Recreation at the project level for new facilities west of Highway 1.

248-2. The commenter states that the EIR should be identical to the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan (PGP). The PGP is incorporated into the Reuse Plan and EIR by reference. It is not necessary to reiterate the PGP into either of these documents. However, refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-129. Amend the first sentence of the paragraph under section 3.10.1.

"The California DPR has prepared the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan, is preparing a Master Plan as required [...] The State Park will also include base-wide infrastructure facilities. The Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan is incorporated herein by reference".

248-3. The commenter requests language be included in the EIR regarding stormwater outfall along the beaches. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-48. Add the following new program after Policy C-6.

"Program C-6.1: The City/County shall work closely with other Fort Ord jurisdictions and the CDPR to develop and implement a plan for stormwater disposal that will allow for the removal of the ocean outfall structures and end the direct discharge of stormwater into the marine environment. The program must be consistent with State Park goals to maintain the open space character of the dunes, restore natural landforms and restore habitat values".

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-164 (Marina). Add the following program to Policy C-6.

"Program C-6.1: The City shall work closely with other Fort Ord jurisdictions and the CDPR to develop and implement a plan for stormwater disposal that will allow for the removal of the ocean outfall structures and end the direct discharge of stormwater into the marine environment. The program must be consistent with State Park goals to maintain the open space character of the dunes, restore natural landforms and restore habitat values".

Volume II. Page 4-167 (Seaside). Add the following program to Policy C-6.

See Program C-6.1 above.

Volume II. Page 4-164(Monterey County). Add the following program to Policy C-6.

See Program C-6.1 above.

248-4. The commenter states that an EIS and/or EIR will be required for a future desalination plant. Such a report is appropriate if a desalination plant is constructed in the future. It is not necessary at this time because it is not currently being proposed by FORA. However, FORA will be required, if a desalination plant is proposed to be constructed, to prepare a new environmental document specific to a new site at Fort Ord. A new facility would be required to implement the

requirements of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, California Coastal Commission, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, California Occupational Safety and Health Administration, California Department of Health Services, California State Lands Commission, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Also, there may be new agencies and new permits created in the interim which an agency proposing a desalination plant may be required the work and implement, respectively.

248-5. The commenter would like to know what plans Seaside has for the area extending into the Bay. FORA does not know what Seaside intends to do with the area in the bay. Therefore, an analysis is not possible at this time.

248-6. The commenter summarizes the previous 5 comments. The response to the above comments are adequately responded to in the preceding 5 comments.

248-7. The commenter would like an alternative included in the EIR besides the "No Project" alternative which will preclude the need for a desalination plant and generate a lower level of wastewater discharge which may ultimately be discharged to the Monterey Bay. FORA has not committed to a desalination plant because of other potential alternatives discussed in response to comment 8-5. Also, wastewater generated by Fort Ord will be reclaimed at the MRWPCA's treatment plant and used in the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP). Future wastewater is also expected to be transferred to the peninsula cities as reclaimed water for use on golf courses and for other landscaping. Phase I of an eventual three phase pipeline will bring water to the Marina area first. This is expected to benefit areas of Fort Ord as well as future development in Marina.

248-8. The commenter indicates a concern about erosion and contaminated stormwater from Fort Ord. Stormwater pollution is adequately addressed in both the Reuse Plan and the EIR. The project is required to implement federal stormwater quality standards associated with the NPDES. Refer to the Reuse Plan (Volume II, section 4.4.2) and the EIR (section 4.5).

248-9. The commenter would like the outfall pipes removed. Refer to response to comment 248-3. Also, refer to the PFIP in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan (page 3-32) for a discussion of pipe removal and page PFIP 1-45 for the sources of funding for the removal of the pipes. More detailed analysis indicating methods of debris removal and transportation routes to be used by heavy equipment will be required at a future date.

248-10. The commenter would like language included in the Reuse Plan and EIR that specifically addresses wetland areas in the dunes that could be constructed and maintained using stormwater. The Reuse Plan and EIR as written is broad enough to be construed to be in support of the commenter's desires and does not preclude such a wetlands project in the dunes.

248-11. The commenter states that the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan (PGP) does not accommodate a hotel site, desalination plant or aquaculture facility. Review of Map 6 in the PGP indicates there is a proposed lodge (40-80 rooms with parking and restaurant). In addition, the text on page 86 of the PGP (last paragraph) states that the Fort Ord sewage treatment plant will be available for development of a desalination plant. Though the PGP indicates a preference that the desalination plant be located east of Highway 1.

As it pertains to Public Facility/Institutional uses depicted in the Reuse Plan land use concept map, the EIR does reference (page 4-7) an aquaculture facility in the area of the existing twelve bunkers which the CDPR intends to use for storage (shown as Polygon 14b in the Reuse Plan and EIR). The State Parks Plan does not, at this time, include an aquaculture facility. Thus it would take an amendment to the State Park Plan and may require a separate environmental document to evaluate the potential impacts of such an operation.

248-12. The commenter requests that a desalination plant be evaluated per the requirement of CEQA. Refer to response to comment 248-4.

248-13. The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate the potential impacts of Seaside's proposed annexation of Monterey Bay. The annexation proposed is not relevant to the proposed project, thus will be subject to a separate environmental analysis.

248-14. The commenter requests that the EIR include a complete description of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. This is not necessary, nor is it required by CEQA that an agency ("responsible" or otherwise) be discussed at the level of detail requested. If the reader would like information on the myriad of agencies involved in the Reuse Plan process, the reader is directed to those particular agencies for the information. An EIR is not the appropriate place to include this information (CEQA Section 15141 and 15146) nor will the absence of this information from the EIR create a situation where the decision makers cannot make an informed decision on the plan.

248-15. The commenter requests that the EIR include a complete description of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Refer to response to comment 248-14.

248-16. The commenter would like information on wastewater treatment plants on Fort Ord. Refer to the PGP section entitled Facilities Element, commencing on page 83.

248-17. The commenter includes a list of information he would like the PGP to contain. The information requested is not relevant to the EIR or the Reuse Plan, but is relevant to the PGP.

Response to Letter 249

249-1. The commenter requests clarification of the language in the Draft Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-47. Amend the first paragraph under Objective B to read as follows:

~~"Building height limits are proposed as part of the design guidelines for the plan."~~

Volume II. Page 4-48. Amend Objective F as follows:

"Objective F: ~~Ensure appropriate design standards for commercial development at Fort Ord.~~ Provide for Community Design principles and guidelines to ensure quality of life for employees and residents of Fort Ord and the surrounding communities."

Volume II. Page 4-49. Amend the first sentence on page to read as follows:

~~"Establishing~~ Ensuring high-quality design standards for Fort Ord commercial ..."

Volume II. Page 4-51. Amend Commercial Land Use Policy B-3 and Program B-3.1 as follows:

"Commercial Land Use Policy B-3: The City of Marina ~~will follow hotel building height limits which are proposed as part of the Community Design standards of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.~~ shall prepare design guidelines for implementing hotel development on former Fort Ord lands consistent with the regional urban design guidelines (to be prepared by FORA) and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.

Program B-3.1: The City of Marina shall review each hotel proposal for consistency with the ~~Community Design standards of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and the City's design guidelines for Fort Ord lands.~~ regional urban design guidelines and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework."

Volume II. Page 4-54. Amend Commercial Land Use Policy B-3 and Program B-3.1 as follows:

"Commercial Land Use Policy B-3: The City of Seaside ~~will follow hotel building height limits which are proposed as part of the Community Design standards of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.~~ shall prepare design guidelines for implementing hotel development on former Fort Ord lands consistent with the regional urban design guidelines (to be prepared by FORA) and the

General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.

Program B-3.1: The City of Seaside shall review each hotel proposal for consistency with the ~~Community Design standards of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and the City's design guidelines for Fort Ord lands.~~ regional urban design guidelines and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework."

Volume I. Page 4-58. Amend Commercial Land Use Policy B-3 and Program B-3.1 as follows:

"Commercial Land Use Policy B-3: The County of Monterey ~~will follow hotel building height limits which are proposed as part of the Community Design standards of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.~~ shall prepare design guidelines for implementing hotel development on former Fort Ord lands consistent with the regional urban design guidelines (to be prepared by FORA) and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.

Program B-3.1: The County of Monterey shall review each hotel proposal for consistency with the ~~Community Design standards of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and the City's design guidelines for Fort Ord lands.~~ regional urban design guidelines and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework."

Volume II. Page 4-52. Amend Program D-1.2 as follows:

"Program D-1.2: The City of Marina shall designate convenience/specialty retail land use on its zoning map and provide textual (and not graphic) standards for development within residential neighborhoods."

Volume II. Page 4-55. Amend Program D-1.2 as follows:

"Program D-1.2: The City of Seaside shall designate convenience/specialty retail land use on its zoning map and provide textual (and not graphic) standards for development within residential neighborhoods."

Volume II. Page 4-58. Amend Program D-1.2 as follows:

"Program D-1.2: The County of Monterey shall designate convenience/specialty retail land use on its zoning map and provide textual (and not graphic) standards for development within residential neighborhoods."

Volume II. Page 4-66. Amend Program D-1.2 as follows:

"Program D-1.2: The City of Marina shall develop special design standards for State Highway 1 Special Design District textual (and not graphic) ..."

Volume II. Page 4-69. Amend Program D-1.2 as follows:

"Program D-1.2: The City of Seaside shall develop special design standards for State Highway 1 Special Design District textual (and not graphic) ..."

249-2. The commenter is requesting program language changes to clarify the intent and consistency of the Reuse Plan. The differences for referred to between the area subject to the designation of a "Special Design District" is based on the different conditions in Marina and Seaside. It is the intent of the Reuse Plan for Marina to establish a design district for the lands in polygons 2a and 2b that are part of the Mixed Use Corporate Center area between Second Ave and Highway 1 and not to limit the district designation to 500 feet. A 500 foot limitation would defeat the objectives of achieving the coordinated development that will not adversely impact the visual resources in the Highway One Scenic Corridor.

Each of the programs under Policy D-1 on page 4-66 contribute to the regulatory context and are not redundant.

249-3. The commenter requests text amendments. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Volume I. Page 3-115. Amend the last paragraph to read as follows:

"This center may represent a more long term opportunity because it is not within the existing infrastructure core area and industrial development would initially require ~~both~~ a connection to Blanco Road and eventually a second outlet across Armstrong Ranch to the north (Note: this site has also been identified as an "opportunity site" for visitor serving uses)".

Volume I. Page 3-116. Amend the first paragraph to read as follows:

Business Park/Light Industrial Land Use. ~~207~~ ~~113~~ acres are projected accommodating approximately 1.81 ~~1.4~~ million sq. ft. of potential light industrial and business park land use.

Visitor-Serving Land Use. 200 unit ~~room~~ hotel with a golf"

249-4. The commenter is requesting program language amendments. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-142. Add the following sentence to the beginning of Program B-1.1.

"Where the City has reason to suspect that they may occur on a proposed development site ..."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-185. Add the following sentence to the beginning of Program B-1.1.

"Where the City has reason to suspect that they may occur on a proposed development site ..."

Volume II. Page 4-192. Add the following sentence to the beginning of Program B-1.1.

"Where the City has reason to suspect that they may occur on a proposed development site ..."

249-5. The commenter states the Reuse Plan is incorrect in its assumption that a coastal pond exists in Polygon 2a. Based on review of the Coastal/Vernal Ponds Comprehensive Management Plan, this area of Fort Ord has not been identified as a vernal or coastal pond. However, the HMP identifies the City of Marina to be the responsible agency for ensuring that conservation and management requirements included in the HMP are fulfilled. The parcel is currently designated in the Reuse Plan for Planned Development Mixed Use District.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-185. Omit Program B-3.1

249-6. The commenter states that the program numbers need to be changed. The numbering system aims to retain as much consistency as possible among the three land use jurisdictions. Therefore, Policy B-3 on page 4-185 of Volume II shall remain "Policy B-3". Policy B-2 is applicable to Seaside and Monterey County only.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II, Page 4-185. Amend the text to include Policy B-2, as follows:

"Biological Resources Policy B-2: Not applicable to Marina."

249-7. The commenter requests that a particular type of geographic index be included in the EIR. This type of index is not included in the EIR because it is not necessary.

249-8. The commenter requests that the EIR include an analysis of the California Road extension north of Reservation Road. Refer to response to comment 197-36 and 197-37.

249-9. The commenter is requesting clarification on the priority of mitigations between the EIS and the EIR. The commenter is concerned with the language in the Final EIS (Volume I, page 6-28) that states future development would be limited to

existing urban areas and degraded open spaces. This language was not carried over to the EIR because it was unnecessarily restrictive. With the HMP, which all future development is subject to, adequate environmental protection is assured. Refer to response to comment 164-13 for additional information on the HMP.

249-10. The commenter requests that the table that cross-references the EIR with the EIS and SEIS be amended.

1. Land Use

Environmental Setting - p4-1
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-4
Cumulative Impacts - p5-46

2. Socioeconomics

Environmental Setting - p4-8
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-4
Cumulative Impacts - p5-47

3. Geology and Soils

Environmental Setting - p4-8
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-5
Cumulative Impacts - p5-50

4. Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply

Environmental Setting - p4-8
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-5
Cumulative Impacts - p5-51

5. Hydrology and Water Quality

Environmental Setting - p4-11
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-5
Cumulative Impacts - p5-53

6. Public Health and Safety

Environmental Setting - p4-12
Impacts and Mitigations - 5-6
Cumulative Impacts - p5-54

7. Traffic and Circulation

Environmental Setting - p4-13
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-6
Cumulative Impacts - p5-55

8. Climate and Air Quality

Environmental Setting - p4-13
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-7
Cumulative Impacts - p5-62

9. Noise

Environmental Setting - p4-14
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-7
Cumulative Impacts - p5-66

10. Biological Resources

Environmental Setting - p4-24
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-8
Cumulative Impacts - p5-91

11. Visual Resources

Environmental Setting - p4-35
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-9
Cumulative Impacts - p5-101

12. Cultural Resources

Environmental Setting - p4-35
Impacts and Mitigations - p5-9
Cumulative Impacts - p5-101

Response to Letter 250

250-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the project. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 251

251-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 252

252-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response. However, the EIR consultant believes that the Final Program EIR adequately discusses the issues.

Response to Letter 253

253-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 254

254-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the project. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 255

255-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the project. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 256

256-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 257

257-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 258

258-1. The commenter submits an opinion. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response. However, the EIR consultant believes that the Final Program EIR adequately discusses the issues.

Response to Letter 259

259-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the project. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 260

260-1. The commenter discusses the McKinney Act property conveyed to the Children's Services International daycare center proposed at the corner of 12th Street and 4th Avenue, and the potential impact a future right-of-way dedication for 4th Avenue would have on this facility. Fourth Avenue is proposed to be an undivided local road that will provide access to the Patton Park community. The exact alignment is currently being accessed by the Army through its parcel survey work. Final plans are not currently available. In addition, at some future date, FORA staff, in conjunction with Marina staff, should re-evaluate the necessity for the alignment and/or its dimensions.

Response to Letter 261

261-1. The commenter would like information on where the water will come from. Refer to the water discussion in the EIR and response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to providing an EIR that is "more in accordance with the wishes of the residents of this area", this is not a Reuse Plan or EIR issue and cannot be responded to. As it pertains to the request that a realistic EIR be prepared, the EIR consultant assures the commenter that the EIR addresses all the necessary environmental impacts.

Response to Letter 262

262-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1

for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

[Start October 7, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 263

263-1. The commenter requests amendment to the EIR text pertaining to future water. The annexation of Fort Ord to MCWRA zones 2 and 2a will be the responsibility of FORA, and is not identified as a mitigation in the Draft EIR because it is a pending and automatic annexation after Reuse Plan approval and completion of the EDC process between the Army and FORA. Furthermore, the contractual agreement between the Army and MCWRA, which will eventually become a contractual agreement between FORA and the MCWRA, will necessarily require compliance by Fort Ord jurisdictions because the only source of water for reuse is through this agreement. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on this inter-agency agreement. Also, refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

263-2. The commenter requests that the EIR discuss the need for compliance with the county requirements for desalination projects and with state requirements for the use of recycled water. As it pertains to desalination, there are more than county requirements, there are federal and state requirements as discussed in response to comment 248-4. As it pertains to "recycled" [reclaimed] water, FORA and Fort Ord jurisdictions will be required to implement existing and any pending or future rules relating to the use of this type of water. It is expected that reclaimed water, which is treated sewer water from the MCWPCA Marina plant, will be used within the MCWD and Fort Ord for use primarily on landscaping (includes golf courses), but also used for industrial uses.

263-3. The commenter states that the Monterey Bay Sanctuaries policies need to be coordinated with future desalination plant plans. There is the potential that at a future date there will be a requirement that a desalination plant be constructed. At that time there will be the need for the project proponent to prepare environmental documents to address the environmental and policy issues. At the time a proposed desalination plant is proposed, the existing federal and state rules applicable at that time will be discussed. The Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan includes language that accommodates a desalination plant on the west side of Highway 1 in the location of the old sewage treatment plant. However, the CDPR's preference is for the desalination plant to be on the east side of Highway 1.

263-4. The commenter requests strong language be included in the EIR pertaining to water conservation and recommends a program that would require separate landscape plumbing for all appropriate new facilities. The EIR currently includes language regarding conservation. Refer to page 4-43, Program B-1.3. As it

pertains to separate landscape plumbing for all appropriate new facilities, the DRMP addresses this in section 3.11.5.4 (d) (3).

Response to Letter 264

264-1. The comment submits an opinion on the public review process. No response necessary.

Response to Letter 265

265-1. The commenter states that jobs and housing should be prioritized. Comment noted. No response necessary.

Response to Letter 266

266-1. The commenter would like the population at Fort Ord not to exceed the population that existed on Fort Ord in 1991. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 267

267-1. The commenter requests the economic data for area communities. Refer to response to comments 43-1, 55-4 and 102-1.

Response to Letter 268

268-1. The commenter is concerned about schools. Schools are adequately addressed in the Reuse Plan, Volume II, commencing on page 4-74. Also, refer to Figure 3.3-1 in Volume I of the Reuse Plan. This figure shows the location of future School/University locations. The smallest areas depicted represent elementary, middle and high school locations. Figure 3.2-1 in the EIR depicts the same land uses.

Response to Letter 269

269-1. The commenter states the EIR is inadequate because it does not contain the most recent figure depicting the location of unexploded ordnance. Refer to 213-20 for a revised figure. Also, the EIR does not include mitigation measures or

alternatives to reduce or eliminate UXO because it was not determined to be a significant impact. Refer to response to comments 32-1 and 213-19.

Response to Letter 270

270-1. The commenter would like to know what a silty aquitard is. A silty aquitard is a confining bed that retards water movement but does not prevent water to and from an adjacent aquifer.

Response to Letter 271

271-1. The comment would like information on a cemetery. Refer to response to comment 44-1.

Response to Letter 272

272-1. The commenter would like to know the total number of residential units in the vicinity of the old Fort Ord landfill site will have to be removed because of structural failure. This new information has been taken into account in the Comprehensive Business Plan. Refer to the revised Exhibit 3 in response to comment 7-2 where the absorption of existing units has been changed as noted in footnote 1. Other changes to the Reuse Plan are not warranted since the overall site capacity, service requirements, traffic impacts, etc., have been established for the number of units that included those to be demolished. The Reuse Plan provides the development capacity to replace these units elsewhere within the planning area. If additional investigations determine that reuse of existing residences is not financially feasible or practical, replacement is provided for in the Reuse Plan.

272-2. The commenter would like information on water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 273

273-1. The commenter states an opinion in support of the project. No comment necessary.

Response to Letter 274

274-1. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 275

275-1. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 276

276-1. The commenter would like information about lifestyle impacts on businesses and the environment. There are no known significant environmental impacts associated with lifestyle impacts.

276-2. The commenter would like to know how many students are 10,000 FTE. Refer to response to comment 59-5.

Response to Letter 277

277-1. The commenter submits general discussion on issues pertaining to Marina. No response necessary.

Response to Letter 278

278-1. The commenter states that the level of cleanup at Fort Ord will result in residual contamination. The Public Health and Safety section of the EIR adequately addresses this issue. Also, refer to response to comments 32-1, 55-8 and 136-6.

Response to Letter 279

279-1. The commenter would like information on water. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 280

280-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the project. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

[End September 13, 1996 FORA public hearing comments]

Response to Letter 281

281-1. The commenter would like the EIR to discuss the CAMU at the landfill site. FORA must rely on the Army to adequately address the landfill site based on existing federal guidelines. The landfill project is currently capped and sealed.

281-2. The commenter states that a golf course is not an option for the landfill site. This is no correct. A golf course can be constructed. Refer to response to comment 197-41.

Response to Letter 282

282-1. The commenter repeats the contents of her previous comment letters submitted to FORA. Refer to response to comment 80, 102, 138 and 178. Also, as it pertains to the MBUAPCD, refer to response to comment 56-3.

Response to Letter 283

283-1. The commenter requests that the EIR discuss on-site safe yield water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 284

284-1. The commenter would like the EIR to address the affordable housing issue with respect to County's inclusionary program. The Reuse Plan does not provide the housing element for each of the land use jurisdictions because of the provisions of SB 899. It is anticipated that each jurisdiction shall comply with state law as well as local policy regarding the provisions of inclusionary programs. Refer to response to comments 155-22 and 155-24. As the commenter notes, however, a substantial amount of residential program in the Reuse Plan will be subsidized. CSUMB's housing program totals 8,193 units. The POM Annex includes 1590 units. In addition, the McKinney Act has conveyed 101 units to homeless service providers. Refer to response to comment 211-13. This contribution to the affordable housing needs within the county is in excess of 44%. A break-down by land use jurisdiction is comparably weighted towards subsidized housing: the City of Marina has 39.6%; the City of Seaside has 44.7%; and the County of Monterey has 49.3%.

284-2. The commenter would like to know what part the Housing and Urban Development agency will have in the Reuse Plan. The final Base Reuse Plan is not subject to HUD review, though it has been reviewed by the Army which is responsible for the transfer of the lands and the realignment of the base.

Response to Letter 285

285-1. The commenter discusses the amount of acreage that would be developed associated with reuse. Refer to response to comment 139-23.

285-2. The commenter would like the EIR to discuss the historic growth rate. The growth rates and Fort Ord's potential to capture a portion of the growth anticipated for the region is summarized in the socio-economic setting of the Reuse Plan, Volume 1, beginning on page 2-10. Refer also to the "Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan (SKMG 1995) This background material is incorporated, in part, into the Draft EIR discussion in section 4.2. This document is available at the FORA office and at local libraries.

285-3. The commenter indicates there is a discrepancy between AMBAG population figures and those used in the Reuse Plan and EIR. Refer to response to comment 167-33.

Response to Letter 286

286-1. The commenter states an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. Through preparation of the Final Program EIR, it is the intent of FORA to provide all the necessary information on all significant environmental issues, whereby FORA will have a document that they can base an informed decision on.

Response to Letter 287

287-1. The commenter states the EIR does not provide evidence of the availability of long-term water supplies. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

287-2. The commenter states the EIR does not discuss the availability of adequate wastewater treatment capacity. The EIR adequately discusses the wastewater issue. Regardless of this, refer to response to comment 82-8.

287-3. The commenter states the EIR does not provide a discussion of the feasibility of expanded roadways. CEQA requires that mitigations be feasible. This is what the EIR has provided as it pertains to new roads. Refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion of the monitoring of LOS relative to mitigation implementation.

287-4. The commenter would like a revised EIR that includes an alternative project using on-site safe-yield water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for an expanded water discussion and 21-1 for the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP), which contains information on limiting future development to a safe yield water supply.

Response to Letter 288

288-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the project. No response necessary.

288-2. The commenter states the EIR does not discuss the needs and concerns of nearby communities.

There are two factors dictating the environmental analysis in the Reuse Plan EIR. Senate Bill (SB) 1180 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064. First, SB 1180 allows FORA to rely in part on the Army's previous analyses in the Final EIS and Final Supplemental EIS for environmental review of the proposed project. As stated on page 1-2 in Draft EIR:

"SB 1180 states that the Lead Agency may "utilize an environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to federal law as the environmental impact report for a federal military base reuse plan," as defined by conditions described in SB 1180 Section 21083.8.1(c). Section 21083.8.2 requires that "the draft environmental impact report shall consist of all or part of the environmental impact statement and any additional information that is necessary to prepare a draft environmental impact report in compliance with this division." Therefore, this Draft EIR has two major objectives:

- 1) To supply any missing elements from the NEPA documents required in order to comply with CEQA in adopting the *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*; and
- 2) To evaluate revisions in the Reuse Plan made since December 12, 1994.

This program-level Draft EIR thus incorporates by reference pertinent background information and analysis from the previous NEPA documents, which is relevant to the identification and evaluation of base-wide environmental impacts addressed in this Draft EIR. This Draft EIR is therefore a supplemental document to the FEIS and DSEIS prepared by the Army".

Secondly, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 requires FORA to make a determination of whether additional issues not discussed in the FEIS and DSEIS may have a significant effect on the environment and will require analysis. This determination is based on, to the extent possible, scientific and factual data. An ironclad definition of "significant effect" is not possible because the significance of an activity may vary with the setting. For example, an activity which may not be significant in an urban area may be significant in a rural area.

In determining whether an effect will be adverse, FORA also considered the views held by members of the public through the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process.

The NOP was circulated by FORA in January 1996 and helped define the contents of the EIR.

Based on the above discussion and the scientific and factual data (e.g., transportation study), the project would have negligible impacts at increasing distances from the project site. This is especially evident in transportation impacts, but also as it relates to views. The EIR treated the viewshed issue from the limited area of the proposed Highway 1 scenic corridor designation and Highway 68 and not from greater distances such as vistas from Pacific Grove. The commenter should refer to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 for additional information on this issue.

Lastly, it is important to note that the Reuse Plan provides a measure of control on future development to reduce visual impacts that will benefit Pacific Grove and Monterey. Refer to response to comment 68-2.

288-3. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response.

288-4. The commenter submits advice to the FORA Board. The advice must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 289

289-1. The commenter would like the RAB to be replaced. Comment noted.

Response to Letter 290

290-1. The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate and FORA must be given a reasonable range of alternatives and an adequate EIR. As it pertains to alternatives, refer to response to comment 27-3. As it pertains to an adequate EIR, the commenter has stated an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. Comment noted.

Response to Letter 291

291-1. The commenter would like information on the desalination plant. Though, the current Fort Ord Dunes State Park General Plan prefers any future desalination plant on the east side of Highway 1, the State Park's General Plan acknowledges the old Fort Ord sewer plant to be the current site preferred by FORA. The advantage of this site is its proximity to the source of water and existing institutional use footprint.

291-2. The commenter would like information on the coastal road. The Fort Ord Dunes State Park General Plan does not accommodate this road.

291-3. The commenter would like information on the Fort Ord Dunes State Park entrances. The State Park's General Plan indicates that Eighth and First Streets are the main vehicle entry points.

Response to Letter 292

292-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR. The EIR authors believe that the document, after completion of the final document, is adequate under CEQA.

Response to Letter 293

293-1. The commenter is requesting detailed information on a future desalination plant. It is not certain that FORA will construct a desalination plant. Other options may avail themselves as discussed in response to comment 8-5. Furthermore, the level of detail requested by the commenter is not appropriate for a program level EIR, but would be appropriate at the project level. As for the compatibility to a state park. A desalination plant, if constructed on the west side of Highway 1, is expected to be located on the old Fort Ord sewer plant site. Also, refer to response to comment 263-3.

Response to Letter 294

294-1. The commenter expresses an opinion on the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Between the Draft and Final EIR, all the environmental issues have been adequately discussed.

Response to Letter 295

295-1. The commenter requests a greater level of detail be provided concerning the impacts of full buildout development or the project needs to be reduced. The matter of reducing the project is a policy issue for FORA to discuss and resolve. As for the information contained in the EIR, between the Draft and Final EIR the environmental information is adequate for the decision makers to base their decision on.

Response to Letter 296

296-1. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan process be expedited. Comment noted.

Response to Letter 297

297-1. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan process be expedited. Comment noted.

Response to Letter 298

298-1. The commenter states that the habitat corridors are insufficient. All of policy 11a and most of 17b, which is the connection between the UC preserve areas and BLM, provides a large area of uninterrupted habitat. As for a corridor between Marina and the dunes on the west side of Patton Park, as indicated in the HMP (Figure 2-3), this area is to be removed as a corridor because of Highway 1 bisects the area and makes a corridor impractical.

298-2. The commenter urges that the development in the Frog Pond area be reduced to preserve habitat and wildlife. The area the commenter is referring to may be in the city boundaries of the City of Del Rey Oaks. The city would like a golf course, hotel, and other visitor serving uses in that area. However, future development in that area will be subject to the requirements of the EIR, as described on page 4-134 and 4-135 (Biological Resources Policy A-8 and A-9).

298-3. The commenter states that because of the unique character of the Fort Ord flora, native plants from on-site stock should be used in the exterior landscaping. It is important to note that non-invasive, non-native plant species are required to be used for erosion control. In this regard, the commenter is referred to response to comment 306-3. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-135. Add the following mitigation measure to impact #1.

“Mitigation: Because of the unique character of Fort Ord flora, the County shall use native plants from on-site stock shall be used in all landscaping except for turf areas. This is especially important with popular cultivars such as manzanita and ceanothus that could hybridize with the rare natives. All cultivars shall be obtained from stock originating on Fort Ord”.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-200. Add the following program:

“Program A-4.7: The County shall use native plants from on-site stock in all landscaping except for turf areas”.

298-4. The commenter would like habitat loss to be mitigated by setting aside existing high-quality habitat. The Reuse Plan has designated 15,000 acres of habitat as mitigation for the reuse of Fort Ord. Furthermore, programs are established in the Reuse Plan to reduce the impact of future development on areas containing habitat, which are set aside for future development.

Response to Letter 299

299-1. The commenter states that future development at Fort Ord should not exceed economic activity that occurred at the time of base closure. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

299-2. The commenter is concerned about transportation funding. Refer to response to comment 21-1 and 22-1.

299-3. The commenter states there is no funding for transit. Refer to response to comments 154-2, 154-24, 198-3, and 210-16.

299-4. The commenter states that too much residential development up front could reduce adequate tax base for revenues. On the contrary, residential uses are a better source for transportation projects than commercial/industrial uses.

299-5. The commenter states that FORA needs to address the issue of density on commercial enterprises. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response. However, the Reuse Plan does include future population totals anticipated for the year 2015 and full buildout. Refer to page 5-11 of the Draft EIR.

299-6. The commenter states the Reuse Plan must be able to accommodate future changes. All general plans are subject to change.

299-7. The commenter states that county development must be addressed in relation to infrastructure, utilities and public services. The discussion contained in the EIR includes north county cumulative projects. Furthermore, the transportation section of the EIR reflects development in north county via the traffic model. The water source discussion is also discussed in the context of its regional implications. Refer to the response to comment 8-5 for additional discussion on water sources. Air quality is also discussed in a regional context.

299-8. The commenter is requesting new methodology to determine open space. Open space areas in the Reuse Plan (indicated as Habitat Management in the Reuse Plan) can and should include active and passive uses.

299-9. The commenter states that residential development's requirement for water should be balanced with the needs of commercial/industrial uses. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

299-10. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

299-11. The commenter would like information on funding. Refer to Appendix B - *Business and Operations Plan* - of the Reuse Plan.

299-12. The commenter states that an alternative should be included that discusses what was lost only. Commenter repeats comment 299-1.

299-13. The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. Comment noted.

299-14. The commenter states that population figures do not correlate with other agencies. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response. However, FORA figures reflect AMBAG projections. Refer to response to comments 167-6, 167-32 and 167-33.

299-15. The commenter requests that market analyses be conducted a specific way. It is important for the Reuse Plan to consider both square feet of commercial space as well as land area to properly anticipate market support, market prototype and physical characteristics. The Reuse Plan and EIR consistently and appropriately refer to square feet and land area.

299-16. The commenter would like FORA to consider a smaller population at Fort Ord. This is a policy consideration for the FORA Board to consider.

Policy Consideration

FORA should consider whether to limit the population at Fort Ord to a smaller number.

Response to Letter 300

300-1. The commenter repeats comment 226-1.

300-2. The commenter repeats comment 226-2.

300-3. The commenter repeats comment 226-3.

300-4. The commenter repeats comment 226-4.

300-5. The commenter repeats comment 226-5.

Response to Letter 301

301-1. The commenter states the optimistic financing scenario does not adequately address the infrastructure needed. The optimistic scenario is based on TAMC's RTP unfunded scenario for this particular roadway.

301-2. The commenter would like information on mosquito/vector control. Refer to response to comment 13-1.

Response to Letter 302

302-1. The commenter would like information on the silty aquitard. Refer to response to comment 270-1.

Response to Letter 303

303-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development; refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4 pertaining to SB 899; and refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion on transportation infrastructure funding and implementation timing.

Response to Letter 304

304-1. The commenter states an opinion on preference of future reuse. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 305

305-1. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

Response to Letter 306

306-1. The commenter points out that FORA should take a stronger role in protecting the habitat reserves currently in the jurisdiction of the BLM and states that future opportunities for placement of public facilities within the BLM habitat management reserve cannot exceed 2 percent of the total BLM acreage. Comment

noted. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

306-2. The commenter states that hot fires are more conducive to natural revegetation of chaparral communities. The information does not change programs. Comment noted. No change to the EIR warranted.

306-3. The commenter states Program A-2.2 of Conservation and Geology Policy A-2, is too limiting. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-32. Amend Program A-2.2 to read as follows:

“The City/County shall develop and make available a list of recommended native plant and non-invasive non-native species, application rates, ...”

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-149. Amend Program A-2.2 to read as follows:

“The City/County shall develop and make available a list of recommend native plant and non-invasive non-native species, application rates, ...”

Volume II. Page 4-155. Amend Program A-2.2 to read as follows:

“The City/County shall develop and make available a list of recommend native plant and non-invasive non-native species, application rates, ...”

306-4. The commenter adds clarification to the UXO discussion in the EIR. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-64. Add the following sentence to the end of the second paragraph under impact 5.

“The public will be permanently excluded from the “High Density Unexploded Ordnance” area because this area’s UXO is expected not to be cleaned up until the development of better ordnance clean-up technology is available”.

Response to Letter 307

307-1. The commenter summarizes the specific concerns itemized in subsequent comments. Refer to response to comment letter 307 beginning with 307-2.

307-2. The commenter questions whether the Reuse Plan exceeds the mission identified for FORA set forth in SB 899. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4 for a discussion of FORA's four established goals and the relationship to economic activity at the time Fort Ord was closed.

307-3. The commenter asks about the process used in the Reuse Planning and specifically about the communities beyond the land use jurisdictions within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord. The Reuse Plan and EIR is based on several years of community planning under the guidance of FORIS that culminated in the plan adopted as an interim Reuse Plan in December 12, 1994. FORA, the joint powers authority that was created subsequent to FORIS reuse planning, is a regionally based authority and the board has broad representation from the region. This context and reuse planning history is summarized in Volume 1 of the Reuse Plan, pages 2-1 through 2-9.

307-4. The commenter asks specifically for references to the concerns of the residents of Pacific Grove and assurances that the needs of Pacific Grove businesses have been defined. Refer to response to comment 288-2.

307-5. The commenter would like to see more regional maps in the DEIR to establish the context for the impacts. The maps used in the DEIR or referenced in the background documents (e.g. the EIS) have been prepared to identify the location of the impact appropriate to the discussion. Section 4.7, Traffic and Circulation, provides maps of the regional roadway network analyzed in the DEIR. Other setting and impact discussions that are more localized in impact are confined to a smaller area, such as the geology and soils, biological resources, etc.

307-6. The commenter requests that an alternative be included in the Draft EIR that contains a development scenario which uses water from on-site wells without aggravating the rate of seawater intrusion. Refer to expanded water discussion in response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 which contains the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP). The DRMP provides language that will assure that pumping from on-site wells will not exacerbate seawater intrusion.

307-7. The commenter questions how the impacts can be dismissed by incorporating policies and programs to be carried out by another jurisdiction. The Reuse Plan is a general plan level document and the EIR is a program EIR on the Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comment 16-3. In addition, the commenter is referred to response to comment 21-1 for an additional mitigation measure to incorporate at Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP) into the

Reuse Plan to enhance the monitoring of development within the limits of resource constraints posed by traffic capacity and water supply.

307-8 The commenter suggests that the scoping of the EIR is not in accordance with CEQA because it did not include a scenario which identifies the level of development possible from the on-site wells without aggravating the rate of seawater intrusion. The 2015 scenario utilized in the Business and Operations Plan (Appendix B) is based on the availability of 6,600 afy. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for a discussion of the potential impacts associated with water supply. Refer also to response to comment 21-1 for an additional mitigation that enhances the monitoring of development within resource constraints.

307-9. The commenter cites a recent appellate court ruling of the California 5th District and suggests the ruling is directly applicable to the DEIR and Plan. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

307-10. The commenter notes that the cleanup of unexploded ordnance is not completed, nor is there an officially approved plan in place and suggests the Army is seeking relief from financial liability. The commenter suggests the DEIR omitted this potential impact from consideration. The impacts associated with hazardous materials is discussed in the DEIR beginning on page 4-54. Refer also to response to comment 55-11.

307-11. The commenter raises the same concern expressed in comment 307-7 in the context of governance and mitigation. Refer to response 307-7.

307-12. The commenter raises concern over the availability of financing resources to go ahead with a plan. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for an additional mitigation measure that links the availability of resources and funding for required improvements with the implementation of specific projects.

307-13. The commenter expresses an opinion that all of the serious environmental problems are regional and local jurisdictions vary widely in the extent and quality of their handling of them. FORA is a regionally-based decision body with specific responsibilities to adopt a Reuse Plan for the former Fort Ord and ensure compliance by the land use jurisdictions. Refer to response to comment 2-1 for an additional mitigation measure that addresses the monitoring of development within resource constraints.

307-14. The commenter suggests that FORA's responsibilities need to be extended beyond 2014 and that an implementation plan is required that clearly and unequivocally states that mitigation measures must be in place before development proceeds. The policies and programs included in Volume 2 of Reuse Plan will be incorporated into the general plans of the local land use jurisdictions in order to be consistent with FORA's Reuse plan. Subsequent to FORA's sunsetting the local land use jurisdictions will continue to be the responsible agencies for development approvals and subject to California planning law and CEQA. Refer to response to

comment 21-1 for an additional mitigation measure that addresses the monitoring of development within resource constraints.

307-15. The commenter requests baseline information by which to measure changes to the economic and environmental conditions to provide credible measures to restore the economic climate that existed prior to the downsizing of Fort Ord. The commenter expresses an opinion that the baseline is inadequately defined. Refer to comment 43-1 for a discussion of the four goals established for FORA in SB 899 and to response to comment 55-4 for the relationship between the FORA Reuse Plan and the AMBAG projections. For additional discussion of the baseline information, refer to the EIS. For a discussion of the socioeconomic factors used as baseline to the Reuse planning, refer to the "Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan," (SKMG 1995) and to response to comment letters 167 and 168.

307-16. The commenter expresses an opinion that the Monterey Peninsula region is already at or beyond its capacity to sustain growth. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 55-4.

307-17. The commenter expresses an opinion that the 28,800 acres of Fort Ord land is presented in a misleading way that exaggerates the amount of currently developable land. The Reuse Plan and DEIR are built on the environmental analysis completed for the Army's EIS on the Realignment of the base and on the HMP that was prepared to protect the approximately 15,000 acres designated for habitat protection. Neither the Reuse Plan nor the DEIR exaggerates the land available for development. The Land Resources for the Reuse Plan is presented in Volume 1, page 3-53, Table 3.4-2 and is also indicated in the section 3.2, page 3-4 of the DEIR.

307-18. The commenter expresses the opinion that an alternative be developed that would take the former Fort Ord area back to the economic health it enjoyed before base closure. Refer to response to comment 43-1 for a discussion of the four goals established for FORA.

The Reuse Plan is premised on the replacement of the jobs and economic activity lost due to the closure of Fort Ord and has developed an Implementation Section that stresses four themes for community development. A new mitigation measure has been identified to strengthen the monitoring aspects of these community development themes and link development directly to resource constraints. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion of the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP).

307-19. The commenter questions whether there is sufficient water available for the project. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also refer to response to comment 21-1.

307-20 The commenter questions whether the City of Seaside, as a past and continuing consumer of MPWMD water, is the benefactor of a "waterfall." It is uncertain what the comment means. Based on a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the MPWMD, MCWRA and the PVWMA (dated December 1991),

and its addendum (dated February 1993), the area of Seaside within Fort Ord would be served only by water provided by MCWRA. The two golf courses will continue to be served by water obtained from Seaside groundwater subbasin, which the MPWMD has exclusive authority to regulate the management of.

307-21. The commenter requests an alternative based on existing water supplies. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for a discussion of water supplies. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion of an additional mitigation measure to strengthen the monitoring of development within resource constraints.

307-22. The commenter requests additional description of alternative new water supplies. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

307-23. The commenter expresses the opinion that additional water supplies will not be supported by local taxpayers. Comment noted.

307-24. The commenter requests more discussion of feasible alternatives for water supplies and their environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

307-25. The commenter expresses the opinion that driving past Fort Ord was once an enjoyable and relaxing experience but now can be life-threatening. The commenter expresses concern that transportation impacts associated with the project have not been adequately analyzed. The commenter suggests that the regional network analyzed should include more jurisdictions. The EIR evaluates the impacts from traffic and identifies adequate mitigations in section 4.7, beginning on page 4-65 of the DEIR. The discussion of impacts on level of service is augmented in response to comment 167-22. Refer also to response to comments 56-4, and 59-8. The network of links analyzed in the DEIR is based on the MCTAM regional model prepared by TAMC and the links evaluated are consistent with TAMC's Draft Report for the "Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study," (JHK 1997).

307-26. The commenter notes that the project will make already serious roadway capacity deficiencies far worse without a credible financial measure to remedy the conditions. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan relies on a nexus analysis to establish the impacts on the regional network attributable to development at Fort Ord. Refer to response to comment 22-1. Refer also to response to comment 21-1 for an additional mitigation measure which includes programs related to FORA's financing of roadways.

The commenter expresses the opinion that traffic alone is a more than adequate reason for constraining new growth at Fort Ord to pre-closure levels or less. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion of an additional mitigation measure to strengthen the monitoring of development within resource constraints.

307-27. The commenter questions whether adequate wastewater facilities are provided for in the Reuse Plan. The wastewater improvements are described in the PFIP, in Appendix B. The recommended sources of financing for capital investments and annual operations is rate-based financing. The on-site capital costs and regional

treatment costs are identified on pages PFIP 1-36 and 1-37. The total capital cost for development through 2015 is \$14,100,000. Financing of these improvements is described in section 3 of the PFIP beginning on page 3-82 which includes a discussion of the buy-in to the treatment capacity at MRWPCA.

The commenter also questions whether there is adequate landfill capacity for the anticipated solid waste generation. The DEIR identifies the remaining life of the Monterey Regional Waste Management District's landfill in Marina as approximately 100 years (as of 1991). The DEIR concludes that ultimate buildout of the proposed project would reduce that life less than 10 years.

The commenter expresses an opinion that the treatment of wastewater and solid waste impact assessment is inadequate. The DEIR is adequate for the decision makers.

307-28. The commenter suggests the impact assessment of visual resources is inadequate because it fails to consider visual quality from across the bay. The approach taken in the Reuse Plan to protect visual resources is based on design principles and objectives and the preparation of design guidelines. Refer to response to comment 242-12. The additional concerns raised by the commenter will be adequately addressed with the implementation of the mitigation measures already included in the programs and policies in the Reuse Plan. Also, refer to response to comment 288-2 regarding the scope of impacts.

307-29. The commenter questions the legal authority of FORA to adopt a Reuse Plan that extends development beyond 2015. FORA's responsibilities include adopting land uses for all of the lands that will be transferred from the Army with the realignment of the former Fort Ord. The lands that have been identified as suitable for development exceed and markets capacity to absorb them by 2015. Refer to response to comment 43-1 for the goals established for FORA in SB 899.

307-30. The commenter asks why the Reuse planning doesn't extend even beyond 50 years. A key principle underlying the implementation of development at Fort Ord is that the development be served by adequate services. An additional mitigation measure is provided to strengthen the monitoring aspects of development to link it to available resources and services. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

307-31. The commenter asks again what the legal authority is for proposing buildout that exceeds the level of use there prior to base closure. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

307-32. The commenter asks if the Plan minimizes disruption of the Monterey Bay area, as mandated in SB 899. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4.

307-33. The commenter questions the objective of speed in the economic redevelopment of Fort Ord. These objectives are based on the fiscal peril to the land use jurisdictions represented by delays to economic development and the

deleterious consequences to reuse with continued deterioration of vacant properties at the former Fort Ord.

307-34. The commenter questions the tradeoff between the need for speed in redevelopment and the minimization of disruption and protection of the environment. Refer to response to comments 43-1 for the goals established for FORA in SB-899. Also refer to response to comment 21-1 for the monitoring of development with respect to resource constraints.

307-35. The commenter asks for clarification of what is meant by economic recovery. The Reuse Plan establishes an objective to replace the lost jobs represented by the 1991 baseline which totals 13,500 active duty military and 4,500 civilian jobs for a total of 18,000 jobs on the former base utilizing the existing 6600 afy. Refer to the "Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan" (SKMG 1995).

307-36. The commenter asks if the project consultants maintain that economic recovery is in itself an "overriding consideration" available to local governments as justification for the project. The DEIR does not identify the need to make overriding considerations to maintain economic recovery. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 55-4. The consultants do not maintain such. However, FORA will be required to balance the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable" to FORA (CEQA Section 15093).

307-37. The commenter asks to what extent FORA is mandated to consider the concerns of on-site jurisdictions as opposed to those of neighboring and nearby communities. FORA is a broadly-based joint powers authority with regional representation that extends beyond the boundary of the former Fort Ord. SB 899 establishes the membership of the Board. The Board is required to consider off-site as well as on-site impacts through CEQA.

307-38. The commenter asks why there is not more graphic representation in the DEIR that relates to the region. The impacts identified in the DEIR are described at the scale to which they can be defined or are appropriate. For example, the traffic analysis utilizes a regional roadway network in the graphics. Refer to response to comment 307-5.

307-39. The commenter asks why there is more than one level of voting in FORA. The FORA Board has both voting and non-voting members (ex-officio). SB 899 establishes the voting membership.

307-40. The commenter asks why another voting representation at the Board would not be possible. Changes to the voting provisions in SB 899 would require changes to the state legislation.

307-41. The commenter asks why the DEIR does not consider all the impacts the Reuse Plan will have on all jurisdictions within the areas likely to be affected by it. Refer to response to comment 288-2.

307-42. The commenter asks what assurances there are to enforce the mitigations in the DEIR. The implementation section of the Reuse Plan, Volume 1, establishes the process and procedures for plan consistency determinations and procedures for appeals and review of development entitlements. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for specific monitoring responsibilities.

307-43. The commenter asks why there is no alternative in DEIR that identifies the level of development possible from the on-site wells without aggravating the rate of seawater intrusion. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

307-44. The commenter asks what analysis has been made of the recent ruling of the 5th District Court of Appeals. Response to comment 8-5 is partially in response to the .

307-45. The commenter asks who is going to pay for rendering the area safe from unexploded ordnance and when it will be completed. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

307-46. The commenter asks what governmental body will be in place to respond to concerns of individuals after 2015 (when FORA no longer exists). The local land use jurisdictions and regional agencies will continue to take their historic and legal responsibilities for the direction and approval of development at the former Fort Ord when FORA no longer exists.

307-47. The commenter asks to what extent will non-local entities be able to intervene in events at Fort Ord (when FORA no longer exists). The land use jurisdictions and agencies will continue to be bound by the requirements of public noticing associated with plan and project reviews and approvals and by CEQA provisions.

307-48. The commenter would like to know who to appeal a FORA decision to. The public can appeal a local decision to FORA, a regional agency, as long as FORA exists (per SB 899, FORA would cease to exist in the year 2014 or upon development of 80 percent of Fort Ord, whichever is sooner. There is no administrative remedy beyond an appeal to FORA.

307-49. The commenter asks if it is stated that mitigation measures must be in place before development is allowed to proceed. Refer to the implementation section of Volume 1 of the Reuse Plan for the review procedures for FORA. Also refer to response to comment 21-1 for the monitoring of the Development Resources and Management Plan.

307-50. The commenter asks if other land use jurisdictions might be entitled to some amount of Seaside's portion of the water assumed to be "available" at Fort Ord.

Per Agreement No. A-06404/Resolution No. 93-387 between the Army and MCWRA, the 6,600 afy for future reuse cannot be transferred outside of Fort Ord boundaries.

307-51. The commenter asks who will pay for water demand created by new construction at Fort Ord. The recommended financing approach is rate-based financing for water supply capital and operational improvements. The costs would be borne by the specific users of the water.

307-52. The commenter asks who will pay for roadway improvements needed as a result of new construction at Fort Ord. Are neighboring jurisdictions financially liable for such projects? The financing of roadway improvements is based on a nexus analysis related to Fort Ord's portion of the traffic impacts associated with the regional network defined by TAMC. Refer to response to comment 22-1. The regional traffic model incorporates AMBAG's development projections for the region through the period to 2015 to forecast the cumulative traffic on all the links in the network. The region is faced with a large measure of unfunded transportation needs. Refer to the draft "Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study," (JHK 1997.).

Also refer to response to comment 21-1. The Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) establishes the management of transportation improvements with programs for: financing FORA's fair share of "on-site," "off-site," and "regional" roadway improvements; participation in reimbursement programs; participation in a regional transportation financing program; and monitoring program.

307-53. The commenter questions why FORA's Reuse Planning extends beyond the 2015 period. Refer to response to comment 307-29.

307-54. The commenter asks who will be liable for cleaning up messes, paying fines, and financing corrective measures if projects approved by the "city/county" (land use jurisdictions) do not comply with assembly bill 939. The Reuse of Fort Ord is required to implement State Law. It is speculative to know who will pay. Each jurisdiction is separately responsible for reducing the solid waste generation rates to the state established targets.

307-55. The commenter would like an explanation of CEQA terms. The use of the term "potential" is commonly used in CEQA documents and merely implies that if the project is approved there is the potential the impact would occur. The mitigation is prescribed to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

307-56. The commenter expresses an opinion that a project for a new local water supply will be controversial and notes that it is likely to require an EIR. Implementation of a new water supply will require an EIR as the commenter notes.

307-57. The commenter asks how much of the former Fort Ord is presently developed. Approximately 5,000 acres is presently developed. See DEIR page 4-3.

307-58. The commenter asks what the proposed distribution of land uses is in the Reuse Plan. The distribution is summarized in the DEIR, page 3-4, as follows:

- 62% Habitat Management
- 9% Educational/Institutional/Public Facilities (includes airport)
- 1% Retail
- 5% Business Park/Light Industrial/Planned Development
- 7% Residential
- 10% Parks and Recreation (including State and Local parks and golf courses)
- 0% Agri-business
- 7% other (rights-of-way 4%; POM Annex 3%)
- <1% Visitor Serving

307-59. The commenter asks for clarification of the lands that have already been transferred from the Army. The major conveyances already accomplished by the Army are identified in Volume 1 of the Reuse Plan, page 2-37.

307-60 The commenter asks for detailed clarification of the land distribution in the Reuse Plan. Volume 1 of the Reuse Plan provides the following summary tabulations:

Table 3.3-1 Page 3-42 Summary Land Use Capacity: Ultimate Development (by land use and by jurisdiction)

Table 3.4-2 page 3-53 Land Resources (by general land use designation)

Table 3.8-1 Page 3-104 City of Marina Land Development Intensity Summary Table (by planning area/district, by use/intensity, by land area/reserves, and by projected development capacity)

Table 3.9-1 Page 3-3-121 City of Seaside Land Development Intensity Summary Table (by planning area/district, by use/intensity, by land area/reserves, and by projected development capacity)

Table 3.10-1 Page 3-130 Monterey County Land Development Intensity Summary Table (by planning area/district, by use/intensity, by land area/reserves, and by projected development capacity)

307-61 The commenter asks why there is not an alternative in the DEIR that is limited to the level of development at the former Fort Ord. Refer to response to comments 43-1 and 307-18.

307-62 The commenter asks for additional analysis of the impacts of an additional water supply. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

307-63. The commenter asks about the ramifications of allotting 3000 afy water to the City of Seaside. This amount of water has not been allocated to Seaside in the context of FORA, the Marina Coast Water District or the MCWRA.

307-64. The commenter asks to what extent are water supplies of the various Peninsula jurisdictions interdependent. The water allocation among the land use jurisdictions at the former Fort Ord will be allocated within the available water supplies. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

307-65. The commenter asks if providing Seaside with a water supply at Fort Ord will affect the supply of water to other MPWMD cities. There is no direct link between the allocation of water to Seaside from the existing 6,600 afy at Fort Ord and the water supplies available to other municipalities.

307-66. The commenter asks who will pay for new water facilities and related infrastructure improvements. The recommended financing method in the PFIP is rate-based financing. See Appendix B, page PFIP 1-22.

307-67. The commenter asks whether continuing challenges to developer fees will affect the likelihood of their use. The commenter appears to be referring to proposition 218. Refer to response to comment 63-2.

307-68. The commenter asks if developer fees are inadequate or unavailable, what alternative sources of funding are there for new water supplies. Refer to response to comment 307-66.

307-69. The commenter asks why no analysis is given of the traffic impacts on the nearby jurisdictions. The DEIR identifies the impacts in section 4.7. Refer also to response to comment 167-22.

307-70. The commenter asks what the traffic conditions will be on Highway 1 segments and on Holman Highway in Pacific Grove. The projected traffic impacts on segments of Highway 1 forecasted to 2015 are summarized in the DEIR in table 4.7-3. Refer also to response to comment 167-22. The link analysis extends from State Highway 68 north to the Santa Cruz County Line. Other segments of Highway 1 have been analyzed by TAMC using the same MCTAM model. These analyses are reported in the draft "Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study," (JHK 1997). No nexus for Fort Ord development is identified for segments of Highway 1 beyond those reported in the DEIR (see table 7-3). The impact analyses do not indicate a nexus beyond the Highway 1 to Holman Highway in Pacific Grove.

307-71. The commenter asks who are the most likely drivers to be killed or injured when the situation becomes worse at the Hwy 1 intersection with Hwy 68. The conditions at this intersection are not considered to be a significant environmental issue. Also, refer to response to comment 288-2.

307-72. The commenter repeats 307-54.

307-73. The commenter asks to what extent is it possible that the environments and economies of neighboring jurisdiction might be impacted by noncompliance with relevant water quality regulations. The commenter's question is speculative. No response is required.

307-74. The commenter asks why the DEIR only considers visual qualities on site and from Hwy 1, State Route 68 and the Salinas Valley. Refer to response to comments 68-2, 203-12 and 288-2.

307-75. The commenter asks what the potential impacts on the viewsheds of coastal areas. Refer to response to comment 288-2.

307-76. The commenter asks what constraints on structure height will be placed on development at Fort Ord. The Community Design Vision includes Design Principle 6: "Adopt Regional Urban Design Guidelines" which provides that FORA will prepare and adopt guidelines for road design, setbacks, building height, landscaping, signage, and other matters of visual importance." Volume 1, page 3-8. Refer to response to comment 203-12. In addition, general development character and design objectives are provided that address Building heights within the Hwy 1 Scenic Corridor and along the bluffs overlooking the Salinas River Valley. These objectives are described in section 3.7 Planning Areas and Districts of Volume 1 of the Reuse Plan. The objectives within the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor is to "Establish a maximum building height related to an identified mature landscape height...." (See page 3-110)

Response to Letter 308

308-1. The commenter states the EIR omits necessary data. This is an opinion on the project. However, the reader is referred to the expanded discussion on water issues contained in response to comment 8-5. All other impacts referenced by the commenter are adequately discussed in the EIR. A revised EIR will not be necessary.

Response to Letter 309

309-1. The commenter submits a recommendation to the FORA Board. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is

necessary. However, the issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 310

310-1. The commenter would like the population at Fort Ord not to exceed the 31,000. The comment is noted and the issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 311

311-1. The commenter would like information on the existing location of hazardous materials and their disposal. Refer to the Final EIS (June 1993) and the Draft EIR, as well as response to comments 32-1, 55-8 and 136-6.

Response to Letter 312

312-1. The commenter states that no development should occur until a safe-yield water supply is available. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 313

313-1. The commenter states that water is inadequate. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on water supply and response to comment 21-1 for the Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) which addresses a safe-yield water use.

313-2. The commenter would like to know how much money has been spent on plans since 1991.

313-3. The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response. However, it is believed that through the development of the Final Program EIR that the Reuse Plan environmental documents are adequate.

Response to Letter 314

314-1. The commenter would like another EIR prepared. The Draft EIR in conjunction with the Final Program EIR adequately addresses all the environmental issues.

Response to Letter 315

315-1. The commenter would like another EIR prepared. The Draft EIR in conjunction with the Final Program EIR adequately addresses all the environmental issues.

Response to Letter 316

316-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development.

316-2. The commenter does not want the frog pond replaced with an office building. There are no plans to replace the frog pond with an office building. The frog pond is part of the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District and is public property used for open space.

Response to Letter 317

317-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development.

Response to Letter 318

318-1 The commenter would like program language amended to clarify the intent of the Reuse Plan. The commenter would like to restrict the program geographically to only the Del Monte Mixed Use District. This restriction would, however, result in potential impacts to the visual quality of the Highway 1 Scenic Corridor. Changes are required to the text to clarify the geographic designation. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-150. Amend Program B-1.2 as follows:

~~"Program B-1.2 (Marina): The City shall require that all development within the Town Center and Del Monte Mixed Use Districts incorporate landscape buffers to screen visual intrusion into the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor.~~

The City shall incorporate landscape buffers and/or other mechanisms adequate to mitigate potential visual impacts on the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor from development within the Mixed use Corporate Center and Del Monte Mixed Use Districts (polygons 2a and 2b)."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-130. Amend Program B-1.2 as follows:

~~"Program B-1.2: The City of Marina shall require that all development within the Town Center and Del Monte Mixed Use Districts incorporate landscape buffers to screen visual intrusion into the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor.~~

The City shall incorporate landscape buffers and/or other mechanisms adequate to mitigate potential visual impacts on the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor from development within the Mixed use Corporate Center and Del Monte Mixed Use Districts (polygons 2a and 2b)."

Response to Letter 319

319-1. The commenter requests that the population be scaled back to the population which existed in 1991. The request must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 320

320-1. The commenter requests that his agency be included in the list of "Local Agencies" "expected to utilize this Draft EIR". The EIR is based on existing conditions. The existing conditions, as discussed on page 1-3 of the Draft EIR, is 1991. The MCWD is not included in the EIR because it is not the water purveyor at Fort Ord.

320-2. The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not state that a future desalination plant will be required to abide by the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary goals and policies. Though the EIR does not discuss this agency it does not preclude the agency's involvement in any future desalination plant. Refer to response to comment 248-4.

320-3. The commenter repeats comment 263. Refer to response to comment 263-1, etc.

320-4. The commenter states that policies and programs should be established for the use of recycled water and desalinated water and a program for protection of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. FORA has not committed to a

desalination plant at this time even though, according to the PFIP, it will be collecting funds for construction of a desalination plant for the period after 2015. This funding may be used for a more cost effective source of water at a later date. Also, Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.2 accommodates desalination. As it pertains to programs to accommodate the use of reclaimed water, refer to response to comment 21-1.

320-5. The commenter would like the Marina Coast Water District to be mentioned and its boundaries and sphere of influence shown on figures. The EIR is based on existing conditions. The existing conditions, as discussed on page 1-3 of the Draft EIR, is 1991. The MCWD is not included in the EIR because it was not and is not currently the water purveyor at Fort Ord. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 3-10. Amend section title:

"3.6 Potential Changes in City and County Boundaries

~~Potential Changes in City, County and Special District Boundaries"~~

Page 3-10. Amend the next to the last sentence in the first paragraph under section 3.6 to read as follows:

"... Fort Ord land into the local cities and the County, ~~and to set up special service districts, such as fire, water and sewer districts~~".

320-6. The commenter would like the agencies with jurisdiction relating to desalination plants to be listed. The level of information request exceeds the information needed in this program level EIR. However, refer to response to comment 248-4 for a list of agencies that would be expected to be involved in a desalination project.

320-7. The commenter would like the EIR to reflect that his agency's facility is not the west side of Highway 1. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-4. Amend the next to the last sentence in the first full paragraph to read as follows.

"...Marina State Beach and the Marina Coast Water District headquarters are is on the west side".

320-8. The commenter requests that the MCWD wells and facilities be shown. This is not necessary because the MCWD is not the water purveyor at Fort Ord.

320-9. The commenter states that it may be possible through an agreement with MCWD to obtain reclaimed water for Fort Ord. This is a given. Future development at Fort Ord is expected to make maximum use of reclaimed water resources. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

320-10. The commenter states that future water for Fort Ord reuse can come from the MCWD deep wells and new connections between Fort Ord and MCWD could also provide Fort Ord with desalinated water from MCWD's new desalination plant. Future development at Fort Ord will be limited to the 6,600 afy of water as stipulated in the agreement between the Army and MCWRA. Additional water from a desalination plant in Marina is a possibility.

320-11. The commenter states the regulatory issues pertaining to desalination should be included in the EIR. This level of detail in a program level EIR is not necessary.

320-12. The commenter request amended to an EIR table. The table is specific to non-water issues. The reference to "afy" was included inadvertently.

320-13. The commenter requests amendments to the EIR text pertaining to water supply. The 1,400 acre feet is discussed in response to comment 8-5. The reclaimed water issue is discussed in new programs contained in response to comment 248-4. As it pertains to desalination, there are options such as the MCWD plant, a new plant in Fort Ord or other shared plant with another jurisdiction.

320-14. The commenter requests that the water purveyor be included in program B-1.1 and C-3.1. The agencies listed are adequate. Also, the new program requested by the commenter is not necessary because it would be redundant to Program C-3.2.

320-15. The commenter requests amendments to the EIR text pertaining to water supply. The text amendments are not necessary at the program EIR level. It should be noted that precluding reference to the MCWD in the discussion does not preclude MCWD from being involved in the process to define issues and resolve them.

320-16. The commenter would like a new program pertaining to future utility trenches and UXO. The protection the commenter seeks for future MCWD activities are currently administered through the Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management (DENR). At the time a specific project is proposed, further detailed analysis pertaining to UXO will be required to determine if construction is planned within known or potential UXO areas. In the event work is within known or potential UXO areas, specific federal protocols must be implemented. More information in this regard, refer to response to comment 32-1.

320-17. The commenter states that all jurisdictions should coordinate placement of utilities underground. Comment noted.

320-18. The commenter states that any future desalination plant must be coordinated with the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. This is addressed in response to comment 248-4 and Policy C-6 - *Hydrology and Water Quality Policy*. (page 4-48 in the Draft EIR).

320-19. The commenter would like UCMBEST to acknowledge water issues. Comment note. Comment is not relevant to the Reuse Plan or the EIR.

320-20. The commenter requests amendments to the EIR text pertaining to water supply. The information the commenter would like in the EIR is too specific for a program level EIR. Furthermore, the agreements referenced by the commenter are subject to change.

320-21. The commenter states that the ultimate project adopted by FORA must contain provision for public utility easements. This is acknowledged by FORA. No changes to the Reuse Plan or EIR are required.

320-22. The commenter is requesting an environmental analysis associated with the future connection of the Fort Ord water infrastructure with the MCWD. This is not part of the project description for the Reuse Plan and EIR, therefore discussion is not warranted. At a future date, FORA must address this issue with whatever agency it determines will be the purveyor of the Fort Ord water system.

Response to Letter 321

321-1. The commenter would like an alternative discussion that includes a project that uses only 7,000 ac and does not exceed current developed areas and areas already conveyed. The commenter is directed to response to comment 27-3. In addition, the EIR includes the "No Project" alternative which addresses the comment.

321-2. The commenter would like an economic profile. Refer to response to comment 43-1 and 102-1.

321-3. The commenter would like to know what number of new civilian jobs would equal the same economic impact that existed at the time of base closure. The Draft EIR addresses the impacts associated with the redevelopment of the base and not the impacts associated with realignment activities by the Army. Refer to the EIS prepared by the Army for the ROD. No further response warranted.

321-4. The commenter would like development options which recoup only the inflation adjusted economic loss and would UCMBEST and CSUMB replace this loss. This alternative is not necessary to address the environmental impacts associated with the Draft Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comments 27-3 and 43-1.

321-5. The commenter would like to know how many additional regional jobs/houses will be created. The analysis for the Reuse Plan did not include this level of detail. The Draft EIR adequately addresses the growth inducement issue and concludes growth will occur.

321-6. The commenter would like to know how induced growth and project impacts will be mitigated and how will mitigation be financed in communities such as Pacific Grove and Monterey. The EIR did not determine that there would be induced or project related impacts in Pacific Grove. As it pertains to Monterey, there is an impact which relates to transportation and this is adequately addressed in the EIR. Therefore, mitigation in Pacific Grove is moot. Mitigation in Monterey pertains only to transportation.

321-7. The commenter is requesting a lower jobs/housing ratio. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

321-8. The commenter would like to know how runoff is to be controlled and the efficiency of removing urban pollution from runoff. The EIR adequately addresses runoff. The commenter is referred to section 4.5. The efficiency of runoff pollution control is an issue not necessary to be discussed in the program level EIR. However, the EIR adequately discusses the issue and provides current federal NPDES requirements for mitigation.

321-9. The commenter would like to know how much more jet aircraft traffic is expected at Monterey Airport. The EIR does not discuss the amount of aircraft

associated with future use at the airport. However, the EIR does discuss the noise contours. Refer to page 4-113 in the EIR.

321-10. The commenter would like a mitigation for increased aircraft noise associated with increase air traffic. Refer to page 4-113 in the EIR.

321-11. The commenter requests an alternative development that preserves the oak forests in Polygons 19a, 21a and 21b. The Habitat Management Plan addresses this issue and provides mitigation for future development in these Polygons. Furthermore, the approximately 15,000 acres of open space at Fort Ord not to be developed and set aside in perpetuity represents de facto mitigation for future Fort Ord development in oak woodlands.

321-12. The commenter would like to know how future high intensity lighting will be controlled to not significantly impact adjacent natural areas.

At the plan level, conditions of approval will be implemented for each development adjacent to natural areas to prevent. To assure this occurs and to manage the numerous federal, state and local holdings in the former base that will be used as habitat management areas, a Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) program was recommended by the HMP as a practical means of coordinating basewide resource management and planning at Fort Ord. This program is an established process used throughout the country for land management and planning purposes and agreed upon through a Memorandum of Understanding. The CRMP is a resource planning, problem solving and management process administered by a group of agency staff, professional biologists and concerned citizens, which allows for direct participation of everyone concerned with natural resources management in a given planning area. An inter-agency and inter-jurisdictional CRMP has been established at Fort Ord, whose objective is to serve as a clearinghouse by providing a forum for information and resource exchange on habitat-related issues, to develop standards for habitat management, monitoring and reporting and to coordinate the implementation of the HMP. The CRMP is intended to benefit all parties by providing for shared resources/expertise for HMP implementation.

321-13. The commenter would like to know what the impacts will be to the open space associated with a future Highway 68 Bypass. Refer to the discussion of the Highway 68 Bypass in response to comment 56-4. If the Bypass is proposed, detailed environmental documentation will be required. As the HMP is currently written, it accommodates the Bypass. This means that replacement acreage would not be required because the area of open space controlled by BLM is a defacto mitigation. However, this does not preclude other mitigation such as funding for habitat restoration elsewhere on Fort Ord, etc.

321-14. The commenter would like to know if mitigation for Laguna Seca would result in the Bypass being moved further to the north. It is too speculative to determine this.

321-15. The commenter would like to know why the Bypass is needed if an existing 4-lane road can handle the projected 2015 flows. The Bypass is intended as a longer term project to be built (if funding is aligned) no later than 2015 and not before 2010.

321-16. The commenter recommends an alternative route for the Highway 68 Bypass. Alternative alignments will be discussed as part of a future environmental document for the Bypass.

321-17. The commenter would like a high speed transit corridor. The project accommodates the multi-modal corridor through Fort Ord that is planned to link North Salinas and Monterey. The project identifies the corridor and provides for the dedication of the necessary lands for the multi-modal improvements including an intermodal center near Highway 1, and two additional park and ride lots. Rail improvements in the corridor are still being explored as a long-range plan by the regional transportation agency (TAMC).

321-18. The commenter inquires about tele-commuting and mass transit options being considered in the traffic analysis. The transportation model reflects the historical mode split which indicates that 2 percent of travelers use the bus, rail, a bike, motorcycle or walk. The TAMC model does not specifically project trip reductions as a result of tele-commuters, but does generically include a modal split that takes trip reduction measures into account. The Reuse Plan does include policies and programs for transportation and demand management (TDM). These are identified in Volume II, page 4-116, and in the Draft EIR on page 4-85.

Response to Letter 322

322-1. The commenter submits general comments about a new plan. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response.

Response to Letter 323

323-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development.

Response to Letter 324

324-1. The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.

Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion on the safe yield use of water for future development.

Response to Letter 325

325-1. The commenter addresses the cost burden of housing in the three local counties that surround Fort Ord and proposed programs to provide affordable rentership of Fort Ord residential properties. Refer to response to comment 284-1, 155-20, and 155-24.

325-2. The commenter addresses the physical deterioration of the existing Fort Ord housing inventory. The Reuse Plan anticipates the reuse of 4434 existing units at Fort Ord. This includes: 1) 1522 units in the several residential neighborhoods in Marina and Seaside portions of Fort Ord (reduced to 1300 units based on environmental concerns); 2) 1253 units located in the county portion of Fort Ord and already conveyed to CSUMB; 3) 1590 units in the Seaside portion of Fort Ord retained by the Army as the POM Annex housing supply; and 4) 291 multi-family units in the Seaside portion of Fort Ord (Sun Bay apartments). A substantial number of units at the former Fort Ord are substandard and require improvements that are not expected to be financially viable.

The suitability of the existing units for housing for different income groups and household types is recognized by FORA. The CSUMB units will be used by the University to support its educational mission. The units retained by the Army are currently occupied and the responsibility of the Army to maintain. The Seaside apartments are currently occupied as rental housing and not in disrepair. Of the 1300 existing units not occupied or managed, 101 units have been claimed through the McKinney Act to serve the "homeless" needs. The 1300 units with reuse potential will be transferred by the Army when the Reuse Plan is adopted and the EIR certified and when a conveyance, such as an economic development conveyance (EDC), is completed between the Army and FORA. Until the conveyance can be accomplished, these 1300 units continue to be at risk of deterioration. FORA is moving as expeditiously as possible to complete the conveyance of the Army's properties into local control.

325-3. The commenter requests that FORA pursue an adequate water supply for the current and future residents of the former Fort Ord. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 326

326-1. The commenter submits an opinion which is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. No commenter necessary

Response to Letter 327

327-1. The commenter states that the EIR needs to be revised because of an inadequate cumulative discussion in the EIR. The EIR cumulative discussion is considered to be adequate for the decision makers to base their decision on. If a more specific discussion on the subject of cumulative impacts were submitted by the commenter a more specific response could have been provided.

Response to Letter 328

328-1. The commenter submits an opinion that is contrary to the conclusion in the EIR that caretaker status associated with the "No Project" alternative would result in degradation of habitat through lack of management. Comment noted.

328-2. The commenter states that the language contained in numerous programs pertaining to coast live oak woodland is insufficient to adequately protect the remaining woodlands area and the language of the programs is insufficient for them to be considered mitigations under CEQA. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-137 and 4-138. Amend programs to read as follows:

"Biological Resources Policy C-2 (City of Marina):

Program C-2.1: The City shall protect the small patches of oak woodland located along the bluffs in Polygon 1c unless project-specific plans for development in those areas cannot proceed without selective tree removal. Where trees are removed, new trees of the same stock as those found on Fort Ord shall be planted in the immediate vicinity.

Program C-2.2: ~~Where Development~~ shall incorporate oak woodland elements into the its design and the City shall provide the following standards for plantings that may occur under oak trees; 1) plantings may occur within the dripline of mature trees, but only at a distance outside of the drip line ~~of five feet from the trunk~~ and 2) plantings under and around oaks should be selected from the list of approved species compiled by the California Oak Foundation (see *Compatible Plants Under and Around Oaks*).

Program C-2.4: The City shall require the use of oaks and other native plant species for project landscaping. To that end, the City shall require collection and propagation of acorns and other plant material from former Fort Ord oak woodlands to be used for restoration areas or as landscape material.

Biological Resources Policy C-2 (Seaside):

Program C-2.1: The City shall adopt an ordinance specifically addressing the preservation of oak trees. At a minimum, this ordinance shall include restrictions for the removal of oaks equal to or greater than six inches in diameter 2 feet off the ground ~~of a certain size~~, requirements for obtaining permits for removing oaks of the size defined, and specifications for relocation and/or replacement of oaks removed. During construction, trees or groups of trees that may be affected by construction activities shall be fenced off at the dripline.

Program C-2.2: When reviewing project plans for developments within oak woodlands, the City shall ~~encourage cluster ing of development~~ wherever possible so that contiguous stands of oak trees can be maintained in the non-developed natural land areas.

Program C-2.4: The City shall require the use of oaks and other native plant species for project landscaping. To that end, the City shall require ~~recommend~~ collection and propagation of acorns and other plant material from former Fort Ord oak woodlands to be used for restoration areas or as landscape material.

Program C-2.6: The City shall require that paving within the dripline of preserved oak trees be avoided wherever possible. To minimize paving impacts, the surfaces around tree trunks shall ~~should~~ be mulched, paving materials shall ~~should~~ be used that are permeable to water, aeration vents shall ~~should~~ be installed in impervious pavement, and root zone excavation shall ~~should~~ be avoided.

Biological Resources Policy C-2: The County shall preserve ~~encourage the preservation and enhance ment of oak~~ the woodland elements in the natural and built environments.

Program C-2.1: The County shall ~~encourage cluster ing of development~~ wherever possible so that contiguous stands of oak trees can be maintained in the non-developed natural land areas.

Program C-2.2: The County shall apply ~~certain~~ restrictions for the preservation of oak and other protected trees in accordance with Chapter 16.60 of Title 16 of the Monterey County Code (Ordinance 3420). Except as follows: No oak or madrone trees removed

Program C-2.3: The County shall require the use of oaks and other native plant species for project landscaping. To that end, the County shall ~~collection and propagate ion of~~ acorns and other plant material from former Fort Ord oak woodlands to be used for restoration areas or as landscape material.

Program C-2.5: The County shall require that paving within the dripline of preserved oak trees be avoided wherever possible. To minimize paving impacts, the surfaces around tree trunks shall ~~should~~ be mulched, paving

materials ~~shall~~ ~~should~~ be used that are permeable to water, aeration vents ~~shall~~ ~~should~~ be installed in impervious pavement, and root zone excavation ~~shall~~ ~~should~~ be avoided.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-186. Add the following new program for Marina.

"Program C-2.4: The City shall require the use of oaks and other native plant species for project landscaping. To that end, the City shall require collection and propagation of acorns and other plant material from former Fort Ord oak woodlands to be used for restoration areas or as landscape material."

Volume II. Page 4-193. Amend Program C-2.2 to read as follows:

"Program C-2.2: When reviewing project plans for developments within oak woodlands, the City shall ~~encourage cluster ing of~~ development wherever possible so that contiguous stands of oak trees can be maintained in the non-developed natural land areas."

Volume II. Page 4-204. Amend Program C-2.1 to read as follows:

"Program C-2.2: The County shall ~~encourage cluster ing of~~ development wherever possible so that contiguous stands of oak trees can be maintained in the non-developed natural land areas."

328-3. The commenter states that the language of the programs is insufficient for them to be considered mitigations under CEQA. The language contained in the Reuse Plan is adequate for the local jurisdictions to evaluate each project individually and respond with the appropriate buffer zone. For example, an athletic field adjacent to residential uses should have a greater setback than an athletic field adjacent to a commercial land use and/or open space. The language in the Reuse Plan provides the local jurisdictions with adequate flexibility to address the set back issue. Therefore, the language contained in the Reuse Plan is appropriate. However, as it pertains to Habitat Management areas, a greater degree of protection may be warranted. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-10. Amend program B-2.1 to read as follows:

"The County of Monterey shall review each future development project for compatibility with adjacent open space land uses and require that suitable open space buffers are incorporated into development plans of incompatible land uses as a condition of project approval. When buffers are required as a condition of approval adjacent to Habitat Management areas, the buffer shall

be at least 150 feet. Roads shall not be allowed within the buffer area except for restricted access maintenance or emergency access roads."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-71. Amend program B-2.1 to read as follows:

"The County of Monterey shall review each future development project for compatibility with adjacent open space land uses and require that suitable open space buffers are incorporated into development plans of incompatible land uses as a condition of project approval. When buffers are required as a condition of approval adjacent to Habitat Management areas, the buffer shall be at least 150 feet. Roads shall not be allowed within the buffer area except for restricted access maintenance or emergency access roads.

328-4. The commenter states the mitigation for the Highway 68 Bypass is not specific enough and therefore is irrelevant to the Bypass project. On the contrary, the mitigation is in the context of a very specific impacts statement, therefore it is specific to the Bypass.

328-5. The commenter addresses golf courses and adequacy of mitigations. The first has to do with likening golf courses to a "park-like setting" and the second to do with the adequacy of mitigations pertaining to the frog pond. In response, the golf course is a park-like setting and second, the programs pertaining to the frog pond are adequate to protect it from stormwater runoff associated with future development.

328-6. The commenter states that recharge of the groundwater will not result in a net increase in overall recharge. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-48. Amend program A-2.1 to read as follows:

"[...] The gauging program shall ~~should~~ be ~~partially or~~ entirely funded by Fort Ord development fees".

Page 4-51 and 4-52. Amend the last sentence on page to read as follows:

"Urbanization of former Fort Ord ~~could~~ ~~would also off-set, to some extent, tend to increase~~ the loss of groundwater recharge from leaky pipes and through irrigation return flow in landscaped areas. Also, by concentrating recharge in small areas, thereby decreasing evapotranspiration losses, where recharge is most likely to occur due to geologic conditions, a net increase in overall recharge could potentially be achieved if an aggressive recharge program throughout Fort Ord is implemented, with urbanization".

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-168. Amend program A-2.1 to read as follows:

“[...] The gauging program shall ~~should~~ be ~~partially or~~ entirely funded by Fort Ord development fees”.

328-7. The commenter requests additional information pertaining to areas outside of the HMP and the impact of threatened, endangered or candidate species in proposed development areas. Refer to response to comment 164-13.

328-8. The commenter states that policy is too weak to provide benefit to HMP species. The policy is supported by programs which are specific and adequately mitigate potential future impacts.

328-9. The commenter states the removal of 63 percent of coastal sage scrub habitat is significant. The EIR recognizes the significance of this loss, but concludes that it is mitigated to a less than significant level through requirements of the HMP.

328-10. The commenter states that a 36 percent reduction in annual grassland is a significant impact and the implementation of Biological Resource Policy B-2 is inadequate. The EIR acknowledges that there is a loss of grassland. However, the EIR concludes that because the remainder of grass on Fort Ord is preserved in perpetuity, the habitat would not be eliminated or substantially reduced. No changes to the EIR will occur regarding this issue.

328-11. The comment is related to comment 328-2.

328-12. The commenter requests a greater level of information on wetlands mitigation. The level of detail requested exceeds the level of analysis for this program level EIR. Detailed analysis pertaining to future development and wetlands will be provided at the time a project is proposed and will be required to use current federal and state wetlands delineation standards and mitigations.

328-13. The commenter states that the language contained in programs is not mitigation. As stated in the EIR, some habitat for species not listed in the HMP would be preserved within the conservation areas and corridors established in the HMP. Therefore, the impacts to these species within proposed future development areas are mitigated fully. To assure that species within proposed future development areas are adequately safeguarded, programs are prescribed in the EIR.

328-14. The commenter states that the “No Project” alternative should not be classified so because there will be impacts. CEQA requires there to be a no project alternative. In this case, it had to be the status quo. This is discussed in the EIR on page 6-16.

328-15. The commenter disagrees with the conclusion of the “No Project” alternative as it pertains to biological resources.

Response to Letter 329

329-1. The commenter asserts the sovereignty of CSUMB and requests that the Reuse Plan include a more extensive description of the legislative background that resulted in the Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act (Government Code, Title 7.5).

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 2-2. Section 2.1.1 Fort Ord Reuse Authority. Amend the description by adding the following to the end of this section:

"The FORA Act provides for the independent actions of the California State University (CSU), the University of California (UC), and the State Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR). Section 67655(j) of the Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act provides that CSU and UC are defined as "Redevelopment Authorities:"

'Redevelopment Authority,' for purposes of the transfer of property at military bases pursuant to Title XXIX of the National Defense Authorization Act for the 1994 fiscal year, means the Fort Ord Reuse Authority, except that, with respect to property within the territory of Fort Ord that is transferred or to b transferred to the California State University or to the University of California, "redevelopment authority" solely for purposes of the transfer of property at military bases pursuant to Title XXIX of the National Defense Authorization Act for the 1994 fiscal year means the California State University or the University of California, and does not mean the Fort Ord Reuse Authority."

The FORA Act further states that the title shall not be construed to limit the rights of the CSU, UC, or CDPR as provided in Section 67678(e) and (f):

(e) This title shall not be construed to limit the rights of the California State University or the University of California to acquire, hold, and use real property at Fort Ord, including locating or developing educationally related or research oriented facilities on this property.

(f) Except for property transferred to the California State University, or to the University of California, and that is used for educational or research purposes, and except for property transferred to the California Department of Parks and Recreation, all property transferred from the federal government to any user or purchaser, whether public or private, shall be used only in a manner consistent with the plan adopted or revised pursuant to Section 67675.

Thus, the powers and duties granted to FORA, which include the planning, financing, and management of the reuse of Fort Ord (e.g. preparation and

implementation of a Reuse Plan), do prevail over local entities, however they do not prevail over the powers and duties of the state when CSU and UC are using the property for "educational or research purposes." (Emphasis provided, see Section 67678(f).)

The commenter states that CSU is not subject to the Reuse Plan land use planning provisions, but this is not an accurate reading of the Title. Anything the universities do that is not for "educational or research purposes" is defacto limited by FORA's Reuse Plan. In addition, FORA exerts its necessary obligations to adequately provide for the necessary infrastructure and anticipate the potential program level environmental impacts of all of the Reuse Plan, including the development within the boundaries of the CSUMB and UCMBEST. FORA cannot make mandatory determinations and has no obligations for development or facilities within the boundaries of CSUMB or UCMBEST. FORA does have an interest, however, in the manner in which development and activities within these boundaries effect the character, quality, and viability of the surrounding lands. Therefore, FORA incorporates into its Reuse Plan, a characterization of the development program sufficient to effectively plan for the surrounding land uses and infrastructure. In addition, FORA expresses its goals and objectives regarding the general development character and design for integrating CSUMB and UC into the Reuse Plan.

329-2. The commenter states that CSU financial obligations are limited. FORA will need to consider the policy implications of the commenters statement.

Policy Considerations

FORA shall consider the character and extent of the financial obligations in the financing of infrastructure and services required for the reuse of the former Fort Ord.

329-3. The commenter repeats comment 329-1. Refer to response to comment 329-1.

329-4 The commenter states that the Business and Operations Plan assumptions are not valid because CSUMB's development program is subject to change. Refer to response to comments 9-13 and 57-1.

329-5. The commenter states that CSUMB is an existing land use. The Reuse Plan identifies the property transfer and describes the level of enrollment applicable during the preparation of the draft Reuse Plan. Figure 3.2.5 in Volume 1 of the Reuse Plan adequately conveys the information requested by the commenter.

329-6. The commenter requests a clarification of the text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-86, paragraph beginning with the CSUMB campus. Amend the last three sentences as follows:

"The HMP Reuse Plan identifies the establishment and maintenance of an oak habitat corridor through this area to connect preserved oak woodlands to the north and south as a desirable goal. Another desirable goal of the HMP Reuse Plan is development of hiker/biker trails either adjacent to or within the north side of the campus. Development of this trail system shall be coordinated with the CSUMB Master Plan."

329-7. The commenter states that the figures accurately illustrate the revised boundaries of the CSUMB campus but the acreage has not been updated in the Reuse Plan. The Reuse Plan will be amended to reflect a total of 1350 acres for the CSUMB campus.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-99, first paragraph. Amend the text as follows:

"The campus of CSUMB totals ~~1,287~~ 1,350 acres..."

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

329-8. The commenter supports FORA in its efforts to prepare comprehensive design guidelines as part of, or supplementary to, the Reuse Plan and staff is available to provide input to this process. Comment noted.

329-9. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan assumptions are speculative in advance of the CSUMB Campus Master Plan currently being prepared. Comment noted.

329-10. The commenter states that reliance on future events as implicated in use of policies and programs to reduce potential significant impacts does not constitute an adequate mitigation unless there are measurable, minimum performance standards and monitoring programs in conjunction with them.

The *Sacramento Old City Association v. City Council of Sacramento* (3d Dist. 1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1011 indicates that deferral of mitigations is acceptable when premised on accepted performance standards that the lead agency can and will guarantee to implement. The level of specificity relating to mitigation measures in this program level EIR is adequate as presented. Future development will be required to provide mitigation monitoring programs that implement the EIR's mitigations. All mitigations are premised on performance standards established by federal, state and

local agencies. For example, mitigations pertaining to sensitive species must correlate with state requirements for protection of a particular sensitive species.

329-11. The commenter states the Figure 4.1-2 is erroneous. The base year for existing conditions for the Draft EIR is 1991 and CSUMB did not yet exist.

Changes to the EIR

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

329-12. The commenter questions the conclusions in the EIR that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of policies and programs. The "means" to ensure that programs are implemented is through each Fort Ord jurisdiction amending its respective general plans to accommodate the Reuse Plan policies and programs and EIR mitigations (translated to policies and programs), thereafter, each specific development proposal submitted to a Fort Ord jurisdiction is required to be consistent with the jurisdiction's general plan policies and program. Through this process, potential impacts are adequately mitigated.

329-13. The commenter requests that the solid waste activities currently being implemented at CSUMB be discussed. The EIR's existing environmental conditions have been defined as those which existed in 1991. Therefore, this constraint precludes discussion of current CSUMB activities.

329-14. The commenter requests that the current water yields be discussed. The EIR's existing environmental conditions have been defined as those which existed in 1991. Therefore, this constraint precludes discussion of current water yields vis-a-vis CSUMB.

329-15. The commenter would like CSUMB referred to as a current land use. The EIR's existing environmental conditions have been defined as those which existed in 1991. CSUMB did not exist at Fort Ord in 1991. Therefore, this constraint precludes discussion of CSUMB.

329-16. The commenter requests a change to the EIR text. The change requested is insubstantial and reflects current conditions. No changes are warranted.

329-17. The commenter states that the air quality section of the EIR relies on future actions and do not ensure that impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level. Refer to response to comment 213-23.

329-18. The commenter requests amendment to the text to reflect that CSUMB, an education institution, in its entirety is a sensitive noise receptor. The context of

the discussion in the EIR the commenter is concerned is existing conditions (i.e., 1991). Therefore, change to the EIR is not warranted.

329-19. The commenter states that impact analyses of airports typically address single event noise levels in addition to community noise equivalent levels. There will be single events where the noise will exceed the community noise equivalent levels. Single events are often associated with military aircraft. However, for planning purposes, the community noise equivalent levels are used.

329-20. The commenter states the noise control policies and programs which result in less than significant impacts are inconsistent with the land use section. Comment is not detailed enough to identify the inconsistency referred to.

329-21. The commenter states the policies and programs pertaining to design guidelines are too broad and general to ensure that the impacts will be less than significant. The level of detail in the Reuse Plan pertaining to visual impacts is adequate for a program level EIR.

329-22. The commenter states that the design objectives contained in the Reuse Plan are too broad and general to ensure that these impacts will be less than significant. Refer to response to comment 203-12. In addition the commenter states that the areas of regional importance" are not defined. The "Regional Urban Design Guideline Areas are defined in Design Principle 6 on page 3-8 of the Reuse Plan, Volume 1 and the areas are identified in the accompanying figure. The areas for which regional urban design guidelines are to be prepared include: Highway 1 Scenic Corridor, the freeway entrances to the former Fort Ord from State Highway 1 (12th Street and the Main Gate areas) and from the east, areas bordering the publicly accessible habitat-conservation areas, major through roadways such as Reservation Road and Blanco Road, as well as other areas to be determined. The urban design guidelines will establish standards for road design, setbacks, building height, landscaping, signage, and other matters of visual importance.

329-23. The commenter restates the concerns in comment 329-22 and states the policies and programs lack specificity and performance standards. Refer to response to comments 329-22 and 203-12.

Response to Letter 330

330-1. The commenter states that the proposed City of Monterey sphere of influence show in Figure 3.6-1 is erroneous. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from

commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

330-2. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. The LAFCO is a County agency, therefore the text is correct. Changes to the EIR are not warranted.

Response to Letter 331

331-1. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

331-2. The commenter requests clarification in the text on issues pertaining to water. There is no hierarchy implied. Each policy is equally important.

331-3. The commenter requests that policy language be defined. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-43. Amend Policy B-1 to read as follows:

"The City/County shall ensure additional water supply ~~to critically deficient areas.~~"

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 1-162, Amend Policy B-1 to read as follows:

"The City/County shall ensure additional water supply ~~to critically deficient areas.~~"

As it pertains to the comment on Policy B-2, an "assured long-term water supply" implies that a source above and beyond 6,600 afy will be sought.

331-4. The commenter requests an additional program pertaining to noise. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-108. Add the following program.

"Program B-1.2: Wherever practical and feasible, the City/County shall segregate sensitive receptors, such as residential land uses, from noise generators through land use planning."

Page 4-109. Add the following to the Noise Element discussion at the bottom of the page.

"Program B-1.2: See above for description of this program."

Discussion pertaining to this new program: strips of office space could buffer homes or school buildings from industrial buildings or high volume roadways. The use of parking lots as a buffer between residential uses and noise generators. Within industrial park areas, the heavy industrial use should be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible.

Page 4-112. Add the following to the Noise Element discussion.

"Program B-1.2: See above for description of this program."

Page 4-114. Add the following to the Noise Element discussion.

"Program B-1.2: See above for description of this program."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-235. Add the following program.

"Program B-1.2: Wherever practical and feasible, the City shall segregate sensitive receptors, such as residential land uses, from noise generators through land use planning."

Volume II. Page 4-238. Add the following program.

"Program B-1.2: Wherever practical and feasible, the City shall segregate sensitive receptors, such as residential land uses, from noise generators through land use planning."

Volume II. Page 4-240. Add the following program.

"Program B-1.2: Wherever practical and feasible, the County shall segregate sensitive receptors, such as residential land uses, from noise generators through land use planning."

331-5. The commenter requests that the upper limit of the Range II noise category for residential uses should be 65 dB not 70 dB to be more consistent with other jurisdictions.

331-6. The commenter requests that a footnote be added to noise tables. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-102. Add the following note to Table 4.9-2.

"Note: Noise ranges are applicable at the property boundary".

Page 4-109. Add the following note to Table 4.9-6.

"Note: Noise ranges are applicable at the property boundary".

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-236. Add the following note to Table 4.5-3.

"Note: Noise ranges are applicable at the property boundary".

Volume II. Page 4-236. Add the following note to Table 4.5-4.

"Note: Noise ranges are applicable at the property boundary".

331-7. The commenter states that there appears to be a contradiction between noise tables. The tables referenced in the noise discussion address two very different types of noise, one is chronic, the other acute and short-term. As it pertains to the standards in the acute and short-term table being too high, they reflect the less stringent Monterey County noise standards for the Range II noise category. Also, refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-102. Amend Range II noise ranges for all residential land uses in Table 4.9-2 to read as follows:

"Residential low density single family, duplex, mobile homes: ~~55-70~~ 55-60

Residential multi-family: ~~60-70~~ 60-65"

Page 4-109. Amend Table 4.9-6. Reduce all noise levels by 5.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-236. Amend Range II noise ranges for all residential land uses in Table 4.5-3 to read as follows:

"Residential low density single family, duplex, mobile homes: ~~55-70~~ 55-60

Residential multi-family: ~~60-70~~ 60-65"

Volume II. Page 4-236. Amend Table 4.5-4. Reduce all noise levels by 5.

331-8. The commenter states that the EIR should discuss the Army's long-term responsibility for cleanup if additional contamination is discovered. This is both a policy issue for the Army to resolve and also, depending on the extent of the contamination, may be an ongoing federal responsibility through "superfund" cleanup funds.

331-9. The commenter states that the issue of birds and turbo jet aircraft needs to be addressed. This issue apparently was not a significant environmental issue when Army was at Fritzsche Airfield and does not appear to be a significant issue at this time. However, if and when it does become an issue, it would be the responsibility of the Marina Airport management, landfill management and the FAA to resolve the issue.

331-10. The commenter clarifies his understanding of the eventual cleanup of the UXO at Fort Ord. The commenter is correct. Furthermore, there is a high impact area within the UXO area that is expected to take the longest time to clean up due to the depth of the UXO.

331-11. The commenter submits information on the landfill site. The current use proposed for the landfill site is an equestrian center and open space. However, this is speculative due to the constraints discussed by the commenter.

331-12. The commenter repeats comment 331-11.

331-13. The consultant submits recommendations for mitigating UXO impacts. The EIR (page 4-64) contains a discussion of the UXO issue and concludes that it will not be a significant impact.

331-14. The commenter references the proposed landfill site uses discussed in the EIR vis-a-vis impact discussion #8 on page 4-16. The golf course site remains an option for the landfill site. Refer to response to comment 197-41.

331-15. The commenter requests additional information on future solid waste. Refer to page 4-40 of the Draft EIR.

331-16. The commenter clarifies the discussion in the EIR on the subject of AB 939. There is a state mandate for reducing solid waste from all sources by 50 percent by the year 2000. Refer to the Changes to the EIR Section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-39. Amend second paragraph to read as follows:

"Assembly Bill (AB 939) mandates a reduction in all California jurisdiction's Monterey County's generated solid waste stream of 50 percent by the year 2000, which is based on a 1990 baseline. ~~by setting a target rate of 5.4 (lb/cap/day) of solid waste.~~"

331-17. The commenter requests an amendment to the text pertaining to degradation of water quality. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text. No change is necessary to program C-1.1 on page 4-63, because this program pertains to Monterey County.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-51. Amend Program C-1.5 to read as follows:

"The City/County shall ..."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-163. Amend Program C-1.5 to read as follows:

"The City shall support the County in the implementing ~~adopt and enforce~~ a hazardous substance control ..."

Volume II. Page 4-166. Amend Program C-1.5 to read as follows:

"The City shall support the County in the implementing ~~adopt and enforce~~ a hazardous substance control ..."

331-18. The commenter requests that references in the Draft EIR and the Reuse Plan pertaining to the cities and the county reporting on the RA-ROD be eliminated, because it is an Army responsibility only. The policy and programs are written not with the intent to require that the cities and the county develop new information. Instead the policies and programs put the cities and the county in a situation where they must educate themselves and their respective citizens on the status of the hazardous materials situation on Fort Ord. The source of the information to be used by the cities and the county will be the Army's EE/CA document (and any other pertinent Army documents) anticipated to be released to the public in April 1997 for public review and comment. However, if the FORA Board determines that the policy and programs are inappropriate, the following policy consideration is provided.

Policy Consideration

Page 1-62 of the Draft EIR. Eliminate Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Policy A-1 and Programs A-1.1 and A-1.2. This would require removal of this language in Volume II of the Reuse Plan as well. Removal of this language from the Reuse Plan and EIR would not preclude the Army from implementing its UXO removal plans.

Therefore, measures required to reduce the risk associated with UXO continue regardless of the local jurisdiction's and the conclusions contained in the Final PEIR would remain the same (i.e. significant and unavoidable impact).

331-19. The commenter requests an expanded trail network discussion. Refer to Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-90. Add the following bullet statement under section entitled Description of the Proposed Trail Network.

- "The Fort Ord trails system shall be considered as an integral part of a larger regional trails network which includes, but is not limited to, the Toro Regional Park trails, existing and proposed Carmel Valley trails, the existing Highway 68 corridor (used as a bike route). Fort Ord trails shall be linked to regional bike/pedestrian trails wherever possible".

Volume I. Figure 3.6-3. Figure needs to reflect text (i.e., "Regional Hiker/Biker Trail" and "Local Hiker/Biker Trail" needs to be amended to read "Major Hiker/Biker Trail" and "Local Hiker/Biker Trail". Also, additional regional access arrows need to be added entering Fort Ord from Creekside Terrace road (area of California Highway Patrol office) on the far east side and through Toro Park residential neighborhood.

Volume II. Page 4-113. Amend Objective B at the bottom of the page to read as follows.

"Objective B: Provide a bicycle system that supports the needs of Fort Ord residents, employees, students and visitors and is integrated into a regional bike system.

331-20. The commenter states that the RV Travel Camp/Youth Camp will require upgraded utilities. Comment noted. Future development would require adequate infrastructure.

331-21. The commenter would like alternative access to Laguna Seca through Barloy Canyon and South Boundary Road maintained for future Laguna Seca events. Comment noted. The discussion is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR. However, the county should continue to allow alternative access to Laguna Seca via South Boundary Road and consider opening Barloy Canyon as well.

331-22. The commenter states that it is not necessary to have the USFWS and CDFG approving potential future expansion of the existing campground. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-132. Omit Program A-3.1.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-198. Omit Program A-3.1.

331-23. The commenter states that a shrew study is an unplanned cost for the county. The cost would not have to be borne by the county but could be borne by a future project proponent.

331-24. The commenter cannot comment on the relationship between the Youth Camp and a Community Park because it has no prior knowledge of the existence of a Community Park. The proposed Community Park is subject to a public benefit conveyance to the City of Marina. Comment noted.

331-25. The commenter states Polygon 31a should be designated in the same manner as Polygons 30b and 30c in the HMP Conservation and/or Management Requirements Area, or whichever designation allows the Parks Department to use the property in the manner requested. Comment noted. The HMP is not within the jurisdiction of FORA to amend.

331-26. The commenter is requesting a tally of the costs for new road construction and identification of all projects. The commenter is referred to the Public Facilities Improvement Plan (PFIP), Table PFIP 1-3, page PFIP 1-26. Also, refer to response to comment 167-22.

331-27. The commenter states that a cooperative interagency effort is required to fund regional transportation infrastructure. Comment noted.

331-28. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

331-29. The commenter requests that a comprehensive master drainage plan be included in the Reuse Plan. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Page 4-49. Add the following mitigation measure.

“Add a new program that shall require preparation of a Master Drainage Plan should be developed for the Fort Ord property to assess the existing natural and man-made drainage facilities, recommend area-wide improvements based on the approved Reuse Plan and develop plans for the control of storm water runoff from future development, including detention/retention and enhanced percolation to the ground water. This plan shall be developed by FORA with funding for the plan to be obtained from future development. All Fort Ord property owners (federal, state and local) shall participate in the funding of this plan. Reflecting the incremental nature of the funding source

(i.e., development), the assessment of existing facilities shall be completed first and by the year 2001 and submitted to FORA. This shall be followed by recommendations for improvements and an implementation plan to be completed by 2003 and submitted to FORA".

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Page 4-164. Add a new program to Hydrology and Water Quality Policy A-1.

"Program A-1.2: A Master Drainage Plan should be developed for the Fort Ord property to assess the existing natural and man-made drainage facilities, recommend area-wide improvements based on the approved Reuse Plan and develop plans for the control of storm water runoff from future development, including detention/retention and enhanced percolation to the ground water. This plan shall be developed by the FORA with funding for the plan to be obtained from future development. All Fort Ord property owners (federal, state and local) shall participate in the funding of this plan. Reflecting the incremental nature of the funding source (i.e., development), the assessment of existing facilities shall be completed first and by the year 2001. This shall be followed by recommendations for improvements and an implementation plan to be completed by 2003"

331-30. The commenter submits a comment too general to justify a specific response. However, the commenter should review pages 1-3 and 12-4 of the Draft EIR for a discussion of future environmental review process.

331-31. The commenter states that the impacts relative to hydrology and water quality should be considered significant. As stated in the EIR, these impacts are reduced to a less than significant level after implementation of the mitigations, which includes policies and programs.

331-32. The commenter states that adopting and enforcing a stormwater detention plan that identifies potential stormwater does not mitigate the lack of water. The commenter misunderstands the table referenced. The table indicates that the combination of policies and programs mitigate the impact. Greater detail regarding this issue is located on page 4-42 to 4-44.

331-33. The commenter requests clarification of table. The information represents the acreage under development when the base was operating in 1991 and what the total urbanized acreage will be associated with full buildout. The water distribution characterization is in acres served as correctly shown in the table. The notes to the table will be amended to clarify this meaning.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-40. Amend Table 4.2-1 to eliminate the last line in the Key, as follows:

"afy = acre feet per year"

331-34. The commenter would like to know what the source of reclaimed water will be and what are the implications to the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) and the Salinas Valley Reclamation Project. The source of reclaimed water will be through the Marina Coast Water District. The MCWD has entered into an agreement (Annexation Agreement and Groundwater Mitigation Framework) with the City of Marina and the MCWRA to transfer reclaimed water back to the local communities for use on future golf courses, recreational lakes and parks, landscaping and industrial processes. Based on a recent study prepared for the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA), reclaimed water use for the Monterey Peninsula has potential, but requires funding for construction of the delivery pipes and reclaimed water storage site. It is expected that the areas of Seaside and Monterey County within Fort Ord will also enter into an agreement with the MCWD.

By the year 2000 it is projected that up to 2,900 afy of reclaimed water could be available. This is projected to be up to 5,900 afy by the year 2015. Fort Ord developments will incrementally use this amount up to as much as 3,000 afy by the year 2015. There are no impacts to the Salinas Valley Reclamation Project which receives 20 million gallons per day for seawater intrusion.

331-35. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

331-36. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

331-37. The commenter would like an amendment to the text. The first paragraph in section 5.1.4 pertains not to water supply but to other public services. The last paragraph in section 5.1.4 pertains to water supply only. Therefore, to change the first paragraph to read like the last paragraph would not be appropriate.

331-38. The commenter requests that the policies and programs should be listed in the text. The EIR author was referencing the policies and programs located on page 4-43 of the Draft EIR. Furthermore, the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP) discusses the future development of Fort Ord in the context of limiting development so as to not exceed the safe-yield water supply. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for the DRMP. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR.

Page 5-5. Amend the next to the last sentence in the second paragraph to read as follows:

“... cities and County shall identify, with the Monterey County Water Resources Agency Monterey Regional Water Control Agency (MCWRA), ...”

331-39. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should suggest a strategy for the preparation of future land use and design plans, so as to be consistent with the overall Reuse Plan goals and objectives. The Comprehensive Business plan anticipated the costs of preparing subsequent land use and design plans and included consultant costs in FORA's operating budget. Under this scenario, FORA could contribute to the preparation for specific plans from the revenues due to FORA. If an alternative role evolves for FORA, the land use jurisdictions can be expected to be faced with the costs of preparing specific plans as provided for in the Reuse Plan. The Specific Plan legislation, provides for reimbursement to the land use jurisdiction that prepares a specific plan (Government Code section 65456). Often, however, the reimbursement can be over a long period of time. For projects of sufficient size, where project proponents can fund the up-front specific planning costs, this is not expected to be a new burden on the land use jurisdictions.

To avoid a piecemeal approach that would subvert the objectives of the Reuse Plan, however, there are likely to be situations in which the land use agency is faced with the up-front costs for the preparation of Specific Plans. The FORA board should consider providing funding support to the land use jurisdictions to avoid such piecemeal development.

Policy Considerations

FORA may want to include in its operating budget costs associated with the preparation of Specific Plans by the land use jurisdictions with reimbursement as provided for in Specific Plan legislation (Government Code section 65456).

331-40. The commenter discusses options available to the county pertaining to revising the existing planning documents on the Monterey Peninsula. Comment noted.

331-41. The commenter requests a clarification of the multi-agency aspect of the MOUT/POST facility.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Page 3-145, Post District, amend as follows:

"MOUT/POST District

The MOUT/POST District for ~~police officer training under the Monterey Peninsula Community College~~ Direction a multi-agency law enforcement training facility.

Projected Land Uses:

Public Facilities Land Use. Approximately 39 acres are projected for MOUT/POST and ~~associated college~~ activities."

The commenter also states the DEIR does not deal sufficiently with possible mitigations for the significant impacts on County public safety and law enforcement. The Reuse Plan provides for the construction of a new fire station within the former Fort Ord and has identified a fiscal cost to the Salinas Rural Fire District. Refer to the Public Services Plan, in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan. The Draft PEIR does not find significant impacts that need to be mitigated. Refer to response to comments 82-3 and 204-18.

331-42. The commenter requests a broadened discussion of the potential mitigations pertaining to fire and police protection impacts including the extension of infrastructure. Mitigations for fire and police protection are not necessary because fire and police protection issues are not determined to be environmental issues. Refer to response to comments 331-41 and 82-3 and 204-18. Extending infrastructure to the MOUT/POST facility will require modifications of the draft CIP. The MOUT/POST facility is not located in an area that is currently served with infrastructure. The facility is an opportunity site as defined in the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 332

332-1. The commenter states the current Reuse Plan exceeds the carrying capacity of the environment and infrastructure. FORA has addressed the potential environmental and infrastructure impacts of the project and has mitigated most of them to a level that is less than significant. As far as how many people there should be at Fort Ord, this is a subjective opinion on the project. However, FORA must consider this opinion.

332-2. The commenter states that Fort Ord should reflect "quality" development through design guidelines and infrastructure improvements must be made prior to or simultaneous to development. The Reuse Plan and the EIR address these concerns. The development of guidelines will occur after Reuse Plan approval,

infrastructure improvements are required to be developed commensurate with future development. The development of infrastructure by phasing and commensurate with development has been enhanced with the Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) discussed in response to comment 21-1. The Reuse Plan addresses the financing of infrastructure.

332-3. The commenter states that the EIR should expand the boundaries of the critical viewshed from Highway 1 to a regional scale. Refer to response to comment 288-2.

332-4. The commenter states an opinion on the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Comment noted.

332-5. The commenter states that if infrastructure is not adequately improved then the jobs/housing balance becomes questionable. Infrastructure is currently being improved at Fort Ord with EDA funding. Current projects include water and sewer infrastructure and road widening, resurfacing and stripping. Additional improvements will be based on funding obtained from new development. The CIP will serve as the management tool to guide the investment in infrastructure. Refer to response to comment 21-1 which establishes the commitments to providing required infrastructure and the monitoring of capacity constraints within adopted levels of service.

The commenter speculates that if economic development does not occur as projected, any developed housing is likely to be acquired not by persons living in Fort Ord or the Monterey Peninsula but by commuters to the Santa Clara Valley. The Comprehensive Business Plan anticipates that housing will be an important component of the early redevelopment of the former Fort Ord and will help contribute to the viability of Fort Ord as a focus for economic development. Comment is noted.

332-6. The commenter is concerned with funding of transportation projects. The Public Facilities Plan in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan provides the detailed itemization of the projects associated with the transportation improvements required to 2015. Refer also to response to comments 57-6 and 59-8 regarding corrections to the project lists to include the Highway 1 segment identified in the comment. Refer to response to comment 167-22 for an augmented discussion of the impacts to the transportation network to isolate project-related impacts, nexus and funding responsibilities. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a description of the transportation funding commitments and monitoring of level of service associated with redevelopment.

332-7. The commenter states that visual impacts on the adjacent communities and the region are not adequately protected with identified view sheds and corridors and concrete design review standards. Refer to response to comment 329-23 and 203-12.

332-8. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water. Also, as it pertains to impacts of water use on neighboring communities, it is assumed the commenter is referencing the Monterey Peninsula. Because the source of water for Fort Ord development is from a different source than the Monterey Peninsula, there would be no impact to Monterey Peninsula communities.

332-9. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan provide an analysis of the fiscal impacts to the region. The fiscal analysis provided in the public Services Plan for Fort Ord is included in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan. The fiscal analysis identifies a potential fiscal shortfall to the three land use jurisdictions within the boundaries of Fort Ord and to the Salinas Rural Fire District. The cumulative shortfall is projected to be approximately \$20 million through the period to 2015. The Public Facility Financing Plan identifies resources from the reuse of Fort Ord that can offset this fiscal shortfall for the jurisdictions. This is summarized in Exhibit 13 in the Comprehensive Business Plan. Refer to response to comment 7-2 for clarification and corrections to the Comprehensive Business Plan and to a revised Exhibit 13. FORA is currently working on an application for an economic development conveyance and is considering a broad range of financing strategies to balance the potential to finance infrastructure and the fiscal shortfalls expected for the local land use jurisdictions.

332-10. The commenter states that the Comprehensive Business Plan contains errors and inconsistencies. Refer to response to comment 7-2 for revisions to the Comprehensive Business Plan to address these concerns.

332-11. The commenter states the mitigation measures contained in the EIR are inadequate and those responsible for their implementation are not identified. The EIR contains those responsible for mitigation in Table 2.5-1. As it pertains to mitigation "trigger mechanisms" CEQA requires mitigations to be implemented as part of a proposed project. In the case of general plan programs, the programs would be translated into a future project's list of conditions and implemented prior to and/or commensurate with the project.

332-12. The commenter would like design standards and guidelines developed prior to Reuse Plan. The current design guidelines provided in the Reuse Plan are adequate for the Fort Ord jurisdictions use when they develop their respective guidelines after Reuse Plan approval. Also, refer to response to comment 203-12.

332-13. The commenter requests that the EIR include a discussion of a project alternative that has the same population as that which existed when it was a military base. The EIR discusses such an alternative, it is the "No Project" alternative which would result in approximately 34,000 residents.

Response to Letter 333

333-1. The commenter would like to know if the Reuse Plan is a “single-project” EIR under 21083.8 or a standard “program-level” EIR. The EIR is a program level EIR and, as stated in 21083.8.1, “all public and private activities taken pursuant to, or in furtherance of, a reuse plan shall be deemed to be a single project”. As stated in the Draft EIR (page 1-3), future projects will tier off of the Reuse Plan EIR. The EIR will be adequate for future projects to tier off.

333-2. The commenter states the environmental setting sections should incorporate background documents by reference. Wherever required, the EIR adequately references other documents.

333-3. The commenter requests that the base year be clarified from topic to topic. The EIR adequately conveys to the reader that the base year is 1991 (page 1-3, section 1.2.2). Wherever the Draft EIR deviates from the base year (i.e., traffic and circulation), this is also stated in the Draft EIR (page 4-73).

333-4. The commenter states the full buildout year is not identified and there is a lack of consistency between topics with the extent of analysis provided for the period after 2015. The full buildout year is discussed in terms of 40-60 years and not a specific year because it is inappropriate to take such a long-term plan and state that full buildout will occur in one particular year. There are too many political and economic uncertainties about the future to allow the discussion to point to a particular year. The lack of consistency is due to the limitations of the information available. For example, the traffic and circulation section of the EIR does not go beyond the year 2015 because that is the extent of the traffic model's baseline information. This situation is discussed in the fourth full paragraph on page 4-68 of the Draft EIR. As it pertains to the air quality section, the MBUAPCD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines require the discussion of full buildout. However, because the air quality analysis is predicated on the traffic model, the air quality impact analysis does not extend past the year 2015 (Draft EIR, page 4-96).

333-5. The commenter would like significance criteria for each environmental topic and a precise correlation between the criteria and the impacts that are analyzed. The EIR consistently contains significance criteria for each environmental topic and is also consistent with the correlation between the criteria and the impact statement.

333-6. The commenter has stated an opinion on the Draft EIR conclusions. Comment noted. As it pertains to fire and police protection, the Final EIR concludes that fire and police protection are no longer environmental, thus there is no longer a conclusion that fire and police impacts are unavoidable and adverse.

333-7. The commenter is requesting a greater level of detail be included in the EIR pertaining to mitigations. The approach used in the EIR vis-a-vis the programs/mitigations is appropriate for use in a general plan document. It will be incumbent upon future developments to implement the programs and mitigations contained in the EIR through establishment of specific performance criteria. The

performance standards the commenter requests require a level of detail above and beyond what is appropriate for a general plan document.

333-8. The commenter would like clarification of the relationship between UC and local jurisdictions. Such a relationship is not pertinent to the EIR.

333-9. The commenter requests additional alternatives be discussed in the EIR especially an alternative that accommodates water available [i.e., safe yield]. The EIR adequately discusses a range of alternatives. Furthermore, future development is required to limit its use of water based on a safe yield supply. Refer to the DRMP discussion in response to comment 21-1.

333-10. The commenter states that the graphics are illegible or uninterpretable. Comment noted. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a response.

Response to Letter 334

334-1. The commenter states that the information in the EIR pertaining to rates are inaccurate. The commenter requests that 1996 data be used. The EIR information used the most up to date information from the census. At the time the economic analyses were being prepared, the 1990 information was the most reliable.

334-2. The commenter states that Realtors and property management firms have expressed concern over a tight rental market in the area. The constraint on production of rental housing is a policy direction which reflects the number of existing rental units in the cities of Marina and Seaside.

334-3. The commenter states a social condition. Comment noted.

334-4. The commenter would like 20 percent of housing to be set aside for inclusionary housing. Refer to response to comment 155-20 and 155-24. Furthermore, if the local jurisdictions determine that they are required to have more inclusionary housing, they would have to amend their housing elements to reflect that potential housing situation.

334-5. The commenter states conditions applicable to the Monterey County Housing Authority and the Fort Ord Facilities and Services for the Homeless under the McKinney Act. Comment noted. Also, refer to response to comment 211-13.

334-6. The commenter provides a comment that is not relevant to the Reuse Plan and the EIR. Comment noted.

334-7. The commenter requests that the FORA Board consider use of redevelopment agency powers and that legislation be introduced which will allow a portion of the redevelopment (35%) housing set-aside authorized under SB 1600 to be utilized to maintain and fund the continuance of the McKinney programs as well as finance other affordable housing programs for the individuals who will live and

work on the former Fort Ord, and on the Monterey Peninsula. FORA should consider this policy.

Policy Considerations

Redevelopment agency powers should be utilized in the financing arrangements at the former Fort Ord and legislation sought to direct a portion of the housing set-aside authorized under SB 1600 to support continuance of McKinney programs and other affordable housing programs.

Response to Letter 335

335-1. The commenter points out that the NOP was not properly circulated because it did not include the EIS. To include the EIS would have been excessive because the EIS is in five volumes. Instead, the EIS was incorporated by reference into the NOP.

335-2. The commenter states that the EIS failed to abide by CEQA. CEQA does not apply to NEPA and federal actions. Comment noted.

335-3. The commenter states the Draft EIR is flawed because the objectives do not meet those with which it was charged [SB 899]. Comment noted. Refer to response to comment 43-1.

335-4. The commenter requests that an alternative be provided that is based on a safe yield water use only. The proposed project includes controls on development vis-a-vis safe-yield. Refer to response to comment 21-1. Also, refer to response to comment 8-5 for an expanded water discussion.

335-5. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

335-6. The commenter states that information in a table is incorrect. Refer to response to comment 167-32.

335-7. The commenter states the EIR contradicts AMBAG population growth. Refer to response to comment 167-33.

335-8. The commenter provides information on the lead content on beaches. Refer to response to comment 55-8.

335-9. The commenter would like to know if the beach sands that have been eroded were tested for lead and what was its concentration. The beach ranges were mapped based on concentrations of lead. Areas that contained greater than or equal to 10 percent lead bullets or fragments were then excavated, screened and removed.

Ultimately, the beach materials screened will be transferred to the landfill site. Larger bullets and fragments are recycled (Dave Eisen, pers. com., February 25, 1997). Also, there are three "blow-out" areas on the bay side of the beaches where wind erosion has exposed bullets. These areas are currently being screened (Ibid.). The remaining beach sands do not contain greater than 1,860 ppm of lead. This is the level of risk assessment used by the Army which is based on the most sensitive segment of the population's physiology (i.e., up to six years of age).

335-10. The commenter would like to know if there is evidence of UXO in the beach area. There is only anecdotal information on this issue. There is no evidence, based on surveys, that UXO exists (Ibid.).

335-11. The commenter would like to know if the Fort Ord landfill site now contains the contaminated beach sands. The landfill will contain the screened beach sand (Ibid.).

335-12. The commenter would like information on buildings that contain lead. Refer to response to comment 139-6.

335-13. The commenter states the table of contents is incorrect. Comment noted.

335-14. The commenter requests information on UXO throughout the base. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

335-15. The commenter would like information on hazardous chemicals leaching into groundwater. There are three areas on Fort Ord that have been identified as sites with known leaching of hazardous chemicals into the groundwater. One site is located at the Marina Municipal Airport (formerly Fritzsche Airfield), another site is at the Fort Ord landfill and the third site is located in the area of 12th Street near the Directorate of Logistics. Each site contaminates the groundwater with volatile organic compounds (VOC). The Army is currently pumping the groundwater, treating what is pumped out and then re-injecting or surface spraying the treated groundwater. In the case of the 12th Street site pumping and treatment will commence in 1997. In order to respond to the changing hydrologic conditions associated with each contaminated site, adjustments in treatment activities and quantity of groundwater pumped at all three sites is continuous based on the on-going monitoring of the contaminated groundwater plume. The treatment used to remove VOC out of the groundwater is a combination of granular carbon and ultraviolet oxidation (Gail Youngblood, pers. com., February 27, 1997).

335-16. The commenter discusses Army clean up policies. The commenter is requesting the EIR to discuss an issue to a level of detail that far exceeds the level of detail necessary for a CEQA document. The request for additional information on a draft policy statement or what could have if future hazardous sites are found would be speculative and would not advance the interests of CEQA. The EIR adequately discusses the hazardous waste and UXO issue by presenting the problem. If future

problems arise on Fort Ord because of past Army activities, this is a policy issue for FORA and the Army to resolve.

335-17. The commenter would like to know if FORA has the authority to require Fort Ord jurisdictions to prepare mitigation program. FORA has the authority through the Reuse Plan and the EIR to require mitigations be implemented.

Response to Letter 336

336-1. The commenter would like reference to a beach frontage road to be omitted from the project description. The reference to this road in the Draft EIR (page 3-6) is in error. A beach frontage road is not part of the project description nor is it included in the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan of May 1996.

Changes to the EIR

Page 3-6. Amend Table 3.2-1 Land Use Under the Proposed Project for polygon number 12b, as follows:

"Open Space/Recreation ~~with Proposed Beach through Road...~~"

336-2. The commenter would like additional permits pertaining to the Coastal Commission to be included in the list. The Public Works Plan the commenter would like listed pertains to a state agency (CDPR) and the Coastal Commission. The list on page 3-11 of the EIR is for FORA or local agencies only. However, a new LCP should be listed. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 3-11. Amend section 3.7.4 as follows:

"Local Coastal Plan ~~Amendment~~"

Page 3-11. Add the following to section 3.7.4 as follows:

"• Coastal Consistency Determination"

336-3. The commenter would like a text amend. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Page 4-11. Add the following to the last sentence in the paragraph following Program E-1.2:

“... the State Parks General Plan, and the Coastal Zone Management Act/California Coastal Act, ...”

336-4. The commenter would like a desalination plant located on the east side of Highway 1 and would like additional environmental impact information pertaining to a desalination plant. The State Parks Plan for the Fort Ord Dunes accommodates a future desalination plant on the west side of Highway 1 in the area of the old sewer treatment plant. However, the CDPR would prefer that the desalination plant be located east of Highway 1 (CDPR 1996). As it pertains to environmental review of a desalination plant, this program level EIR will not address the specific impacts of such a project. However, it is incumbent upon future desalination project proponents to do the necessary environmental evaluation at a future date. Also, refer to the desalination discussion in response to comment 8-5.

336-5. The commenter would like a text amendment. Refer to response to comment 165-17.

336-6. The commenter would like to know why the EIR consultant has placed an adequate water source under the section titled “Hydrology and Water Quality”. Associated with extraction of water from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin is seawater intrusion. Therefore, the EIR included stormwater detention as a method to hinder seawater intrusion, thus its association with water quality and its inclusion in “Hydrology and Water Quality”.

336-7. The commenter would like land use controls on future projects if the roadway infrastructure cannot accommodate it. The Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) addresses this issue. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

336-8. The commenter states that widening Highway 1, if it is to occur, will require authorization by the Coastal Commission. Comment noted.

Response to Letter 337

337-1. The commenter states that the proposed buildout population of 72,000 is not justified by the enabling legislation that created FORA as a means to economic recovery. The use of economic recovery as a means to justify a statement of overriding considerations will be challenged. Comment noted. Refer to response to comment 43-1.

337-2. The commenter states the “Draft EIR and accompanying documents” do not provide analysis sufficient to justify the proposed aggregate totals. This is an opinion on the documents. Comment noted.

337-3. The commenter states the Draft EIR relies on future studies. Refer to response to comment 165-9.

337-4. The commenter states the Draft EIR fails to provide a legal mechanism to forcibly down-size the “aggregate totals” should future analysis prove that stated “not to exceed envelopes” are not achievable. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for the mechanism to manage development within resource limits.

337-5. The commenter states that impacts must be discussed and major infrastructure improvements must be provided. The EIR discusses all the relevant environmental impacts and provides the necessary language for future mitigation through implementation of the DRMP discussed in response to comment 21-1.

337-6. The commenter states that FORA guidelines must be created prior to the approval of a Reuse Plan. It is uncertain what “FORA guidelines” the commenter refers to. However, the Reuse Plan must be approved and then the local general plans must be amended prior to any action by local jurisdictions.

337-7. The commenter discusses the EIS. Comments noted.

337-8. The commenter would like information on asbestos and lead. Refer to response to comment 8-1 and 139-6.

337-9. The commenter states the EIR must include a safe yield alternative. This issue is addressed in response to comment 21-1. Also, refer to response to comment 27-3.

337-10. The commenter states the Draft EIR does not provide adequate environmental analysis. The commenter states an opinion on the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Comment noted.

337-11. The commenter would like information on a wastewater treatment plant. There is no proposal to build a wastewater treatment plant. Refer to response to comment 82-8.

337-12. The commenter requests an updated list of projects be included in the EIR. The list of cumulative projects in the Draft EIR is adequate. Furthermore, there are no known additional projects that could change the conclusions contained in the cumulative discussion of the EIR.

337-13. The commenter requests a polygon by polygon analysis. Such an analysis is not necessary to convey to the decision makers and the public the project characteristics.

337-14. The commenter requests a “complete breakdown” for each jurisdiction. The information requested is included in the Reuse Plan, Volume I in Tables 3.8-1 (page 3-104), 3.9-1 (page 3-122), and 3.10-1 (page 3-130).

337-15. The commenter requests that the EIR use “water-conservation driven formulas”. Refer to the water discussion in response to comment 8-5.

337-16. The commenter would like page 5-25 of the DSEIS to be amended. FORA does not have jurisdiction to amend the DSEIS.

337-17. The commenter would like a discussion of any "still existing conflicts between the project description in the Draft EIR and the current "visions" of each jurisdictions". CEQA requires the project to evaluate the project as proposed, not subsequent potentially speculative "visions" that a local jurisdiction may have.

337-18. The commenter requests additional information pertaining to water use. The level of detail requested is not necessary to include in the document. The information currently contained in the Draft EIR concerning project water use per land use type is adequate.

337-19. The commenter would like chlorine contour maps included in the EIR. The level of detail requested is not necessary to include in the document. The information currently contained in the Draft and Final EIR concerning seawater intrusion is adequate.

337-20. The commenter would like safe-yield water to be clearly defined. The safe-yield issue is a regional problem requiring a regional solution. To this end, the MCWRA is addressing the seawater issue through its yet to be released Basin Management Plan and the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project. Determining a safe-yield water use vis-a-vis Fort Ord wells will be a task for the MCWRA. Refer to the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP) in response to comment 21-1.

337-21. The commenter requests that pumping records of existing Fort Ord wells be provided. The well records are available and indicate that the current pumping for all of Fort Ord (CSUMB, UC, POM, etc.) from Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin is approximately 1,700 afy. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

337-22. The commenter would like the stormwater outfall pipes removed from the beach. Refer to response to comment 206-2.

337-23. The commenter would like clarification on CSUMB housing. The campus is currently preparing a master plan for the campus. The program utilized in the Reuse Plan reflects FORA's understanding of the program and phasing provided by CSUMB in order to project infrastructure requirements and traffic impacts. The build-out program used by FORA is summarized in Table 3.3-1 of Volume I of the Reuse Plan, page 3-42. The program includes: 1) the equivalent of 5100 units in Marina and Seaside located in the central campus core, based on the campus's goal to house 80% of the 25,000 FTE enrollment; 2) 3093 units in Monterey County for the use of faculty, staff, and a portion of the graduate and upper division students that include reuse of 1253 existing units and the infill potential of 1840 units.

337-24. The commenter would like accurate development plans for the East Garrison. Development plans are not available at this time. Any future

development would be required to hook-up to the MRWPCA sewage treatment facility.

337-25. The commenter states an opinion regarding development density. Comment noted.

337-26. The commenter states that future development is subject to inclusionary housing laws. The inclusionary housing issue will be dealt with by each jurisdiction under their housing element. It is not the responsibility of FORA to determine what will be inclusionary housing.

337-27. The commenter would like protection of the viewshed that extends to views that can be seen from the Pacific Grove walk path. Potential view impacts from Pacific Grove walk paths are not considered to be a significant environmental issue. Refer to response to comment 288-2.

337-28. The commenter would like a polygon by polygon summary of all the issues. The information requested is not necessary to convey to the reader and the decision makers what the impacts of the project are.

337-29. The commenter states that using 1991 as the baseline year will seriously flaw the Draft EIR's analysis of a complex issue. The 1991 baseline year is as allowed by Public Resources Code section 21083.8.1. As it pertains to seawater intrusion, a safe-yield will be required to be determined by the MCWRA, as discussed in response to comment 21-1.

337-30. The commenter reiterates the requirements of AB 3180 and states that the ability of FORA to impose administrative and judicial sanctions, etc. must be analyzed. FORA's responsibility for mitigations will ultimately be passed to the local jurisdictions who will be required to implement their respective general plans which must first be amended and then approved by FORA. It is important to reiterate California Government Code Section 67675 which states that all property transferred from the federal government to any user or purchaser, whether public or private, shall be used only in a manner consistent with the adopted or revised reuse plan. Refer to Volume II of the Reuse Plan, page 3-555.

337-31. The commenter states that the Draft EIR is insufficient because it does not contain the information the commenter requested in her 2/12/96 NOP letter. The NOP comments are repeated in this comment letter and are responded to herein. The commenter then submits an opinion regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Comment noted.

337-32. The commenter states the EIR contains unsubstantiated opinion. As it pertains to water impacts, refer to response to comment 8-5. As it pertains to wastewater, refer to response to comment 82-8. As it pertains to future road construction impacts, refer to response to comment 56-4.

337-33. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan will be used as a specific plan by local jurisdictions. Comment noted. As it pertains to the intent of the Reuse Plan, the language contained in the EIR is appropriate, because a general plan does not deal with a particular project, but instead deals with the broad picture associated potential future projects.

337-34. The commenter states that the preparation of the general plan elements for the land use jurisdictions is confused with FORA's Reuse Plan. The Reuse Plan includes three documents, as described in the Summary, Volume I, pages 1-1 through 1-19. Volume I is the "Context and Framework" for the Reuse Plan. Volume II includes the "Reuse Plan Elements" for the general plan policies and programs for the land use agencies. Appendix B of the Reuse Plan (a separately bound document) provides the "Business and Operations Plan" that includes the "Comprehensive Business Plan," "Public Facilities Implementation Plan," and the "Public Services Plan."

337-35. The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not discuss all the environmental issues and FORA is "piecemealing" the project. The Reuse Plan is, for all practical intent and purpose, a general plan document. Therefore, the Draft and Final EIR evaluates the total of the environmental impacts that 72,000 people are expected to have. No piecemealing of a larger project has occurred or is going to occur.

337-36. The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. Comment noted.

337-37. The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. Comment noted.

337-38. The commenter would like the CSUMB Master Plan included in the Reuse Plan. The CSUMB Master Plan is currently being prepared and is not available. However, Volume I of the Reuse Plan contains a section on CSUMB's planning district the commenter may want to refer to.

337-39. The commenter would like specific information on the impacts associated with the Highway 68 Bypass, the widening of the existing Highway 68 and the impacts that would be expected as a result of road widening at the intersection of Highway 68 and Highway 218. This level of detail is not appropriate for the Reuse Plan. At the time a proposal is submitted for roadwork, the environmental analysis will proceed from there.

337-40. The commenter would like information on the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and its consistency determination of Fort Ord reuse. The CCC will revise their coastal consistency determination for the Reuse Plan. Refer to comment letter 336.

337-41. The commenter would like information on the costs and impacts associated with demolition of future structures. Refer to response to comment 8-1.

As it pertains to lead and asbestos, refer to response to comment 139-6. The environmental impacts of removing structures will be administered and evaluated for its potential impacts separately from the Reuse Plan and EIR.

337-42. The commenter would like information on density. The density is per the gross acre. The commenter would also like evidence that higher densities are required. A higher density in some areas of Fort Ord is appropriate for students because it will bring down costs and transit because it will increase the cost-effectiveness for bus transit operations. Furthermore, higher density will make rail transit more cost-effective.

337-43. The commenter repeats comment 337-1. Section 4.2 of the Draft EIR provides a setting description for socioeconomic conditions, impacts, and conditions. As it pertains to the military versus civilian economy, refer to response to comment 1-2 and to response to comment 43-1 regarding FORA's goals.

337-44. The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan include a variety of elements. The Reuse Plan provides local jurisdictions with the basic structure for future design guidelines that can be used for view protection from Highway 1 and other identified visual resources of regional importance. This is discussed in response to comment 68-2 and 203-12. As it pertains to oak tree removal, refer to response to comment 328-2. As it pertains to establishing realistic priority development areas, the Reuse Plan is silent on this because the Reuse Plan encourages the market to determine where growth should occur at Fort Ord. The UXO, hazardous wastes and seismic issues are pertinent to future development and these issues are addressed in the Draft and Final EIR.

337-45. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water. The EIR will not discuss water use in the Monterey Bay in the context the commenter would like because the water use within the MPWMD is not pertinent.

337-46. The commenter would like information on the growth rate. Refer to response to comment 167-32 and 167-33.

337-47. The commenter would like precise building heights. The Reuse Plan did not require exact building heights, but instead addresses the issue in the context of the height of mature trees. The EIR does not consider there to be a significant environmental issue pertaining to visual resources.

337-48. The commenter disagrees with a sentence regarding future hotels on the Monterey Peninsula. The cumulative list of projects used in the EIR is based on the best available information from each jurisdiction. The level of detail included in the Draft EIR is sufficient to determine the potential cumulative impacts of regional development and will allow the decision makers to make an informed decision. As it pertains to 1,793 sand dune hotel room/condo units contemplated by Marina for the area west of Highway 1, the Draft EIR does not recognize that 1,790 units will be

constructed. As it pertains to a 6-story hotel in the redevelopment area in Seaside, these were not determined to occur within the 2015 time frame. Only “foreseeable future projects” were listed in Table 5.1-1.

337-49. The commenter would like information on the seawater intrusion problem. Refer to response to comment 8-5.

337-50. The commenter repeats comment #337-26 and discusses inclusionary housing objectives. Refer to response to comments 155-22, 155-24, 211-4 through 211-12, and 284-1.

337-51. The commenter states that the Reuse Plan is inconsistent with SB 899. Refer to response to comment 43-1.

337-52. The commenter states the Draft EIR fails to provide a legal mechanism to prevent land that does not have viable infrastructure from being sold to private parties. Wherever development would be allowed to occur per the Reuse Plan and where there is currently no infrastructure (roads, water lines), future development would be required to pay for the necessary infrastructure. Refer for response to comment 21-1.

337-53. The commenter notes that the Reuse Plan envisions a different program than that pursued by the US Army for the lands at the former Fort Ord. Comment noted. The commenter would like to know if the estimated area for reuse includes the Highway 68 Bypass ROW. page 3-4 of the Draft EIR states the Highway 68 Bypass is treated as “an open space and habitat management area” as was done in the DSEIS.

337-54. The comment is concerned about sinking houses at Abrams Park residential community. The Reuse Plan has taken into account and revised earlier estimates of the existing residential units suitable for reuse. See the revised exhibit 3 in response to comment 7-2.

337-55. The commenter is concerned about a golf course on the landfill site. There are issues pertaining to a golf course on top of a landfill cap that may not accommodate such a use. Refer to response to comment 197-41.

337-56. The commenter would like to know if 406 residents would create a financial burden. This issue is irrelevant to CEQA. No response warranted. Refer to response to comments 211-4 through 211-12 and 284-1.

337-57. The commenter would like specific mitigation language to be contained in the EIR. The commenter’s request that future subdivisions be contingent on the availability of water, wastewater and transportation infrastructure throughout Fort Ord is inappropriate for a general plan document and its Draft EIR. The EIR is a program level document which clearly establishes what the future potential impacts will be and addresses these potential impacts with policies, programs and mitigations. It is not feasible and not necessary to build all the

infrastructure upfront and then approve projects. Instead, development will occur incrementally as the market is willing in tandem with infrastructure development. The implementation of the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP) discussed in response to comment 21-1 addresses the management of growth vis-a-vis infrastructure development.

337-58. The commenter would like to know when the federal government will resolve the McKinney Act applications. This is a matter outside the scope of CEQA. No response warranted.

337-59. The commenter would like to know why there is no alternative that is premised on a safe-yield water use. The Draft EIR (page 4-43; Program C-3.1) states that a safe -yield water supply shall be defined to determine water supplies. This program, in effect, addresses the comment because the program states that development shall be premised on a safe-yield water supply. However, this program has been augmented with the DRMP (response to comment 21-1). Therefore, because of program C-3.1 (and the DRMP), there was no need to include a redundant alternative in the Draft EIR.

337-60. The commenter states the “No Project” alternative in the Draft EIR does not meet the requirements of CEQA. The commenter also states that the Draft EIR should have included Army Alternative 5, which reflects open space and the POM Annex. Army Alternative 5 was rejected from consideration because the Record of Decision by the Army rejected this alternative due to the negative economic impacts. Furthermore, Alternative 5 consists of open space, the POM and does not include a university, residential development, employment-generating uses, or other development to provide economic opportunity. Use of this alternative in the EIR would be useless because there are ongoing military disposal actions which have resulted in new or continued uses (i.e., CSUMB and the golf courses).

337-61. The commenter would like to know if to avoid a soil fertility crisis FORA would use this crisis as an overriding consideration in the project approval process. It cannot be determined what FORA will do in this regard.

337-62. The commenter submits an opinion regarding the adequacy of the alternatives discussion contained in the Draft EIR. Comment noted.

337-63. The commenter would like information on phasing. Buildout is anticipated to occur in a 40 to 60 year time frame. Therefore, development would be phased by virtue of it occurring over this period of time.

337-64. The commenter states that the planned development mixed use district should be eliminated because it does not provide an opportunity to calculate traffic flows, compatibility issues, estimate water use, etc. The implication of the comment is that there is a hole in the environmental analysis wherever there is a mixed use district indicated on the proposed land use concept map. The commenter is incorrect. The Draft EIR does consider the mixed use district in all the impact analyses.

337-65. The commenter states that the policies and programs contained in the EIR should be deleted because they are misleading the decision makers and the public. The Reuse Plan must contain policies and programs. To understand the Reuse Plan intent, purpose and structure, the commenter is referred to the State of California's Office of Planning and Research, General Plan Guidelines.

In general, California state law (Government Code Section 65300) requires each city and county (including chartered cities) to adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which ... bears relation to its planning". The role of each community's general plan is to act as a "constitution" for development, the foundation upon which all land use decisions are to be based. It expresses community development goals and embodies public policy relative to the distribution of future land use, both public and private.

Furthermore, SB 899 authorizes the FORA Board to prepare and adopts a Reuse Plan for the future use and development of the land at Fort Ord to serve as the official local plan for reuse of the former military base (Fort Ord Reuse Plan, Vol. I, page 2-2, second full paragraph). SB 899 indicates that all Fort Ord property that has been transferred from the federal government must be used in a manner consistent with the Board's Reuse Plan, except for property transferred from the federal government to the CSU and US institutions, as well as the CDPR.

337-66. The commenter states that it is unnecessary to ask FORA to approve the moving of the POM annex. Comment noted.

337-67. The commenter would like to know, as a result of moving the POM entirely to one side of North-South Road, how many new military housing units would be built and what number would be torn down, and how many new civilian units would be built. The reconfiguration of the POM Annex will require the replacement of approximately 590 residential units. The impacts of development, vis-a-vis water, sewer, transportation, and habitat, associated with military use and civilian reuse have been discussed in the Draft and Final EIR.

337-68. The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. Comment noted.

337-69. The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR. Comment noted.

337-70. The commenter would like more specific information on the location of all the cumulative developments. Refer to response to comment 337-48.

337-71. The commenter would like an expanded list of "foreseeable projects". The EIR does not include the City of Salinas which the commenter focuses on because it was not determined to be within the impact area. The commenter requests information regarding traffic impacts on the 101 corridor. The MCTAM model runs on the traffic impacts of the project do not indicate significant impacts to the 101 corridor.

337-72. The commenter would like information on wastewater. Refer to response to comment 82-8. Also, upon conveyance, the existing East Garrison wastewater facility will be red flagged by the County and permanently shut down. As it pertains to water, refer to response to comment 8-5. Water use is projected to be 13,500 afy not 18,262 afy as stated in the EIR.

337-73. The commenter would like the full text of SB 899 included in the EIR. It is not necessary to include the enabling legislation in the EIR. The level of information included in the EIR is adequate for the readers and is adequate for the decision makers to base a decision on.

337-74. The commenter would like information on schools. No schools are proposed to be removed. However, there are four existing elementary schools, and one middle school that will be conveyed to the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District. In addition, the MPUSD has identified a vacant site for a new elementary school to add to the existing facilities. The City of Marina has identified a potential high school site as well.

337-75. The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not discuss whether any of the 8,000 existing structures that are not to be demolished need to be retained. The reason a building that is not demolished but is retrofitted instead does not pertain to an environmental impact.

337-76. The commenter would like to know if Marina's 200-foot setback from a fault line is sufficient. From the perspective of the California Department of Education, the Education Code requires only that a school building not be placed on a fault line (Stan Rose, pers. com., February 27, 1997). However, Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations states that there is a general requirement of 50-feet from known faults lines within the Alquist-Priolo zone. An Alquist-Priolo zone is a designated area (by the State of California) which contain fault proximity constraints for new structures. Though several inferred or concealed earthquake faults either cross or are adjacent to Fort Ord (the San Andreas fault is within 25 miles), Alquist-Priolo zones have not been identified on Fort Ord.

337-77. The commenter would like to know what the eastern zone is as it pertains to geology. As stated on page 4-251 of the Reuse Plan, Volume II, the eastern zone is predominantly the area of Fort Ord in the jurisdiction of Monterey County. Some development would occur in this area and would be required to be constructed per the state standards applicable to areas with "moderately high" and "high" ground failure and landslide potential.

337-78. The commenter states that due to potential seismic hazards, development should be reduced in the area of Reservation Road where there is a "potentially active seismic fault line". The existing state standards relevant to structures addresses the potential fault issue. Development density and type as proposed in the Reuse Plan is adequate in the context of state standards. Identifying an alternative building site for a desalination plant would be a requirement of a future environmental document for a desalination plant.

337-79. The commenter states that a "revised Draft EIR should closely examine the advantages of revenue sharing to reduce unneeded development. This is an issue that is not pertinent to CEQA because it is not identified as having a physical impact on the environment.

337-80. The commenter would like to know if Seaside is still considering a "cruise ship pier". It is not known what intentions the City of Seaside has in mind for the area it would like to annex that is in the Monterey Bay.

337-81. The commenter states that there is no finite project description. The Reuse Plan is as finite as it can be without getting into a specific development project, for which there are none to get specific about.

337-82. The commenter would like to know if the Army conducted tests of the quality of runoff from Fort Ord. No such tests are known to have occurred. Refer to response to comment 206-2, 248-3 and 248-9 for additional information on outfall pipes.

337-83. The commenter would like information on the Army selling property without a Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comment 139-43.

337-84. The commenter would like proposed development areas to be eliminated that are in proximity to UXO areas as a response to the need to reduce the project's size because of resource constraints. The areas proposed for development that are in proximity to inland ranges where UXO occur would not be built on until the Army has removed the UXO. Furthermore, there is no requirement to reduce the project's size because of constraints associated with water and transportation. The development is expected to occur concurrent with water availability and development of transportation infrastructure.

337-85. The commenter would like to know why the Highway 101 corridor is not included in the EIR analysis. The MCTAM model does include development along the Highway 101 corridor. Furthermore, the project's vehicle traffic on Highway 101 associated with future development on Fort Ord is insignificant relative to the total flow of traffic on this highway.

337-86. The commenter would like additional information on the potential impacts associated with future road construction. Refer to response to comment 56-4.

337-87. The commenter submits an opinion on the Reuse Plan. Comment noted.

337-88. The commenter would like to know where all the development is going to occur at Fort Ord. Future development will occur as indicated in Figure 3.2-1 in the Draft EIR.

337-89. The commenter would like more information on water. Refer to response to comment 8-5. Also, the cost of water infrastructure is discussed in Table 1-4 of the Public Facilities Implementation Plan contained in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan (i.e., Business and Operations Plan).

337-90. The commenter questions a statement made in the Draft EIR. In the context discussed in the Draft EIR, the statement made in the Draft EIR is correct.

337-91. The commenter would like to know of the 39,000 people at Fort Ord in the year 2015 as indicated on 5-3 of the Draft EIR, how many will be students. As stated on page 5-3 of the Draft EIR (first paragraph), there would be 10,000 students.

337-92. The commenter states that the "opinion" of the FORA consultant cannot be believed. There are no "opinions" contained in the EIR.

337-93. The commenter would like to know where it is stated in the Draft EIR or the "accompanying documents" that the "general plans for the cities and county will be the 2015 plan". The commenter is referred to Volume I of the Reuse Plan, commencing on page 3-155. Also, refer to the text of SB 899 which reiterates the requirements of the local agencies pertaining to incorporation of the Reuse Plan document into local agencies general plans. SB 899 is available at local libraries and/or is available through elected state government representatives.

337-94. The commenter would like to know what a developer buys. In the future, when land is sold at Fort Ord, the property will be subject to the particular jurisdiction's general plan policies and programs which will be consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

337-95. The commenter would like to know what legal mechanism is provided in the Draft EIR to prevent the sale of land for which there is no infrastructure. There is no such mechanism discussed in the EIR. However, the sale of land will be accompanied with receipt of funding from the purchaser for the purchasers fair share contribution to impact mitigation. Through this process, funds are collected and applied to the various impacts identified in the EIR.

337-96. The commenter requests that Figure 3.2-1 be amended to delineate UC MBEST Center. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR. As it pertains to the UC Master Plan being included with the EIR, it is not necessary to include it physically. However, it is included in the Final PEIR by reference.

Changes to the EIR.

Figure 3.2-1. Amend figure to delineate UC MBEST Center

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume I. Figure 3.3-1. Amend figure to delineate UC MBEST Center

337-97. The commenter would like up-to-date information in the Final PEIR. UXO and hazardous materials are adequately discussed in the Draft EIR and Final PEIR.

337-98. The commenter repeats comment 337-28.

337-99. The commenter is concerned about viewshed. The Reuse Plan and the EIR address this issue. For additional information, refer to response to comment 203-12. As it pertains to giving consideration to views from Pacific Grove and Monterey, views from these communities were not considered to be a potentially significant environmental issue. Refer to response to comment 288-2.

337-100. The commenter would like more information on wastewater. Refer to response to comment 82-8.

337-101. The commenter states the EIR alludes to the feasibility of using the East Garrison wastewater treatment facility. The East Garrison treatment plant is no longer operable and will be shut down permanently by the County of Monterey when it is conveyed to the county.

337-102. The commenter repeats comments 337-18, 19, 20, 21, 29, 45 and 49.

337-103. The commenter states that potential future water impoundment areas should be identified and the Reuse Plan map amended to reduce development displaced by water impoundment sites. The Reuse Plan cannot and does not identify specific locations because there are no specific projects to discuss. Therefore, precluding developments cannot be done as requested by the commenter.

337-104. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

337-105. The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not notify non-reuse plan residents and farmers that they have been asked in the past to pay for 80 percent of the proposed pipeline and proposed dam. What proposed pipeline and what proposed dam? The comment is not specific enough to warrant a response.

337-106. The commenter states that a desalination plant is the least likely water solution. Comment noted.

337-107. The commenter discusses desalination. The total water need for full buildout of Fort Ord is estimated at 13,500 (refer to response to comment 8-5). Of this amount, 3,000 afy would be used as reclaimed water, thus leaving a potable water requirement of 10,500 afy. Since the Army and MCWRA contract agreement stipulates that 6,600 will be supplied to Fort Ord, that leaves an outstanding water

need of 3,900. Therefore, a desalination plant would be built to provided approximately 3,900 afy.

337-108. The commenter is concerned about the desalination plant and seismic impacts to a plant. Any future structures will be required to be constructed per the Uniform Building Code.

337-109. The commenter repeats comment 337-22.

337-110. The commenter would like to know what the current water use is at Fort Ord. Refer to response to comment 68-3

337-111. The commenter would like to know what a silty aquitard is. A silty aquitard is a confining bed that retards water movement but does not prevent water to and from an adjacent aquifer.

Response to Letter 338

338-1. The commenter states that a proposed roadway adjacent to the south boundary of Marina is inappropriate due to a variety of reasons. No impact analysis relating to this roadway is included in the EIR because of the program level nature of the EIR. Future environmental analysis would be required for this particular roadway. The particular roadway is necessary to provide adequate circulation for local residents.

338-2. The commenter states that a proposed roadway adjacent to the east boundary of Marina is inappropriate due to a variety of reasons. No impact analysis relating to this roadway is included in the EIR because of the program level nature of the EIR. Future environmental analysis would be required for this particular roadway. The particular roadway is necessary to provide adequate circulation for local residents.

338-3. The commenter discusses numerous discrepancies in the transportation figures in volumes I and II of the Reuse Plan related to the extension of Crescent Avenue outside the boundaries of Fort Ord. The intention of the transportation network is to link development within Fort Ord with the existing neighborhood in Marina to the north but not promote through traffic. The Crescent Avenue connection is proposed beginning at Reindollar Avenue (south of Los Arboles Jr. High School) and extending south to the existing roadway that serves Patton Park. The existing roadway in Patton Park will be upgraded to a collector and, generally following the boundary of Fort Ord, connect Del Monte Road on the west with Abrams Drive on the east. Refer to Figure PFIP 1-3 page PFIP 1-50 for a description of the phased roadway projects to 2015 that provide for the connection to Reindollar (project T-14) and the connection to Del Monte Road (project T-39).

The Roadway Classification and Multimodal Corridor, Figure 3.5-2 (Volume I, page 3-69) accurately portrays the roadway hierarchy showing the new collector linking Del Monte Blvd. and Imjin Road (along Abrams Drive). This figure does not show any local road connections (e.g. the connection to Reindollar Avenue). This figure does accurately portray the role of California to serve as a minor arterial connecting the 12th/Imjin corridor with Reservation Road.

The Transportation Right-of Way Reservations, Figure 4.2-7 (Volume II, page 4-121) also accurately portrays the intended ROW's to serve the future roadway network for arterials and collectors. The ROW reservations show the required connection to Reindollar at the Crescent Avenue location.

The remaining transportation network figures are diagrammatic representations of the role of Crescent Avenue and reflect the transportation model assumptions for distributing trips from the existing neighborhoods. These figures generalize the role of Crescent as a collector connecting Del Monte Blvd. with Reservation Road. These figures should be modified to clarify the intent of the transportation network.

Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amendments. Though no changes to the Reuse Plan and EIR graphics or tables will be included with the Reuse Plan and Final PEIR documents, a compilation of the requests from commenters for changes to graphics or tables will be provided to FORA. It will then be the responsibility of FORA to provide the changes requested at a future date after the certification of the EIR.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Amend the following figures so they are consistent and reflect the connection at Crescent Avenue only from Reindollar Avenue south:

Volume I. Page 3-65. Figure 3.5-1.

Volume II. Page 4-98. Figure 4.2-2

Volume II. Page 4-99. Figure 4.2-3.

338-4. The commenter repeats comment 338-1.

338-5. The commenter requests that environmental analysis of roadways adjacent to Marina boundaries be included in the EIR. The EIR is a program level environmental document, which is based on a regional transportation model and, as such, does not provide the type of detailed analysis requested by the commenter. However, future development proposals will be required to provide the CEQA mandated environmental analysis to discuss the issues brought up by the applicant. Also, refer to response to comment 165-9.

Response to Letter 339

339-1. The commenter would like a project alternative included in the EIR which is based on the constraints associated with existing infrastructure and water. As it pertains to infrastructure (assumed to mean transportation), the EIR recognizes that there are deficiencies which need to be mitigated. Refer to response to comment 22-1 and 167-22. As it pertains to water, this is addressed in an expanded water discussion in response to comment 8-5 and the Development and Resources Management Plan (DRMP) in response to comment 21-1. Response to comment 21-1 also addresses transportation infrastructure development.

339-2. The commenter would like a reduced project in a revised Reuse Plan. Refer to response to comment 43-1.

339-3. The commenter states that a balance between jobs and housing may not necessarily reduce commute distances. Refer to response to comment 167-7.

339-4. The commenter is concerned with transportation funding. Refer to response to comment 22-1. Also refer to the Draft Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study (JHK January 6, 1997).

339-5. The commenter states that a connection between CSUMB and Highway 68 will be needed before 2015. The Reuse Plan accommodates such a connection along the existing North-South Road corridor in phases before 2005. However, the pace of development could delay this.

339-6. The commenter would like a scaled down project. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 340

340-1. The commenter states that because the MPWMD jurisdiction includes parts of Fort Ord, there will be an unrealistic expectation on the part of those who build on Fort Ord within the jurisdiction of MPWMD that water from the MPWMD will be available. There may be such an expectation on the part of future property owners at Fort Ord, however the MPWMD will limit the availability of water from the Seaside aquifer to a safe-yield (i.e., no seawater intrusion) to those who propose more than one hook up from their well. It is important to note that the MPWMD, nor the MCWRA, can prevent a person from drilling a well and obtaining water from the aquifer below them.

340-2. The commenter states that an alternative based on safe-yield water needs to be discussed. The Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) contained in response to comment 21-1 addresses this issue.

340-3. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water. As it pertains to planned implementation schedules for water projects, FORA will be working with the Fort Ord Water Purveyor and the MCWRA in developing new sources of water to accommodate future growth beyond that which can be accommodated by the 6,600 afy. Future water system installation and maintenance would be provided by the Fort Ord Water Purveyor through fees collected from new development and ongoing water use fees. The water infrastructure would be expanded as development occurs, but only in the context of a safe-yield water supply.

340-4. The commenter would like to know how new uses and water demand will be tracked. The water use tracking system to be implemented by the future water purveyor will have to be determined at a future date. The DRMP provides guidance on this issue. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

340-5. The commenter states that the MPWMD has jurisdiction over water infrastructure systems within the MPWMD and it should be listed with the other agencies listed under section 3.7 in the Draft EIR. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 3-12. Add the following section:

"3.7.10 Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

Future development that may use Seaside sub-basin water will be required to obtain permits, to include the following: compliance with conservation and rationing ordinances and required permits for creation / amending / annexations of water distribution systems and obtaining individual water meters for specific development projects within the MPWMD."

340-6. The commenter would like to know what is FORA's position vis-a-vis Senate Bill 901 and its mandate for a water supply assessment from the project areas water purveyor. At the time the Notice of Preparation for the Draft PEIR was sent out, FORA examined the requirements of SB 901 and concluded that FORA was already meeting the requirements of SB 901 and that FORA, in preparing a "regional plan", may not need to comply with the provisions of SB 901.

In addition, the Army/MCWRA agreement is construed by FORA to implement the intent of SB 901, the agreement, which allocates 6,600 afy of water to FORA to implement the reuse of Fort Ord, is intended, along with requests for qualifications and proposals from water purveyors on how they plan to serve the former Fort Ord, to implement the requirements of SB 901. However, the agreement does not address the full buildout of Fort Ord. FORA is addressing long-term water supplies through collection of funds from future Fort Ord development. Also, refer to response to

comment 8-5 for a discussion of potential future water sources and their potential impacts.

FORA further solicited qualifications and the proposals from various potential water purveyors on how they would serve the reuse of the former military base. Several water purveyors submitted proposals on how they planned to serve the buildout. FORA eventually agreed to negotiate first with the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD). The MCWD is now working with FORA to plan for the provision of water service given the existing resource constraints and the potential long-term water supply needs. Although FORA may or may not be required to comply with SB 901, because of the "regional" nature of this reuse planning effort, FORA has actively worked with the MCWRA and local water purveyors to plan for the provision of water service at the former Fort Ord.

FORA would further expect that individual jurisdictions, although currently provided a water allocation by FORA based on the 6,600 afy provided by the MCWRA/Army agreement, would still be required to comply with the provisions of SB 901 for projects containing 500 or more residential units. Compliance would be required as a part of the environmental noticing as provided in the SB 901 legislation.

340-7. The commenter corrects text. All references to the "Seaside Valley" should be replaced with "Seaside Basin".

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-38. Water Supply. Replace all references to the "Seaside Valley" to "Seaside Basin."

340-8. Based on the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) discussed above, the MPWMD has no permit authority over water extracted from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin.

340-9. The commenter would like a discussion of a worst case scenario where the safe-yield water supply was less than 6,600 afy. Per the agreement between the Army and the MCWRA discussed in response to comment 8-5 if water extraction exceeds safe-yield, the MCWRA is required to provide an alternative source of safe-yield water from another location within MCWRA jurisdiction.

340-10. The commenter would like to know what is the source of the reclaimed water. The MCWPCA treatment plant. The commenter would like to know if the effects of conservation measures on reclaimed water flow was considered. The EIR assumes a 15 percent water conservation effort. However, additional water savings could be obtained through implementation of water conservation efforts similar to those imposed by the MPWMD's Regulation 13, which requires installation of drip irrigation and recirculating hot water systems, and offering incentives for the installation of ultra-low water using appliances such as washing machines and dishwashers. As it pertains to a desalination plant, FORA is not totally committed to

this water source at this time, though, per the PFIP, FORA will be collecting funds from future development for such a facility and anticipates that it could provide one-third of the post 2015 water requirements (approximately 3,500 afy). FORA does consider the desalination plant as a future source of potable water for Fort Ord Reuse, but also considers other sources such as those discussed in response to comment 8-5.

340-11. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

340-12. The commenter states that although it has not worked to date with FORA on future water impoundment sites on Fort Ord, it looks forward to cooperating with the cities and the county on this issue. Comment noted.

340-13. The commenter states that it looks forward to cooperating with the cities and the county on the subject of providing future water supply. Comment noted.

340-14. The commenter states that to save water, FORA should consider using the MPWMD's water conservation regulation #13. Refer to Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-43. Amend Program B-1.3 to read as follows:

"The City/County shall adopt and enforce a water conservation ordinance, which includes requirements for plumbing retrofits and is at least as stringent as Regulation 13 of the MPWMD Monterey County's ordinance, ..."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-162. Amend Program B-1.3 to read as follows:

"The City shall adopt and enforce a water conservation ordinance, which includes requirements for plumbing retrofits and is at least as stringent as Regulation 13 of the MPWMD Monterey County's ordinance, ..."

Volume II. Page 4-165. Amend Program B-1.3 to read as follows:

"The City shall adopt and enforce a water conservation ordinance, which includes requirements for plumbing retrofits and is at least as stringent as Regulation 13 of the MPWMD Monterey County's ordinance, ..."

Volume II. Page 4-168. Add the following program.

Program B-1.3: The County shall adopt and enforce a water conservation ordinance for its jurisdiction within Fort Ord, which is at least as stringent as Regulation 13 of the MPWMD.

340-15. The commenter would like a water demand management program discussion. The level of detail requested exceeds that which is necessary for a program level EIR. As a water conservation program is developed, a management program would be needed.

340-16. The commenter states that the MPWMD looks forward to cooperating with other agencies in determining a safe-yield water supply as it pertains to both the Salinas and Seaside aquifers. Comment noted.

340-17. The commenter states an interest in participating in developing an implementing measures to prevent further seawater intrusion. Comment noted.

340-18. The commenter is in disagreement with the conclusion made in the EIR pertaining to the need for new local water supplies. Comment noted. Also, refer to the expanded water discussion in response to comment 8-5.

340-19. The commenter notes that the PFIP includes approximately 4000 individual water meters and submits a recommendation for water metering for individual units for all new construction. The meters referred to in the PFIP are included to retrofit existing structures. Refer to the Policy Consideration below.

Policy Consideration

The FORA Board shall consider installing separate meters on all new construction to the greatest extent possible in order to monitor water waste. Individual meters are one of the Best Management Practices adopted in the Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Urban Water Conservation in California by local water companies under the terms of AB 797 (1983) and subsequent amending legislation.

Response to Letter 341

341-1. The commenter would like a scaled back reuse plan. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

341-2. The commenter would like a mitigation monitoring program. Refer to response to comment 165-9.

341-3. The commenter states that the EIR does not contain a discussion of the water quality impacts associated with golf courses and other land uses. Refer to 4.5 in the EIR for a full discussion on this issue.

341-4. The commenter requests that stronger language be include in policy statements. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-9. Amend Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy A-1 to read as follows:

"The County of Monterey shall ~~protect~~ encourage the conservation and ~~preservation~~ of irreplaceable natural resources and open spaces..."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-64. Amend Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy A-1 to read as follows:

"The City shall ~~protect~~ encourage the conservation and ~~preservation~~ of irreplaceable natural resources and open spaces..."

Volume II. Page 4-67. Amend Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy A-1 to read as follows:

"The City shall ~~protect~~ encourage the conservation and ~~preservation~~ of irreplaceable natural resources and open spaces..."

Volume II. Page 4-70. Amend Recreation/Open Space Land Use Policy A-1 to read as follows:

"The County of Monterey shall ~~protect~~ encourage the conservation and ~~preservation~~ of irreplaceable natural resources and open spaces..."

341-5. The commenter requests that a new program be included. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-9. Add the following new program.

"Program A-1.2: The County of Monterey shall cause to be recorded a Natural Ecosystem Easement deed restriction that will run with the land in perpetuity for all identified open space lands".

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-70. Add the following new program.

“Program A-1.2: The County of Monterey shall cause to be recorded a Natural Ecosystem Easement deed restriction that will run with the land in perpetuity for all identified open space lands”.

341-6. The commenter requests that a new policy be included. The intent of the policy as written is to use open space as a buffer. It is believed that the commenter’s proposed language differs from the intent of the language in the Reuse Plan and the Draft EIR.

341-7. The commenter states that a change incorporated in the Reuse Plan reflects the commenter previous suggestion. Comment noted.

341-8. The commenter would like to know what “assist” means in Program E-1.2. Refer to the Changes to the Reuse Plan section below for amended text.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-73. Remove Program E-1.2 and renumber the remaining programs.

341-9. The commenter requests a change in policy text. The language contained in the policy is adequate as written to address the impact. No change is warranted.

341-10. The commenter requests a change in policy text. The language contained in the policy is adequate as written to address the impact. No change is warranted. The implementation program associated with this policy adequately addresses the impact.

341-11. The commenter requests a change in program text. Refer to response to comment 306-3

341-12. The commenter would like to know if the omission of programs is by design. Only those programs contained in the Reuse Plan determined to be appropriate to mitigate an impact are included in the EIR.

341-13. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-47. Amend the second sentence under the first impact statement to read as follows:

“... which could interfere with groundwater recharge and accelerate surface erosion and sedimentation.”

341-14. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. The text as presented adequately addresses the potential impact.

341-15. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. The text as presented adequately addresses the potential impact.

341-16. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. The text as presented adequately addresses the potential impact.

341-17. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-68. Amend Policy A-2 at the top of the page to read as follows:

“... on newly developed lands do not decrease or increase the magnitude and duration of flows less than or greater than the mean annual ...”

Change to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-168. Amend Policy A-2 to read as follows:

“... on newly developed lands do not decrease or increase the magnitude and duration of flows less than or greater than the mean annual ...”

341-18. The commenter states that precipitation and runoff is not particular to the east side of Fort Ord only. The intent of including the program for Monterey County only is because it is the area which contains creeks. The west side (the area of cantonment) contains drainage pipes not creeks.

341-19. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-48. Add Policy C-1. to the impact discussion.

341-20. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-48. Remove “to the extent feasible” from Policy C-2.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-163. Remove “to the extent feasible” from Policy C-2.

Volume II. Page 4-166. Remove “to the extent feasible” from Policy C-2.

Volume II. Page 4-170. Remove “to the extent feasible” from Policy C-2.

341-21. The commenter requests an amendment to the text. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-50. Amend Program C-2.1 to read as follows:

“The City /County shall develop and make available a description of feasible and effective measures and site drainage designs that will ~~could~~ be implemented in new development to minimize water quality impacts.

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-163. Amend Program C-2.1 to read as follows:

“The City /County shall develop and make available a description of feasible and effective measures and site drainage designs that will ~~could~~ be implemented in new development to minimize water quality impacts.

Volume II. Page 4-166. Amend Program C-2.1 to read as follows:

“The City /County shall develop and make available a description of feasible and effective measures and site drainage designs that will ~~could~~ be implemented in new development to minimize water quality impacts.

Volume II. Page 4-170. Amend Program C-2.1 to read as follows:

“The City /County shall develop and make available a description of feasible and effective measures and site drainage designs that will ~~could~~ be implemented in new development to minimize water quality impacts.

341-22. The commenter states that the two polygons discussed in impact #3 is insufficient. The golf course is singled out because it poses a potentially greater threat to the frog pond, including nitrates entering the pond. The remaining polygons discussed by the commenter are adequately covered by the other impact discussions in section 4.5 of the Draft EIR.

341-23. The commenter states the reference to a policy as a County policy is incorrect. The Frog Pond is in County jurisdiction, therefore, it is discussed in the county context.

341-24. The commenter would like an expanded program A-8.1. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-134. Amend Biological Resources Program A-8.1 to read as follows:

"The County shall prohibit development in Polygons 31b, 29a, 29b, 29c, 29d, 29e and 25 from discharging storm water or other water into the ephemeral drainage that feeds into the Frog Pond."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-201. Amend Biological Resources Program A-8.1 to read as follows:

"The County shall prohibit development in Polygons 31b, 29a, 29b, 29c, 29d, 29e and 25 from discharging storm water or other water into the ephemeral drainage that feeds into the Frog Pond."

341-25. The commenter supports policies and programs. Comment noted.

341-26. The commenter would like a new program added which appears to be redundant to the commenters requests for program amendments as indicated in response to comments 341-17 and 341-24.

341-27. The commenter would like the statement for impact 4 to be amended to reflect the potential for erosion associated with construction and long-term land use. The impact statement is specific to construction related impacts and shall remain as is. Long-term land use impacts are discussed under impact 2.

341-28. The commenter would like an amendment to the policy language. The policy language is appropriate as written. The accompanying program language is specific and non-evasive and clearly delineates a course of action to be taken by the city and the county.

341-29. The commenter would like an amendment to language in a program. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-50. Amend Program C-4.1 to read as follows:

"... shall develop a program that will provide, to every landowner, occupant, and other appropriate entities, ~~to owners of property~~ new waterways, information concerning vegetation ..."

Changes to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-164. Amend Program C-4.1 to read as follows:

“... shall develop a program that will provide, to every landowner, occupant, and other appropriate entities, ~~to owners of property new waterways,~~ information concerning vegetation ...”

Volume II. Page 4-167. Amend Program C-4.1 to read as follows:

“... shall develop a program that will provide, to every landowner, occupant, and other appropriate entities, ~~to owners of property new waterways,~~ information concerning vegetation ...”

Volume II. Page 4-170. Amend Program C-4.1 to read as follows:

“... shall develop a program that will provide, to every landowner, occupant, and other appropriate entities, ~~to owners of property new waterways,~~ information concerning vegetation ...”

341-30. The commenter would like a new program that addresses soil disturbance during construction at certain times of the year. The EIR consultant is confident that the programs contained in Soils and Geology policy A-2 are adequate to address the commenters concern. Refer to pages 4-50 and 4-51 in the Draft EIR.

341-31. The commenter would like a new program that addresses soil disturbance during construction at certain times of the year. The EIR consultant is confident that the programs contained in Soils and Geology policy A-2 are adequate to address the commenters concern. Refer to pages 4-50 and 4-51 in the Draft EIR.

341-32. The commenter would like additional discussion pertaining to the potential contamination of groundwater via hazardous waste spills as a result of future activities. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-51. Amend impact statement #5 to read as follows.

"Impact: Degradation of Water Quality from Potential Hazardous Material Spills ~~During Construction~~."

341-33. The commenter states that hazardous and toxic spills does not terminate when construction ceases. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 4-51. Amend Program C-1.5 to read as follows.

"The City/County shall adopt and enforce a hazardous substance control ordinance that requires that hazardous substance control plans be prepared and implemented for all construction activities involving the handling, storing, transport, or disposal of hazardous waste materials..."

341-34. The commenter submits new program language amendments pertaining to Biological Resources Policy A-8.1 and A-8.2 for Monterey County. As it pertains to the commenter's concerns pertaining to Policy A-8.1, refer to response to comment 341-24 for a discussion of stormwater discharge to Polygon 31a from adjacent polygons; as it pertains to not increasing storm water flow into Polygon 31a, refer to response to comment 341-17; and as it pertains to storm water management engineering methods, refer to the existing City/County Soils and Geology Policy A-2 and its accompanying programs. Program A-8.2 is amended as follows. Refer to the Changes to the EIR and Changes to the Reuse Plan sections below for amended text.

Change to the EIR

Page 4-134. Amend Program A-8.2 to read as follows:

"The County shall ... along the border of Polygons 31a and 31b. A fuel break maintaining the existing tree canopy (i.e., shaded fuel break) shall be located within a five acre primary buffer zone on the western edge of Polygon 31b. No buildings or roadways will be allowed in this buffer zone with the exception of picnic areas, trailheads, interpretive signs, drainage facilities, and park district parking. Firebreaks should be designed to protect structures in Polygon 31b from potential wildfires in Polygon 31a. Barriers shall ~~should~~ be designed to prohibit unauthorized access into Polygon 31a."

Change to the Reuse Plan

Volume II. Page 4-202. Amend Program A-8.2 to read as follows:

"The County shall require installation of appropriate firebreaks and barriers sufficient to prevent unauthorized vehicle access along the border of Polygon 31a and 31b. A fuel break maintaining the existing tree canopy (i.e., shaded fuel break) shall be located within a five acre primary buffer zone on the western edge of Polygon 31b. No buildings or roadways will be allowed in this buffer zone with the exception of picnic areas, trailheads, interpretive signs, drainage facilities, and park district parking. Firebreaks should be designed to protect structures in Polygon 31b from potential wildfires in Polygon 31a. Barriers shall ~~should~~ be designed to prohibit unauthorized access into Polygon 31a."

Response to Letter 342

342-1. The commenter states that there is an ongoing dialogue between agencies concerning Highway 68. Comment noted.

342-2. The commenter would like language added to the text. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.

Changes to the EIR

Page 3-4. Add the following sentence to the end of the second paragraph.

“CalTrans and BLM have an approved MOU which addresses future uses of the Highway 68 Bypass easement and interim management of lands within the corridor”.

342-3. The commenter reiterates what the Draft EIR text states.

342-4. The commenter states that ongoing dialogue exists between public agencies pertaining to Laguna Seco meeting its goals to serve the public. Comment noted.

342-5. The commenter disagrees with the conclusion contained in the EIR. Comment noted.

342-6. The commenter suspects the use of the Florida Department of Transportation analysis to be inaccurate. The Florida information was agreed upon by TAMC and the EIR’s transportation consultant. Refer to response to comments 210-6 and 210-63.

342-7. The commenter states that it is CalTrans policy to use the most current HCM. The EIR used the most current HCM (i.e., 1994).

342-8. The commenter would like to know why the Hatton Canyon project is included in the “No Conversion - Army Use Only” column of Table 4.7-2. This column implies that the Hatton Canyon project would occur regardless of reuse of Fort Ord. Also, refer to response to comment 59-8, 59-9 and 89-7.

342-9. The commenter states that CalTrans is looking at both a Highway 68 Bypass and widening the existing Highway 68 to four lanes. Comment noted.

342-10. The commenter states that CalTrans is not aware of any widening of Highway 218 in any financially constrained plan. FORA will be providing funding for a segment of Highway 218 based on a nexus analysis. This funding is indicated in the PFIP, PFIP Table 1-3.

342-11. The commenter states that information in Table 4.7-3 is incorrect. The information contained in the EIR reflects those conditions which existed in 1993-94.

342-12. The commenter states that the language contained in the policies are vague. The language used in the EIR transportation section is appropriate for use in programs. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for the financing commitments to transportation facilities. Also refer to response to comments 7-2 and 9-13 for changes to the draft Comprehensive Business Plan.

342-13. The commenter submits that FORA should distribute its discretionary funding equally. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for the financing commitments to transportation facilities. Refer to the following policy language.

Policy Consideration

The FORA board shall consider distributing its off-site roadway improvements funding equally to all roadways.

342-14. The commenter states that there is a cooperative agreement between agencies pertaining to the widening of Highway 1. Comment noted.

Response to Letter 343

343-1. The commenter states the economic analysis pertaining to the Reuse Plan is premised on FORA receiving the former military base from the Army gratis.

343-2. The commenter submits an opinion on the cooperative nature, or lack of, of the various agencies. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

343-3. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

343-4. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

343-5. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

343-6. The commenter would like to know if Fort Ord could have one unified government. Fort Ord has been with the jurisdictions of three agencies for a number of years. They include Marina, Seaside and Monterey County. It would require each of these agencies to relinquish their sovereignty over their respective pieces of Fort Ord for their to be one single government entity.

343-7. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR. No response is necessary.

343-8. The commenter states that adequate roadway infrastructure is required to meet future reuse. This is correct and FORA has addressed this issue

through exacting development fees from future reuse projects to pay for infrastructure. Refer to response to comment 22-1 for a discussion of transportation funding. Refer to response to comment 21-1 for a discussion of how FORA will meter future development vis-a-vis infrastructure constraints.

343-9. The commenter submits a recommendation for future water source to be considered by the FORA board. Comment noted.

343-10. The commenter submits a recommendation for future economic opportunities at Fort Ord. Comment noted.

Response to Letter 344

344-1. The commenter would like the transfer of the base to civilian use to cease until the UXO is removed. As it pertains to the Army doing an EIS, this has been done and is available at local libraries.

Response to Letter 345

345-1. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water. As it pertains to an alternative project, CEQA requires that an alternative to a project avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the project. Therefore, because the EIR does not contain any significant unavoidable impacts pertaining to water use, an alternative would not be required. Regardless of this, the commenter is referred to response to comment 8-5 for additional information on water, and response to comment 21-1 for the Development and Resources Management Plan, which addresses the phased development of Fort Ord based on resource constraints. As it pertains to alternatives, the commenter is referred to response to comment 27-3.

345-2. The commenter would like an alternative plan which preserves coastal oaks and requires widening of existing roads only. An alternative such as the one recommended does not address any particular unmitigated impact associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the alternative requested will not be included in the EIR.

345-3. The commenter would like an alternative plan which addresses replacing the economic activity that existed at the time of based closure. Refer to response to comment 43-1.

Response to Letter 346

346-1. The commenter would like a reduced project. The issue raised must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 347

347-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the project but does not directly address the Reuse Plan or the EIR. The issues raised in this comment letter must be considered by the FORA Board before they make a final determination on the EIR and the Reuse Plan.

Response to Letter 348

348-1. The commenter states that the UXO figure contained in the EIR is incorrect. Refer to response to comment 213-20.

348-2. The commenter refers to "chemical agents" used by former troops and would like this discussed in the EIR. The Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) (January 1997) prepared by the Army contains a list of small arms and ordnance and explosives located during sampling activities and removal actions at Fort Ord. The list includes demolition charge TNT. Also found were tear gases within the CSUMB footprint (Site 4c in the EE/CA report). Tear gases including ortho-chlorobenzylmalononitrile (CS) and chloroacetphenone (CN) were used on site 4c and powdered tear gas agents or used capsules may have been dumped in the area. A removal action to a depth of 3 feet was conducted on this site (approximately 6 acres) as part of the larger CSUMB footprint removal activities.

Chemical agent identification sets (CAIS) may have been used during training at sites 4a, 4b and 4c and in building 2820, and that part of the training involved the use of minute amounts of mustard gas (probably as part of CAIS). Therefore, it is possible that powdered gas agent was dumped in the area or used capsules were discarded there. The area has been or will be checked for residue of tear gas (Earth Tech 1997). In March of this year, another CAIS was found at Fort Ord. The set is estimated to be 40 to 60 years old and contains vials of chemical samples of diluted mustard, lewisite, chloropicrin strength phosgene, all ingredients of poison gases used in World War I.

Response to Letter 349

349-1. The commenter states that the FORA board should start over with a specific plan that recognizes the limitations of water and roadway infrastructure. The EIR was written with this in mind. With the information contained in the Final

Program EIR, the adequacy of the EIR for the FORA Board to base their decision on is adequate.

Response to Letter 350

350-1. The commenter would like the project limited to approximately 31,500 people in the year 2015. The maximum anticipated population currently estimated in the EIR for the year 2015 (Table 5.2-11) is 38,895, which includes 10,000 CSUMB students. As it pertains to full buildout population, refer to response to comment 43-1.

350-2. The commenter submits numerous general comments regarding planning, the future, and aesthetics. Also, the commenter recommends a unique approach to addressing the aesthetics of future development at Fort Ord through a non-funded group who would give guidance and encouragement to local Fort Ord agencies in design and landscape matters (much like an Architectural Review Board), so that future development is oriented toward proper scale and ample landscaping. Refer to the following Policy Consideration

Policy Consideration

Establish an Architectural Review Board for Fort Ord.

Response to Letter 351

351-1. The commenter requests information on impacts and mitigations. The level of detail requested by the commenter exceeds that necessary for a program level EIR. Refer to response to comment 16-3. Also, as discussed in the Draft EIR (section 1.3), future projects will be subject to future environmental review, with the potential that some future projects could proceed with the minimum amount of new environmental information above and beyond that which is included in the Reuse Plan Draft and Final EIRs. This determination will be based on the information presented in section 1.3.

351-2. The commenter would like to know who will be keeping track of mitigations, project conditions and who will have enforcement power over mitigations to be implemented at Fort Ord. FORA will have authority at the reuse plan level. Subsequent projects to be implemented at the local level will have their own mitigations which will be monitored by the local jurisdictions.

351-3. The commenter states that a successful mitigation is measured by a successful track record and that the EIR must identify successful examples identical to or similar to those mitigations proposed in the Reuse Plan EIR. The commenter refers to projects that are known to not have implemented prescribed mitigations.

The EIR consultant team prescribes mitigations known to work based on previous experience and technical understanding of impacts and mitigations. Mitigations, to include programs in the case of this Reuse Plan, fulfill the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, which requires that mitigations be expected to reduce adverse impacts. To provide the commenter with the type of information requested exceeds the level of information required of a program or project level EIR.

As it pertains to monitoring and enforcement of mitigations, the EIR consultant team merely prescribes the mitigations it knows from experience will work that will reduce an adverse impact to a less than significant level. It is the responsibility of the lead agency to implement the mitigations through monitoring and enforcement. Whether the lead agency monitors and enforces the mitigations is a legal issue for the lead agency be aware of and is not an issue pertinent to preparation of the environmental documents.

351-4. The commenter would like to know what mechanism the public has to enforce the mitigations. The public has full access to the public record pertaining to projects. Therefore, the public can track a future project's approval and implementation of conditions.

351-5. The commenter is addressing another project approved by another agency and would like to know, based on the project the commenter refers to and the public agency responsible for mitigation monitoring, how can any mitigation measures other than "avoidance" be responsibly recommended. The commenter's issue does not pertain to the FORA project.

351-6. The commenter would like the text to be simplified and sentences reduced in length. Comment noted. Improvement will be made in the Final Program EIR.

351-7. The commenter would like the consultant to contact each commenter by phone if any question or comment is unclear. Every effort has been made to call commenters. However, though the EIR consultant to "read through a comment" or "read between the lines" to interpret what some commenters are saying when it is not apparent, it is ultimately the responsibility of the commenter to provide short and concise statements that can be quickly interpreted.

351-8. The commenter would like the EIR to include any issue brought to light by the public. This approach to CEQA is inappropriate because not all issues are pertinent to a physical impact to the environment. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.a, an EIR shall identify and focus on the "significant environmental effects of the proposed project".

351-9. The commenter would like all the comments submitted during the scoping process that were not addressed in the EIR. The issues raised during the NOP process have been discussed in the Draft and/or Final Program EIR. The commenter is encouraged to read through the Final Program EIR response to comments to determine that this is correct.

351-10. The commenter requests a comparison between the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and other developments. This information, though informative, is not necessary to convey to the readers and the decision makers the impacts of the proposed project.

351-11. The commenter would like information on methodology, forecast data, evidence, references, sources of information, to substantiate conclusions contained in the EIR. The information the commenter requests is contained in the Reuse Plan and EIR documents.

351-12. The commenter expresses his preference for discussion of impacts. Comment noted.

351-13. The commenter would like access to computer models. As it pertains to transportation, the commenter should contact TAMC. As it pertains to Air Quality modeling (CALINE4), the commenter should contact the California Air Resources Board.

351-14. The commenter would like to know how conclusions are not allowed to be established before facts are investigated. CEQA requires that conclusions be based on substantiated information only.

351-15. The commenter would like all double-speak to be removed from the EIR. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response.

351-16. The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR summary. Comment noted.

351-17. The commenter would like an "honest no-project alternative" discussed in the EIR, where there is no use at Fort Ord. The Army has the legal right to dispose of its land holdings as it sees fit, which is what it has been doing and will continue to do. Therefore, the request by the commenter cannot be provided in the EIR because CEQA requires that alternatives be discussed that are reasonable only. The no-project alternative, as defined by the commenter, is not reasonable.

351-18. The commenter states that a reasonable range of alternatives is not examined in the EIR. This is an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR which the EIR consultant disagrees with. Also, refer to response to comment 27-3.

351-19. The commenter would like economic data to substantiate what the economic loss has been since base closure and would like an alternative discussion included in the EIR which addresses reuse of Fort Ord that does not exceed the level of economic activity that existed at the time of base closure. Refer to response to comment 43-1.

351-20. The commenter would like to know the cost of clean-up at Fort Ord. Such costs are the responsibility of the Army. Therefore, the commenter is referred to the Army for a response. However, the EIR adequately discusses health and

safety issues to the extent appropriate for the situation which exists at Fort Ord, i.e., there being a federal agency involved with clean-up of contaminated water and soils, as well as UXO. The Army will address the UXO issue in further detail with the release of its Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) to be submitted for public review this year.

351-21. The commenter would like a particular alternative discussed in the EIR. The alternative requested does not fulfill the requirements of CEQA as it pertains to alternatives. CEQA states that an alternative avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. There is no apparent correlation between what the commenter's recommended alternative and a reduction of impacts. Therefore, this particular type of alternative will not be included in the EIR.

351-22. The commenter would like a particular alternative which does not exceed the resources available. The project does not exceed the resources available as a result of implementation of policies and programs. For example, Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-2, C-3 and their associated Programs C-3.1 and C-3.2, limit development to a prescribed safe-yield water supply. Impacts to transportation infrastructure, like all projects, are mitigated through payment of impact fees wherever feasible by law. Furthermore, the Reuse Plan (Volume I, page 3-150) discusses FORA's Growth Management Principles and Approach, which has subsequently been augmented with the Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP). Refer to response to comment 21-1 for discussion of the DRMP. Therefore, because the proposed project does not exceed resource constraints, an alternative that addresses reuse that does not exceed resource constraints is not necessary.

351-23. The commenter would like a disclaimer be incorporated in the Draft EIR. Refer to response to comment 55-4. Also, the reason the disclaimer was physically left out of the EIR is because the disclaimer is inferred when using AMBAG statistics.

351-24. The commenter would like the EIR to state in the summary that toxic chemicals are to be used on golf courses. Section 4.5 adequately discusses this issue. Refer to this section of the EIR.

351-25. The commenter would like information on all recent and proposed golf courses for the Monterey Peninsula. The information requested is not germane to development on Fort Ord and would not increase the level of understanding of the environmental impacts associated with development at Fort Ord.

351-26. The commenter would like to know the percentage and total amount of water in acre feet relating to existing Monterey Peninsula golf courses and how much additional water demand the proposed golf courses would use. The two existing Fort Ord golf courses are projected to continue to use the same amount of water from the Seaside aquifer (160 afy per golf course). As for the proposed Fort Ord golf courses' water use and existing Monterey Peninsula golf courses, there is

no correlation between the two because future Fort Ord golf courses will have a different source of water than those on the remainder of the Monterey Peninsula.

351-27. The commenter would like information on the amount of water existing golf courses use on the Monterey Peninsula. It is beyond the scope of work for this EIR to analyze regional golf course water use in relation to service areas.

351-28. The commenter would like to know what species of plant, animal and insects typically are found on the existing Fort Ord golf courses. The level of analysis requested by the commenter is not required for a program level EIR.

351-29. The commenter would like to know what species of plant, animal and insects are expected to be found on the proposed Fort Ord golf courses. The predominant species of plant found on the golf course will be golf course turf. Secondly, there will be native plant species interspersed throughout the golf course to add landscape aesthetic to the course, and provide, to some small extent, habitat for native wildlife species. The species that would inhabit a golf course are expected to be a mix of some native species and introduced species. Further analysis of this issue is not required for a program level EIR.

351-30. The commenter states that the EIR does not describe toxic runoff from golf courses and home landscaping. The golf course issue is discussed commencing on page 4-49 of the Draft EIR. Home landscaping is not considered to be a significant impact to the environment, relative to large chemical users such as golf courses and agricultural operations. Therefore, home landscaping as a significant source of toxic runoff is not discussed in the EIR. Future golf course projects will be required to undergo additional environmental analysis per the requirements of CEQA. This program level EIR is not the appropriate medium to discuss the level of detail asked for by the commenter.

351-31. The commenter would like the EIR to state in the Summary how the drinking water supply is "downstream" from the proposed golf courses. This issue is discussed in the EIR commencing on page 4-49. CEQA does not require this information to be in the Summary.

351-32. The commenter is requesting detailed information on golf courses. the level of analysis requested is not appropriate for a program level EIR. However, all future golf courses will be required to undergo additional environmental review per the requirements of CEQA where the information requested would be discussed.

351-33. The commenter would like a reduced project whereby water use would be less than significant. The Draft EIR concludes that water impacts are less than significant. Therefore, mitigation in this regard would be moot.

351-34. The commenter would like a map showing the entire footprint of "edge effects". This information is not available because it is beyond the scope of work for this program level EIR.

351-35. The commenter would like information on the health of each animal species residing within proximity of a list of land uses and types of infrastructure the commenter provides. This discussion will not address each of the potential hundreds of animal, plant and insect species that occur at Fort Ord. This discussion will be of a qualitative nature only to address the commenter's concern regarding "edge effects". The tenet of "edge effects" is that impacts of a project will extend out beyond the boundary line of a project and into habitat area surrounding the project site. The extent of the impact directly correlates with the type of land use.

For example, an electrical power box placed in the middle of a relative pristine area will have fewer impacts relative to "edge effects", than a residence constructed in a similar relatively pristine environment. A residence could have kids, dogs, cats (all assumed to be unconfined), which have the potential to impact species in the immediate area and beyond the property boundary. Impacts associated with a subdivision's residences is essentially the same.

The point the commenter appears to be making is that the footprint of a development project's impact does not necessarily stop at the project boundary line. There is an interface between what is not developed (remaining habitat) and what is "developed" where, though the development is clearly absent, a project's impacts can still occur. However, the impact off the project property is at a lesser gradient over distance. Therefore, the impact "off-site" is expected to be less than that "on-site". For example, the impact associated with the use of night lighting. Though apparently innocuous, many species, especially those nocturnal, are potentially denied access to an area of habitat that surrounds a development project if light is directed into adjacent habitat. Thus, the requirement in many environmental documents that lighting be avoided entirely and/or directed only to specific targets on the project site and away from the area where habitat (human or otherwise) exists.

Though the impact to species on the periphery of development is at a lesser level than the direct impact of habitat loss associated with clearing land and replacing habitat with a structure, parking lots, and other urban structures, the closer an animal species is to human habitat, the greater the threats to its existence.

Furthermore, a civilian use of Fort Ord with its relatively active and less confined student population (relative to the previous soldier population) could result in greater human intrusion into areas of Fort Ord on a more regular basis than when Fort Ord was used as a military base. Increased use of the base by non-Fort Ord residents for recreational use (e.g., mountain bike riding and walking) will also add to the total quantify of physical human intrusion and its concurrent impacts/disturbances to plant and animal species.

Is the "edge effect" a significant project or cumulative impact above and beyond the impacts already discussed in the EIR? The EIR consultant concludes that the Draft EIR adequately addresses the projects potentially significant impacts, and through implementation of policies, programs and mitigations, the potential direct impacts and those associated with the "edge effect" are adequately addressed and mitigated.

There are two reasons for the “edge effect” being adequately addressed and mitigated in the EIR. First, through setting aside approximately 15,000 acres of Habitat Management area potential impacts associated with “edge effect” are adequately off-set, and second, through implementation of policies, programs and mitigations, which direct future development to constrain its impacts within the area designated for future urban development on Fort Ord.

To specifically address the impacts associated with the health of each animal species residing within proximity of a list of land uses and types of infrastructure the commenter provides, the following general discussion is provided.

A dirt path and roadway will create dust that will temporarily contaminate the air which animals will breath, thus temporarily adversely impacting their health. By itself this may not be a significant impact, but through repeated episodes, the health of a species may degrade to the point where the habitat in proximity to the dust becomes inhabitable. As is the case with a dirt road, the impact of an asphalt roadway on animal species primarily relates to road kill. Furthermore, roads will increase the surface area and increase the area where edge effect occurs, thus diminishing habitat where human intrusion does not occur.

As it pertains to power lines, septic systems, and underground utilities, the primary impact relates to initial construction and then long-term impacts associated with the regular clearing of vegetation within the utility’s right-of-way. The impact to wildlife is similar to that discussed above relating to a home or subdivision. Utilities will subdivide previously undisturbed habitat which often result in the introduction of exotic plant species, human intrusion, etc.. Therefore, utilities are also associated with the edge effect and degrade habitat in the “edge zone”. However, clearing also allows introduction of plant species that some animal species incorporate into their diet. Therefore, the edge effect, in this context, is considered beneficial.

351-36. The commenter would like complete documentation to determine the minimum distance from any-made structure needed to insure an area of un-impacted wildland. The information requested is not required for a legally adequate EIR and is beyond the scope of this program EIR. Each habitat type has different site parameters and thus may require differing sized buffer areas to insure continued viability and integrity. Also, the Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) program was recommended by the HMP and is discussed in response to comment 164-13. The CRMP would be the appropriate tool for accommodating edge effects.

351-37. The commenter would like information on edge effects and weather. Significant impacts on vegetation and wildlife are discussed in section 4.10 of the EIR. Areas of future tree removal relating to a specific project will occur in scattered various areas of Fort Ord. Development will result in some habitat fragmentation even if no significant direct loss of habitat will occur. Generally, however, most wildlife species would continue to use habitat areas outside developed homesites. For example, oak woodland and chaparral birds, including raptors, often nest and forage in proximity to human habitation. No single, minimum distance from human

habitations is appropriate for all wildlife species or habitat areas. Site specific data on conditions of on-site forests is not available and is beyond the scope of work of this program EIR.

351-38. The commenter would like proposed mitigation for micro-climate changes near roads and homes. The EIR consultant has determined that micro-climate changes near roads and homes, relative to chaparral and oak woodland, is not a significant environmental impact requiring mitigation. Though there would be a micro-climate situation pertaining to these habitats, chaparral would be expected to benefit from increased sun exposure in the interface area where, for example, a road would be located. Also, as it pertains to oak woodlands, any potential negative effect resulting from a change in the micro-climate would be immediately off-set by increased growth of sun tolerant brush, such as sticky monkey flower, ceanothus, deer brush, manzanita, etc., which would fill in space in and around a newly exposed forest surface area and act as a climate modifier.

351-39. The commenter would like a discussion of the health of wildlands when they are reduced to islands. Except in the habitat management area, there will be islands of habitat interspersed throughout Fort Ord as urban development occurs. These habitat areas will be compromised vis-a-vis their value to wildlife.

351-40. The commenter addresses the issue of forest cutting which is not pertinent to oak woodlands.

351-41. The commenter would like detailed information on sound relating to construction. This information is inappropriate for a program level EIR. Future projects will be required to address this issue per the requirements of CEQA.

351-42. The commenter would like detailed information on tree removal. This information is inappropriate for a program level EIR. Future projects will be required to address this issue per the requirements of CEQA.

351-43. The commenter would like water use calculations to be based on a 100 year drought. This is not the approach taken in the EIR.

351-44. The commenter would like an alternative that would not exceed the reliable sustainable water available in a worst case drought year at the end of the summer at the end of the last year of a 100-year drought. The EIR will not include such an alternative because CEQA requires that an alternative address a significant impact or impacts associated with the proposed project. The alternative proposed by the commenter does not address any particular unmitigated impact.

351-45. The commenter would like comparative water use information between each alternative. Refer to page 2-10 of the Draft EIR. Also refer to response to comment 8-5.

351-46. The commenter would like reference to a reliable water source contained in the Summary. Refer to page 4-42 of the EIR which discusses the 6,600 afy. Also, refer to response to comment 8-5 for an expanded water discussion.

351-47. The commenter would like reference to a reliable water source contained in the Executive Summary. The EIR does not contain an executive summary.

351-48. The commenter would like to know the minimum and maximum amount of sustainable water which is available for the projected from its own resources and put this information in the summary. The source of water for reuse is from the Salinas Valley aquifer. Through an agreement between the Army and the MCWRA, 6,600 afy is guaranteed for Fort Ord reuse.

351-49. The commenter would like a mitigation that prohibits all use of chemicals on all golf courses. This is not determined to be necessary per the golf course discussion on page 4-49 of the Draft EIR.

351-50. The commenter would like an alternative and mitigation that will cease all development when toxics are found in the water used for the Monterey Peninsula. The EIR will not include such an alternative because CEQA requires that an alternative address a significant impact or impacts associated with the proposed project. The alternative proposed does not address any particular unmitigated impact.

351-51. The commenter would like an alternative and mitigation which prohibits the use of all toxics and chemicals upstream from any water course that flows into drinking water supplies or fish habitat, or the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. The EIR will not include such an alternative because CEQA requires that an alternative address a significant impact or impacts associated with the proposed project. The alternative proposed does not address any particular unmitigated impact.

351-52. The commenter is requesting a significantly expanded air quality section. The air quality section contained in the EIR is based on the requirements of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District's CEQA Air Quality Guidelines pertaining to program level EIRs (MBUAPCD 1995). Therefore, the information requested by the commenter will not be provided.

351-53. The commenter would like to know how many buildings would be taller than existing buildings. This is a program level EIR which cannot address the level of detail requested by the commenter.

351-54. The commenter would like detailed information on visual pollution from future light sources. The Draft EIR does not consider this to be a significant issue warranting discussion.

351-55. The commenter would like detailed information on visual pollution from future light sources as seen from aircraft. The Draft EIR does not consider this to be a significant issue warranting discussion.

351-56. The commenter would like economic information relating to reuse. Economic issues are not pertinent to CEQA, and the Draft EIR unless there is a physical impact that is the result of the economic activity (CEQA Guidelines 15131).

351-57. The commenter would like a revised UXO figure. Refer to response to comment 213-20.

351-58. The commenter would like more information on chemical weapons and sacks of TNT found on Fort Ord. Refer to response to comment 348-2.

351-59. The commenter states the EIR does not contain adequate information pertaining to the risk from UXO remaining, including chemical weapons and sacks of TNT. The commenter is referred to response to comment 32-1 for additional discussion on UXO.

351-60. The commenter would like to know what the largest unexploded bomb is and what damage it could do to humans. The list of ordnance and explosives (OE) found to date are included in Appendix B of the EE/CA available at FORA offices. The EE/CA document is anticipated to be released for public review in April 1997.

351-61. The commenter would like the Draft EIR's conclusion regarding UXO to be reevaluated. Refer to response to comment 32-1.

351-62. The commenter requests an analysis of heavy metals and how they could affect human health. The issue pertains to lead in the beach area. The Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the lead removal operations at the beach have addressed the health issue. The Army is currently extracting lead to a level which is safe and appropriate for the type of proposed recreational uses at the beach. Also, refer to response to comment 55-8.

351-63. The commenter would like an alternative reuse of Fort Ord that contains no UXO. The Army is responsible for removing military related OE in perpetuity at Fort Ord (Earth Tech 1997). The OE found to date and potentially remaining OE in unknown areas of Fort Ord include various small arms caliber ordnance, projectiles, rockets and guided missiles, hand grenades, land mines, pyrotechnics, bombs, demolition materials, etc. Unexploded ordnance contractors have been involved in conducting sampling and removal activities since 1993. Based on Archives Search Reports (ASR) sites are identified and OE removed to a depth of up to 4 feet.

The EE/CA discusses what the Army has found to date and acknowledges that the OE removal process is "a work in progress" and that "new information and further discoveries inherently affect the findings and recommendations of the EE/CA" (Earth Tech 1997). To date, the maximum depth of OE removal has been 4 feet,

though there may be OE at greater depths (Ibid.). The Army will not be scouring the entire base, thus "all current and future recipients of former Fort Ord property must be made aware that, for nearly 80 years, the installation was used for a variety of military activities that involved OE, and that any area of the installation may potentially contain OE" (Ibid.). To remove all OE is technically feasible but economically infeasible. This compels a conclusion that an alternative discussion in the EIR which includes a zero OE is not feasible. Therefore, such an alternative will not be discussed.

Refer to response to comment 32-1 for additional discussion on UXO/OE.

351-64. The commenter would like a mitigation requiring 100 percent removal of OE. The commenter is referred to response to comment 32-1.

351-65. The commenter would like a map of the existing wells and the plume from the landfill. There is a plume of toxics in the groundwater (180-foot aquifer) associated with the landfill. The plume is currently in containment through a series of pumping wells which allow for the extraction of the contaminated groundwater and its treatment before its return to the groundwater. This process is currently keeping the plume from migrating any further (Gail Youngblood, pers. com., March 6, 1997). If the commenter would like a map of existing wells and the plume, the commenter is deferred to the office of the Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management (DENR) at Fort Ord.

Response to Letter 352

352-1. The commenter would like a revised discussion of the cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR addresses this issue. Refer to section 5.0 in the Draft EIR.

Response to Letter 353

353-1. The commenter states that there are metals in the water which exceeds maximum allowable limits. The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response. However, if potable water exceeds the allowable limits of the various constituents that Title 22 prescribed, this would have to be addressed by the water purveyor.

Response to Letter 354

354-1 The commenter states that the landfill is not adequately addressed in the EIR. The landfill site has been capped. In addition, the aquifer that underlies the landfill is also being pumped and filtered to remove volatile organic compounds.

This is an ongoing project that will continue for many years due to the extensive contamination.

354-2. The commenter is concerned with chemical agent identification sets found at Fort Ord and would like a discussion of this issue in the EIR. Refer to response to comment 348-2.

354-3. The commenter would like a revised UXO figure. Refer to response to comment 213-20.

Response to Letter 355

355-1. The commenter is concerned about water use. Refer to response to comment letter 8-5 for an expanded discussion on water use and response to comment letter 21-1 regarding phased development vis-a-vis water.

Response to Letter 356

356-1. The commenter would like a project that is limited by natural resource constraints. The Reuse Plan accommodates future development based on the limited resources available to it. Also, the Reuse Plan now incorporates stronger language pertaining to development and constraints. Refer to response to comment 21-1.

Response to Letter 357

357-1. The commenter submits an opinion on the proposed project. Comment noted.

357-2. The commenter would like information on employment, housing, etc. The commenter is referred to the Reuse Plan, Volume I.

357-3. The commenter would like alternatives to the project. Refer to the alternatives discussion in the Draft EIR, Section 6.

357-4. The commenter recommends a format for development of the Reuse Plan. Comment noted.

357-5. The commenter would like information on environmental impacts. Refer to section 4 of the EIR.

357-6. The commenter would like to know where the water would come from. This issue is discussed in the Draft EIR in section 4.4 and is augmented with additional information contained in response to comment 8-5.

Response to Letter 358

358-1. The commenter would like a revised Draft EIR.

Response to Letter 359

359-1. The commenter would like a revised Draft EIR.

Response to Letter 360

360-1. The commenter would like a revised Draft EIR.

Response to Letter 361

361-1. The commenter would like incentives to help Marina and Seaside.
Comment noted.

Response to Letter 362

362-1. The commenter would like reuse based on existing water at Fort Ord. The water available to Fort Ord is part of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. A safe-yield water supply is assured through policies and programs presented in the Draft and Final EIRs. Refer to response to comment 8-5 for information on water use and 21-1 for future development based on water constraints.

3.0 REFERENCES

3.1 Bibliography

- Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. *1994 Regional Population and Employment Forecast*. May 11, 1994
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. *Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan*. May 1996.
- CH2MHILL. *Monterey Peninsula Reclaimed Water Urban Reuse Feasibility Study Update*. Final Report. September 1996
- Earth Tech. *Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis - Phase I*. Draft. January 1997
- EDAW, Inc. and EMC Planning Group, Inc. *Fort Ord Reuse Plan. Appendix B: Business and Operations Plan*. May, 1996
- EIP Associates. *Near-Term Desalination Project*. December 7, 1992.
- EMC Planning Group, Inc., *Fort Ord Infrastructure Improvement Project Environmental Assessment/Initial Study*. April 1996
- JHK & Associates. *Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study*. January 6, 1997
- Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*. October 1995.
- Monterey County Water Resources Agency. *Hydrogeology and Water Supply of Salinas Valley, A White Paper Prepared by the Salinas Valley Ground Water Basin Hydrology Conference*. June 1995.
- Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. *Monterey County Housing Element*. November 10, 1992
- Montgomery Watson. *MCWRA Basin Management Plan. Technical Memorandum*. June 3, 1996
- Reimer, Paul. Reimer Associates. *Response to Water Questions*. August 15, 1996
- Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group. *Assessment of Planning Baseline and Market Data - Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan*. November 7, 1995
- Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group. *Final FORA Comprehensive Plan (CBP): Response to Requests for Clarifications*. July 24, 1996
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. *Other Physical Attributes Baseline Study of Fort Ord*. April 1992
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. *Environmental Impact Statement - Fort Ord Disposal and Reuse*. Final, Volume 1. June 1993.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. *Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement - Fort Ord Disposal and Reuse*. Final. June 1996.

Zander Associates. *Biological Resources Management Planning*, September 1995

3.2 Persons Contacted

Bowles, Jim. Naval Post Graduate School Public Works Department

Eisen, Dave. Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management

Heydt, Henry. California Department of Education. School Facilities Planning Division. Assistant Director.

Israel, Keith. Monterey County Regional Water Pollution Control Agency

Lord, Trisha. California State University, Monterey Bay

Temple, Linda. Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management

Rose, Stan. California Department of Education

Thomasburg, Kathy. Monterey County Water Resources Agency

Youngblood, Gail. Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management

Youngblood, Rich. Marina Coast Water District

3.3 Report Preparers

Fort Ord Reuse Authority

Michael Houlemard, Executive Officer

Dennis Potter, Planning Services Manager

EMC Planning Group

Michael Groves, Principal

Allan Gatzke, Project Manager

Matthew Sundt, Project Manager

Appendix C

Table of Comments

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING TABLE HAS BEEN ALPHABETIZED IN THREE SECTIONS. THE HEAVY SOLID LINES ON PAGES 35 AND 73 IN THIS TABLE DELINEATE THE THREE SECTIONS.

TABLE OF COMMENTS

COMMENT NUMBER	SUMMARY OF COMMENT	SUBJECT
4-1	The commenter has submitted the same comments in comment letter 1.	
14-5	Refer to comment letter 30	
14-6	Refer to comment letter 31	
59-15	The commenter states that FORA should proceed carefully with approving the project and consider its ramifications.	ADVISE
56-6	Army air remission reduction credit discussion need to be revised	AIR QUALITY
56-7	Request for discussion on Rule 1000	AIR QUALITY
56-8	Request for amendment to ambient Air Quality discussion	AIR QUALITY
56-9	Request consistency determination with AQMP	AIR QUALITY
56-10	Conformity determination w/ transportation Conformity Rule	AIR QUALITY
56-11	Air Quality policies should apply to all Ft. Ord Jurisdictions, not just Marina + Seaside	AIR QUALITY
56-12	Clarification on EPA requirements	AIR QUALITY
56-13	Revise Caline 4 Analysis	AIR QUALITY
56-14	Define Sensitive receptors	AIR QUALITY
165-37	The commenter states that the discussion of emission credits is incorrect.	AIR QUALITY
165-38	The commenter states that quantification of emissions should be conducted for each roadway and the results included in the EIR.	AIR QUALITY
165-41	The commenter requests that cumulative impacts need to be quantified and used in making a consistency determination for compliance with the existing AQMP.	AIR QUALITY
165-39	The commenter states that specific mitigation measures and their effectiveness should be identified and a matrix showing how these measures would reduce emissions.	AIR QUALITY/CEQA
165-40	The commenter would like to know who is responsible for mitigation implementation.	AIR QUALITY/CEQA

164-2	The commenter would like information on a new runway and runway extension at the airport.	AIRPORT
27-3	Alternatives	ALTERNATIVES
51-2	The commenter states that the "No Project" alternative should be selected as the project.	ALTERNATIVES
67-3.	The commenter would like to know what are the alternatives to the plan.	ALTERNATIVES
82-4.	The commenter would like to know if there are project alternatives including one designed to reduce significant impacts.	ALTERNATIVES
82-5.	The commenter states that the EIR does not discuss a project alternative that reduces impacts.	ALTERNATIVES
117-1	The commenter would like to know why the proposed project with twice the population of alternative 6R would have fewer impacts to sensitive habitat.	ALTERNATIVES
139-33	The commenter states that the EIR lacks feasible and reasonable alternatives.	ALTERNATIVES
165-4	The commenter states that an alternative that is limited by the constraints of existing infrastructure or support facilities needs to be included in the EIR.	ALTERNATIVES
165-5	The commenter would like a discussion of baseline conditions associated with the No Project alternative.	ALTERNATIVES
165-6	The commenter requests that each alternative be compared based on economic information.	ALTERNATIVES
165-7	The commenter would like the EIR to include an alternative which is based on existing infrastructure limitations.	ALTERNATIVES
165-30	The commenter requests that an alternative be discussed that is based on minimizing environmental impacts.	ALTERNATIVES
165-31	The commenter reiterates that the "No Project" alternative does not fulfill project objectives for economic enhancement and states the EIR does not provide a reasonable range of project alternatives.	ALTERNATIVES
165-49	The commenter states that the EIR must include a discussion of a reasonable range of alternatives and states that both of the environmentally superior alternatives were rejected.	ALTERNATIVES
165-60	The commenter would like to know what are the groundwater policies that Alternatives 7 and 8 are inconsistent with.	ALTERNATIVES
142-7	The commenter is requesting an alternatives discussion that includes a project based on safe yield water use only.	ALTERNATIVES WATER
155-5	The commenter would like an alternative that includes development limited to the year 2015.	ALTERNATIVES/
98-4	The commenter would Like to know if there is a smaller project alternative.	ALTERNATIVES/SB 899
82-6.	The commenter is concerned with an alternative project description that does not exceed the available water supply.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER

89-15	The commenter requests that the EIR consider only a population supported by a source of on-site, safe yield water.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
90-5	The commenter would like the EIR revised to reflect development at Fort Ord based on water resources that now exist at Fort Ord.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
91-1	The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate a reduced project supported by a source of on-site, safe yield water only.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
97-1	The commenter would like more information on the groundwater policies that Alternatives 6R, 7 and 8 are inconsistent with.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
133-1	The commenter states that the EIR should consider a safe yield alternative.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
165-32	The commenter requests that a project alternative be included in the EIR which is based on existing groundwater resources.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
167-6	The commenter states that the AMBAG 1994 population forecast for the year 2015 used in Table 5.2-1 is incorrect.	AMBAG
167-32	The commenter states that Table 5.2-1 in the EIR contains incorrect AMBAG population forecast information.	AMBAG
167-33	The commenter states the population statistics are incorrect in the EIR.	AMBAG
56-15	Consistency w/ AMBAG pop. projections	AMBAG CONSISTENCY
1-4	The commenter asks for clarification of whether the AMBAG population forecasts include student, POM Annex, and the rehabilitation of existing residential neighborhoods on the base.	AMBAG STATS
1-5	Same as 1-4	AMBAG STATS
21-2	AMBAG population figures?	AMBAG STATS
7-1	Comment re: annexation procedure	ANNEXATION
60-1	The commenter points out that the annexation process is not adequately addressed in the text and maps of the Reuse Plan and EIR.	ANNEXATION
57-2	Polygon 29C conveyance to Monterey has not occurred yet	ANNEXATION/MONTEREY
164-15	The commenter would like to know where in the EIR is there a discussion on the protection of "high sensitivity" archaeological resources. Refer to pages 4-153 to 4-156 in the EIR.	ARCHAEOLOGY
139-43	The commenter would like more information regarding the sale of land by the Army without a local reuse plan in place.	ARMY
1-19	The commenter provides additional descriptive material regarding existing bicycle access to the Pacific Coast Bikeway.	BIKE
164-18	The commenter recommends to the FORA board that South Boundary Road be included as a bike and pedestrian trail. The commenter would like to know what hiking and bicycle clubs and associations were consulted by FORA when it developed the Fort Ord trails plan.	BIKE
118-1	The commenter would like to know what BRAC law would allow the Army to sell off the land.	BRAC LAW
60-59.	The commenter states that the Business Plan has not been thoroughly integrated into the Reuse Plan and EIR.	BUSINESS PLAN

44-1	The commenter would like a cemetery	CEMETERY
119-1	The commenter would like information on a national cemetery	CEMETERY
36-5	The commenter states the EIR is too general and lacks adequate details on infrastructure impacts and impacts of mitigation measures.	CEQA
55-2	Revise EIR every 5 years	CEQA
55-12	EIR must be consistent w/ local plans	CEQA
89-2	The commenter is concerned about adequate discussion of impacts associated with development beyond the year 2015.	CEQA
142-17	The commenter states that the lack of easy availability of the EIR seems to violate the intent of CEQA.	CEQA
155-3	The commenter would like to know if the programs and policies are enforceable.	CEQA
155-4	The commenter states the feasibility of mitigations must be addressed. CEQA requires that all mitigations be feasible, reasonable, and enforceable.	CEQA
155-8	The commenter would like to know what "CEQA case" is being referred to in the EIR on page 4-2.	CEQA
165-1	The commenter states that the EIR does not fulfill any of the requirements of CEQA he lists.	CEQA
165-2	The commenter states that the level of analysis in the program level EIR prepared for the Fort Ord Reuse Plan is inadequate based on his interpretation of CEQA.	CEQA
165-8	The commenter states the EIR mitigations are vague and unquantifiable.	CEQA
165-9	The commenter states that the mitigations in the EIR, which include policies and programs, are inadequate because they require future studies or consultation with regulatory agencies.	CEQA
165-20	The commenter states that performance standards are required as part of the EIR.	CEQA
165-22	The commenter states that the mitigations in the EIR are inadequate and states that the EIR misleads the reader into thinking that the programs and policies will be enacted.	CEQA
165-34	The commenter states that the EIR does not identify who is responsible for implementation of mitigations.	CEQA
165-36	The commenter states that the mitigation that would allow FORA to fund off-site roadways at their discretion is inadequate because options, priorities, financial needs, potential funding, etc. are not described.	CEQA
165-42	The commenter states that the mitigations are not made specific to the cities of Marina and Seaside.	CEQA
165-43	The commenter states that the UCMBEST Center impacts discussed in the EIR are inadequate.	CEQA

165-61	The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate and needs to be reissued as a revised Draft EIR.	CEQA
167-2	The commenter points out that the EIR identifies unmitigated significant impacts.	CEQA
6-1	Ft. Ord Dunes State Beach vs. Park	COASTAL
6-2	Change acreage of dunes to 885 acres	COASTAL
6-4	Regional Multi-agency visitor center	COASTAL
6-5	Coastal Frontage Road	COASTAL
37-1	controlled beach access	COASTAL
111-1	The commenter would like to know if future City of Marina plans for the coast will affect plans for coastal development within Fort Ord.	COASTAL
139-10	The commenter would like to know if the plan is consistent with the coastal act.	COASTAL ACT
55-8	Lead removal from beaches	COASTAL/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
1-18	The commenter refers to text in the Administrative draft that has been subsequently changed in the draft Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
9-9	The commenter requests clarification of the ownership of the golf courses.	CORRECTING TEXT
9-13	The commenter recommends that the financial information in the Comprehensive Business Plan be reviewed to substantiate the development model, projections and assumptions.	CORRECTING TEXT
9-15	The commenter requests that the residential development represented in the various portions of the Reuse Plan be consistent.	CORRECTING TEXT
56-1	Table 4.7-2 + 4.7-3 are switched	CORRECTING TEXT
57-9	Amend table 3.3-1	CORRECTING TEXT
57-10	Amend table 3.10-1	CORRECTING TEXT
57-11	Indicate that Poly .29b + 29d are within Park/R&D District	CORRECTING TEXT
57-12	Amend text in Community Park discussion	CORRECTING TEXT
57-16	States "NRMA" is incorrect. need to state "Habitat Management" (HM)	CORRECTING TEXT
57-18	Revise table 2.4-1 so that it adds up to 100%	CORRECTING TEXT
57-19	Map indicates NRMA instead of "HM"	CORRECTING TEXT
57-20	Change reference to Appendix A to "B"	CORRECTING TEXT
57-22	Change Table 3.3-1 in Business Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
60-11.	The commenter states that Fort Ord was selected for closure in 1991 not 1990.	CORRECTING TEXT
60-16.	The commenter requests text amendment pertaining to description of Neighborhood Retail locations.	CORRECTING TEXT
60-19.	The commenter notes incorrect directional reference pertaining to the location of open space at Fort Ord.	CORRECTING TEXT
60-36.	The commenter points out that Program D-1.2 is out of place.	CORRECTING TEXT
60-38.	The commenter notes that the Broadway Avenue gate access to Fort Ord is open.	CORRECTING TEXT

60-60.	The commenter points out that "RKS" should read "RKG".	CORRECTING TEXT
155-14	The commenter points out that Table 5.2-1 appears contradictory.	CORRECTING TEXT
167-13	Tables 4.7-2 and 4.7-3 were inadvertently mislabeled.	CORRECTING TEXT
167-14	The commenter requests that a misspelling be changed and that the AMBAG population and employment forecast of 1994 is missing from the bibliography.	CORRECTING TEXT
167-24	The commenter states there is a typographical error in paragraph 4 on page 4-82.	CORRECTING TEXT
62-1.	The commenter is concerned about payment to the Army for the Fort Ord property.	COST OF LAND
64-2.	The commenter wants to know if the requirement to pay the Army for the land would kill the project.	COST OF LAND
48-4	CSUMB # of Students	CSUMB
108-1	The commenter would like to know if more housing will be allocated to CSUMB.	CSUMB
139-8	The commenter requests that the CSUMB master plan be included in the Reuse Plan EIR.	CSUMB/PLANNING
164-11	The commenter would like to know where in the EIR is there a discussion of the approved and proposed developments.	CUMULATIVE
88-5	The commenter requests that the EIR discuss cumulative impacts.	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS
89-13	The commenter would like to know if the Reuse Plan has taken into account the growth in the entire region.	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS
142-14	The commenter states that the cumulative impacts analysis in the EIR is inadequate.	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS
139-34	The commenter states the EIR omitted cumulative projects.	CUMULATIVE PROJECTS
1-12	The commenter requests clarification regarding how the Reuse Plan identifies the development areas for the City of Del Rey Oaks.	DEL REY OAKS
1-14	The commenter states that the South Gate Planning Area should be identified as Del Rey Oaks.	DEL REY OAKS
60-13.	The commenter states that Polygons 31a and 31b have not been properly labeled or identified in the Reuse Plan [and by association the EIR].	DEL REY OAKS
60-46.	The commenter states that Figure 3.2-1 is incorrectly drawn. The NAE area appears to be too large and the polygon border and label are inaccurate.	DEL REY OAKS
60-48.	The commenter requests that the EIR acknowledge that Del Rey Oaks has made a formal request to LAFCO to annex properties in Monterey County Jurisdiction.	DEL REY OAKS
60-49.	The commenter states that Figure 3.6-1 is incorrectly drawn and should reflect the current status of request to LAFCO.	DEL REY OAKS
60-51.	The commenter states open space relating to the "Frog Pond" (Polygon 31a) should be 15 acres not 22 acres.	DEL REY OAKS

60-53.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks be referenced in text.	DEL REY OAKS
60-55.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks be referenced in text.	DEL REY OAKS
60-56.	The commenter states that there should not be barriers to Polygon 31a.	DEL REY OAKS
60-57.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks be referenced in text.	DEL REY OAKS
60-65.	The commenter requests additional language be added to the text pertaining to Community Building Strategy.	DEL REY OAKS
60-66.	The commenter states that the "opportunity zone" concept for the South Gate Planning Area should be included in the discussion.	DEL REY OAKS
60-67.	The commenter requests that the Del Rey Oaks conference center, hotel and golf course be added to an exhibit.	DEL REY OAKS
60-68	The commenter requests that the proposed Del Rey Oaks hotel site be included in the discussion.	DEL REY OAKS
60-69	The commenter requests that the proposed Del Rey Oaks golf course site be included in the discussion.	DEL REY OAKS
60-79	Commenter requests identification of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey as proposed land recipients.	DEL REY OAKS
60-80	Commenter requests identification of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey as proposed land recipients.	DEL REY OAKS
60-82.	Commenter requests that a general geographic reference to the Southwest and Northwest service areas be changed to the "Southgate Planning Area."	DEL REY OAKS
60-86.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey should be identified.	DEL REY OAKS
60-90.	The commenter notes that the PFIP correctly identifies the habitat area as 15 acres on Polygon 31a.	DEL REY OAKS
60-43.	The commenter states that the ephemeral drainage into the Frog Pond from development should not be precluded because implementation of Best Management Practices can preserve the quality of the habitat in the Frog Pond.	DEL REY OAKS/DRAINAGE
60-17.	The commenter requests text amendment pertaining to potential future commercial property in Del Rey Oaks and the Hwy 68 by-pass.	DEL REY OAKS/HWY 68 BYPASS
60-74	The commenter questions the demolition costs of unrealistically high.	DEMOLITION/FINANCING
139-11	The commenter states that there are no accurate estimate for demolition costs.	DEMOLITION/FINANCING
6-3	Desal Plant acreage w/in area of existing sewage treatment Plant	DESALINATION
55-7	The commenter would like to know where a desal plant would be located and would like to know if depositing brine into the bay is allowed.	DESALINATION
94-1	The commenter is concerned about the potential environmental impacts associated with a desalination plant.	DESALINATION

162-13	The commenter states that the desalination plant should be identified in the Dunes State Park Plan.	DESALINATION
165-58	The commenter requests additional information on desalination	DESALINATION
165-13	The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.1 will be implemented.	DRAINAGE
165-14	The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.2 will be implemented.	DRAINAGE
165-15	The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program B-1.3 will be implemented.	DRAINAGE
165-16	The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-2 will be implemented.	DRAINAGE
165-17	The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-3 will be implemented.	DRAINAGE
165-18	The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program C-3.1 will be implemented.	DRAINAGE
165-19	The commenter would like to know how Hydrology and Water Quality Program C-3.2 will be implemented.	DRAINAGE
165-24	The commenter requests detailed analysis of future stormwater detention requirements.	DRAINAGE
165-56	This comment repeats the previous comment (#24).	DRAINAGE
165-57	This comment repeats the previous comment (#24).	DRAINAGE
139-42	The commenter would like more information on the characteristics of dune outfall pipe relating to stormwater runoff.	DRAINAGE/COASTAL
11-1	Commenter wants shooting ranges	EAST GARRISON
1-6	The commenter states that page 2-6 of the Reuse Plan is incorrect as it pertains to soldiers spending in the local community.	ECONOMIC STATS
20-1	# of dwelling units and vacancy rates	ECONOMIC STATS
60-62.	The commenter states that the absorption rates forecast needs to include a golf course in the 1996-2000 planning horizon.	ECONOMIC/FORECAST
95-1	The commenter states that the proposed buildout population of 72,000 is not justified by the enabling legislation that created FORA as a means to economic recovery.	ECONOMIC/SB 899
1-2	The commenter questions whether the CSUMB campus will create a level of economic activity approximating that of the military departing the area since the students are only around for approximately 9 months (or 180 academic days).	ECONOMICS
67-4.	The commenter would like to know if the economic analysis assumption are in the Draft EIR or Reuse Plan.	ECONOMICS
142-13	The commenter would like more information on economic development.	ECONOMICS

9-2	The commenter asks for clarification of the demographic and employment overview summarized in the Comprehensive Business Plan and specifically requests background information for the employment projections.	EMPLOYMENT
36-2	Request for executive Summary	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
48-5	Summary vs. Ex. Summary + overlays	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
60-81	Commenter requests that the PFIP and PSP have an integrated executive summary.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
9-7	Commenter refers to the numerous PBC requests for properties in the planning area identified as the University Village in Seaside.	FINANCING
9-16	The commenter would like to know why will municipalities not be entitled to either payments in lieu of property taxes or franchise fees from system earnings.	FINANCING
9-17	The commenter states the burden of financing non-profit housing by the City of Marina needs to be addressed.	FINANCING
9-18	Commenter notes explanations of impact fees, special taxes, cash flows, LOS, land value analyses, debt service, and capital costs, etc., are presented without embellishment.	FINANCING
34-3	The commenter is concerned with infrastructure development financing.	FINANCING
36-6	What happens if \$ can't be raised	FINANCING
36-7	Where is discussion about current resident taxpayer who are going to be affected by new development	FINANCING
60-2	The commenter states that page IV-18 of the Reuse Plan has dramatic impact on the role and financial future of FORA.	FINANCING
60-63.	The commenter states that the costs in exhibit 4 need to include the phasing of capital improvements more closely linked to proposed development scenarios.	FINANCING
60-64.	The commenter questions the cost burden on future development.	FINANCING
60-72	The commenter questions some of the financial performance model results.	FINANCING
60-73	The commenter questions some of the financial performance model results.	FINANCING
60-75	Commenter questions some of the financial performance model results.	FINANCING
60-76	Commenter observes that the results of the model may not be realistic if other assumptions do not materialize.	FINANCING
60-77	Commenter questions some of the financial performance model results.	FINANCING
60-78	Commenter observes that a program for sharing revenues and costs among affected local governments has not been approved.	FINANCING

60-89.	The commenter suggests the infrastructure costs exceed current land values.	FINANCING
63-2.	The commenter wants to know if proposition 218 has been weighted in the Reuse Plan.	FINANCING
63-3.	The commenter wants to know if the Reuse Plan's "balanced budget" would be "unbalanced" if the Reuse Plan were modified.	FINANCING
64-1.	The commenter wants to know if costs contained in the Reuse Plan were firmer than the income/revenue estimates.	FINANCING
66-2.	The commenter wants to know if the financial information is available for public review.	FINANCING
66-3.	The commenter wants to know who is responsible for Mello-Roos financing.	FINANCING
88-4	The commenter would like to know who is responsible for the infrastructure required.	FINANCING
139-39	The commenter would like more information on the "shared revenue stream".	FINANCING
155-19	The commenter requests that additional information on financing be provided.	FINANCING
3-1	The commenter expresses concern that the Public Service Plan in Appendix B of the Reuse Plan may overstate the revenues to the City of Marina.	FINANCING/MARINA
59-5	The commenter would like to know how many students equal a Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) student.	FTE
1-17	The commenter refers to text in the Administrative draft that has been subsequently changed in the draft Reuse Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
9-1	The commenter notes that there is a multiplicity of agendas within FORA.	GENERAL COMMENT
9-11	The commenter requests clarification of the location of the "Planned Residential Extension Districts."	GENERAL COMMENT
34-2	The commenter states that there are some conflicts between the numbers used in the various documents.	GENERAL COMMENT
48-2	City boundaries	GENERAL COMMENT
52	The commenter states that the EIR is loaded with assumptions and the people need the opportunity to ask where the assumptions lead.	GENERAL COMMENT
53	The commenter states that AMBAG has concerns regarding the percentages used in the draft are not AMBAG numbers.	GENERAL COMMENT
54	Comment is not pertinent to substance of the EIR	GENERAL COMMENT
60-8	The commenter request that persons names be referenced in the Reuse Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
60-37.	The commenter points out that the reference to "club house" should be pluralized.	GENERAL COMMENT
60-83.	Commenter suggests that "key informants" should be identified.	GENERAL COMMENT

67-6.	The commenter would like to know what happened at Hamilton Air Force Base.	GENERAL COMMENT
70-1	The commenter would like to know where UCSC is, what is the current status of the cemetery and why the Army gave land away and spent \$500 million to clean it up. The commenter would like to know if there are no solutions to long range plan than why proceed.	GENERAL COMMENT
71-1.	Where will the proceeds from the sale of land go. The commenter would like to know if there are no solutions to long range plan than why proceed.	GENERAL COMMENT
72-1.	The commenter addresses transportation, water, pollution, loss of open space and wildlife as it pertains to the proposed project.	GENERAL COMMENT
73-6.	The commenter states that the proposed project has too many visitor-serving facilities and that visitors clog roads, take long showers, leave their pollutants and then leave town.	GENERAL COMMENT
82-3.	The commenter would like to know if the EIR provides adequate impact analysis and realistic mitigations.	GENERAL COMMENT
88-7	The commenter requests that FORA staff or an independent authority review the EIR for their professional judgment.	GENERAL COMMENT
89-11	The commenter would like to know if the Monterey Peninsula can absorb an additional 1,800 more hotel rooms and its tourists who do not worry about water conservation.	GENERAL COMMENT
92-2	The commenter would like to know why all the FORA board members are not present.	GENERAL COMMENT
105-1	The commenter states that Fort Ord is necessary for economic health of the community.	GENERAL COMMENT
126-2	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan contains speculative "assumptions".	GENERAL COMMENT
134-1	The commenter states without submitting any particulars that the EIR is incomplete and inadequate.	GENERAL COMMENT
135-1	The commenter supports the previous two comments.	GENERAL COMMENT
137-1	The commenter agrees with the previous comment	GENERAL COMMENT
139-5	The commenter would like additional information on "aggregate totals" and "not to exceed envelopes".	GENERAL COMMENT
139-18	The commenter would like more information on the number of hotel units currently in the planning stages in the Monterey Bay area.	GENERAL COMMENT
139-19	The commenter would like for information on baseline data.	GENERAL COMMENT
139-21	The commenter would like for information on internal inconsistencies.	GENERAL COMMENT
139-25	The commenter states that mitigation measures should not be confused with the project.	GENERAL COMMENT
139-27	The commenter states that the "no project" alternative could result in 34,000 residents requiring 9,000 afy of water.	GENERAL COMMENT

139-31	The commenter states that the policies and programs are not legally enforceable.	GENERAL COMMENT
139-41	The commenter states that a stable and finite project description is lacking.	GENERAL COMMENT
139-48	The commenter would like more information on undevelopable areas at Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
148-1	The commenter would like more information on vocational service relative to housing development.	GENERAL COMMENT
149-1	The commenter states that Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) at Marina would excel in occupational training.	GENERAL COMMENT
150-1	The commenter supports keeping some large lots at Fort Ord as in Marina.	GENERAL COMMENT
155-6	The commenter states that impacts associated with development beyond 2015 are based on modeling.	GENERAL COMMENT
155-7	The commenter provides clarification on the "underlying activity" described in the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
155-18	The commenter recommends to the decision makers to recognize that economic success depends on conservation of its natural resources.	GENERAL COMMENT
162-1	The commenter would like to know if there will be a redevelopment agency at Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
162-4	The commenter states that institutional facilities will enhance the economy.	GENERAL COMMENT
162-8	The commenter states that the future forecast for light-industrial development by 2015 is relative small compared to the City of San Jose.	GENERAL COMMENT
162-12	The commenter points out that lodging facilities proposed at Fort Ord will be good for Sand City and will not compete with the Sand City lodging facilities that are coastal oriented.	GENERAL COMMENT
164-5	The commenter would like to know why the EIR does not reflect the CSUMB president's statement that the population at CSUMB would probably never achieve 25,000 full-time students.	GENERAL COMMENT
164-8	The commenter apparently disapproves of using Highway 156 to attract Silicon Valley satellite facilities.	GENERAL COMMENT
164-10	The commenter would like to know if "big semi-trucks going into the new business parks at Fort Ord" is discussed in the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
164-19	The commenter would like to know what an HOV is.	GENERAL COMMENT
164-20	The commenter would like to know what "fine-grained" means.	GENERAL COMMENT
165-21	The commenter requests that agreements between jurisdictions be developed prior to certification of the EIR and approval of a Reuse Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
167-5	The commenter requests that the word substantially be removed from the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT

139-38	The commenter would like more information pertaining to seismic hazards	GEOLOGY
164-16	The commenter would like economic and market analysis for justifying golf courses.	GOLF COURSE
34-1	The commenter states the various graphics in the Reuse Plan and EIR reference 605 acres in the UC Natural Reserve System. This is incorrect.	GRAPHICS
57-17	Changes figures 4.1-4, 4.1-7 and 4.4-1 in Vol. 2	GRAPHICS
57-21	Change Figures 3.2-1, 3.2-2, 3.6-1 and 6.4-1 in EIR	GRAPHICS
59-4.	The commenter states that jurisdiction delineation on maps use different graphics type nomenclature, which makes understanding the graphics difficult.	GRAPHICS
60-58.	The commenter requests that a figure be provided in color.	GRAPHICS
60-70	The commenter states that Figure 3.3-1 does not correctly depict Polygon 31a and 31b.	GRAPHICS
60-71	The commenter states that the exhibit should include reference to the cities of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey.	GRAPHICS/DEL REY OAKS
96-1	The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate because it does not discuss the specific location of future groundwater recharge areas which would result in a reduction of the area for urban development.	GROUNDWATER RECHARGE
142-12	The commenter would like more information on growth.	GROWTH
139-15	The commenter would like more information on growth inducing impacts.	GROWTH INDUCEMENT
165-50	The commenter states that the project is growth inducing and if used as a project alternative is a revised EIR, should be identified as such.	GROWTH INDUCING
46-3	Growth Management and water/Sewer	GROWTH MANAGEMENT/ WATER/SEWER
164-13	The commenter would like to know what changes to the EIR will be required to accommodate known threatened and endangered species that occur in the coastal dunes.	HABITAT
164-14	The commenter would like to know where in the EIR are specific plans to protect threatened and endangered species.	HABITAT
167-31	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should use principles of the emerging field of Conservation Biology and provide habitat corridor linkages.	HABITAT
162-2	The commenter points out a clarification in the text pertaining to sharing costs for costs of habitat should be limited to Fort Ord jurisdictions.	HABITAT/FINANCING
162-14	The commenter reiterates comment 2 above.	HABITAT/FINANCING
59-8	The commenter states that Table 5.1.1 on page 5-1 of the EIR does not include the Hatton Canyon Freeway, but the Reuse Plan does on page 3-66.	HATTON CANYON

89-7	The commenter would like to know if the Reuse Plan assumes a new Hatton Canyon roadway.	HATTON CANYON
8-1	Army should be responsible for "toxic" paint on bldg..	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
8-2	"Toxic" bldg.. as it pertains to 4000 acres	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
8-3	Negotiable between FORA and Army rd. toxic and bldgs.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
8-4	\$400,000.00 is "preposterous" re: pilot program to recycle "toxic" bldgs.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
98-2	The commenter is concerned with toxics and the timing of buildout.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
98-5	The commenter would like to know if the cost of demolition will be partially paid by other peninsula cities.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
139-6	The commenter would like additional information on asbestos and lead contamination clean up.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
139-44	The commenter would like more information on the subject of toxics.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
16-4	Toxics and ordnance	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/ORDNANCE
139-20	The commenter would like more information on inclusionary housing.	HOUSING
158-1	The commenter wants existing housing units to be rented.	HOUSING
162-10	The commenter states that future Fort Ord housing will compete with Sand City housing.	HOUSING
164-6	The commenter would like additional information on the existing housing market.	HOUSING
155-20	The commenter states that a housing element is required because the reuse plan is a general plan and all general plans require a housing element.	HOUSING ELEMENT
155-21	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should include the use/destruction/sale of housing in the Housing Element.	HOUSING ELEMENT
155-22	The commenter would like an inclusionary housing program included in the Housing Element of the Reuse Plan.	HOUSING ELEMENT
155-23	The commenter requests that the statement contained in the Business Plan that states "both Seaside and Marina have a sufficient supply of low income housing within their existing residential areas" be substantiated.	HOUSING ELEMENT
155-24	The commenter states that housing to meet the needs of the community is needed.	HOUSING ELEMENT
114-1	The commenter would like to know if the Reuse Plan is consistent with the County's 1,200 low and moderate income housing units set aside at Fort Ord.	HOUSING/COUNTY
35-1	Remove 1000' r/o/w from graphics	HWY 68 BYPASS
40-1	Hwy 68 bypass needed	HWY 68 BYPASS
59-6	The commenter want to know if the two parallel dashed lines shown in the southern boundary area of Fort Ord is the Hwy 68 bypass.	HWY 68 BYPASS
59-7	The commenter would like to know what the dashed lined indicate.	HWY 68 BYPASS

59-10	The commenter points out that the EIR and Reuse Plan indicate conflicting positions on whether the Hwy 68 by-pass will be constructed or not and the EIR does not provide an analysis of what the characteristics of local roadways will be without construction of this project.	HWY 68 BYPASS
139-9	The commenter states that Caltrans needs an alternative Highway 68 alignment.	HWY 68 BYPASS
159-1	The commenter states that the Caltrans right-of-way proposal for the Highway 68 Bypass was not properly advertised and the commenter requests that the right-of-way for this bypass depicted in the Reuse Plan be removed.	HWY 68 BYPASS
163-1	The commenter reiterates his previous comment (#159).	HWY 68 BYPASS
139-22	The commenter would like more information on land sales.	LAND SALES
139-26	The commenter would like more information on "newly excessed parcels".	LAND SALES
139-24 60-45.	The commenter would like more information on the landfill site. The commenter notes an inappropriate reference to Marina is contained in the County of Monterey section on cultural resources.	LANDFILL MARINA
9-5	The commenter disagrees on the marketing approach advanced by the real estate economist.	MARKETING
162-5	The commenter states that Fort Ord may be difficult to market because of the costs of water and road systems.	MARKETING
162-6	The commenter points out that because there are three jurisdictions at Fort Ord developing clear development agenda and process at Fort Ord may be difficult.	MARKETING
162-7	The commenter points out that Fort Ord will be perceived as "extremely sensitive to environmental growth issues".	MARKETING
162-9	The commenter states that the future forecast for research and development is unpredictable.	MARKETING
162-11	The commenter questions if the economic forecast for an "entertainment center", which includes shopping, restaurants and multi-screen theaters, would be in demand during the projected construction period 2011 to 2015.	MARKETING
164-3	The commenter states that the "village" commercial viability is questionable due to the proximity of "big box" retailers.	MARKETING
59-11 1-3	The commenter requests information on the Marina Coast Water District. The commenter would prefer to see the ethnicity breakdown for all cities on the peninsula rather than for just Marina, Seaside and Sand City.	MCWD METHODOLOGY
89-12	The commenter would like to know if the plan has factored in the existing hotel rooms and development currently under construction.	METHODOLOGY

59-9	The commenter points out that the EIR and Reuse Plan indicate conflicting positions on whether the Hatton Canyon project will be constructed or not and the EIR does not provide an analysis of what the characteristics of local roadways will be without construction of the Hatton Canyon project.	MODELING/HATTON CANYON
57-13	Amend text in Monterey City Corp. Yard discussion	MONTEREY
57-14	Changes to graphics requested	MONTEREY/GRAPHICS
2-1	The commenter requests changes in the Reuse Plan to reflect the requests for conveyances for lands to serve the Monterey Salinas Transit (MST) facilities and a change in the text description in the Plan to designate the proposed Intermodal Center.	MST
9-19	Commenter compliments the diagram illustrating the breakdown of property tax distribution.	OPINION
10-4	The commenter discusses "real" jobs and Fort Ord becoming an "Orange County" or another "San Jose".	OPINION
14-4	Lost trailer home	OPINION
23-1	Does not like project elements	OPINION
25-1	Preserve the community	OPINION
26-1	Does not want the community to be sold off to the world	OPINION
29-1	Commenter lost residence	OPINION
31-1	Preamble - not relevant	OPINION
31-2	Why rush into the project	OPINION
33-2	The commenter references a CEQA Section pertaining to the state being required to comment on the Army's cleanup plans.	OPINION
36-3	EIR should be cheaper	OPINION
41-1	need additional campgrounds	OPINION
42-1	not pertinent to Reuse Plan or EIR	OPINION
45-1	Not pertinent to EIR	OPINION
46-1	General - not specific	OPINION
47-1	Not pertinent	OPINION
48-1	Not pertinent	OPINION
49-1	Not pertinent	OPINION
50-1	Not pertinent	OPINION
57-8	Comprehensive list of all Polygons	OPINION
58-1	The commenter implies that population growth is causing changes. The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	OPINION
59-1	The commenter agrees with the Summary discussion.	OPINION
59-2	The commenter believes that the discussion in the EIR pertaining to transportation, water, sewer, air and population is inadequate.	OPINION
59-3	The commenter does not like the format of the EIR "summary".	OPINION
67-2.	The commenter would like to know where the public sentiment factor is.	OPINION

69-1	The commenter would like to know if there are no solutions to long range plan than why proceed.	OPINION
73-7.	The commenter states the Fort Ord Reuse Plan does not consider the needs of Monterey County residents.	OPINION
74-1.	Commenter invites those in attendance to visit Hopkins Marine station to look at Fort Ord.	OPINION
77-2.	The commenter provides a statement about the impacts of the proposed project.	OPINION
79-1.	The commenter states that one reason for the time frame associated with public review period is a financial one.	OPINION
81-2.	The commenter provides a rhetorical list of his projections as it pertains to the CEQA process.	OPINION
82-2.	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	OPINION
82-7.	The commenter provides a rhetorical list of his projections as it pertains to the CEQA process.	OPINION
88-6	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan documents are inadequately prepared.	OPINION
89-14	The commenter states that when the Reuse Plan is adopted it will be "far harder, if not impossible, to modify"	OPINION
139-7	The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate.	OPINION
154-24	The commenter is disappointed that the EIR concludes that there would be an unavoidable significant impact relative to traffic and circulation.	OPINION
166-1	The commenter states that 72,000 people at buildout is too many people.	OPINION
166-2	The commenter states that she does has no desire to have the Monterey peninsula as an extension of "Silicon Valley".	OPINION
55-10	Unexploded ordnance	ORDNANCE
55-11	EIR does not adequately discuss unexploded ordinance	ORDNANCE
68-1	The commenter would like to know if open space includes unexploded ordnance and would preclude public use as open space.	ORDNANCE
139-47	The commenter would like more information on unexploded ordnance.	ORDNANCE
122-1	The commenter states that the need to recover lost jobs will be used as a basis for an overriding consideration.	OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
165-3	The commenter states that the use of a statement of overriding conditions based on economic recovery or infeasible alternatives should not be considered by FORA.	OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
138-2	The commenter also states that economic recovery should not be used by the FORA Board as a basis for a statement of overriding considerations.	OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS/ SB 899

60-85.	The commenter asks if a figure PFIP 1-3 on page PFIP 1-50 is consistent with the detail in the tables.	PFIP
21-1	Phase development	PHASED DEVELOPMENT
57-1	Dev. Ft. Ord w/ Consideration for <u>managed growth</u>	PHASED DEVELOPMENT
59-14	The commenter requests that development occur in a phased manner.	PHASED DEVELOPMENT
139-29	The commenter would like information on phasing.	PHASED DEVELOPMENT
82-9.	The commenter states that Fort Ord redevelopment should be phased so as to not exceed safe-yield water.	PHASED DEVELOPMENT/WATER
1-7	The commenter asks where the "Town Center" is envisioned to be.	PLANNING
1-8	The commenter asks how many village centers are in the plan and would like to know if there is an artists depiction.	PLANNING
1-9	The commenter asks whether compact, identifiable development patterns (consistent with Peninsula Prototypes) with definable edges, entries and structure is incompatible with the objective of linking the development seamlessly into the existing communities.	PLANNING
1-13	The commenter would like additional information on "edge".	PLANNING
1-15	The commenter states that the reference to "seamless" appears to contradict other references in the Reuse Plan regarding "discernible and urban edges".	PLANNING
14-3	Residential Densities	PLANNING
28-1	Preference for Lower density in Seaside	PLANNING
48-3	BLM + view corridor	PLANNING
57-15	Request change to EIR	PLANNING
65-1.	Who will be "balancing" development at Fort Ord.	PLANNING
66-4.	The commenter wants to know how realistic is the plan adoption scenario.	PLANNING
104-1	The commenter would like to know when BLM will take over.	PLANNING
110-1	The commenter would like to know who will be paying for the land at Fort Ord.	PLANNING
120-1	The commenter would like to know who determined the "planning premises" for the Reuse Plan.	PLANNING
139-12	The commenter states that the density limits are not acceptable.	PLANNING
139-23	The commenter states that the EIR uses 10,000 acres whereas the Army built on 5,000 acres.	PLANNING
139-30	The commenter would like more information on the "Planned Development Mixed Use Districts".	PLANNING
139-40	The commenter would like more information on the peculiarities and conflicts associated with spheres of influence.	PLANNING
142-10	The commenter would like more information on potential future development on the east and west side of Highway 101.	PLANNING
142-15	The commenter states that the EIR does not adequately discuss the implications and impacts of the creation of many legal lots of record.	PLANNING

164-12	The commenter would like to know how the county can make planning decisions for Fort Ord without adopting land use designations first, following county land use guidelines.	PLANNING
166-3	The commenter believes the proposed residential densities are too high and would like to have them reduced to 4 units per acre.	PLANNING
167-7	The commenter requests that reference to the jobs/housing balance be removed from the EIR because there is no mechanism to ensure that persons employed in the area also live there.	PLANNING
7-2	Reference to new page IV-18 (distributed at 6/6/96 Adm. comm. meeting)	PLANNING/DEL REY OAKS
57-3	City design standards should be applied to York Rd. Plng. Area	PLANNING/MONTEREY
57-4	8 - mile gate road should be constructed in York Rd. Plng. Area	PLANNING/MONTEREY
57-5	80 - foot easement on roads in York Rd. Plng. Area	PLANNING/MONTEREY
73-5.	The commenter is concerned about pollution.	POLLUTION
139-28	The commenter would like to know what the expenses would be associated with moving the POM.	POM
9-3	The commenter asks for clarification of the absorption of the existing residential stock at Fort Ord.	POPULATION
59-13	The commenter requests discussion on mitigations associated with population increase.	POPULATION
73-1.	The commenter is concerned with the proposed project's population.	POPULATION
89-10	The commenter would like to know if the Monterey Peninsula can absorb an increase in population by 72,000.	POPULATION
143-2	The commenter would like to know if the Monterey Peninsula can accommodate an additional 57 percentage increase in population.	POPULATION
164-4	The commenter would like to know what the population impact will be associated with reuse.	POPULATION
16-3	Program EIR is too broad	PROGRAM EIR
17-2	Ex. Summary vs. Summary and Program EIR vs. staged EIR	PROGRAM EIR
36-4	Programmed vs. staged	PROGRAM EIR
139-32	The commenter states that the program EIR is misused in this case.	PROGRAM EIR
142-6	The commenter states that a program EIR is too general.	PROGRAM EIR
55-1	The commenter requests that a staged EIR be provided and that development should be based on a safe yield water source.	PROGRAM EIR/SAFE YIELD
60-91.	Comments 91 through 112 (except #109) refer to the Public Services Plan (PFIP) and all comments request that the analyses, tables, and text include the identification of the Cities of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-92.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-93.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-94.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-95.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-96.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS

60-97.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-98.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-99.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-100.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-101.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-102.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-103.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-104.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-105.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-106.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-107.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-108.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-110.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-111.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-112.	Dito comment 60-91	PSP/DEL REY OAKS
60-109.	The commenter suggests that the inflation rate assumed in the analysis should be reviewed and alternative scenarios included.	PSP/FINANCING
82-10.	The commenter requests that a revised Draft EIR be recirculated.	RECIRCULATE EIR
31-4	Scale down project	REDUCE PROJECT
67-5.	The commenter would like to know what it would take to reduce the plan by one-half or two-thirds.	REDUCE PROJECT
73-4.	The commenter wants to know if existing residents now living in the area should suffer to allow massive new development for a new population. The readers preference appears to not allow new population in the region.	REDUCE PROJECT
81-6.	The commenter states the proposed project should be downsized.	REDUCE PROJECT
167-4	The commenter states that the project should be downsized to reduce adverse impacts associated with long-term buildout.	REDUCE PROJECT
60-3	The commenter states that, based on proposed annexations, there should be five land use/political jurisdictions at Fort Ord, not three.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-4	The commenter would like the text edited to reflect that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey are proposed land use jurisdictions.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-5	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-6	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-7	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-9.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE

60-10.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-12.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-14.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-15.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-20.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-21.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-22.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-23.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in a revised figure.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-24.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-25.	The commenter states open space relating to the "Frog Pond" should be 15 acres not 22 acres.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-26.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-27.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-28.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-29.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in a revised figure.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-30.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-31.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-32.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-33.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-34.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-35.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-39.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in a revised figure.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE

60-40.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced in a revised figure.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-47.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-50.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be referenced as proposed jurisdictions in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
60-60.	The commenter requests that Del Rey Oaks and Monterey be included in an exhibit showing jurisdictions that will have responsibility for municipal and public service functions.	REUSE PLAN FOR FIVE
98-3	The commenter would like to know what the percentage of the total population growth will be in the year 2015.	REUSE PLAN/GENERAL
5-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
10-1	Commenter reflects on the lack of meetings to accommodate public input.	REVIEW PERIOD
10-2	The commenter is concerned with the limited number of copies of the Reuse Plan and EIR available at public places.	REVIEW PERIOD
10-5	Comment refers to the public not being aware of the proposed project.	REVIEW PERIOD
12-1	Extend Review Period	REVIEW PERIOD
14-1	Extend review Period	REVIEW PERIOD
14-2	Extend review Period	REVIEW PERIOD
16-1	Extend review Period	REVIEW PERIOD
16-5	Extend review Period	REVIEW PERIOD
17-1	Extend review Period	REVIEW PERIOD
24-1	Need workshops and executive summary	REVIEW PERIOD
26-2	Publicize through TV a Coast weekly	REVIEW PERIOD
27-1	Extend public review period	REVIEW PERIOD
27-2	need workshops	REVIEW PERIOD
30-4	Extend public review period	REVIEW PERIOD
33-1	Extend public review Period	REVIEW PERIOD
36-1	Request for extend public review period	REVIEW PERIOD
38-1	Extend public review period	REVIEW PERIOD
46-2	Extend public review period + provide workshop	REVIEW PERIOD
57-7	Extend public review period	REVIEW PERIOD
75-1.	The commenter would like an extend public review period.	REVIEW PERIOD
76-2.	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
77-1.	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
78-1.	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
80-2.	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
81-1.	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
81-5.	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
82-1.	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
83-1.	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD

86-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
87-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
89-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
90-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
92-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
101-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
126-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
127-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
128-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
131-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
132-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
136-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
139-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
139-51	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended and that a revised EIR be prepared.	REVIEW PERIOD
141-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
143-3	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
144-2	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
145-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
146-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
147-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
152-5	The commenter would like more current information on economic conditions.	REVIEW PERIOD
155-15	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended and that the EIR be recirculated.	REVIEW PERIOD
156-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
157-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
160-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
161-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	REVIEW PERIOD
130-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended and that a revised EIR be prepared and would like Fort Ord developed to include a national cemetery, as well as facilities for the indigents and the homeless.	REVIEW PERIOD/ CEMETERY/PLANNING
39-1	Same comment as comment letter 33.	REVIEW PERIOD/OPINION
43-1	Requests that Reuse Plan buildout replace only that military population lost due to base closure	SB 899
55-3	SB 899 does not authorize FORA to induce growth by on the pop. originally at Ft. Ord	SB 899
55-4	A statement of overriding conditions cannot be evoked by FORA because FORA is not mandated to exceed population projections	SB 899
62-2.	The commenter is concerned that the proposed Reuse Plan exceeds replacement of the former Fort Ord population.	SB 899

67-1.	The commenter would like to know where the impact is that was suffered when Fort Ord closed.	SB 899
72-2.	The commenter requests that the proposed project be limited to a population that existed at Fort Ord when the Army was present.	SB 899
88-1	The commenter requests that the proposed project be limited to a population that existed at Fort Ord when the Army was present.	SB 899
89-6	The commenter would like to know why the Reuse Plan accommodates a larger population than was here before.	SB 899
100-1	The commenter states that FORA is not mandated to exceed the population which existed at Fort Ord in 1991 (i.e., 31K). The commenter states that the population figures and water figures are not proportional.	SB 899
102-1	The commenter requests particular types of economic data be included in the EIR.	SB 899
117-2	The commenter would like to know why Alternative 6R fails to meet economic recovery when it provides approximately the same number of jobs as there were when Fort Ord was a military base.	SB 899
123-1	The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate because it fails to provide alternatives that comply with the required reuse plan elements contained in SB 899.	SB 899
138-1	The commenter is requesting that each FORA Board member city provide an economic profile for the fiscal year preceding the closure of Fort Ord and for the most recent fiscal year to determine the need for "economic recovery".	SB 899
139-3	The commenter states that the EIR fails to address a reasonable range of alternatives because the alternatives cannot meet the requirements set forth in SB 899.	SB 899
139-4	The commenter would like additional information on the stated project objective (EIR, page 3-2) to accommodate regional growth.	SB 899
139-13	The commenter would like more information on "economic recovery" as a project objective.	SB 899
139-36	The commenter would like more information on the importance of SB 899.	SB 899
142-1	The commenter states that the EIR does not prove that economic dislocation has occurred.	SB 899
142-2	The commenter states the EIR does not take into account the recession/depression that occurred at the time of base closure and has continued until recently.	SB 899
142-3	The commenter states that Vol. 1 of the Reuse Plan contradicts numerous studies and articles referenced in the Monterey Herald newspaper over the last 4 years.	SB 899

142-4	The commenter states that the EIR is not objective in its presentation of economic issues.	SB 899
142-5	The commenter repeats comment 142-1.	SB 899
152-4	The commenter is concerned about water use.	SB 899
155-9	The commenter states that the jobs/housing ratio at Fort Ord at the time of base closure was .77 and the proposed ratio is 2.05.	SB 899
155-16	The commenter states that the proposed buildout population of 72,000 is not justified by the enabling legislation that created FORA as a means to economic recovery.	SB 899
155-17	The comment is similar to comment 155-18.	SB 899
162-15	The commenter states that the city supports restoration of economic and housing activity that existed prior to the base closure.	SB 899
165-45	The commenter states that the proposed buildout population exceeds the SB 899 mandate and if FORA uses a statement of overriding consideration to justify the significant negative impacts of the project this shall be challenged.	SB 899
165-46	The commenter states that if there is no evidence included in the EIR pertaining to economic recovery, then reference to economic recovery should be stricken from the EIR	SB 899
165-47	The commenter states that a revised EIR should be provided which retains the intent of SB 899.	SB 899
165-48	The commenter states that economic data is needed to determine if economic recovery is justified.	SB 899
56-2	EIR must be revised to include analysis of "existing conditions"	SB 1180
164-1	The commenter would like to know if there is policy that relates to building a freeway and/or expressway adjacent to a school.	SCHOOL
139-37	The commenter would like more information on school citing.	SCHOOLS
9-10	The commenter refers to the screening process that will happen in the Seaside University Planning Area.	SCREENING
1-16	The commenter would like a reference to housing stock relative to the Sun Bay Apartments and Brostrom Park.	SEASIDE
60-41.	The commenter states that Seaside has been left out of the soil conservation policies.	SEASIDE
60-44.	The commenter states that Seaside has been left out of the biological resources section.	SEASIDE
1-11	The commenter would like to have Brostrom Park to be specifically mentioned as one of the existing residential neighborhoods throughout the Reuse Plan.	SEASIDE/CORRECTING TEXT
21-5	Ex. Summary; tax payers; etc.	SUMMARY
142-16	The commenter would like an executive summary.	SUMMARY
32-1	The commenter is concerned with the clean up of toxic materials and unexploded ordnance.	TOXIC/ORDNANCE

59-12	The commenter states that for alternative modes of transportation to work in reducing emissions, people must be informed of the correlation between alternative modes and improved air quality, otherwise mitigation will be required.	TRANSIT
61-1.	The commenter requests information on future transit at Fort Ord.	TRANSIT
85-2	The commenter states that future transit needs necessitates intercounty coordination.	TRANSIT
154-1	The commenter states that the transit facilities are not correctly depicted in the text or graphics.	TRANSIT
154-2	The commenter states that transit service funding has and is being cut back by the federal government, therefore a new source of funding will be required to provide transit service at Fort Ord.	TRANSIT
154-4	The commenter points out that the Reuse Plan is partial to discussion of streets and road but leaves out a similar discussion pertaining to transit.	TRANSIT
154-5	The commenter states that the discussion of park and ride lots should specifically identify the two locations where MST plans to develop park and ride lots.	TRANSIT
154-6	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan discusses parking management but fails to endorse it.	TRANSIT
154-7	The commenter would like the Marina design objectives on page 3-103 of Volume 1 to include a language promoting the use of the park and ride facility which is planned for the corner of Imjin Road and 12th Street.	TRANSIT
154-9	The commenter would like the CSUMB design objectives on page 3-118 of Volume 1 to include language that encourages the use of alternate transportation by providing convenient and direct transit access to campus activity centers.	TRANSIT
154-10	The commenter would like the Marina design objectives on page 3-103 of Volume 1 to include a language promoting the use of the park and ride facility which is planned for the corner of Gigling Road and Eighth Avenue.	TRANSIT
154-11	The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan (Volume 1, page 3-149) contain a more balanced view of all circulation components, not just roadway improvements to increase single occupancy vehicle use, especially as it relates to the preparation of phasing scenarios.	TRANSIT
154-19	The commenter points out that the RIDES Paratransit program currently provides service from 7:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m., not from 10:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. as stated on page 4-103 in Volume 2.	TRANSIT

154-20	The commenter points out that the figure on page 4-110 of Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan - <i>Transit Activity Centers and Corridors</i> , incorrectly depicts the proposed MST transit center to be at First Avenue and Eighth Street.	TRANSIT
154-21	The commenter points out that there should be more transit activity centers shown on figure 4.2-5 in Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan.	TRANSIT
154-22	The commenter would like the Key Transit Corridors in Figure 4.2-5 in Volume 2 to include additional roadways.	TRANSIT
154-25	The commenter implies that the regional mode split assumptions used in the traffic analysis could in fact be worse (i.e., more vehicle trips on area roadways) unless adequate funding is provided to allow necessary expansion of transit services at the same rate overall as vehicle trips increase.	TRANSIT
154-26	The commenter states that the Fort Ord transportation infrastructure will fail to deliver the adequate service unless adequate funding is provided for transit service.	TRANSIT
154-28	The commenter requests that Table 4.7-2 in the EIR be amended to include regional transit capital improvements information.	TRANSIT
154-29	The commenter states that the life of a transit coach is twelve years and accordingly this must be reflected into the capital improvement plan.	TRANSIT
154-30	The commenter points out that the traffic and circulation section of the EIR includes figures depicting the transportation network for the year 2015 and full buildout, but does not include a figure showing the proposed transit network.	TRANSIT
154-3	The commenter states the Public Facilities Implementation Plan does not address transit service needs in the same manner as it addresses regional roadway improvements vis-a-vis assigning the costs of roadway improvements to the reuse of Fort Ord.	TRANSIT O&M
154-8	The commenter would like the Marina design objectives on page 3-108 of Volume 1 to include language that encourages the use of and compliment the Fort Ord Transportation Center at First Avenue and Fifth Street.	TRANSIT O&M
154-23	The commenter would like to know if the program language included in section 4.2.3.3 - <i>Transit Policies and Program</i> , pertaining to "support" is financial or moral support.	TRANSIT/FINANCING
154-27	The commenter states that the coordinating efforts described in Policy A-1 on page 4-84 of the EIR can only work if funding is available to provide transit services.	TRANSIT/FINANCING
153-1	The commenter requests that the public review period be extended.	TRANSIT/GRAPHICS
30-2	Dev. should be based on available road capacity	TRANSPORTATION
56-3	Wants "financially constrained" and "optimistically financed" scenarios included as mitigations or as a proposed project	TRANSPORTATION

56-4	Secondary Impacts associated w/ traffic mitigations	TRANSPORTATION
56-5	States proposed roadway improvements are not in the Metropolitan transportation plan	TRANSPORTATION
57-6	6 - laning Del Monte is wrong + FORA/faire share payment should go to transit	TRANSPORTATION
73-2.	The commenter is concerned about traffic on Highway 68.	TRANSPORTATION
85-1	The commenter states that the widening of Hwy 1 under the optimistically financed heading is not adequate.	TRANSPORTATION
85-4	The commenter states that the EIR should be reviewed for consistency with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.	TRANSPORTATION
88-3	The commenter is concerned that transportation impacts are not adequately discussed in the EIR.	TRANSPORTATION
90-4	The commenter states the Reuse Plan would severely impact peninsula highways.	TRANSPORTATION
113-1	The commenter would like to know what the impacts of future road construction will be on Reservation Road and Highway 68.	TRANSPORTATION
113-2	The commenter would like to know what the off-site traffic impacts will be on the Peninsula.	TRANSPORTATION
139-16	The commenter would like more information on the discrepancy in growth projections between the EIR, AMBAG and historic conditions.	TRANSPORTATION
139-45	The commenter would like more information on the impacts associated with future roadway projects.	TRANSPORTATION
142-11	The commenter would like more information on transportation mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION
154-12	The commenter points out that the circulation strategy discussion on page 3-150 of the Reuse Plan needs to include more comprehensive discussion of all circulation issues.	TRANSPORTATION
154-13	The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-31 of Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program, which would state that the City of Marina shall encourage the development of an integrated street pattern for new developments which provides linkages to the existing street network and discourages cul-de-sac's or dead-end streets.	TRANSPORTATION
154-14	The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-36 of Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program, which would state that the City of Seaside shall encourage the development of an integrated street pattern for new developments which provides linkages to the existing street network and discourages cul-de-sac's or dead-end streets.	TRANSPORTATION
154-15	The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-41 of Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program.	TRANSPORTATION

154-16	The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-52 of Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program.	TRANSPORTATION
154-17	The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-55 of Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program.	TRANSPORTATION
154-18	The commenter recommends that policy E on page 4-59 of Volume 2 of the Reuse Plan be augmented with a new program.	TRANSPORTATION
167-25	The commenter requests a language change.	TRANSPORTATION
155-13	The commenter states that the traffic and circulation analysis does not include an evaluation of the project's impacts on existing roads and highways and does not clearly identify mitigation measures.	TRANSPORTATION
164-7	The commenter would like to know if the road infrastructure will be constructed prior to or after light industrial land uses are in place.	TRANSPORTATION
164-9	The commenter would like to know what guarantee is there that Caltrans will not expand the two lane area of Highway 218 between North/South Road and Fremont Boulevard.	TRANSPORTATION
165-33	The commenter states that the EIR does not depict existing traffic conditions.	TRANSPORTATION
165-35	The commenter states that the traffic model and the mitigations are not consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the State Implementation Plan.	TRANSPORTATION
167-3	The commenter states that the EIR must identify the "constrained scenario", vis-a-vis traffic and circulation, as the project's unavoidable traffic impacts.	TRANSPORTATION
167-10	The commenter states that the transportation study is based on the TAMC model which is not based on the AMBAG model.	TRANSPORTATION
167-11	The commenter requests clarification of the discussion on existing methodology used in the EIR to describe baseline conditions.	TRANSPORTATION
167-12	The commenter requests clarification of the discussion on existing traffic conditions reported in the EIR and states that without traffic count data for specific locations, existing conditions cannot be said to have been adequately documented as required by CEQA.	TRANSPORTATION
167-15	The commenter would like to know why the LOS for Highway 101 was omitted.	TRANSPORTATION
167-16	The commenter points out that the LOS results are reported in Appendix B, not C.	TRANSPORTATION
167-17	The commenter would like to know if the Draft EIR modal split assumptions used for the traffic forecasts documented, and if so where.	TRANSPORTATION

167-18	The commenter states that the procedures by which the socioeconomic forecasts were coded to the Draft EIR forecast model travel zones should be documented so that AMBAG can determine whether the traffic forecasts used for this DEIR are consistent with AMBAG traffic forecasts for the same roadways, under various alternatives and years.	TRANSPORTATION
167-19	The commenter repeats comment 15	TRANSPORTATION
167-20	The commenter would like to know how the Annual Average Daily Traffic on Highway 156 east of Castroville decreases without capacity improvements to this roadway.	TRANSPORTATION
167-21	The commenter would like to know if the Draft EIR modal split assumptions used for the traffic forecasts documented, and if so where.	TRANSPORTATION
167-22	The commenter states that the standard of significance for traffic and circulation impacts is unclear.	TRANSPORTATION
167-23	The commenter requests a language change to the standard of significance.	TRANSPORTATION
167-26	The commenter requests clarification of the intent of the "Optimistic Financing Scenario" vis-a-vis CEQA.	TRANSPORTATION
167-27	The commenter states that Program A-1.1 does not ensure a funding is in place prior to the impact.	TRANSPORTATION
167-28	The commenter states that Streets and Roads Policy A-1.2 is an ineffective mitigation because FORA does not have the authority to make financial contributions to off-site transportation improvements.	TRANSPORTATION
167-29	The commenter states that Streets and Roads Program C-1.4 is an ineffective mitigation because there is no language that would require implementation of the mitigation prior to the impact.	TRANSPORTATION
167-30	The commenter states that pedestrian and Bicycles Policy B-1 is an ineffective mitigation because there is no language that would require implementation of the mitigation prior to the impact.	TRANSPORTATION
9-4	The commenter suggests funding for Hwy 156 shouldn't be the sole responsibility of FORA and a funding source should be identified for all transportation needs.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
9-14	The commenter repeats the concern over the financing of Highway 156.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
60-84.	Commenter requests that the phasing and financing of improvements to North South Road must be clarified (pages PFIP 1-130 and 1-132).	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
63-1.	The commenter wants to know if the \$137 million was for on base improvements.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
66-1.	The commenter wants to know where the funds are coming from that would fund future transportation costs.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING

81-4.	The commenter states that 800 million dollars of off-site highway construction is proposed.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
89-5	The commenter would like to know how future road widening would be funded.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
98-1	The commenter is concerned with the transportation costs.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
162-3	The commenter points out that a Fort Ord area transportation impact fee should be discussed in the EIR.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
85-3	The commenter states that the Final PEIR should reference the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County's rail studies and how future rail service might alleviate future traffic impacts.	TRANSPORTATION/RAIL SERVICE
84-2	The commenter states that future transit needs necessitates intercounty coordination.	TRANSPORTATION/TRANSIT
30-1	Transportation + water inadequate	TRANSPORTATION/WATER
22-1	Inadequate road infrastructure, water + cost	TRANSPORTATION/WATER/ FINANCING
75-2.	The commenter is concerned about transportation, water, sewer and capacity vis-a-vis the available water.	TRANSPORTATION/WATER/ SEWER
55-9	Insufficient mitigation in EIR pertaining to transportation, water, and viewshed	TRANSPORTATION/WATER/VISUAL
21-3	UC's 605 acres in National Reserve System needs to be reflected in the planning documents and other UC concerns about representation of UC in EIR + Reuse Plan	UC
34-4	The commenter notes that the Reuse Plan does not identify the lands that would allow Research and Development on the parcel owned by UC between Imjin and Inter-Garrison Roads.	UC
139-46	The commenter would like the UC Master plan included in the EIR.	UC/PLANNING
13-1	Mosquito and vector control	VECTORS
1-1	The commenter questions whether the description of the "vision" for Fort Ord described in Chapter 1 of the Context and Framework gives the impression that the CSUMB campus will be a focal point from which all other development will spread.	VISUAL
1-10	The commenter asks for clarification on how the Highway 1 Scenic Corridor is defined.	VISUAL
9-6	Commenter asks if the 500 foot wide strip designated as a "special design district" will affect the initial 12 acres of land projected for low-density single-family detached units in Seaside.	VISUAL
9-8	The commenter asks how the 500 foot "special design district" (scenic corridor) will affect the regional retail opportunity site at the Main Gate along Highway One.	VISUAL
139-17	The commenter would like more information about height limits.	VISUAL

142-9	The commenter would like more information on aesthetics and viewsheds.	VISUAL
68-2	The commenter would like to know if there would be height restrictions.	VISUAL/HEIGHT
89-8	The commenter would like to know how the Hwy 1 corridor can be kept from being visually impacted without design guidelines.	VISUAL/HEIGHT
89-9	The commenter would like to know why there are no height limits on new buildings.	VISUAL/HEIGHT
139-14	The commenter requests that the design guidelines be included in the EIR.	VISUAL/HEIGHTS
9-12	The commenter expresses concern about the designation of a "special design district" (referred in the Reuse Plan as the Highway One Scenic Corridor).	VISUAL/PLANNING
30-5	Put Reuse Plan to a vote	VOTE
60-87.	The commenter suggests that the wastewater demand forecasts may need to be adjusted in the City of Del Rey Oaks utilizes reclaimed water on site rather than utilizing the capacity of the MRWPCA plant in Marina.	WASTEWATER
60-88.	The commenter suggests a change to the wastewater screen summary based on comment 87.	WASTEWATER
89-4	The commenter is interested in how wastewater treatment will be expanded	WASTEWATER
90-3	The commenter states the proposed project would use 90 percent of the wastewater treatment plant.	WASTEWATER
139-49	The commenter would like more information relating to wastewater treatment capacity.	WASTEWATER
8-5	The commenter is concerned with issues pertaining to water.	WATER
15-1	safe yield water	WATER
16-2	Commenter requests a safe yield alternative be discussed in the EIR.	WATER
18-1	The commenter requests additional information on water	WATER
30-3	Inadequate water	WATER
31-3	Where is water coming from	WATER
43-2	Inadequate water available	WATER
48-6	Water supply	WATER
51-1	Water issue	WATER
51-3	The commenter states that Fort Ord should not be accepted from the Army until water is available.	WATER
55-5	Water Supply concern	WATER
60-42.	The commenter states that the safe yield of the Seaside basin has not been determined.	WATER
60-52.	The commenter points out that the Seaside basin provides water to other uses other than the Fort Ord golf courses.	WATER
64-3.	The commenter wants to know what agency is responsible for providing water to Fort Ord.	WATER

68-3	The commenter states there is no alternative to the proposed project and there is the potential for pumping which could cause salt water intrusion. The commenter would also like to know how much water is being pumped at this time.	WATER
73-3.	The commenter is concerned about water issues.	WATER
76-1.	The commenter is concerned about the limitation that water resources would place on the project.	WATER
80-1.	The commenter states that the EIR does not disclose all the impacts and future development should be based on a safe yield.	WATER
80-3.	The commenter states that two-thirds of the water needed for full buildout of Fort Ord does not exist on Fort Ord.	WATER
81-3.	The commenter states the EIR does not analyze impacts. Also, the commenter wants to know how many lots of record will be within the Monterey Peninsula Water District (MPWMD).	WATER
84-1	The commenter is concerned about the limitation that water resources would place on the project.	WATER
89-3	The commenter would like to know where the 18,000 acre-feet of water come from.	WATER
90-2	The commenter states the proposed project would use too much water.	WATER
93-1	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
99-1	The commenter has stated that the information on the 180 and 400 foot aquifers is not up to date.	WATER
103-1	The commenter requests water information.	WATER
106-1	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
107-1	The commenter would like additional information on the water storage facilities discussed in the EIR.	WATER
107-2	The commenter would like to know if geologic studies have been done for the water storage facilities.	WATER
112-1	The commenter would like to know how much water was allocated to the U.S. Army when they were at Fort Ord.	WATER
115-1	The commenter would like specific information on current water use and water loss conditions at Fort Ord.	WATER
116-1	The commenter is concerned that the water discussion is inadequate.	WATER
121-1	The commenter is concerned with regional water problems.	WATER
124-1	The commenter would like to know how many acre-feet per year could be taken from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin within the Fort Ord political jurisdiction which would not result in overdraft or seawater intrusion.	WATER
129-1	The commenter is concerned with new development in light of water problems.	WATER
139-35	The commenter would like more information on recycled water	WATER

139-50	The commenter would like more information on future water sources.	WATER
142-8	The commenter would like more information on water supply.	WATER
143-1	The commenter would like more information on water.	WATER
144-1	The commenter would like more information on water.	WATER
151-1	The commenter states that the 20-year plan water infrastructure may need to be scaled down because of cost.	WATER
152-1	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
152-2	The commenter would like to know how much water is currently needed for properties that have already been conveyed.	WATER
152-3	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
155-10	The commenter is concerned with the availability of water.	WATER
155-11	The commenter disagrees with the conclusion contained in the EIR regarding water impacts.	WATER
165-10	The commenter would like to know how additional water will be ensured.	WATER
165-11	The commenter would like to know specific details on timing, financial implications, environmental impacts, and water fees for future hook-ups and monthly service.	WATER
165-12	The commenter would like to know how the water infrastructure will be administrated.	WATER
165-23	The commenter states that there would be a CEQA violation if long term water supply were not evaluated.	WATER
165-25	The commenter states that there is inadequate long-term water supply.	WATER
165-26	The commenter states that more information is required to justify the conclusion that local water supplies are reduced to a less than significant impact.	WATER
165-27	The commenter requests that the project water requirements be put into perspective with the other regional growth forecasts and projections of where the water supply for the county will be obtained.	WATER
165-28	The commenter states that the policies and programs cannot be used because of the recent court decision related to Stanislaus natural Heritage Project, Sierra Club, et al., v. County of Stanislaus and Diablo Grande Limited Partnership	WATER
165-29	The commenter states that the mitigations for water use are mitigation measures until they are formally designated.	WATER
165-51	The commenter requests additional data on seawater intrusion.	WATER
165-52	The commenter requests additional information on safe yield water.	WATER
165-53	The commenter states that the EIR does not include a discussion of current water use data.	WATER
165-54	The commenter would like clarification on current water metering, water use and water line loss vis-a-vis the 6,600 afy.	WATER
165-55	This comment repeats the previous comment (#26)	WATER

165-59	The commenter would like more information on importing water to Fort Ord.	WATER
167-8	The commenter recommends that water conservation associated with landscaping be quantified and included in the EIR.	WATER
167-1	The commenter would like to know if a water constrained analysis is included in the discussed as part of the proposed project or alternatives.	WATER/ALTERNATIVES
165-44	The commenter states that the water discussion relative to the UCMBEST Center is inadequate.	WATER/CEQA
164-17	The commenter would like to know if future golf courses will be using potable water and if so will development occur first so that development's treated wastewater can be used.	WATER/GOLF COURSE
167-9	The commenter would like the EIR to include annual water usage of both existing and proposed golf courses.	WATER/GOLF COURSES
155-12	The commenter requests that a water allocation and monitoring plan be implemented as part of the proposed project.	WATER/GROWTH MANAGEMENT
109-1	The commenter would like to know if the proposed Armstrong Ranch development will be allocated more housing units if part of the ranch is set aside for development of a water storage facility.	WATER/MARINA/ARMSTRONG
88-2	The commenter would like to know how water, effluent and trash disposal will be resolved pertaining to the proposed full buildout.	WATER/PUBLIC SERVICES
140-1	The commenter would like a project alternative included in the EIR that includes a project based on safe yield water use only.	WATER/SB 899/ALTERNATIVES
82-8.	The commenter states that the EIR does not discuss the impacts of future water infrastructure, new roadways and does not provide an on-site location for a wastewater treatment plant.	WATER/TRANSPORTATION
125-1	The commenter does not approve of the proposed project because on water and transportation problems.	WATER/TRANSPORTATION
139-2	The commenter states that the EIR must be revised to address environmental impacts such as water systems and road projects.	WATER/TRANSPORTATION
155-1	The commenter states the EIR does not adequately address the impacts associated with water, transportation, etc.	WATER/TRANSPORTATION
155-2	This comment is the same as comment 155-1.	WATER/TRANSPORTATION
19-1	What is FORA. Allow people to vote	WHAT IS FORA/VOTE
10-3	The commenter is concerned about the York Road connection to the Highway 68 bypass.	YORK ROAD
21-4	York Road	YORK ROAD
60-54.	The commenter states that Figure 4.7-2 should show York Road.	YORK ROAD
35-2	Do not connect York Road to Hwy 68 Bypass	YORK ROAD/HWY 68 BYPASS
60-18.	The commenter requests that York Road be shown on maps as connecting Hwy 68 and the Hwy 68 by-pass.	YORK ROAD/HWY 68 BYPASS

213-23	The commenter requests additional information on air quality impacts.	AIR QUALITY
173-1	The commenter states the EIR does not provide alternative that foster informed decision making.	ALTERNATIVES
173-2	The commenter states that the "No Project" alternative's population projection of 35,000 is misleading because in this alternative CSUMB is proposing as many as 25,000 students.	ALTERNATIVES
199-1	The commenter states that the EIR does not provide alternative solutions to address the impacts of water, traffic and wastewater.	ALTERNATIVES
200-2	The commenter would like an alternative discussion be included in the EIR which reflects a reuse scenario with reduced density that can be served by concurrent infrastructure.	ALTERNATIVES
213-34	The commenter states the information contained in section 6 of the EIR is outdated and new information from the Army should be used.	ALTERNATIVES
213-83	The commenter states the number of dwelling units for Alternatives 7, 7R and 8 discussed in the SEIS are exceeded by the Reuse Plan.	ALTERNATIVES
248-7	The commenter would like an alternative included in the EIR besides the "No Project" alternative which will preclude the need for a desalination plant and generate a lower level of wastewater discharge which may ultimately be discharged to the Monterey Bay.	ALTERNATIVES
290-1	The commenter states that the EIR is inadequate and FORA must be given a reasonable range of alternatives and an adequate EIR.	ALTERNATIVES
307-61	The commenter asks why there is not an alternative in the DEIR that is limited to the level of development at the former Fort Ord.	ALTERNATIVES
299-12	The commenter states that an alternative should be included that discusses what was lost only.	ALTERNATIVES/SB 899
167-44	The commenter requests that the EIR include a table in the alternatives discussion that compares each alternative's daily vehicle and person trips.	ALTERNATIVES/TRANSPORTATION
287-4	The commenter would like a revised EIR that includes an alternative project using on-site safe-yield water supply.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
307-21	The commenter requests an alternative based on existing water supplies.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
307-24	The commenter requests more discussion of feasible alternatives for water supplies and their environmental impacts.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
307-43	The commenter asks why there is no alternative in DEIR that identifies the level of development possible from the on-site wells without aggravating the rate of seawater intrusion.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
167-34	The commenter states that the information in the EIR is not consistent with AMBAG information	AMBAG
167-35	The commenter requests clarification in the EIR.	AMBAG
167-39	The commenter repeats comment 167-34.	AMBAG

167-40	The commenter repeats comment 167-34.	AMBAG
167-41	The commenter requests an amendment to the language in the text.	AMBAG
167-45	The commenter requests that the EIR be consistent with AMBAG's "average vehicle occupancy".	AMBAG
168-4	The commenter requests that "three county region" forecasts be amended to read "two county region" (Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties).	AMBAG
168-5	The commenter requests that all table and text reference to AMBAG forecast of "jobs for the region", "regional employment", etc. be amended.	AMBAG
168-6	The commenter requests that the AMBAG forecasts for population on page 2-15 of Volume 1 of the Reuse Plan include 20,000 CSUMB students.	AMBAG
168-7	The commenter requests that text be taken out of Volume 1.	AMBAG
168-8	The commenter requests that the text be amended to reflect AMBAG data.	AMBAG
168-9	The commenter requests that the text be amended to reflect AMBAG data.	AMBAG
168-10	The commenter requests that the household forecast used in Volume 1 be cited.	AMBAG
168-11	The commenter repeats comment 168-4.	AMBAG
168-12	The commenter would like the Reuse Plan (Volume 1, page 2-17) to be amended so as to cite the source of an employment estimate used in the document and also state that the estimate differs from AMBAG's.	AMBAG
168-13	The commenter requests that the source of information be identified and also state that the estimate differs from AMBAG's.	AMBAG
285-3	The commenter indicates there is a discrepancy between AMBAG population figures and those used in the Reuse Plan and EIR.	AMBAG CONSISTENCY
299-14	The commenter states that population figures do not correlate with other agencies.	AMBAG CONSISTENCY
168-16	The commenter request that the AMBAG <i>Livable Communities Initiative for the Monterey Bay Region</i> be incorporated in the Reuse Plan and include its five principles.	AMBAG PLANNING
168-19	The commenter recommends that Policy C-1 (Volume II, page 4-112) be amended to include <i>Livable Communities Initiative for the Monterey Bay Region</i> policy #2.	AMBAG/PLANNING
168-20	The commenter recommends that Policy C-1.1 (Volume II, page 4-112) be amended to include <i>Livable Communities Initiative for the Monterey Bay Region</i> policy #4.	AMBAG/PLANNING
213-78	The commenter states (the "Army") that they shall fund their own infrastructure improvements per the agreements governing transfer of the infrastructure system.	ARMY

213-7	The commenter states the EIR should be amended to be based on the present boundaries of the POM Annex and be compatible with lands that have been screened for transfer.	ARMY/POM ANNEX
213-10	The commenter would like the EIR to include a discussion of the incompatibilities of the proposed reconfiguration of the POM Annex, such as the location of replacement Army facilities (e.g., the fire station and Burger King) and the land use conflicts between existing Army residential areas, other sensitive Army land uses and adjacent private land uses.	ARMY/POM ANNEX
213-72	The commenter asks if any detailed development plans have been prepared for the relocation of POM Annex housing to polygon 20c.	ARMY/POM ANNEX
213-73	The commenter requests a time line for reuse that takes into account the outcome of the Army's current "Excess II" screening process.	ARMY/POM ANNEX
213-21	The commenter states that as it pertains to future road construction on Fort Ord, funding mechanism which do not include the Army should be seriously considered.	ARMY/TRANSPORTATION
168-18	The commenter states the Reuse Plan does not go far enough to support bicycle facilities.	BIKE
168-21	The commenter requests greater detail be provided regarding the bicycle network and revise the proposed bicycle network figure (4.2-6).	BIKE
210-14	The commenter states that a program should be included in the Reuse Plan that requires each jurisdiction to implement the Reuse Plan's bicycle standards.	BIKE
213-22	The commenter states that as it pertains to future construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities on Fort Ord, funding mechanism which do not include the Army should be seriously considered.	BIKE
175-1	The commenter expressed an interest in a national cemetery at Fort Ord.	CEMETERY
219-1	The commenter would like a cemetery	CEMETERY
271-1	The comment would like information on a cemetery	CEMETERY
167-38	The commenter states that Salinas should be included in the cumulative projects table in the EIR (Table 5.1-1).	CEQA
176-3	The commenter states that a new EIR must be prepared to reflect the real impacts of losing military jobs.	CEQA
189-1	The commenter would like to know what the CEQA requirements are for property surrounding Fort Ord.	CEQA
198-2	The commenter states that infrastructure development should occur concurrently with development projects	CEQA
200-7	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan develop a funding mechanism treating base wide infrastructure (Transportation, water, sewer, drainage) projects as single projects to mitigate impacts.	CEQA

204-3	The commenter states the City of Marina has determined that the costs of providing municipal services on the base will lead to unavoidable environmental impacts.	CEQA
204-18	The commenter states that the EIR should evaluate the impact associated with Marina not providing public safety services at Fort Ord.	CEQA
209-3	The commenter would like to know how the EIR proposes to solve the problems of wastewater disposal, road expansion and desalination or other water source conservation or development.	CEQA
210-10	The commenter states that a particular policy cannot be a mitigation unless it specifies feasible mitigation measures that are tied to performance standards.	CEQA
210-18	The commenter states that imposing policies and programs on a project does not constitute a mitigation unless there is an implementing mechanism in place that activates the policies and programs and the commenter states that ordinances and regulations should be identified that are assumed to mitigate the cumulative transportation impacts.	CEQA
231-6	The commenter requests economic statistics on local communities to indicate how they have been impacted economically by the base closure.	CEQA
242-7	The commenter states that many intersections and east/west routes are identified in the EIR to be in need of upgrading, but the relative merits of the options are not discussed, thus, the commenter contends, the decision makers do not have adequate information on which to base an informed decision on.	CEQA
242-18	The commenter states that a mitigation monitoring program will be a powerful tool to minimize impacts on the region.	CEQA
288-2	The commenter states the EIR does not discuss the needs and concerns of nearby communities.	CEQA
307-4	The commenter asks specifically for references to the concerns of the residents of Pacific Grove and assurances that the needs of Pacific Grove businesses have been defined.	CEQA
307-7	The commenter questions how the impacts can be dismissed by incorporating policies and programs to be carried out by another jurisdiction.	CEQA
307-9	The commenter cites a recent appellate court ruling of the California 5th District and suggests the ruling is directly applicable to the DEIR and Plan.	CEQA
307-11	The commenter raises the same concern expressed in comment 307-7 in the context of governance and mitigation.	CEQA

307-14	The commenter suggests that FORA's responsibilities need to be extended beyond 2014 and that an implementation plan is required that clearly and unequivocally states that mitigation measures must be in place before development proceeds.	CEQA
307-42	The commenter asks what assurances there are to enforce the mitigations in the DEIR.	CEQA
307-44	The commenter asks what analysis has been made of the recent ruling of the 5th District Court of Appeals.	CEQA
307-49	The commenter asks if it is stated that mitigation measures must be in place before development is allowed to proceed.	CEQA
307-55	The commenter would like an explanation of CEQA terms.	CEQA
307-41	The commenter asks why the DEIR does not consider all the impacts the Reuse Plan will have on all jurisdictions within the areas likely to be affected by it.	CEQA/SB 1180
206-2	The commenter states that the current unsafe condition of stormwater outfalls need to be corrected or removed.	COASTAL
248-1	The commenter lists concerns regarding coastal resources:	COASTAL
248-2	The commenter states that the EIR should be identical to the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan (PGP).	COASTAL
248-3	The commenter requests language be included in the EIR regarding stormwater outfall along the beaches.	COASTAL
248-9	The commenter would like the outfall pipes removed.	COASTAL
248-10	The commenter would like language included in the Reuse Plan and EIR that specifically addresses wetland areas in the dunes that could be constructed and maintained using stormwater.	COASTAL
248-12	The commenter requests that a desalination plant be evaluated per the requirement of CEQA.	COASTAL
248-13	The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate the potential impacts of Seaside's proposed annexation of Monterey Bay.	COASTAL
248-14	The commenter requests that the EIR include a complete description of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.	COASTAL
291-2	The commenter would like information on the coastal road.	COASTAL
291-3	The commenter would like information on the Fort Ord Dunes State Park entrances.	COASTAL
167-46	Commenter requests that the word "Associated" in Table 7.4 be changed to "Association".	CORRECTING TEXT
168-3	The commenter would like the sources cited in each of the tables in section 2.2 of the Reuse Plan to be revised	CORRECTING TEXT
168-14	The commenter requests that the text be revised because of inaccuracies.	CORRECTING TEXT
168-15	The commenter requests the that the text be revised because of inaccuracies	CORRECTING TEXT

197-115	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	CORRECTING TEXT
197-116	The commenter requests clarification of language pertaining to conveyance of the water supply system.	CORRECTING TEXT
197-120	The commenter would like a change to the PFIP text.	CORRECTING TEXT
197-121	The commenter would like a footnote added.	CORRECTING TEXT
197-122	The commenter would like the PFIP to summarize outstanding policy issues.	CORRECTING TEXT
197-124	The commenter requests an amendment to the Public Services Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
197-125	The commenter requests verification of the text.	CORRECTING TEXT
197-126	The commenter requests changes be made to tables 4-9 through 4-12 in the Public Services plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
203-11	The commenter discusses the residential density issue pertaining to Bostrom Park.	CORRECTING TEXT
204-6	The commenter would like the Reuse Plan modified to reflect that most of the existing 1,522 units designated "Medium Density Residential" in the Reuse Plan (Polygon 4) are attached.	CORRECTING TEXT
204-24	The commenter states that the jurisdictional boundary descriptions for the cities of Marina and Seaside are incorrectly referenced in the text.	CORRECTING TEXT
204-26	The commenter states that the reference to the City of Marina General Plan should be to its 1983 update.	CORRECTING TEXT
210-25	The commenter states that the text is incorrect.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-1	The commenter summarizes the comments.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-3	The commenter points out erroneous information in the EIR regarding the Final SEIS.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-4	The commenter states that the programmatic EIR approach should expedite FORA's preparation of project-specific documents through the use of tiering.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-5	The commenter states the acreage of Fort Ord is 27,879 if you count the railroad right-of-way, or 52 acres less if you do not.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-6	The commenter states the acreage for the POM Annex should be 805 acres.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-9	The commenter states that the 18 percent figure used in the EIR to describe disturbed area on Fort Ord needs to be verified with the Army, because the Army's estimate is approximately 25 percent for the total area disturbed.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-28	The commenter states that the USFWS has eliminated the candidate categories C1, C2 and replaced it with C.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-35	The commenter states that Figure 6.4-1 is incorrect. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-36	The commenter states the information regarding the golf course is incorrect.	CORRECTING TEXT

213-37	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-38	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-39	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-40	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-41	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-43	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-44	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-45	Commenter recommends that at the end of the public review period, the Army and FORA staff compute the latest acreage totals for PBC's, EDC's and federal transfers and other transfers and also compute revised usage percentages so the most accurate figures available are used based on the latest digitized information.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-46	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-47	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
213-48	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
213-49	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
213-50	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
213-51	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
213-52	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
213-53	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
213-54	Commenter requests a text change to clarify and correct Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-55	Commenter requests a text change to clarify and correct Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-56	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT

213-57	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan, because it is no longer correct.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-58	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-59	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-60	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-61	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-62	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-63	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan to add a label on the illustrative plan indicating that the New Guest Lodge and lands west of Highway 1 will be a state park.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-64	Commenter suggest the illustrative figure is not consistent with current ongoing screening	CORRECTING TEXT
213-65	Commenter asks who is the developer to underwrite costs? Capital? for new residential neighborhoods.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-66	Commenter notes that the parcel size for the visitor's center is 11.25 acres.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-67	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	CORRECTING TEXT
213-68	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-69	Commenter requests a revisions to the graphics to update boundaries on maps in the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-70	Commenter notes that the "best guess of land to be managed by BLM is 14,023 acres and more accurate information will be available later.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-74	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume II of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-75	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume II of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-77	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Appendix B to the Reuse Plan, the Business and Operations Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-80	The commenter states that the EIR's percentage for various land uses under alternatives 6R, 7 and 8 are different from those in the SEIS.	CORRECTING TEXT
249-2	The commenter is requesting program language changes to clarify the intent and consistency of the Reuse Plan.	CORRECTING TEXT
249-3	The commenter requests text amendments.	CORRECTING TEXT
249-4	The commenter is requesting program language amendments.	CORRECTING TEXT

249-5	The commenter states the Reuse Plan is incorrect in its assumption that a coastal pond exists in Polygon 2a.	CORRECTING TEXT
249-6	The commenter states that the program numbers need to be changed.	CORRECTING TEXT
249-10	The commenter requests that the table that cross-references the EIR with the EIS and SEIS be amended.	CORRECTING TEXT
213-33	The commenter does not agree with the EIR's conclusion that the public services cumulative impacts are less than significant.	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS
197-108	The commenter points out that the PFIP includes a desalination plant in the later phase of development yet there is no clear direction at this time that this plant should be constructed.	DESALINATION
197-113	The commenter repeats statement regarding financing the desalination plant.	DESALINATION
197-117	The commenter requests clarification of the text pertaining to a desalination plant.	DESALINATION
197-118	The commenter requests clarification of the text pertaining to a desalination plant.	DESALINATION
248-11	The commenter states that the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan (PGP) does not accommodate a hotel site, desalination plant or aquaculture facility. Review of Map 6 in the PGP indicates there is a proposed lodge (40-80 rooms with parking and restaurant).	DESALINATION
291-1	The commenter would like information on the desalination plant.	DESALINATION
293-1	The commenter is requesting detailed information on a future desalination plant.	DESALINATION
183-3	The commenter states that a particular policy is inadequate.	DRAINAGE
198-9	The commenter states that storm water runoff impacts was not analyzed in the Reuse Plan, therefore it cannot be determined if the policies and programs used as mitigation measures are sufficient.	DRAINAGE
198-10	The commenter expresses concern of the general nature of a storm water runoff program.	DRAINAGE
248-8	The commenter indicates a concern about erosion and contaminated stormwater from Fort Ord.	DRAINAGE
267-1	The commenter requests the economic data for area communities	ECONOMIC
167-42	The commenter states that the multiplier effect of a civilian job is greater than its military counterpart and, therefore, should be reflected in the EIR	ECONOMICS
176-1	The commenter expresses concern regarding new jobs relative to the number of jobs associated with the former military economy exceeds the mandate of FORA.	ECONOMICS
180-1	The commenter requests economic data on base closure.	ECONOMICS
209-2	The commenter would like to know where the information is pertaining to existing housing, unemployment and labor skills available and would like to know what kind of jobs would be generated.	ECONOMICS

242-16	The commenter would like to know if the economic/market analysis included economic multipliers for secondary jobs created in the region and would like to know if Fort Ord growth will reduce the growth of housing and employment for other cities on the Peninsula.	ECONOMICS
242-17	The commenter would like to know if the labor market will be able to absorb the anticipated activities and if not has the economic/market analysis accounted for new workers attracted to the region.	ECONOMICS
299-5	The commenter states that FORA needs to address the issue of density on commercial enterprises.	ECONOMICS
299-15	The commenter requests that market analyses be conducted a specific way.	ECONOMICS
197-110	The commenter states that the summary cost screen for all capital improvements needs to reflect the reallocation resulting from imposition of a one-time Mello-Roos fee.	FINANCING
197-114	The commenter requests that BLM, State Parks and UC be parenthetically referenced as agencies that carry their own habitat management costs in Table PFIP 3-1 (page 3-24).	FINANCING
197-123	The commenter would like the PFIP to state when the special tax will begin to be collected.	FINANCING
200-5	The commenter would like the EIR to recommend that the assumptions for implementing Fort Ord infrastructure improvements be clearly listed in the Final Reuse Plan.	FINANCING
200-6	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include infrastructure funding mechanism that will assure infrastructure development that is concurrent with new development.	FINANCING
200-8	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a policy requiring each jurisdiction to develop more detailed allocations of infrastructure costs for each planning area and then require coordinated infrastructure development programs per planning area linked to base wide infrastructure.	FINANCING
203-3	The commenter would like FORA to address the upfront cost issues.	FINANCING
203-4	The commenter states the PFIP does not include the costs of annual operations.	FINANCING
203-5	The commenter states that the PFIP assumes CSUMB and UCSC will pay their fair share of capital costs.	FINANCING
203-7	The commenter would like the Business and Operations Plan to reflect that lands to be directly conveyed to Seaside through a conveyance mechanism outside the purview of SB 899 and SB 1600 do not require any of the proceeds to be provided to FORA.	FINANCING
207-1	The commenter has questions about inconsistencies between the Infrastructure Study and the Draft Reuse Plan.	FINANCING

210-20	The commenter would like to know if CSUMB and UC are required to pay special taxes.	FINANCING
210-21	The commenter would like to know if the Mello-Roos fees will be used to cover transit O&M costs.	FINANCING
299-4	The commenter states that too much residential development up front could reduce adequate tax base for revenues.	FINANCING
299-11	The commenter would like information on funding.	FINANCING
307-12	The commenter raises concern over the availability of financing resources to go ahead with a plan.	FINANCING
307-67	The commenter asks whether continuing challenges to developer fees will affect the likelihood of their use.	FINANCING
184-1	The commenter is concerned with who is responsible for fire hazards.	FIRE
306-2	The commenter states that hot fires are more conducive to natural revegetation of chaparral communities.	FIRE
307-39	The commenter asks why there is more than one level of voting in FORA.	FORA
307-40	The commenter asks why another voting representation at the Board would not be possible.	FORA
307-46	The commenter asks what governmental body will be in place to respond to concerns of individuals after 2015 (when FORA no longer exists).	FORA
307-47	The commenter asks to what extent will non-local entities be able to intervene in events at Fort Ord (when FORA no longer exists).	FORA
307-48	The commenter asks what the immediate superior to FORA is in terms of rights of appeal.	FORA
313-2	The commenter would like to know how much money has been spent on plans since 1991.	FORA
167-37	The commenter requests language be removed from the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
174-1	The commenter states that the EIR is so general that it is inadequate and the public cannot make an informed decision.	GENERAL COMMENT
182-1	The commenter states that veterans health care is a problem.	GENERAL COMMENT
182-2	The commenter would like to know why students get priority over veterans.	GENERAL COMMENT
186-1	The commenter expresses concern over a broad range of issues, to include: water supply; traffic and circulation; wastewater treatment capacity; taxation of neighboring communities to finance infrastructure expansion; and viewshed.	GENERAL COMMENT
186-2	The commenter expresses concern about the political situation.	GENERAL COMMENT
187-1	The commenter commends the effort to develop the Reuse Plan	GENERAL COMMENT
189-2	The commenter expresses that he would like his community to progress.	GENERAL COMMENT

191-3	The commenter states that Vietnam Veterans of Monterey County will be “getting a chunk” of land on Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
191-4	The commenter states that there are inconsistencies and credibility issues with other jurisdictions.	GENERAL COMMENT
191-5	The commenter states that there are “white holes’ that BLM will ask for.	GENERAL COMMENT
192-1	The commenter request that all FORA board members be present for all public hearings.	GENERAL COMMENT
193-1	The commenter warns that the economic projections of the Reuse Plan not be followed blindly and allowed to become self-fulfilling.	GENERAL COMMENT
197-1	The commenter lists the primary issues that concern UC. The specific comments follow.	GENERAL COMMENT
200-1	The commenter states that the proposed project would result in significant environmental impacts associated with traffic, water and scenic highways.	GENERAL COMMENT
213-2	The commenter states the Table of Contents in the EIR incorrectly references the starting page for section 4.10.	GENERAL COMMENT
204-20	The commenter requests clarification in the numbers used in Table 2.2-1 in Volume I of the Reuse Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
206-1	The commenter (the State Lands Commission) expresses pleasure with the Fort Ord Dunes State Park and would be pleased to consider a lease of properties under its jurisdiction to a public agency for these purposes.	GENERAL COMMENT
206-3	The commenter notes that the transfer of properties will be preceded by complete remediation for hazardous substances.	GENERAL COMMENT
209-1	The commenter requests that a revised EIR be prepared for a project based on existing infrastructure.	GENERAL COMMENT
209-5	The commenter submits a recommendation to FORA pertaining to developing a reuse plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
209-6	The commenter states that the proposed project would have a variety of environmental impacts.	GENERAL COMMENT
210-1	The commenter provides general comments which summarize specific comments contained in the comment letter.	GENERAL COMMENT
211-14	The commenter discusses the McKinney Act property conveyed to the Children’s Services International daycare center proposed at the corner of 12th Street and 4th Avenue, and the potential impact a future right-of-way dedication for 4th Avenue would have on this facility.	GENERAL COMMENT
212-1	The commenter would like to know if there is something that could slow down development at Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
212-2	The commenter hits on a number of environmental issues.	GENERAL COMMENT
217-1	The commenter would like to see a revised EIR and a specific plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
218-1	The commenter discusses the DEIR and the size of the plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
220-1	The commenter asserts the Reuse Plan is a Specific Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT

222-1	The commenter provides a rhetorical summary of his concerns pertaining to Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
223-1	The commenter states that the Monterey County Farm Bureau is against a "Westside Bypass" and any proposed roadway which would eliminate productive farmlands. The "Westside Bypass" is an identified facility in the TAMC's regional network.	GENERAL COMMENT
223-2	The commenter states the BLM lands on Fort Ord should be used for future public benefit needs such as a new Highway 68 Bypass.	GENERAL COMMENT
226-4	The commenter would like to know why only three jurisdictions are involved.	GENERAL COMMENT
228-1	The commenter is concerned with the population, water and other resources.	GENERAL COMMENT
230-3	The commenter would like to know why we need 45,000 new jobs.	GENERAL COMMENT
230-4	The commenter would like a revised EIR recirculated.	GENERAL COMMENT
232-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that addresses a smaller scope.	GENERAL COMMENT
234-2	The commenter discusses general impacts of the project.	GENERAL COMMENT
242-11	The commenter applauds the design elements and principles evident in the Reuse Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
242-20	The commenter would like information on how fees will be collected and infrastructure developed simultaneous to new development.	GENERAL COMMENT
248-4	The commenter states that an EIS and/or EIR will be required for a future desalination plant.	GENERAL COMMENT
248-5	The commenter would like to know what plans Seaside has for the area extending into the Bay.	GENERAL COMMENT
248-6	The commenter summarizes the previous 5 comments.	GENERAL COMMENT
248-16	The commenter would like information on wastewater treatment plants on Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
249-7	The commenter requests that a particular type of geographic index be included in the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
249-9	The commenter is requesting clarification on the priority of mitigations between the EIS and the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
252-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
265-1	The commenter states that jobs and housing should be prioritized	GENERAL COMMENT
266-1	The commenter would like the population at Fort Ord not to exceed the population that existed on Fort Ord in 1991.	GENERAL COMMENT
274-1	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
275-1	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
276-1	The commenter would like information about lifestyle impacts on businesses and the environment.	GENERAL COMMENT

277-1	The commenter submits general discussion on issues pertaining to Marina	GENERAL COMMENT
285-1	The commenter discusses the amount of acreage that would be developed associated with reuse.	GENERAL COMMENT
285-2	The commenter would like the EIR to discuss the historic growth rate.	GENERAL COMMENT
288-3	The comment is not specific enough to warrant a specific response.	GENERAL COMMENT
288-4	The commenter submits advise to the FORA Board.	GENERAL COMMENT
289-1	The commenter would like the RAB to be replaced.	GENERAL COMMENT
292-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
296-1	The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan process be expedited.	GENERAL COMMENT
297-1	The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan process be expedited.	GENERAL COMMENT
301-2	The commenter would like information on mosquito/vector control.	GENERAL COMMENT
305-1	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
307-1	The commenter summarizes the specific concerns itemized in subsequent comments.	GENERAL COMMENT
307-3	The commenter asks about the process used in the Reuse Plan and specifically about the communities beyond the land use jurisdictions within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
307-13	The commenter expresses an opinion that all of the serious environmental problems are regional and local jurisdictions vary widely in the extent and quality of their handling of them.	GENERAL COMMENT
307-16	The commenter expresses an opinion that the Monterey Peninsula region is already at or beyond its capacity to sustain growth.	GENERAL COMMENT
307-17	The commenter expresses an opinion that the 28,800 acres of Fort Ord land is presented in a misleading way that exaggerates the amount of currently developable land.	GENERAL COMMENT
307-33	The commenter questions the objective of speed in the economic redevelopment of Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
307-34	The commenter questions the tradeoff between the need for speed in redevelopment and the minimization of disruption and protection of the environment.	GENERAL COMMENT
307-57	The commenter asks how much of the former Fort Ord is presently developed.	GENERAL COMMENT
309-1	The commenter submits a recommendation to the FORA Board.	GENERAL COMMENT
314-1	The commenter would like another EIR prepared.	GENERAL COMMENT
315-1	The commenter would like another EIR prepared.	GENERAL COMMENT
316-2	The commenter does not want the frog pond replaced with an office building.	GENERAL COMMENT
213-17	The commenter states the golf courses belong to the Army.	GOLF COURSE

203-8	The commenter would like the Business and Operations Plan to be updated to reflect that the Army will transfer ownership of the two existing golf courses to Seaside.	GOLF COURSES
204-15	The commenter requests that a figure be amended to show a 20 acre recreational conveyance to the City in polygon 2b.	GRAPHICS
204-22	The commenter states that figures erroneously depict Marina and the Armstrong Ranch.	GRAPHICS
204-25	The commenter questions the accuracy of the depiction of Polygon 2a as a HMP Reserve and/or Corridor in Figure 3.6-2 contained in Volume I.	GRAPHICS
213-8	The commenter states that Figure 3.2-1 contains incorrect information.	GRAPHICS
307-5	The commenter would like to see more regional maps in the DEIR to establish the context for the impacts.	GRAPHICS
307-38	The commenter asks why there is not more graphic representation in the DEIR that relates to the region.	GRAPHICS
197-107	The commenter request a modification of Figure 1-3.	GRAPHICS/TRANSPORTATION
168-17	The commenter repeats comment 167-31.	HABITAT
213-24	The commenter would like the text pertaining to habitat amended.	HABITAT
213-25	The commenter would like additional animal species included in the discussion. Refer to the Changes to the EIR section below for amended text.	HABITAT
213-26	The commenter would like additional animal species included in the discussion.	HABITAT
213-27	The commenter would like the text pertaining to riparian communities to be amended.	HABITAT
213-29	The commenter would like a table updated.	HABITAT
213-30	The commenter points out a typographical mistake.	HABITAT
298-1	The commenter states that the habitat corridors are insufficient.	HABITAT
298-2	The commenter urges that the development in the Frog Pond area be reduced to preserve habitat and wildlife.	HABITAT
298-3	The commenter states that because of the unique character of the Fort Ord flora, native plants from on-site stock should be used in the exterior landscaping.	HABITAT
298-4	The commenter would like habitat loss to be mitigated by setting aside existing high-quality habitat.	HABITAT
306-1	The commenter points out that FORA should take a stronger role in protecting the habitat reserves currently in the jurisdiction of the BLM and states that future opportunities for placement of public facilities within the BLM habitat management reserve cannot exceed 2 percent of the total BLM acreage.	HABITAT
311-1	The commenter would like information on the existing location of hazardous materials and their disposal.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

213-31	The commenter states the EIR unnecessarily exceeds the requirements of the HMP.	HMP
213-32	The commenter states that buckwheat habitat in the coastal dunes cannot be disturbed in increments greater than 10 percent at a time because to remove more than 10 percent may reduce the wildlife population of Smith's blue butterfly to below self-sustaining levels.	HMP
213-42	Commenter requests a clarifying text change to Volume I of the Reuse Plan	HMP
211-1	The commenter provides information and clarification on subject of the McKinney Act.	HOUSING
211-2	The commenter reiterates CEQA section 15131 pertaining to social and economic issues.	HOUSING
211-3	The commenter discusses the Operations Plan.	HOUSING
211-4	The commenter states that the Fort Ord communities must not use proposed policies to eliminate land uses which serve low income individuals.	HOUSING
211-5	The commenter requests that Objective F on page 4-27 of the Reuse Plan (Volume II) should be reworded.	HOUSING
211-6	The commenter requests that Program F-1.2 on page 4-32 of the Reuse Plan (Volume II) should be reworded.	HOUSING
211-7	The commenter states that Program F.1-3 is erroneous.	HOUSING
211-8	The commenter requests that Program G-1.1 be amend.	HOUSING
211-9	The commenter reiterates state housing requirements pertaining to housing elements and recommends a new policy or program.	HOUSING
211-10	The commenter would like Seaside's policies and programs to reflect the above amendments made to the City of Marina policies and programs above.	HOUSING
211-11	The commenter would like Seaside to rebuild ten transitional housing units.	HOUSING
211-12	The commenter would like the Reuse Plan relevant to Seaside be amended as reflected in response to comments 211- 4 through 211- 9.	HOUSING
211-13	The commenter requests that a table be included in the Reuse Plan to document the status of the McKinney Act transfers.	HOUSING
215-1	Commenter supports the Reuse Plan.	HOUSING
221-1	The commenter would like stronger housing language incorporated in the Reuse Plan that will benefit the homeless	HOUSING
223-4	The commenter addresses low-income housing.	HOUSING
284-1	The commenter would like the EIR to address the affordable housing issue.	HOUSING
284-2	The commenter would like to know what part the Housing and Urban Development agency will have in the Reuse Plan.	HOUSING

210-32	The commenter requests clarification of the text pertaining to Highway 68.	HWY 68
190-1	The comment is a repeat of the commenter's previous comments 159 and 163	HWY 68 BYPASS
307-59	The commenter asks for clarification of the lands that have already been transferred from the Army.	LAND SALES
185-1	The commenter expresses a concern about landfill.	LANDFILL
213-11	The commenter requests clarification regarding use of the landfill site.	LANDFILL
213-12	The commenter would like additional discussion on the potential impacts future land use would have on the landfill cap.	LANDFILL
213-76	The commenter notes that the landfill cap design has been completed per the Army's program requirements.	LANDFILL
213-81	The commenter states that the EIR and SEIS do not correspond as it relates to the landfill site (Polygon 8a).	LANDFILL
272-1	The commenter would like to know the total number of residential units in the vicinity of the old Fort Ord landfill site will have to be removed because of structural failure	LANDFILL
281-1	The commenter would like the EIR to discuss the CAMU at the landfill site.	LANDFILL
307-54	The commenter asks who will be liable for cleaning up messes, paying fines, and financing corrective measures if projects approved by the "city/county" (land use jurisdictions) do not comply with assembly bill 939.	LANDFILL
307-72	The commenter repeats 307-54.	LANDFILL
176-2	The commenter states that Silicon Valley is the target of all marketing programs.	MARKETING
177-1	The commenter expresses his support of the Reuse plan.	OPINION
201-1	The commenter expresses an opinion which does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	OPINION
202-1	The commenter would like a national cemetery.	OPINION
205-1	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan cannot satisfy everyone.	OPINION
205-2	The commenter expresses and opinion about FORA.	OPINION
205-3	The commenter expresses and opinion about FORA.	OPINION
208-1	The commenter would like the project to be downsized.	OPINION
209-4	The commenter submits an opinion.	OPINION
224-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project.	OPINION
226-5	The commenter believes that privatizing the water utilities is appropriate.	OPINION
232-3	The commenter states an opinion on the project.	OPINION
233-1	The commenter states an opinion on the project.	OPINION
247-1	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	OPINION

250-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project.	OPINION
254-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project.	OPINION
255-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project.	OPINION
258-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project.	OPINION
259-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project.	OPINION
273-1	The commenter states an opinion in support of the project.	OPINION
280-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project.	OPINION
282-1	The commenter repeats the contents of her previous comment letters submitted to FORA.	OPINION
286-1	The commenter states an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR.	OPINION
288-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project.	OPINION
294-1	The commenter expresses an opinion on the adequacy of the Draft EIR.	OPINION
299-13	The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR.	OPINION
304-1	The commenter states an opinion on preference of future reuse.	OPINION
306-3	The commenter states Program A-2.2 of Conservation and Geology Policy A-2 is too limiting.	OPINION
307-25	The commenter expresses the opinion that driving past Fort Ord was once an enjoyable and relaxing experience but now can be life-threatening.	OPINION
307-56	The commenter expresses an opinion that a project for a new local water supply will be controversial and notes that it is likely to require and EIR.	OPINION
308-1	The commenter states the EIR omits necessary data.	OPINION
313-3	The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR.	OPINION
213-18	The commenters states there are other more recent sources of information pertaining to UXO or toxic clean-ups at Fort Ord.	ORDNANCE
213-19	The commenter has a preference for different language as it pertains to UXO.	ORDNANCE
213-20	As it pertains to a revised unexploded ordnance figure.	ORDNANCE
214-1	The commenter spoke of UXO and toxics.	ORDNANCE
216-1	The commenter spoke of UXO. Refer to response to comment 32-1.	ORDNANCE
269-1	The commenter states the EIR is inadequate because it does not contain the most recent figure depicting the location of unexploded ordnance.	ORDNANCE
306-4	The commenter adds clarification to the UXO discussion in the EIR.	ORDNANCE
307-10	The commenter notes that the cleanup of unexploded ordnance is not completed, nor is there an officially approved plan in place and suggests the Army is seeking relief from financial liability.	ORDNANCE
307-45	The commenter asks who is going to pay for rendering the area safe from unexploded ordnance and when it will be completed.	ORDNANCE

167-36	The commenter would like the EIR to state why FORA should adopt a plan for uses beyond 20 years.	PLANNING
172-1	The commenter states that the proposed housing densities are too high.	PLANNING
195-2	The commenter would like to see a long range planning and management agency for the Monterey Peninsula.	PLANNING
200-12	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a policy that the ultimate development pattern at Fort Ord reflect AMBAG's "Livable Communities Initiative".	PLANNING
200-17	The commenter requests that the Final EIR recommend that FORA will monitor and annually review its plan implementation, particularly its CIP, and that the Plan be regularly updated at least every 5 year.	PLANNING
203-2	The commenter would like FORA authority to respect the autonomy of local jurisdictions.	PLANNING
203-9	The commenter states that the level of specificity in the Reuse Plan is excessive.	PLANNING
203-10	The commenter identifies an example in the text in the Reuse Plan pertaining to future development as an example which allows the flexibility the land use jurisdictions wish to retain in order to respond to and capitalize on opportunities as they arise.	PLANNING
203-12	The commenter states that Seaside should play more than a supporting role in developing design guidelines.	PLANNING
204-1	The commenter states that if Fort Ord is severely restricted from developing the pressures for growth will occur elsewhere.	PLANNING
204-2	The commenter would like FORA not to reduce the long-term plan to a 20-year plan because it would increase the annual growth rate of the plan by 250 percent, which would create economic difficulties.	PLANNING
204-4	The commenter would like better opportunities for lower density single family residential development.	PLANNING
204-5	The commenter states the Reuse Plan is too restrictive, too precise and not general enough and will result in severely limiting future flexibility which may be necessary.	PLANNING
204-8	The commenter requests flexibility in developing design guidelines.	PLANNING
204-10	The commenter says the Draft Plan is overly ambitious in terms of the extent of its goals and policies and may limit flexibility in implementation of the Plan.	PLANNING
204-11	The commenter repeats a request for greater flexibility.	PLANNING
204-12	The commenter would like the text to indicate that square footage for development can be moved around the base.	PLANNING
204-13	The commenter would like more flexibility in the Reuse Plan so that "market reality" and the demands of "economic forces" can proceed to redevelop Fort Ord.	PLANNING

204-14	The commenter states that AMBAG's Livable Communities Initiative should be recognized as a reference document and should not be considered as a policy document constraining the reuse plan.	PLANNING
204-16	The commenter states the Reuse Plan is too restrictive as it pertains to Recreation policies and requests a change to one of the programs.	PLANNING
204-19	The commenter states that the identification of "gateways" discussed in the Reuse Plan is too specific.	PLANNING
204-21	The commenter states that the "Marina Town Center" illustrative is not representative of any recognized planning process.	PLANNING
204-27	The commenter states that the discussion of community parks should include the potential to provide neighborhood-serving facilities as well.	PLANNING
242-14	The commenter would like a floor-area-ratio (FAR) that would allow for more compact development in the commercial, industrial and manufacturing categories.	PLANNING
242-15	The commenter would like to know why there is no significant open space breaks between Seaside and Marina.	PLANNING
248-17	The commenter includes a list of information he would like the PGP to contain.	PLANNING
249-1	The commenter requests clarification of the language in the Draft Reuse Plan.	PLANNING
299-6	The commenter states the Reuse Plan must be able to accommodate future changes.	PLANNING
299-7	The commenter states that county development must be addressed in relation to infrastructure, utilities and public services.	PLANNING
299-8	The commenter is requesting new methodology to determine open space.	PLANNING
307-58	The commenter asks what the proposed distribution of land uses is in the Reuse Plan.	PLANNING
307-60	The commenter asks for detailed clarification of the land distribution in the Reuse Plan.	PLANNING
204-9	The commenter discusses the community design vision issue.	PLANNING/VISUAL
168-2	The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan use the most recent California Department of Finance population figures for Monterey County.	POPULATION
310-1	The commenter would like the population at Fort Ord not to exceed the 31,000.	POPULATION/SB 899
242-3	The commenter addresses the program EIR approach used in conjunction with the Reuse Plan and states the benefits expected to be derived from a program EIR are not materialized in the Reuse Plan EIR, because the alternatives analysis are not fully developed.	PROGRAM EIR
264-1	The comment submits an opinion on the public review process.	PUBLIC REVIEW

210-13	The commenter states that operations and maintenance costs of the fixed guideway/rail service to serve the Fort Ord must be identified.	RAIL
295-1	The commenter requests a greater level of detail be provided concerning the impacts of full buildout development or the project needs to be reduced.	REDUCE PROJECT
299-16	The commenter would like FORA to consider a smaller population at Fort Ord.	REDUCED PROJECT/SB 899
213-82	The commenter states that Polygon 17b in the Reuse Plan and EIR contains an area designated "Public Facility/Institutional".	RV PARK
176-4	The commenter states that Fort Ord jurisdictions can ignore the Reuse Plan.	SB 899
178-1	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan and EIR exceed the mandates of SB 899.	SB 899
195-1	The commenter expresses an interest in limiting the population at Fort Ord to what it was at the time of base closure because there would not be significant impacts.	SB 899
199-2	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should replace only what was lost as a result of the population and economic impacts of the former military base	SB 899
200-3	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should set the level of economic activity at the former Fort Ord to the level that existed at that the time of base closure and the rate of development should be tied to the ability to fund infrastructure and minimize infrastructure costs.	SB 899
200-4	The commenter states that the population in 2015 should be no more than approximately 31,500 people.	SB 899
200-16	The commenter requests that the EIR include a discussion of the plan policies and programs enforcement and appeal procedures.	SB 899
223-6	The commenter is requesting that an economic impact analysis be prepared by FORA relative to the reuse of Fort Ord.	SB 899
229-1	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR.	SB 899
230-1	The commenter states that the increase in population at Fort Ord is contradictory to SB 899's objective to enhance the quality of the environment.	SB 899
232-2	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR.	SB 899
234-1	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR.	SB 899
235-1	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR.	SB 899
236-1	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan goes beyond the scope of the four objectives legislated by SB 899 and would like a revised EIR.	SB 899

242-1	The commenter addresses the SB 899 goals and questions why the Reuse Plan exceeds the goals with a greater population, greater economic activity, etc.	SB 899
242-2	The commenter requests that the EIR contain an alternative that addresses the intent of SB 899 only.	SB 899
299-1	The commenter states that future development at Fort Ord should not exceed economic activity that occurred at the time of base closure.	SB 899
307-2	The commenter questions whether the Reuse Plan exceeds the mission identified for FORA set forth in SB 899.	SB 899
307-15	The commenter requests baseline information by which to measure changes to the economic and environmental conditions to provide credible measures to restore the economic climate that existed prior to the downsizing of Fort Ord.	SB 899
307-18	The commenter expresses the opinion that an alternative be developed that would take the former Fort Ord area back to the economic health it enjoyed before base closure.	SB 899
307-29	The commenter questions the legal authority of FORA to adopt a Reuse Plan that extends development beyond 2015.	SB 899
307-30	The commenter asks why the Reuse planning doesn't extend even beyond 50 years.	SB 899
307-31	The commenter asks again what the legal authority is for proposing buildout that exceeds the level of use there prior to base closure.	SB 899
307-32	The commenter asks if the Plan minimizes disruption of the Monterey Bay area, as mandated in SB 899.	SB 899
307-35	The commenter asks for clarification of what is meant by economic recovery.	SB 899
307-53	The commenter questions why FORA's Reuse Planning extends beyond the 2015 period.	SB 899
307-36	The commenter asks if the project consultants maintain that economic recovery is in itself an "overriding consideration" available to local governments as justification for the project.	SB 899/CEQA
307-37	The commenter asks to what extent FORA is mandated to consider the concerns of on-site jurisdictions as opposed to those of neighboring and nearby communities.	SB 899/CEQA
268-1	The commenter is concerned about schools.	SCHOOLS
278-1	The commenter states that the level of cleanup at Fort Ord will result in residual contamination.	TOXICS
200-10	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a program identifying how transit service to Fort Ord will be funded.	TRANSIT

210-12	The commenter states that each jurisdiction should work with MST in developing funding mechanism for operations and maintenance (O&M) because without this funding MST would be required to cut service from other areas in order to serve Fort Ord.	TRANSIT O&M
210-22	The commenter states that transit system's O&M must be funded if transit is proposed as a mitigation measure and without funding for O&M, transit will be ineffective as a mitigation.	TRANSIT O&M
210-29	The commenter states that no mitigation is proposed to pay for maintaining existing transit levels of service.	TRANSIT O&M
210-30	The commenter states that there is no mitigation proposed to reimburse MST for lost fares as a result of a system wide slow-down in schedule speed of the bus system.	TRANSIT O&M
210-36	The commenter would like to know which transit corridors will require new service, additional service or frequencies due to traffic congestion and what will be the cost of additional service.	TRANSIT O&M
210-6	The commenter states that TAMC does not use the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) as stated in the EIR and the reuse plan. The commenter is correct.	TRANSIT/CMP
210-7	The commenter states that the text does not adequately convey what the off-site traffic impacts are.	TRANSIT/CMP
210-8	The commenter states that on-site roads do not meet TAMC LOS standards listed in the CMP or RTP.	TRANSIT/CMP
210-28	The commenter states the mitigation monitoring program does not convey which roadways will be significantly impacted and does not convey what the resulting LOS will be.	TRANSIT/CMP
210-31	The commenter states that the EIR should use the CMP LOS standards.	TRANSIT/CMP
210-40	The commenter requests that the travel times and the degree of LOS F should be indicated per the standards of Caltrans.	TRANSIT/CMP
210-15	The commenter would like to know if the Fort Ord jurisdictions are legally bound to include a traffic ordinance fee consistent with the PFIP and include this policy in their general plans.	TRANSIT/MITIGATION
188-2	The commenter expresses a concern about transportation issues.	TRANSPORTATION
191-2	The commenter states that Blanco Road needs to be 4 lanes.	TRANSPORTATION
197-105	The commenter requests clarification of the information in the text.	TRANSPORTATION
197-106	The commenter states that the PFIP indicates the Blanco Road extension will be built in the 2001 through 2005 period, yet other portions of the document indicate development of this road segment would occur later.	TRANSPORTATION
197-111	The commenter requests clarification of the information in the text.	TRANSPORTATION
197-112	The commenter requests that discrepancies in the text pertaining to the Blanco Road extension to amended.	TRANSPORTATION

198-1	The commenter requests that the EIR include discussion of the expected traffic impact on Davis Road.	TRANSPORTATION
198-3	The commenter states that the EIR's forecast for transportation infrastructure is based on historical transport mode splits.	TRANSPORTATION
198-4	The commenter recommends that the EIR include scenarios with different mixes of conventional and alternative transportation modes.	TRANSPORTATION
200-9	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a program managing traffic related to available capacity of roads and transit systems.	TRANSPORTATION
200-11	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include FORA'S policy for paying its fair share of regional highway expansion, including Highways 1, 101, 68 and 156.	TRANSPORTATION
204-7	The commenter questions the accuracy of the traffic model analysis and believes the need for a Blanco Road extension will be sooner.	TRANSPORTATION
204-17	The commenter states the Reuse Plan should further address the need for improvement to Highway 1.	TRANSPORTATION
204-23	The commenter would like to know if there is any discussion provided relative to a comparison between vehicle trips when the lands were used by the Army prior to 1991, compared to reuse.	TRANSPORTATION
207-2	The commenter notes that the Reuse Plan proposed regional (transportation) improvements are not the same as those included in the FORIS report.	TRANSPORTATION
207-3	The commenter takes exception to differences between the Reuse Plan Volumes 1 and 2 and the project listing in the PFIP of Appendix B.	TRANSPORTATION
207-4	The commenter requests clarification on the basis of the nexus analysis, and roadway financing assumptions in the Business Plan.	TRANSPORTATION
207-5	The commenter asks for clarification on the planned improvements to Intergarrison Road/8th Street.	TRANSPORTATION
207-6	The commenter's request makes no sense in light of the commenter's confusion among the role of the various documents.	TRANSPORTATION
207-7	The commenter provides a reconciliation chart to compare the Business Plan assumptions (Appendix B) with the Reuse Volumes 1 and 2.	TRANSPORTATION
210-2	The commenter states that the language in the Reuse Plan (Vol. I) pertaining to the Prunedale Bypass is incorrect because the bypass is not assured to be completed until additional local funding sources become available, and because of this situation the text and all model runs conducted as part of the Reuse Plan should reflect the current transportation capacities only.	TRANSPORTATION

210-3	The commenter would like to know if the section of Hwy 101 north of Hwy 156 or Hwy 156 itself, or any other CMP segment/intersections expected to be significantly impacted by cumulative development if the Prunedale Bypass is not built by 2015.	TRANSPORTATION
210-4	The commenter would like to know if the Prunedale Bypass is listed as a mitigation measure for the CMP segments/intersections expected to be significantly impacted by cumulative development.	TRANSPORTATION
210-5	The commenter would like to know if the improvements to Davis Road are intended to be completed by 2015, if not then the traffic model must be rerun to reflect traffic and circulation conditions during the winter months.	TRANSPORTATION
210-9	The commenter states that without substantial evidence for traffic conditions beyond 2015, there cannot be a statement of overriding conditions because such conditions require substantial evidence.	TRANSPORTATION
210-11	The commenter states that a transit policy directing jurisdictions to promote transportation demand management should be included.	TRANSPORTATION
210-16	The commenter states the combined effect of revising the land use plan, implementing paid parking, funding both rail and bus service and designing accessible neighborhoods for bikes, pedestrian, vanpools, buses and rail will reduce significant impacts.	TRANSPORTATION
210-17	The commenter states the EIR must use LOS standards contained in the CMP, must evaluate alternative modes of transportation, must investigate multimodal alternatives for improving the LOS, and states that alternative forms of transportation must be funded because it is beyond the region's ability to fund.	TRANSPORTATION
210-23	The commenter would like to know when transportation mitigations will be implemented.	TRANSPORTATION
210-24	The commenter would like to know if there is a timing standard for transit service improvements.	TRANSPORTATION
210-26	The commenter states that the impacts of each road and transit route must be identified and their mitigation costs and funding sources defined.	TRANSPORTATION
210-27	The commenter would like the mitigation monitoring program to be amended to include additional information.	TRANSPORTATION
210-33	The commenter requests additional traffic information.	TRANSPORTATION
210-34	The commenter would like to know what percentage of the cumulative transportation impacts for each regional road section is expected to be significantly impacted.	TRANSPORTATION
210-35	The commenter would like to know which of the roadway improvement projects are mitigation measure and to what degree LOS is improved.	TRANSPORTATION

210-38	The commenter requests clarification of the model run pertaining to Blanco and Davis Roads vis-a-vis closure of Davis Road during the winter months due to flooding that occurs on that roadway.	TRANSPORTATION
210-39	The commenter states that widening of Blanco Road and Davis Road is not in the RTP adopted by TAMC nor is the new bridge on Davis Road in the RTP or county CIP.	TRANSPORTATION
210-41	The commenter requests additional traffic information on the optimistically financed scenario.	TRANSPORTATION
210-42	The commenter provides a list of additional information that should be included in the EIR.	TRANSPORTATION
210-44	The commenter would like to know which optimistically financed roadway is a mitigation.	TRANSPORTATION
210-45	The commenter would like to know if the roadway improvements in the optimistically financed scenario are mitigations for cumulative impacts or proposed Reuse Plan impacts for 2015 and the buildout time frame.	TRANSPORTATION
210-46	The commenter would like to know how FORA will be able to certify that the project's economic recovery goals are not met without quantifying the fiscal impacts of closure and each reuse alternative.	TRANSPORTATION
210-47	The commenter would like additional transportation information.	TRANSPORTATION
210-49	TAMC requests that the Final Program EIR be available for their review before the plan is approved or the EIR certified.	TRANSPORTATION
210-50	The commenter states that FORA is subject to CEQA Section 15130.	TRANSPORTATION
210-51	The commenter would like the EIR to identify which roadway sections will be significantly impacted by the project and cumulative development and whether proposed mitigations bring the LOS up to CMP standards.	TRANSPORTATION
210-52	The commenter lists methods that can be used to reduce significant impacts of the proposed project on regional roadways and also states that it would not suffice or be acceptable to TAMC for FORA to prepare findings pertaining to statements of overriding consideration, which concludes that other agencies will be responsible for regional roadways.	TRANSPORTATION
210-53	The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION
210-56	The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION
210-57	The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION
210-58	The commenter requests clarification on the transit impacts and mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION
210-59	The commenter would like information on transportation improvement funding.	TRANSPORTATION

210-60	The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION
210-62	The commenter states that FORA has an obligation to fund its fair-share impacts on regional roadways.	TRANSPORTATION
210-63	The Florida Department of Transportation methodology is consistent with the HCM planning method.	TRANSPORTATION
220-4	The commenter states the Draft EIR fails to discuss the impacts of on- or off-base transportation impacts.	TRANSPORTATION
227-1	The commenter does not want the extension of California Avenue.	TRANSPORTATION
235-3	The commenter indicates a concern with funding of transportation projects.	TRANSPORTATION
242-4	The commenter raises four issues pertaining to transportation system constraints where a regional, state or federal funding source or sources are not forthcoming.	TRANSPORTATION
242-5	The commenter would like information on Highway 1.	TRANSPORTATION
242-6	The commenter requests that development at Fort Ord be limited to a level that does not exceed road capacity for which full funding is secured and which avoids the significant impact of further drops in the level of service beyond those projected without Fort Ord.	TRANSPORTATION
249-8	The commenter requests that the EIR include an analysis of the California Road extension north of Reservation Road.	TRANSPORTATION
260-1	The commenter discusses the McKinney Act property conveyed to the Children's Services International daycare center proposed at the corner of 12th Street and 4th Avenue, and the potential impact a future right-of-way dedication for 4th Avenue would have on this facility.	TRANSPORTATION
287-3	The commenter states the EIR does not provide a discussion of the feasibility of expanded roadways.	TRANSPORTATION
299-3	The commenter states there is no funding for transit.	TRANSPORTATION
301-1	The commenter states the optimistic financing scenario does not adequately address the infrastructure needed.	TRANSPORTATION
307-26	The commenter notes that the project will make already serious roadway capacity deficiencies far worse without a credible financial measure to remedy the conditions.	TRANSPORTATION
307-52	The commenter asks who will pay for roadway improvements needed as a result of new construction at Fort Ord.	TRANSPORTATION
307-69	The commenter asks why no analysis is given of the traffic impacts on the nearby jurisdictions.	TRANSPORTATION
307-70	The commenter asks what the traffic conditions will be on Highway 1 segments and on Holman Highway in Pacific Grove.	TRANSPORTATION
307-71	The commenter asks who are the most likely drivers to be killed or injured when the situation becomes worse at the Hwy 1 intersection with Hwy 68.	TRANSPORTATION

179-1	The commenter requests information on the impacts of proposed future roadway construction projects.	TRANSPORTATION/CEQA
179-2	The commenter states that the EIR does not explain the traffic impacts if no off-site improvements occur and for this reason the EIR is inadequate.	TRANSPORTATION/CEQA
210-43	The commenter states that FORA must balance development with environmental impacts and would like clarification as to how FORA will achieve a balance in light of uncertain public revenues.	TRANSPORTATION/CEQA
210-54	The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION/CEQA
210-55	The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION/CEQA
203-6	The commenter questions whether FORA should commit funds to off-base regional roadways when other public or private agencies to benefit from roadway improvements have not committed to similar funding mechanism.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
210-19	The commenter would like to know which implementation measure in the Reuse Plan establishes the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District and which mitigation measure requires its funds.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
223-3	The commenter discusses funding of roadway improvements.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
299-2	The commenter is concerned about transportation funding.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
210-48	The commenter would like the standard of significance used in the traffic and circulation discussion to be amended.	TRANSPORTATION/LOS
210-61	The commenter requests clarification on the traffic impacts and mitigations.	TRANSPORTATION/LOS
210-37	The commenter requests detailed information on the MCTAM model adjustments.	TRANSPORTATION/MODEL
198-11	The commenter requests that the letter of comment on the Reuse Plan's Notice of Preparation submitted to FORA by Salinas be responded to.	TRANSPORTATION/WATER/ DRAINAGE
197-2	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan repeatedly misuses the word "comprise".	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-3	The commenter states that numbering some of the tables in Volume 1 appear to be in error.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-5	The commenter requests that UC, CSU and State Parks be included as land use jurisdictions.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-6	The commenter states that reference to the LRA is incorrect.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-7	The commenter states that the reader can incorrectly interpret that FORA has authority/jurisdiction over property conveyed to other state agencies.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-8	The commenter suggests different language be used in the text to add clarity.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1

197-10	The commenter suggests different language be used in the text to add clarity.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-11	The commenter request clarification of the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-12	The commenter suggests different language be used in the text to add clarity.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-13	The commenter request clarification of the text	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-14	The commenter suggests different language be used in the text to add clarity.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-15	The commenter states that the summary text and the table contain discrepancies.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-16	The commenter states the bulleted statements of square footage do not appear to relate properly to the accompanying text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-17	The commenter requests an amendment to the text as it pertains to lodging facilities.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-18	The commenter requests an amendment to the text as it pertains to the EDC and FORA.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-22	The commenter requests that the managed habitat on Fort Ord be acknowledged on page 3-19 in Volume 1.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-23	The commenter requests an amendment to the text to reflect conditions at the Fritzsche Airfield.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-26	The commenter requests that the "Planned Development Mixed Use" for UCMBEST Center lands reflect a longer list for "Permitted Range of Uses" to reflect their Master Plan.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-27	The commenter states that the hotel opportunity site on the north side of Reservation Road should not limit UC to developing such on the south side of Reservation Road instead.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-29	The commenter requests an addition to the text pertaining to polygons 8b and 8c.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-30	The commenter requests an addition to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-31	The commenter requests removal of part of the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-32	The commenter requests that Table 3.3-1 and the text preceding it be amended to list separately the summary land use capacity: Ultimate Development for UCMBEST.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-33	The commenter requests amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-34	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-35	The commenter requests an amendment to Table 3.4-1 to add "experimental agriculture" to the permitted range of uses	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-37	The commenter would like a text amendment as it pertains to California Avenue extension.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-38	The commenter requests that the text be amended to include a discussion of the UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1

197-40	The commenter requests that the text be amended to reflect that UC may not receive the landfill parcel (Polygon 8a).	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-41	The commenter states that the language in the text pertaining to commercial recreation use on the landfill cap is incorrect.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-43	The commenter requests that the Oak Woodland Reserve Areas identified in Figure 3.6-2 should be appropriately referenced in the text and policies cross-referenced.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-44	The commenter requests that the table be amended.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-45	The commenter requests that the table be amended.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-47	The commenter requests amendments to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-48	The commenter reiterates what is written in the text and states that the 5.0 million square feet slightly exceeds the UC projections of 4.4 million square feet.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-49	The commenter requests that the text be amended.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-50	The commenter states the text should be amended to include Polygons 8b and 8c.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-51	The commenter states that the landfill site discussion is incorrect.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-52	The commenter states that the text is incorrect.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 1
197-53	The commenter requests that the report make it clear to the reader where FORA authority is limited with respect to UC, CSU, State Parks, other state agencies, and federal agencies.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-54	The commenter requests that all UCMBEST lands (excluding the NRS parcels) be permitted a range of uses larger than that identified in the Planned Mixed Use District.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-55	The commenter requests amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-56	The commenter requests amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-57	The commenter asks that modifications to the HMP need to be appropriately referenced or reprinted in Volume 2.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-59	The commenter suggests that fewer parking lanes on urban streets be provided to reduce the potential conflicts with bicycles and reduce the overall amount of impervious surfacing and costs associated with maintenance.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-60	The commenter suggests a change to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-61	The commenter suggests a change to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-62	The commenter requests additional information be included in the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-63	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-64	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-65	The commenter states that the HMP Implementing/Management Agreement Exhibit C incorrectly shows UCNRS is responsible for parcel SR3.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2

197-67	The commenter requests that the ex-officio members of the FORA Board be identified at the beginning of the Comprehensive Business Plan.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-68	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-69	The commenter requests that Exhibit 1 of the Comprehensive Business Plan be amended to clarify UC's police responsibilities and to identify responsibilities for Storm Water Collection and Water Supply and Distribution.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-70	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should specifically identify ways to expedite clean-up of contaminated areas.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-71	The commenter objects to the language used in the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-72	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-73	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-74	Response to comment 197-73 negates this comment.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-75	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-76	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-77	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-78	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-79	The commenter states that light industrial properties rarely sell as high as \$6.50 per square foot.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-80	The commenter makes a comment about the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-81	The commenter requests an amendment to the text	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-82	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-83	The commenter makes a comment about the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-84	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-85	The commenter would like to know if the demolition costs are included in the feasibility equations and state how they will be paid for.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-87	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-88	The commenter requests an amendment to the text regarding marketing strategy.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-89	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-90	The commenter provides a market recommendation.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-91	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-92	The commenter requests that the text be amended.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-93	The commenter requests an amendment to Figure 3.3-1.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-94	The commenter requests an amendment to Figure 3.3-1.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-95	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/CORRECTING TEXT/VOLUME 2
197-103	The commenter states that the statement in the PFIP that all property taxes will be needed to pay for on-going services, thereby precluding the use of the Tax Increment Financing, conflicts with previous comments in the Reuse Plan and eliminates a valuable development tool.	UC/FINANCING

197-104	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	UC/FINANCING
197-66	The commenter requests clarification of how the Habitat Management Costs are derived and funded.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-86	The commenter would like to know why the total burden of development per acre is higher for the MBEST center.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-96	The commenter cannot verify numbers in the text and would like assistance.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-97	The commenter states that per acre costs for UC are contradictory.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-98	The commenter requests that the text pertaining to developer fees from UC to FORA be amended.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-99	The commenter states that the operating costs in the text are excessive.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-100	The commenter points out a spelling error in the text.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-101	The commenter would like to know if the figure includes funding for Highway 156.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-102	The commenter requests that the Mello-Roos fees be clearly delineated for infrastructure capital and maintenance only.	UC/FINANCING/VOLUME 2
197-4	The commenter states that the base closure date is 1991.	UC/GENERAL COMMENT/VOLUME 1
197-9	The commenter states that the 85-86 percent public use area at Fort Ord which contains unexploded ordnance "hardly seem likes a public use".	UC/GENERAL COMMENT/VOLUME 1
197-19	The commenter would like changes in the "landscape setting" graphic on page 3-4.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-20	The commenter would like changes in the "mixed use villages" graphic on page 3-5.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-21	The commenter requests that the jurisdictions be indicated on the figure on page 3-11	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-24	The commenter requests that figure 3.2-5 be amended to including shading to indicate that parcels 8b and 8c are part of the UCMBEST Center and provide a separate shading for the UC/NRS Fort Ord Natural Reserve areas.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-25	The commenter states that figure 3.3-1 should include 'UCMBEST" in the graphic.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-28	The commenter states that "UCMBEST" should be included in figure 3.2-5 as well as other modifications to this figure.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-36	The commenter states that the extension of California Avenue (north of Reservation Road) should not be indicated on Figure 3.5-2 because it is currently under discussion with the City of Marina.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-39	The commenter requests a change to the Habitat Management Framework figure, 3.6-2 to add a designation for UC/NRS.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-42	The commenter requests that UC be included in Figure 3.6-2 as is CSUMB.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1

197-46	The commenter requests that Figure 3.8-1 be amended.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 1
197-58	The commenter states there is a discrepancy in the text as it pertains to Blanco Road.	UC/GRAPHICS/VOLUME 2
197-109	The commenter points out a discrepancy between the Reuse Plan and the FORIS study's UCMBEST water demand and demand basis for wastewater flow.	UC/WATER
182-3	The commenter would like to know what the FORA board will do to accommodate veterans.	VETERANS
191-1	The commenter is concerned with the potential visual impacts of a new hotel	VISUAL
200-15	The commenter would like the Final EIR to recommend a program requiring Fort Ord jurisdictions to adopt specific design guidelines for development affecting the Highway 1 and Highway 68 scenic corridors.	VISUAL
203-1	The commenter expresses his concern about the "conceptual" discussion in the Reuse Plan as it pertains to Seaside.	VISUAL
242-12	The commenter is concerned about views from Highway 1.	VISUAL
242-13	The commenter would like clarification of language contained in the Reuse Plan pertaining to limiting future building height within the Highway 1 scenic corridor.	VISUAL
307-28	The commenter suggests the impact assessment of visual resources is inadequate because it fails to consider visual quality from across the bay.	VISUAL
307-74	The commenter asks why the DEIR only considers visual qualities on site and from Hwy 1, State Route 68 and the Salinas Valley.	VISUAL
307-75	The commenter asks what the potential impacts on the viewsheds of coastal areas.	VISUAL
307-76	The commenter asks what constraints on structure height will be placed on development at Fort Ord.	VISUAL
181-1	The commenter states that the EIR does not contain adequate information on waste treatment capacity.	WASTEWATER
181-2	The commenter states the EIR alludes to the feasibility of using the East Garrison wastewater treatment facility.	WASTEWATER
220-3	The commenter states the Draft EIR fails to discuss the impacts of new and/or expanded wastewater treatment.	WASTEWATER
238-2	The commenter indicates a concern with waste treatment.	WASTEWATER
248-15	The commenter requests that the EIR include a complete description of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.	WASTEWATER
287-2	The commenter states the EIR does not discuss the availability of adequate wastewater treatment capacity.	WASTEWATER
307-27	The commenter questions whether adequate wastewater facilities are provided for in the Reuse Plan.	WASTEWATER

168-1	The commenter would like strong water conservation measures imposed on future construction.	WATER
169-1	The commenter would like information on water resource jurisdictions.	WATER
170-1	The commenter would like more information in the EIR pertaining to a long-term water source vis-a-vis the recent Stanislaus natural Heritage Project, Sierra Club, et al., v. County of Stanislaus and Diablo Grande Limited Partnership case.	WATER
171-1	The commenter is request additional information on water.	WATER
183-1	The commenter requests additional information on water.	WATER
183-4	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan would allow subdivision without the a future water source.	WATER
188-1	The commenter expresses a concern about water issues.	WATER
188-3	The commenter refers to Stanislaus natural Heritage Project, Sierra Club, et al., v. County of Stanislaus and Diablo Grande Limited Partnership	WATER
194-1	The commenter expresses a concern on the availability of water and desalination in particular.	WATER
196-1	The commenter expresses a concern about the availability of a long-term water source	WATER
197-119	The commenter would like the Historic Allocations plan to state that since the MBEST Center had very little water use historically, this option would prevent development of the MBEST Center and foreclose the economic benefits that would otherwise accrue from it.	WATER
198-5	The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate a scenario where future development does not aggravate seawater intrusion.	WATER
198-7	The commenter would like additional information on future water supply.	WATER
198-8	The commenter would like to know if the agreement between the Army and the MCWRA would allow the use of the 6,600 afy anywhere on Fort Ord.	WATER
200-13	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a water allocation and monitoring program for 6,600 af.	WATER
200-14	The commenter would like the EIR to include a recommendation that the Final Reuse Plan include a policy that new water sources come from a variety of sources.	WATER
213-13	The commenter clarifies the Army/MCWRA contract.	WATER
213-14	The commenter clarifies the Army/MCWRA contract..	WATER
213-15	The commenter would like a discussion pertaining to water use and coastal dependent land uses having water use priority.	WATER
213-16	The commenter provides comment on the water discussion in the EIR.	WATER

213-71	Commenter asks for clarification of the differences between the anticipated water supply LOS standard and wastewater LOS standard.	WATER
213-79	The commenter states that future water use will require negotiations between the purveyor/agencies and MCWRA.	WATER
223-5	The commenter discusses water.	WATER
225-1	The commenter would like a new EIR that is based on a safe yield water supply and contains full disclosure of all the environmental impacts.	WATER
226-1	The commenter states that strong water conservation measures and "insitu locations" of storm water will reduce water demand.	WATER
226-2	The commenter provides recommendations to enhance understanding of the amount of water that is precipitation and falls on Fort Ord.	WATER
226-3	The commenter believes that more conservation of water can be had with sufficient surface water storage and reservoirs.	WATER
230-2	The commenter would like to know where the water is coming from.	WATER
231-2	The commenter would like to have a by land use type break down of projected water use.	WATER
231-3	The commenter would like an in-depth study of Fort Ord's hydrology.	WATER
231-4	The commenter would like information on historical water use.	WATER
231-5	The commenter would like to know the status of the water delivery system.	WATER
231-7	The commenter indicates a concern with water and sea water intrusion.	WATER
231-8	The commenter would like the EIR to include an alternative that uses safe yield water only.	WATER
234-3	The commenter indicates a concern with water issues.	WATER
235-2	The commenter indicates a concern with water and sea water intrusion.	WATER
235-4	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
236-2	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
237-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
238-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
239-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
240-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
241-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
242-8	The commenter would like information on the environmental impacts of future sources of water.	WATER

242-9	The commenter would like to know what are the impacts of salt water intrusion and what would happen if the state adjudicates Monterey County's water supply.	WATER
242-10	The commenter would like to know how vulnerable water infrastructure would be if a natural disaster would occur and if an interruption were to occur would Fort Ord development compete with current users of water supplies in the MPWMD.	WATER
242-19	The commenter states that there are no programs to assure that projects are not approved without a fully developed water supply.	WATER
242-21	The commenter would like a stronger EIR.	WATER
243-1	The commenter is concerned with the size of the project and the apparent lack of water to serve the project.	WATER
244-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
245-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR to be circulated and additional discussion on the issues of seawater intrusion, height limits and unexploded ordnance (UXO).	WATER
246-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source.	WATER
251-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
253-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
256-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
257-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
261-1	The commenter would like information on where the water will come from.	WATER
262-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
263-1	The commenter requests amendment to the EIR text pertaining to future water	WATER
263-2	The commenter requests amendment to the text pertaining to a recent agreement and groundwater mitigation framework.	WATER
263-3	The commenter states that the Monterey Bay Sanctuaries policies need to be coordinated with future desalination plant plans.	WATER

263-4	The commenter requests strong language be included in the EIR pertaining to water conservation and recommends a program that would require separate landscape plumbing for all appropriate new facilities.	WATER
270-1	The commenter would like to know what a silty aquatard is	WATER
279-1	The commenter would like information on water.	WATER
283-1	The commenter requests that the EIR discuss on-site safe yield water supply.	WATER
287-1	The commenter states the EIR does not provide evidence of the availability of long-term water supplies.	WATER
299-9	The commenter states that residential development's requirement for water should be balanced with the needs of commercial/industrial uses.	WATER
299-10	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
300-1	The commenter repeats comment 226-1.	WATER
300-2	The commenter repeats comment 226-2.	WATER
300-3	The commenter repeats comment 226-3.	WATER
300-4	The commenter repeats comment 226-4.	WATER
300-5	The commenter repeats comment 226-5.	WATER
302-1	The commenter would like information on the silty aquitard	WATER
303-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
307-6	The commenter requests that an alternative be included in the Draft EIR that contains a development scenario which uses water from on-site wells without aggravating the rate of seawater intrusion.	WATER
307-19	The commenter questions whether there is sufficient water available for the project.	WATER
307-20	The commenter questions whether the City of Seaside, as a past and continuing consumer of MPWMD water, is the benefactor of a "waterfall."	WATER
307-22	The commenter requests additional description of alternative new water supplies.	WATER
307-23	The commenter expresses the opinion that additional water supplies will not be supported by local taxpayers	WATER
307-50	The commenter asks if other land use jurisdictions might be entitled to some amount of Seaside's portion of the water assumed to be "available" at Fort Ord.	WATER
307-51	The commenter asks who will pay for water demand created by new construction at Fort Ord.	WATER
307-62	The commenter asks for additional analysis of the impacts of an additional water supply.	WATER
307-63	The commenter asks about the ramifications of allotting 3000 afy water to the City of Seaside.	WATER

307-64	The commenter asks to what extent are water supplies of the various Peninsula jurisdictions interdependent.	WATER
307-65	The commenter asks if providing Seaside with a water supply at Fort Ord will affect the supply of water to other MPWMD cities.	WATER
307-66	The commenter asks who will pay for new water facilities and related infrastructure improvements.	WATER
307-68	The commenter asks if developer fees are inadequate or unavailable, what alternative sources of funding are there for new water supplies.	WATER
307-73	The commenter asks to what extent is it possible that the environments and economies of neighboring jurisdiction might be impacted by noncompliance with relevant water quality regulations.	WATER
312-1	The commenter states that no development should occur until a safe-yield water supply is available	WATER
313-1	The commenter states that water is inadequate.	WATER
316-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
317-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
198-6	The commenter requests that the EIR evaluate an additional scenario where future development uses only the 6,600 afy.	WATER/ALTERNATIVE
167-43	The commenter repeats comment 1	WATER/ALTERNATIVES
173-3	The commenter would like an alternative discussion in the EIR which is based on a safe yield water supply only.	WATER/ALTERNATIVES
188-4	The commenter requests that the EIR include a discussion of an alternative project based on available water at Fort Ord.	WATER/ALTERNATIVES
220-2	The commenter discusses the <i>Stanislaus natural Heritage Project</i> ,	WATER/CEQA
307-8	The commenter suggests that the scoping of the EIR is not in accordance with CEQA because it did not include a scenario which identifies the level of development possible from the on-site wells without aggravating the rate of seawater intrusion.	WATER/CEQA
231-1	The commenter would like to know what is the typical water use for a golf course.	WATER/GOLF COURSE
220-5	The commenter requests that the safe yield project alternative be discussed in the Final EIR.	WATER/SB 899/RECIRCULATE EIR
183-2	The commenter states that a flaw of the EIR is that it considers water and traffic projects as part of the project description, not mitigations.	WATER/TRANSPORTATION

329-17	The commenter states that the air quality section of the EIR relies on future actions and do not ensure that impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.	AIR QUALITY
351-52	The commenter is requesting a significantly expanded air quality section.	AIR QUALITY
328-14	The commenter states that the "No Project" alternative should not be classified so because there will be impacts.	ALTERNATIVES
333-9	The commenter requests additional alternatives be discussed in the EIR especially an alternative that accommodates water available [i.e., safe yield].	ALTERNATIVES
335-4	The commenter requests that an alternative be provided that is based on a safe yield water use only.	ALTERNATIVES
337-59	The commenter would like to know why there is no alternative that is premised on a safe-yield water use.	ALTERNATIVES
339-1	The commenter would like a project alternative included in the EIR which is based on the constraints associated with existing infrastructure and water.	ALTERNATIVES
345-2	The commenter would like an alternative plan which preserves coastal oaks and requires widening of existing roads only.	ALTERNATIVES
351-17	The commenter would like an "honest no-project alternative" discussed in the EIR, where there is no use at Fort Ord.	ALTERNATIVES
351-18	The commenter states that a reasonable range of alternatives is not examined in the EIR.	ALTERNATIVES
351-21	The commenter would like a particular alternative discussed in the EIR.	ALTERNATIVES
351-22	The commenter would like a particular alternative which does not exceed the resources available.	ALTERNATIVES
351-45	The commenter would like comparative water use information between each alternative.	ALTERNATIVES
351-63	The commenter would like an alternative reuse of Fort Ord that contains no UXO.	ALTERNATIVES
356-1	The commenter would like a project that is limited by natural resource constraints.	ALTERNATIVES
357-3	The commenter would like alternatives to the project.	ALTERNATIVES
321-10	The commenter would like a mitigation for increased aircraft noise associated with increase air traffic.	ALTERNATIVES/HABITAT
337-9	The commenter states the EIR must include a safe yield alternative.	ALTERNATIVES/WATER
351-23	The commenter would like a disclaimer be incorporated in the Draft EIR.	AMBAG
335-6	The commenter states that information in a table is incorrect.	AMBAG CONSISTENCY
335-7	The commenter states the EIR contradicts AMBAG population growth.	AMBAG CONSISTNECY
331-19	The commenter requests an expanded trail network discussion.	BIKE

321-6	The commenter would like to know how induced growth and project impacts will be mitigated and how will mitigation be financed in communities such as Pacific Grove and Monterey.	CEQA
328-2	The commenter states that the language contained in numerous programs pertaining to coast live oak woodland is insufficient to adequately protect the remaining woodlands area and the language of the programs is insufficient for them to be considered mitigations under CEQA.	CEQA
328-3	The commenter states that the language of the programs is insufficient for them to be considered mitigations under CEQA.	CEQA
328-5	The commenter addresses golf courses and adequacy of mitigations.	CEQA
328-11	The comment is related to comment 328-2.	CEQA
328-12	The commenter requests a greater level of information on wetlands mitigation.	CEQA
328-13	The commenter states that the language contained in programs is not mitigation.	CEQA
329-10	The commenter states that reliance on future events as implicated in use of policies and programs to reduce potential significant impacts does not constitute an adequate mitigation unless there are measurable, minimum performance standards and monitoring programs in conjunction with them.	CEQA
329-12	The commenter questions the conclusions in the EIR that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of policies and programs.	CEQA
329-21	The commenter states the policies and programs pertaining to design guidelines are too broad and general to ensure that the impacts will be less than significant.	CEQA
329-22	The commenter states that the design objectives contained in the Reuse Plan are too broad and general to ensure that these impacts will be less than significant. Refer to response to comment 203-12.	CEQA
329-23	The commenter restates the concerns in comment 329-22 and states the policies and programs lack specificity and performance standards.	CEQA
332-11	The commenter states the mitigation measures contained in the EIR are inadequate and those responsible for their implementation are not identified.	CEQA
333-1	The commenter would like to know if the Reuse Plan is a "single-project" EIR under 21083.8 or a standard "program-level" EIR.	CEQA
333-5	The commenter would like significance criteria for each environmental topic and a precise correlation between the criteria and the impacts that are analyzed.	CEQA
333-7	The commenter is requesting a greater level of detail be included in the EIR pertaining to mitigations.	CEQA

335-1	The commenter points out that the NOP was not properly circulated because it did not include the EIS.	CEQA
335-2	The commenter states that the EIS failed to abide by CEQA.	CEQA
337-4	The commenter states the Draft EIR fails to provide a legal mechanism to forcibly down-size the "aggregate totals" should future analysis prove that stated "not to exceed envelopes" are not achievable.	CEQA
337-5	The commenter states that impacts must be discussed and major infrastructure improvements must be provided.	CEQA
337-30	The commenter reiterates the requirements of AB 3180 and states that the ability of FORA to impose administrative and judicial sanctions, etc. must be analyzed.	CEQA
351-3	The commenter states that a successful mitigation is measured by a successful track record and that the EIR must identify successful examples identical to or similar to those mitigations proposed in the Reuse Plan EIR.	CEQA
351-4	The commenter would like to know what mechanism the public has to enforce the mitigations.	CEQA
357-5	The commenter would like information on environmental impacts.	CEQA
328-8	The commenter states that policy is too weak to provide benefit to HMP species.	CEQA/HABITAT
328-9	The commenter states the removal of 63 percent of coastal sage scrub habitat is significant.	CEQA/HABITAT
328-10	The commenter states that a 36 percent reduction in annual grassland is a significant impact and the implementation of Biological Resource Policy B-2 is inadequate.	CEQA/HABITAT
337-27	The commenter would like protection of the viewshed that extends to views that can be seen from the Pacific Grove walk path.	CEQA/VISUAL
348-2	The commenter refers to "chemical agents" used by former troops and would like this discussed in the EIR.	CHEMICAL AGENTS
354-2	The commenter is concerned with chemical agent identification sets found at Fort Ord and would like a discussion of this issue in the EIR.	CHEMICAL AGENTS
336-1	The commenter would like reference to a beach frontage road to be omitted from the project description.	COASTAL
336-2	The commenter would like additional permits pertaining to the Coastal Commission to be included in the list.	COASTAL
337-40	The commenter would like information on the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and its consistency determination of Fort Ord reuse.	COASTAL ACT
320-1	The commenter requests that his agency be included in the list of "Local Agencies" "expected to utilize this Draft EIR".	CORRECTING TEXT
320-7	The commenter would like the EIR to reflect that his agency's facility is on the west side of Highway 1.	CORRECTING TEXT
320-12	The commenter request amended to an EIR table.	CORRECTING TEXT

329-16	The commenter requests a change to the EIR text.	CORRECTING TEXT
331-33	The commenter requests clarification of table.	CORRECTING TEXT
331-41	The commenter requests a clarification of the multi-agency aspect of the MOUT/POST facility.	CORRECTING TEXT
332-10	The commenter states that the Comprehensive Business Plan contains errors and inconsistencies.	CORRECTING TEXT
335-13	The commenter states the table of contents is incorrect.	CORRECTING TEXT
336-3	The commenter would like a text amend.	CORRECTING TEXT
336-5	The commenter would like a text amendment.	CORRECTING TEXT
340-7	The commenter corrects text.	CORRECTING TEXT
329-4	The commenter states that the Business and Operations Plan assumptions are not valid because CSUMB's development program is subject to change.	CSUMB
329-5	The commenter states that CSUMB is an existing land use.	CSUMB
329-15	The commenter would like CSUMB referred to as a current land use.	CSUMB
329-2	The commenter states that CSU financial obligations are limited.	CSUMB/FINANCING
329-1	The commenter asserts the sovereignty of CSUMB and requests that the Reuse Plan include a more extensive description of the legislative background that resulted in the Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act (Government Code, Title 7.5).	CSUMB/SOVEREIGNTY
329-3	The commenter repeats comment 329-1.	CSUMB/SOVEREIGNTY
352-1	The commenter would like a revised discussion of the cumulative impacts.	CUMMULATIVE IMPACTS
337-12	The commenter requests an updated list of projects be included in the EIR.	CUMMULATIVE PROJECTS
337-70	The commenter would like more specific information on the location of all the cumulative developments.	CUMMULATIVE PROJECTS
337-71	The commenter would like an expanded list of "foreseeable projects".	CUMMULATIVE PROJECTS
337-41	The commenter would like information on the costs and impacts associated with demolition of future structures.	DEMOLITION/FINANCING
320-2	The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not state that a future desalination plant will be required to abide by the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary goals and policies.	DESALINATION
320-6	The commenter would like the agencies with jurisdiction relating to desalination plants to be listed.	DESALINATION
320-11	The commenter states the regulatory issues pertaining to desalination should be included in the EIR.	DESALINATION
320-18	The commenter states that any future desalination plant must be coordinated with the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.	DESALINATION
336-4	The commenter would like a desalination plant located on the east side of Highway 1 and would like additional environmental impact information pertaining to a desalination plant.	DESALINATION

337-106	The commenter states that a desalination plant is the least likely water solution.	DESALINATION
337-107	The commenter discusses desalination.	DESALINATION
337-108	The commenter is concerned about the desalination plant and seismic impacts to a plant.	DESALINATION
321-9	The commenter would like to know how much more jet aircraft traffic is expected at Monterey Airport.	DRAINAGE
331-29	The commenter requests that a master drainage plan be included in the Reuse Plan.	DRAINAGE
337-22	The commenter would like the stormwater outfall pipes removed from the beach.	DRAINAGE
337-82	The commenter would like to know if the Army conducted tests of the quality of runoff from Fort Ord.	DRAINAGE
337-109	The commenter repeats comment 337-22.	DRAINAGE
341-16	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	DRAINAGE
341-17	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	DRAINAGE
341-18	The commenter states that precipitation and runoff is not particular to the east side of Fort Ord only.	DRAINAGE
341-19	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	DRAINAGE
341-20	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	DRAINAGE
341-21	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	DRAINAGE
337-79	The commenter states that a "revised Draft EIR should closely examine the advantages of revenue sharing to reduce unneeded development.	FINANCING
351-20	The commenter would like to know the cost of clean-up at Fort Ord.	FINANCING
331-26	The commenter is requesting a tally of the costs for new road construction and identification of all projects.	FINANCING/TRANSPORTATION
331-27	The commenter states that a cooperative interagency effort is required to fund regional transportation infrastructure.	FINANCING/TRANSPORTATION
332-6	The commenter is concerned with funding of transportation projects.	FINANCING/TRANSPORTATION
331-42	The commenter requests a broadened discussion of the potential mitigations pertaining to fire and police protection impacts including the extension of infrastructure.	FIRE PROTECTION
337-61	The commenter would like to know if to avoid a soil fertility crisis FORA would use this crisis as an overriding consideration in the project approval process.	FORA
321-18	The commenter inquires about tele-commuting and mass transit options being considered in the traffic analysis.	GENERAL COMMENT
329-9	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan assumptions are speculative in advance of the CSUMB Campus Master Plan currently being prepared.	GENERAL COMMENT
331-9	The commenter states that the issue of birds and turbo jet aircraft needs to be addressed.	GENERAL COMMENT

331-20	The commenter states that the RV Travel Camp/Youth Camp will require upgraded utilities.	GENERAL COMMENT
331-22	The commenter states that it is not necessary to have the USFWS and CDFG approving potential future expansion of the existing campground.	GENERAL COMMENT
331-24	The commenter cannot comment on the relationship between the Youth Camp and a Community Park because it has no prior knowledge of the existence of a Community Park.	GENERAL COMMENT
331-25	The commenter states Polygon 31a should be designated in the same manner as Polygons 30b and 30c in the HMP Conservation and/or Management Requirements Area, or whichever designation allows the Parks Department to use the property in the manner requested.	GENERAL COMMENT
331-30	The commenter submits a comment too general to justify a specific response.	GENERAL COMMENT
331-37	The commenter would like an amendment to the text	GENERAL COMMENT
331-38	The commenter requests that the policies and programs should be listed in the text.	GENERAL COMMENT
332-1	The commenter states the current Reuse Plan exceeds the carrying capacity of the environment and infrastructure.	GENERAL COMMENT
333-2	The commenter states the environmental setting sections should incorporate background documents by reference.	GENERAL COMMENT
333-3	The commenter requests that the base year be clarified from topic to topic.	GENERAL COMMENT
334-6	The commenter provides a comment that is not relevant to the Reuse Plan and the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-3	The commenter states the Draft EIR relies on future studies.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-13	The commenter requests a polygon by polygon analysis.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-14	The commenter requests a "complete breakdown" for each jurisdiction.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-16	The commenter would like page 5-25 of the DSEIS to be amended.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-17	The commenter would like a discussion of any "still existing conflicts between the project description in the Draft EIR and the current "visions" of each jurisdictions".	GENERAL COMMENT
337-28	The commenter would like a polygon by polygon summary of all the issues.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-31	The commenter states that the Draft EIR is insufficient because it does not contain the information the commenter requested in her 2/12/96 NOP letter.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-33	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan will be used as a specific plan by local jurisdictions.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-38	The commenter would like the CSUMB Master Plan included in the Reuse Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT

337-44	The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan include a variety of elements.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-47	The commenter would like precise building heights.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-52	The commenter states the Draft EIR fails to provide a legal mechanism to prevent land that has not viable infrastructure from being sold to private parties.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-53	The commenter notes that the Reuse Plan envisions a different program than that pursued by the US Army for the lands at the former Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-56	The commenter would like to know if 406 residents would create a financial burden.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-57	The commenter would like specific mitigation language to be contained in the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-63	The commenter would like information on phasing.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-80	The commenter would like to know if Seaside is still considering a "cruise ship pier".	GENERAL COMMENT
337-88	The commenter would like to know where all the development is going to occur at Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-91	The commenter would like to know of the 39,000 people at Fort Ord in the year 2015 as indicated on 5-3 of the Draft EIR, how many will be students.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-93	The commenter would like to know where it is stated in the Draft EIR or the "accompanying documents" that the "general plans for the cities and county will be the 2015 plan".	GENERAL COMMENT
337-94	The commenter would like to know what a developer buys.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-97	The commenter would like up-to-date information in the Final PEIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-98	The commenter repeats comment 337-28.	GENERAL COMMENT
339-2	The commenter would like a reduced project in a revised Reuse Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
339-6	The commenter would like a scaled down project.	GENERAL COMMENT
341-1	The commenter would like a scaled back reuse plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
341-2	The commenter would like a mitigation monitoring program.	GENERAL COMMENT
341-12	The commenter would like to know if the omission of programs is by design.	GENERAL COMMENT
341-25	The commenter supports policies and programs.	GENERAL COMMENT
343-1	The commenter states the economic analysis pertaining to the Reuse Plan is premised on FORA receiving the former military base from the Army gratis.	GENERAL COMMENT
343-2	The commenter submits an opinion on the cooperative nature, or lack of, of the various agencies.	GENERAL COMMENT
343-6	The commenter would like to know if Fort Ord could have one unified government.	GENERAL COMMENT

343-10	The commenter submits a recommendation for future economic opportunities at Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
349-1	The commenter states that the FORA board should start over with a specific plan that recognizes the limitations of water and roadway infrastructure.	GENERAL COMMENT
350-2	The commenter submits numerous general comments regarding planning, the future, and aesthetics.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-1	The commenter requests information on impacts and mitigations.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-2	The commenter would like to know who will be keeping track of mitigations, project conditions and who will have enforcement power over mitigations to be implemented at Fort Ord.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-5	The commenter is addressing another project approved by another agency and would like to know, based on the project the commenter refers to and the public agency responsible for mitigation monitoring, how can any mitigations measures other than "avoidance" be responsibly recommended.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-6	The commenter would like the text to be simplified and sentences reduced in length.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-8	The commenter would like the EIR to include any issue brought to light by the public.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-9	The commenter would like all the comments submitted during the scoping process that were not addressed in the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-10	The commenter requests a comparison between the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and other developments.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-11	The commenter would like information on methodology, forecast data, evidence, references, sources of information, to substantiate conclusions contained in the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-12	The commenter expresses his preference for discussion of impacts.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-13	The commenter would like access to computer models.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-14	The commenter would like to know how conclusions are not allowed to be established before facts are investigated.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-15	The commenter would like all double-speak to be removed from the EIR.	GENERAL COMMENT
351-16	The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR summary.	GENERAL COMMENT
357-2	The commenter would like information on employment, housing, etc.	GENERAL COMMENT
357-4	The commenter recommends a format for development of the Reuse Plan.	GENERAL COMMENT
361-1	The commenter would like incentives to help Marina and Seaside.	GENERAL COMMENT
337-76	The commenter would like to know if Marina's 200-foot setback from a fault line is sufficient.	GEOLOGY

337-77	The commenter would like to know what the eastern zone is as it pertains to geology.	GEOLOGY
337-78	The commenter states that due to potential seismic hazards, development should be reduced in the area of Reservation Road where there is a "potentially active seismic fault line".	GEOLOGY
351-24	The commenter would like the EIR to state in the summary that toxic chemicals are to be used on golf courses.	GOLF COURSE
351-25	The commenter would like information on all recent and proposed golf courses for the Monterey Peninsula.	GOLF COURSE
351-26	The commenter would like to know the percentage and total amount of water in acre feet relating to existing Monterey Peninsula golf courses and how much additional water demand the proposed golf courses would use.	GOLF COURSE
351-27	The commenter would like information on the amount of water existing golf courses use on the Monterey Peninsula.	GOLF COURSE
351-28	The commenter would like to know what species of plant, animal and insects typically are found on the existing Fort Ord golf courses.	GOLF COURSE
351-29	The commenter would like to know what species of plant, animal and insects are expected to be found on the proposed Fort Ord golf courses.	GOLF COURSE
351-30	The commenter states that the EIR does not describe toxic runoff from golf courses and home landscaping.	GOLF COURSE
351-32	The commenter is requesting detailed information on golf courses.	GOLF COURSE
351-49	The commenter would like a mitigation that prohibits all use of chemicals on all golf courses.	GOLF COURSE
338-3	The commenter discusses numerous discrepancies in the transportation figures in volumes I and II of the Reuse Plan.	GRAPHICS
329-7	The commenter states that the figures accurately illustrate the revised boundaries of the CSUMB campus but the acreage has not been updated in the Reuse Plan.	GRAPHICS
329-11	The commenter states the Figure 4.1-2 is erroneous.	GRAPHICS
330-1	The commenter states that the proposed City of Monterey sphere of influence show in Figure 3.6-1 is erroneous.	GRAPHICS
333-10	The commenter states that the graphics are illegible or uninterpretable.	GRAPHICS
337-46	The commenter would like information on the growth rate.	GROWTH
321-11	The commenter requests an alternative development that preserves the oak forests in Polygons 19a, 21a and 21b.	HABITAT
328-7	The commenter requests additional information pertaining to areas outside of the HMP and the impact of threatened, endangered or candidate species in proposed development areas.	HABITAT
329-6	The commenter requests a clarification of the text.	HABITAT

331-23	The commenter states that a shrew study is an unplanned cost for the county.	HABITAT
341-4	The commenter requests that stronger language be include in policy statements.	HABITAT
341-5	The commenter requests that a new program be included.	HABITAT
341-6	The commenter requests that a new policy be included.	HABITAT
341-7	The commenter states that a change incorporated in the Reuse Plan reflects the commenter previous suggestion.	HABITAT
341-8	The commenter would like to know what "assist" means in Program E-1.2.	HABITAT
341-22	The commenter states that the two polygons discussed in impact #3 is insufficient.	HABITAT
341-23	The commenter states the reference to a policy as a County policy is incorrect.	HABITAT
341-24	The commenter would like an expanded program A-8.1.	HABITAT
341-26	The commenter would like a new program added which appears to be redundant to the commenters requests for program amendments as indicated in response to comments 341-17 and 341-24.	HABITAT
341-28	The commenter would like an amendment to the policy language.	HABITAT
341-29	The commenter would like an amendment to language in a program.	HABITAT
341-34	The commenter submits new program language amendments pertaining to Biological Resources Policy A-8 for Monterey County.	HABITAT
351-34	The commenter would like a map showing the entire footprint of "edge effects".	HABITAT
351-35	The commenter would like information on the health of each animal species residing within proximity of a list of land uses and types of infrastructure the commenter provides.	HABITAT
351-36	The commenter would like complete documentation to determine the minimum distance from any-made structure needed to insure an area of un-impacted wildland.	HABITAT
351-37	The commenter would like information on edge effects and weather.	HABITAT
351-38	The commenter would like proposed mitigation for micro-climate changes near roads and homes.	HABITAT
351-39	The commenter would like a discussion of the health of wildlands when they are reduced to islands.	HABITAT
351-40	The commenter addresses the issue of forest cutting which is not pertinent to oak woodlands.	HABITAT
351-42	The commenter would like detailed information on tree removal.	HABITAT
341-33	The commenter states that hazardous and toxic spills does not terminate when construction ceases.	HAZADOUS MATERIALS
331-8	The commenter states that the EIR should discuss the Army's long-term responsibility for cleanup if additional contamination is discovered.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

335-8	The commenter provides information on the lead content on beaches.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
335-9	The commenter would like to know if the beach sands that have been eroded were tested for lead and what was its concentration.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
335-11	The commenter would like to know if the Fort Ord landfill site now contains the contaminated beach sands.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
335-12	The commenter would like information on buildings that contain lead.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
335-15	The commenter would like information on hazardous chemicals leaching into groundwater.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
335-16	The commenter discusses Army clean up policies.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
337-8	The commenter would like information on asbestos and lead.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
351-62	The commenter requests an analysis of heavy metals and how they could affect human health.	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
321-5	The commenter would like to know how many additional regional jobs/houses will be created.	HOUSING
325-1	The commenter addresses the cost burden of housing in the three local counties that surround Fort Ord and proposed programs to provide affordable rentership of Fort Ord residential properties.	HOUSING
325-2	The commenter addresses the physical deterioration of the existing Fort Ord housing inventory.	HOUSING
334-1	The commenter states that the information in the EIR pertaining to rates are inaccurate.	HOUSING
334-2	The commenter states that Realtors and property management firms have expressed concern over a tight rental market in the area.	HOUSING
334-3	The commenter states a social condition.	HOUSING
334-4	The commenter would like 20 percent of housing to be set aside for inclusionary housing.	HOUSING
334-5	The commenter states conditions applicable to the Monterey County Housing Authority and the Fort Ord Facilities and Services for the Homeless under the McKinney Act.	HOUSING
334-7	The commenter requests that the FORA Board consider use of redevelopment agency powers and that legislation be introduced which will allow a portion of the redevelopment (35%) housing set-aside authorized under SB 1600 to be utilized to maintain and fund the continuance of the McKinney programs as well as finance other affordable housing programs for the individuals who will live and work on the former Fort Ord, and on the Monterey Peninsula.	HOUSING
337-23	The commenter would like clarification on CSUMB housing.	HOUSING
337-26	The commenter states that future development is subject to inclusionary housing laws	HOUSING
337-50	The commenter repeats comment #337-26 and discusses inclusionary housing objectives.	HOUSING

337-54	The commenter is concerned about sinking houses at Abrams Park residential community.	HOUSING
337-58	The commenter would like to know when the federal government will resolve the McKinney Act applications.	HOUSING
337-75	The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not discuss whether any of the 8,000 existing structures that are not to be demolished need to be retained.	HOUSING
321-12	The commenter would like to know how future high intensity lighting will be controlled to not significantly impact adjacent natural areas.	HWY 68 BYPASS
321-13	The commenter would like to know what the impacts will be to the open space associated with a future Highway 68 Bypass.	HWY 68 BYPASS
321-14	The commenter would like to know if mitigation for Laguna Seca would result in the Bypass being moved further to the north.	HWY 68 BYPASS
321-15	The commenter would like to know why the Bypass is needed if an existing 4-lane road can handles the projected 2015 flows.	HWY 68 BYPASS
328-4	The commenter states the mitigation for the Highway 68 Bypass is not specific enough and therefore is irrelevant to the Bypass project.	HWY 68 BYPASS
342-1	The commenter states that there is an ongoing dialogue between agencies concerning Highway 68.	HWY 68 BYPASS
337-83	The commenter would like information on the Army selling property without a Reuse Plan.	LAND SALES
337-95	The commenter would like to know what legal mechanism is provided in the Draft EIR to prevent the sale of land for which there is no infrastructure.	LAND SALES
331-11	The commenter submits information on the landfill site.	LANDFILL
331-12	The commenter repeats comment 331-11.	LANDFILL
331-14	The commenter references the proposed landfill site uses discussed in the EIR vis-a-vis impact discussion #8 on page 4-16.	LANDFILL
337-55	The commenter is concerned about a golf course on the landfill site.	LANDFILL
351-65	The commenter would like a map of the existing wells and the plume from the landfill.	LANDFILL
354-1	The commenter states that the landfill is not adequately addressed in the EIR.	LANDFILL
321-8	The commenter would like to know how runoff is to be controlled and the efficiency of removing urban pollution from runoff.	NOISE
329-18	The commenter requests amendment to the text to reflect that CSUMB, an educational institution, in its entirety is a sensitive noise receptor.	NOISE
329-19	The commenter states that impact analyses of airports typically address single event noise levels in addition to community noise equivalent levels.	NOISE

329-20	The commenter states the noise control policies and programs which result in less than significant impacts are inconsistent with the land use section.	NOISE
331-4	The commenter requests an additional program pertaining to noise.	NOISE
331-5	The commenter requests that the upper limit of the Range II noise category for residential uses should be 65 dB not 70 dB to be more consistent with other jurisdictions.	NOISE
331-6	The commenter requests that a footnote be added to noise tables.	NOISE
331-7	The commenter states that there appears to be a contradiction between noise tables.	NOISE
351-41	The commenter would like detailed information on sound relating to construction.	NOISE
326-1	The commenter submits an opinion which is not pertinent to the Reuse Plan or the EIR.	OPINION
327-1	The commenter states that the EIR needs to be revised because of an inadequate cumulative discussion in the EIR.	OPINION
328-1	The commenter submits an opinion that is contrary to the conclusion in the EIR that caretaker status associated with the "No Project" alternative would result in degradation of habitat through lack of management.	OPINION
328-15	The commenter disagrees with the conclusion of the "No Project" alternative as it pertains to biological resources.	OPINION
332-4	The commenter states an opinion on the adequacy of the Draft EIR.	OPINION
333-6	The commenter has stated an opinion on the Draft EIR conclusions.	OPINION
337-2	The commenter states the "Draft EIR and accompanying documents" do not provide analysis sufficient to justify the proposed aggregate totals.	OPINION
337-6	The commenter states that FORA guidelines must be created prior to the approval of a Reuse Plan.	OPINION
337-10	The commenter states the Draft EIR does not provide adequate environmental analysis.	OPINION
337-25	The commenter states an opinion regarding development density.	OPINION
337-32	The commenter would like more information on future water use, wastewater capacity and transportation impacts.	OPINION
337-34	The commenter states that the preparation of the general plan elements for the land use jurisdictions is confused with FORA's Reuse Plan.	OPINION
337-35	The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not discuss all the environmental issues and FORA is "piecemealing" the project.	OPINION
337-37	The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR.	OPINION
337-48	The commenter disagrees with a sentence regarding future hotels on the Monterey Peninsula.	OPINION

337-60	The commenter states the "No Project" alternative in the Draft EIR does not meet the requirements of CEQA.	OPINION
337-64	The commenter states that the planned development mixed use district should be eliminated because it does not provide an opportunity to calculate traffic flows, compatibility issues, estimate water use, etc.	OPINION
337-65	The commenter states that the policies and programs contained in the EIR should be deleted because they are misleading the decision makers and the public.	OPINION
337-68	The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR.	OPINION
337-81	The commenter states that there is no finite project description.	OPINION
337-87	The commenter submits an opinion on the Reuse Plan.	OPINION
337-92	The commenter states that the "opinion" of the FORA consultant cannot be believed.	OPINION
343-3	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	OPINION
343-4	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	OPINION
343-5	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	OPINION
347-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the project but does not directly address the Reuse Plan or the EIR.	OPINION
357-1	The commenter submits an opinion on the proposed project.	OPINION
337-36	The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR.	OPINON
337-62	The commenter submits an opinion regarding the adequacy of the alternatives discussion contained in the Draft EIR.	OPINON
337-69	The commenter submits an opinion on the adequacy of the EIR.	OPINON
337-90	The commenter questions a statement made in the Draft EIR.	OPINON
343-7	The commenter does not address the content of the Reuse Plan or PEIR.	OPINON
320-16	The commenter would like a new program pertaining to future utility trenches and UXO.	ORDNANCE
331-10	The commenter clarifies his understanding of the eventual cleanup of the UXO at Fort Ord.	ORDNANCE
331-13	The consultant submits recommendations for mitigating UXO impacts	ORDNANCE
331-18	The commenter requests that references in the Draft EIR and the Reuse Plan pertaining to the cities and the county reporting on the RA-ROD be eliminated, because it is an Army responsibility only.	ORDNANCE
335-10	The commenter would like to know if there is evidence of UXO in the beach area.	ORDNANCE
335-14	The commenter requests information on UXO throughout the base.	ORDNANCE
344-1	The commenter would like the transfer of the base to civilian use to cease until the UXO is removed.	ORDNANCE

348-1	The commenter states that the UXO figure contained in the EIR is incorrect.	ORDNANCE
351-57	The commenter would like a revised UXO figure.	ORDNANCE
351-58	The commenter would like more information on chemical weapons and sacks of TNT found on Fort Ord.	ORDNANCE
351-59	The commenter states the EIR does not contain adequate information pertaining to the risk from UXO remaining, including chemical weapons and sacks of TNT.	ORDNANCE
351-60	The commenter would like to know what the largest unexploded bomb is and what damage it could do to humans.	ORDNANCE
351-61	The commenter would like the Draft EIR's conclusion regarding UXO to be reevaluated.	ORDNANCE
351-64	The commenter would like a mitigation requiring 100 percent removal of OE.	ORDNANCE
354-3	The commenter would like a revised UXO figure.	ORDNANCE
318-1	The commenter would like program language amended to clarify the intent of the Reuse Plan.	PLANNING
321-7	The commenter is requesting a lower jobs/housing ratio.	PLANNING
329-8	The commenter supports FORA in its efforts to prepare comprehensive design guidelines as part of, or supplementary to, the Reuse Plan.	PLANNING
331-39	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan should suggest a strategy for the preparation of future land use and design plans, so as to be consistent with the overall Reuse Plan goals and objectives.	PLANNING
331-40	The commenter discusses options available to the county pertaining to revising the existing planning documents on the Monterey Peninsula.	PLANNING
332-2	The commenter states that Fort Ord should reflect "quality" development through design guidelines and infrastructure improvements must be made prior to or simultaneous to development.	PLANNING
332-5	The commenter states that if infrastructure is not adequately improved then the jobs/housing balance becomes questionable.	PLANNING
332-12	The commenter would like design standards and guidelines developed prior to Reuse Plan.	PLANNING
337-24	The commenter would like accurate development plans for the East Garrison.	PLANNING
337-84	The commenter would like proposed development areas to be eliminated that are in proximity to UXO areas as a response to the need to reduce the project's size because of resource constraints.	PLANNING
337-66	The commenter states that it is unnecessary to ask FORA to approve the moving of the POM annex.	POM

337-67	The commenter would like to know, as a result of moving the POM entirely to one side of North-South Road, how many new military housing units would be built and what number would be torn down, and how many new civilian units would be built.	POM
346-1	The commenter would like a reduced project.	REDUCE PROJECT
350-1	The commenter would like the project limited to approximately 31,500 people in the year 2015.	REDUCE PROJECT
358-1	The commenter would like a revised Draft EIR.	REVISE EIR
359-1	The commenter would like a revised Draft EIR.	REVISE EIR
360-1	The commenter would like a revised Draft EIR.	REVISE EIR
319-1	The commenter requests that the population be scaled back to the population which existed in 1991.	SB 899
321-2	The commenter would like an economic profile.	SB 899
321-3	The commenter would like to know what number of new civilian jobs would equal the same economic impact that existed at the time of base closure.	SB 899
321-4	The commenter would like development options which recoup only the inflation adjusted economic loss and would UCMBEST and CSUMB replace this loss.	SB 899
332-9	The commenter requests that the Reuse Plan provide an analysis of the fiscal impacts to the region.	SB 899
332-13	The commenter requests that the EIR include a discussion of a project alternative that has the same population as that which existed when it was a military base.	SB 899
335-3	The commenter states the Draft EIR is flawed because the objectives do not meet those with which it was charged [SB 899].	SB 899
335-17	The commenter would like to know if FORA has the authority to require Fort Ord jurisdictions to prepare mitigation program.	SB 899
337-1	The commenter states that the proposed buildout population of 72,000 is not justified by the enabling legislation that created FORA as a means to economic recovery.	SB 899
337-42	The commenter would like information on density. The density is per the gross acre.	SB 899
337-43	The commenter repeats comment 337-1.	SB 899
337-51	The commenter states that the Reuse Plan is inconsistent with SB 899.	SB 899
337-73	The commenter would like the full text of SB 899 included in the EIR.	SB 899
345-3	The commenter would like an alternative plan which addresses replacing the economic activity that existed at the time of base closure.	SB 899

351-19	The commenter would like economic data to substantiate what the economic loss has been since base closure and would like an alternative discussion included in the EIR which addresses reuse of Fort Ord that does not exceed the level of economic activity that existed at the time of base closure.	SB 899
351-56	The commenter would like economic information relating to reuse.	SB 899
333-4	The commenter states that the full buildout year is not identified and there is a lack of consistency between topics with the extent of analysis provided for the period after 2015.	SB 1180
337-29	The commenter states that using 1991 as the baseline year will seriously flaw the Draft EIR's analysis of a complex issue.	SB 1180
337-74	The commenter would like information on schools.	SCHOOLS
341-9	The commenter requests a change in policy text.	SOILS
341-10	The commenter requests a change in policy text.	SOILS
341-11	The commenter requests a change in policy text.	SOILS
341-13	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	SOILS
341-14	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	SOILS
341-15	The commenter requests an amendment to the text.	SOILS
341-27	The commenter would like the statement for impact 4 to be amended to reflect the potential for erosion associated with construction and long-term land use.	SOILS
341-30	The commenter would like a new program that addresses soil disturbance during construction at certain times of the year.	SOILS
341-31	The commenter would like a new program that addresses soil disturbance during construction at certain times of the year.	SOILS
329-13	The commenter requests that the solid waste activities currently being implemented at CSUMB be discussed.	SOLID WASTE
331-15	The commenter requests additional information on future solid waste.	SOLID WASTE
331-16	The commenter clarifies the discussion in the EIR on the subject of AB 939.	SOLID WASTE
321-16	The commenter recommends an alternative route for the Highway 68 Bypass.	TRANSIT
321-17	The commenter would like a high speed transit corridor.	TRANSIT
331-21	The commenter would like alternative access to Laguna Seca through Barloy Canyon and South Boundary Road maintained for future Laguna Seca events.	TRANSPORTATION
336-7	The commenter would like land use controls on future projects if the roadway infrastructure cannot accommodate it.	TRANSPORTATION
336-8	The commenter states that widening Highway 1, if it is to occur, will require authorization by the Coastal Commission.	TRANSPORTATION

337-39	The commenter would like specific information on the impacts associated with the Highway 68 Bypass, the widening of the existing Highway 68 and the impacts that would be expected as a result of road widening at the intersection of Highway 68 and Highway 218.	TRANSPORTATION
337-85	The commenter would like to know why the Highway 101 corridor is not included in the EIR analysis.	TRANSPORTATION
337-86	The commenter would like additional information on the potential impacts associated with future road construction.	TRANSPORTATION
338-1	The commenter states that a proposed roadway adjacent to the south boundary of Marina is inappropriate due to a variety of reasons.	TRANSPORTATION
338-2	The commenter states that a proposed roadway adjacent to the east boundary of Marina is inappropriate due to a variety of reasons.	TRANSPORTATION
338-4	The commenter repeats comment 338-1.	TRANSPORTATION
338-5	The commenter requests that environmental analysis of roadways adjacent to Marina boundaries be included in the EIR.	TRANSPORTATION
339-3	The commenter states that a balance between jobs and housing may not necessarily reduce commute distances.	TRANSPORTATION
339-5	The commenter states that a connection between CSUMB and Highway 68 will be needed before 2015.	TRANSPORTATION
342-2	The commenter would like language added to the text.	TRANSPORTATION
342-3	The commenter reiterates what the Draft EIR text states.	TRANSPORTATION
342-4	The commenter states that ongoing dialogue exists between public agencies pertaining to Laguna Seco meeting its goals to serve the public.	TRANSPORTATION
342-5	The commenter disagrees with the conclusion contained in the EIR.	TRANSPORTATION
342-6	The commenter suspects the use of the Florida Department of Transportation analysis to be inaccurate.	TRANSPORTATION
342-7	The commenter states that it is Caltrans policy to use the most current HCM.	TRANSPORTATION
342-8	The commenter would like to know why the Hatton Canyon project is included in the "No Conversion - Army Use Only" column of Table 4.7-2.	TRANSPORTATION
342-9	The commenter states that Caltrans is looking at both a Highway 68 Bypass and widening the existing Highway 68 to four lanes.	TRANSPORTATION
342-10	The commenter states that Caltrans is not aware of any widening of Highway 218 in any financially constrained plan.	TRANSPORTATION
342-11	The commenter states that information in Table 4.7-3 is incorrect.	TRANSPORTATION
342-12	The commenter states that the language contained in the policies is vague.	TRANSPORTATION
342-13	The commenter submits that FORA should distribute its discretionary funding equally.	TRANSPORTATION

342-14	The commenter states that there is a cooperative agreement between agencies pertaining to the widening of Highway 1.	TRANSPORTATION
343-8	The commenter states that adequate roadway infrastructure is required to meet future reuse.	TRANSPORTATION
339-4	The commenter is concerned with transportation funding.	TRANSPORTATION/FINANCING
333-8	The commenter would like clarification of the relationship between UC and local jurisdictions.	UC
337-96	The commenter requests that Figure 3.2-1 be amended to delineate UC MBEST Center.	UC
320-17	The commenter states that all jurisdictions should coordinate placement of utilities underground.	UTILITIES
320-21	The commenter states that the ultimate project adopted by FORA must contain provision for public utility easements.	UTILITIES
332-3	The commenter states that the EIR should expand the boundaries of the critical viewshed from Highway 1 to a regional scale.	VISUAL
332-7	The commenter states that visual impacts on the adjacent communities and the region are not adequately protected with identified view sheds and corridors and design review standards.	VISUAL
337-99	The commenter is concerned about viewshed.	VISUAL
351-53	The commenter would like to know how many buildings would be taller than existing buildings.	VISUAL
351-54	The commenter would like detailed information on visual pollution from future light sources.	VISUAL
351-55	The commenter would like detailed information on visual pollution from future light sources as seen from aircraft.	VISUAL
337-11	The commenter would like information on a wastewater treatment plant.	WASTEWATER
337-72	The commenter would like information on wastewater.	WASTEWATER
337-100	The commenter would like more information on wastewater.	WASTEWATER
337-101	The commenter states the EIR alludes to the feasibility of using the East Garrison wastewater treatment facility.	WASTEWATER
320-3	The commenter repeats comment 263-1.	WATER
320-4	The commenter states that policies and programs should be established for the use of recycled water and desalinated water and a program for protection of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin.	WATER
320-5	The commenter would like the Marina Coast Water District to be mentioned and its boundaries and sphere of influence shown on figures.	WATER
320-8	The commenter requests that the MCWD wells and facilities be shown.	WATER
320-9	The commenter states that it may be possible through an agreement with MCWD to obtain reclaimed water for Fort Ord.	WATER

320-10	The commenter states that future water for Fort Ord reuse can come from the MCWD deep wells and new connections between Fort Ord and MCWD could also provide Fort Ord with desalinated water from MCWD's new desalination plant.	WATER
320-13	The commenter requests amendments to the EIR text pertaining to water supply.	WATER
320-14	The commenter requests that the water purveyor be included in program B-1.1 and C-3.1.	WATER
320-15	The commenter requests amendments to the EIR text pertaining to water supply.	WATER
320-19	he commenter would like UCMBEST to acknowledge water issues.	WATER
320-20	The commenter requests amendments to the EIR text pertaining to water supply.	WATER
320-22	The commenter is requesting an environmental analysis associated with the future connection of the Fort Ord water infrastructure with the MCWD.	WATER
321-1	The commenter would like an alternative discussion that includes a project that uses only 7,000 afy and does not exceed current developed areas and areas already conveyed.	WATER
322-1	The commenter submits general comments about a new plan.	WATER
323-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
324-1	The commenter would like a revised EIR that contains a project with a safe-yield water source and provides a full disclosure of the environmental impacts.	WATER
325-3	The commenter requests that FORA pursue an adequate water supply for the current and future residents of the former Fort Ord.	WATER
328-6	The commenter states that recharge of the groundwater will not result in a net increase in overall recharge.	WATER
329-14	The commenter requests that the current water yields be discussed.	WATER
331-1	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
331-2	The commenter requests clarification in the text on issues pertaining to water.	WATER
331-3	The commenter requests that policy language be defined.	WATER
331-17	The commenter requests an amendment to the text pertaining to degradation of water quality.	WATER
331-28	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
331-31	The commenter states that the impacts relative to hydrology and water quality should be considered significant.	WATER

331-32	The commenter states that adopting and enforcing a stormwater detention plan that identifies potential stormwater does not mitigate the lack of water.	WATER
331-34	The commenter would like to know what the source of reclaimed water will be and what are the implications to the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) and the Salinas Valley Reclamation Project	WATER
331-35	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
331-36	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
332-8	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
335-5	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
336-6	The commenter would like to know why the EIR consultant has placed was a safe-yield water source under the head "Hydrology and Water Quality".	WATER
337-15	The commenter requests that the EIR use "water-conservation driven formulas".	WATER
337-18	The commenter requests additional information pertaining to water use.	WATER
337-19	The commenter would like chlorine contour maps included in the EIR.	WATER
337-20	The commenter would like safe-yield water to be clearly defined.	WATER
337-21	The commenter requests that pumping records of existing Fort Ord wells be provided.	WATER
337-45	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
337-49	The commenter would like information on the seawater intrusion problem.	WATER
337-89	The commenter would like more information on water.	WATER
337-102	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
337-103	The commenter states that potential future water impoundment areas should be identified and the Reuse Plan map amended to reduce development displaced by water impoundment sites.	WATER
337-104	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
337-105	The commenter states that the Draft EIR does not notify non-reuse plan residents and farmers that they have been asked in the past to pay for 80 percent of the proposed pipeline and proposed dam.	WATER
337-110	The commenter would like to know what the current water use is at Fort Ord.	WATER
337-111	The commenter would like to know what a silty aquitard is.	WATER
340-1	The commenter states that because the MPWMD jurisdiction includes parts of Fort Ord, there will be an unrealistic expectation on the part of those who build on Fort Ord within the jurisdiction of MPWMD that water from the MPWMD will be available.	WATER
340-2	The commenter states that an alternative based on safe-yield water needs to be discussed.	WATER
340-3	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER

340-4	The commenter would like to know how new uses and water demand will be tracked.	WATER
340-5	The commenter states that the MPWMD has jurisdiction over water infrastructure systems within the MPWMD and it should be listed with the other agencies listed under section 3.7 in the Draft EIR.	WATER
340-6	The commenter would like to know what is FORA's position vis-a-vis Senate Bill 901 and its mandate for a water supply assessment from the project areas water purveyor.	WATER
340-8	Based on the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) discussed above, the MPWMD has no permit authority over water extracted from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin.	WATER
340-9	The commenter would like a discussion of a worst case scenario where the safe-yield water supply was less than 6,600 afy.	WATER
340-10	The commenter would like to know what is the source of the reclaimed water.	WATER
340-11	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
340-12	The commenter states that although it has not worked to date with FORA on future water impoundment sites on Fort Ord, it looks forward to cooperating with the cities and the county on this issue.	WATER
340-13	The commenter states that it looks forward to cooperating with the cities and the county on the subject of providing future water supply.	WATER
340-14	The commenter states that to save water, FORA should consider using the MPWMD's water conservation regulation #13.	WATER
340-15	The commenter would like a water demand management program discussion.	WATER
340-16	The commenter states that the MPWMD looks forward to cooperating with other agencies in determining a safe-yield water supply as it pertains to both the Salinas and Seaside aquifers.	WATER
340-17	The commenter states an interest in participating in developing an implementing measures to prevent further seawater intrusion.	WATER
340-18	The commenter is in disagreement with the conclusion made in the EIR pertaining to the need for new local water supplies.	WATER
340-19	The commenter notes that the PFIP includes approximately 4000 individual water meters and submits a recommendation for water metering for individual units for all new construction.	WATER
341-3	The commenter states that the EIR does not contain a discussion of the water quality impacts associated with golf courses and other land uses.	WATER
341-32	The commenter would like additional discussion pertaining to the potential contamination of groundwater via hazardous waste spills as a result of future activities.	WATER
343-9	The commenter submits a recommendation for future water source to be considered by the FORA board.	WATER

345-1	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
351-31	The commenter would like the EIR to state in the Summary how the drinking water supply is "downstream" from the proposed golf courses.	WATER
351-33	The commenter would like a reduced project whereby water use would be less than significant.	WATER
351-43	The commenter would like water use calculations to be based on a 100 year drought.	WATER
351-44	The commenter would like an alternative that would not exceed the reliable sustainable water available in a worst case drought year at the end of the summer at the end of the last year of a 100-year drought.	WATER
351-46	The commenter would like reference to a reliable water source contained in the Summary.	WATER
351-47	The commenter would like reference to a reliable water source contained in the Executive Summary.	WATER
351-48	The commenter would like to know the minimum and maximum amount of sustainable water which is available for the projected from its own resources and put this information in the summary.	WATER
351-50	The commenter would like an alternative and mitigation that will cease all development when toxics are found in the water used for the Monterey Peninsula.	WATER
351-51	The commenter would like an alternative and mitigation which prohibits the use of all toxics and chemicals upstream from any water course that flows into drinking water supplies or fish habitat, or the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.	WATER
353-1	The commenter states that there are metals in the water which exceeds maximum allowable limits.	WATER
355-1	The commenter is concerned about water use.	WATER
357-6	The commenter would like to know where the water would come from.	WATER
362-1	The commenter would like reuse based on existing water at Fort Ord.	WATER

Appendix D

Assessment of Planning
Baseline and Market Data
Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan



SEDWAY KOTIN MOUCHLY GROUP
Real Estate and Urban Economics

**ASSESSMENT OF
PLANNING BASELINE AND MARKET DATA
FORT ORD BASE REUSE PLAN**

Prepared by:

SEDWAY KOTIN MOUCHLY GROUP

Prepared for:

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

Date:

November 7, 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	I-1
Contents of Report	I-1
Purpose of Report	I-2
II. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	II-1
Background	II-1
Major Findings and Conclusions	II-6
Variance with Previous Studies	II-11
III. DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC OVERVIEW	III-1
Demographic Trends	III-1
Employment Trends	III-2
Demographic Forecasts	III-4
Employment Forecast	III-6
IV. MARKET ASSESSMENT	IV-1
Employment Center Uses	IV-1
Residential Uses	IV-4
Retail Uses	IV-10
Lodging Facility Uses	IV-14
Recreational Uses	IV-17
V. REAL ESTATE IMPACTS OF PUBLIC CONVEYANCE USES	V-1
Introduction	V-1
McKinney Act Housing Reuse	V-1
Municipal Airport	V-2
Public Facilities	V-2
Colleges and Universities	V-2
University Research and Enterprise Center	V-3
Public and Private Schools	V-3
Continued Military Use	V-4
Parks and Open Space	V-4
VI. MARKET CONCLUSIONS	VI-1
Light Industrial/Business Park	VI-1
Office and Research and Development	VI-3
Residential Uses	VI-7
Retail	VI-11
Lodging Facilities	VI-13
Recreation	VI-13
Employment	VI-14

ASSUMPTIONS AND GENERAL LIMITING CONDITIONS

Section I INTRODUCTION

CONTENTS OF REPORT

Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group (SKMG) has prepared the following discussion of its major findings and conclusions regarding the market potential of various uses for the development and reuse of Fort Ord. In addition, a summary of the planning baseline strengths and weaknesses has been provided. SKMG was retained to provide a concise summary report of its market assessment findings and conclusions, relying extensively upon readily available sources of data, supplemented by targeted research, as a general assessment of future market conditions. In conducting its analysis, however, SKMG felt that more extensive additional market research was warranted, and therefore has conducted a more comprehensive market analysis than was originally contemplated. In addition, the need to extensively document these findings and conclusions became evident during the course of the study. Thus, the following is a fairly extensive report document. Nonetheless, SKMG's research and analysis efforts should not to be construed as a complete market feasibility analysis.

The major land uses examined in this research effort include the following:

- Office and research and development
- Industrial and business park
- Residential
- Retail
- Limited number of "other uses," later identified as lodging facility, golf course and equestrian center

As part of this analysis, the impact of various public benefit conveyance uses has been taken into consideration, including educational institutions, homeless programs, airport, public parks and other transfers.

The following report has been organized into the following sections following this introduction:

- a summary of SKMG's major findings and conclusions, along with a discussion of approach and assumptions;
- an economic, demographic overview, including forecasts through 2015;
- an assessment of the demand potential for various uses researched through 2015;

- a discussion of the real estate impacts of public conveyance uses; and
- conclusions regarding potential capture of demand within the Fort Ord property by phase of development through 2015.

For ease of use, exhibits providing tabular data have been appended to the section of this report in which they are referenced.

SKMG's market research and conclusions have been undertaken with the extensive cooperation and coordination of all members of the Consulting Team, which includes the firms of EDAW, Inc., EMC Planning Group Inc., Reimer Associates, The Ingram Group, Zander Associates, JHK & Associates, Angus McDonald & Associates, Remy and Thomas, Fenton and Keller, and Resource Corps International.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This market assessment has been carefully tailored to the Consulting Team's needs in creating a plan for 2015 that

- optimizes the various objectives for the reuse of the military base, which generally include economic, fiscal and environmental objectives;
- responds to opportunities and constraints posed by the physical property;
- capitalizes on forecast market conditions and trends; and
- balances projected revenues generated with infrastructure costs and their timing.

This planning process has been conducted over the course of the past four months. In order to provide input to the Consulting Team during this process, SKMG has provided various iterations of its market forecasts to facilitate planning. These iterations were prepared prior to the completion of the market research and analysis. One of these iterations was a table entitled "Fort Ord Development and Absorption Potential," dated in August 1995, which was distributed at the "Visioning Workshop" to facilitate discussion at that event. Those and other forecasts have been refined during the course of this research and analysis.

The Team has prepared a plan for the full build-out of the Fort Ord property that is responsive to SKMG's market assessment conclusions regarding Fort Ord's long-term development potential. However, this build-out will take development far beyond SKMG's 20-year forecast horizon.

Refinements to the plan will be tested in the next stage of the Team's efforts, and an implementation plan through the year 2015 will be prepared. The goal of this planning process will be to develop a strategy plan that achieves an optimal balance between providing a financial return in order to fund needed infrastructure while also generating a positive net fiscal impact on the affected local jurisdictions. An additional goal of this assignment has been to develop a plan that will replace the employment lost by the closure of Fort Ord as quickly as possible. The following market assessment provides a context for developing an optimal implementation plan that will be prepared during the future phases of this contract.

This assessment of the market potentials for the reuse of Fort Ord is also intended to be of assistance to the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) and its respective jurisdictions in their efforts to prepare a market-responsive reuse plan for the Fort Ord property. This report can be utilized as baseline information for marketing plans and for planning efforts.

Section II SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

BACKGROUND

Prior to presenting SKMG's major findings and conclusions, a summary has been provided of the firm's general approach or methodology in conducting this assignment and initial assumptions utilized, including an assessment of Fort Ord's significant assets and challenges that will impact its reuse potential. This summary is provided below.

Approach

In conducting SKMG's market assessment of the reuse potential of Fort Ord, the following general approach was used:

- Historical patterns of population, household and employment were examined for the region (three-county area comprising Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties), Monterey County and the Monterey Peninsula. In particular, historical and recent patterns of employment growth and loss by sector were examined.
- The regional economic dynamics were examined and Monterey County's and Monterey Peninsula's roles in this regional economy were assessed. Economic growth sectors that are likely to have strong future growth potential were particularly examined.
- The area's positive assets and challenges relative to future growth were assessed. In addition, the potential for mitigating challenges was explored.
- SKMG examined various employment forecasts for the area, including a critical review of Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) forecasts. These forecasts were further examined in view of further research conducted as described below.
- For each potential land use that has been identified in the Fort Ord Plan, SKMG researched the historical and recent market conditions through compilation and review of existing data, site visits, telephone surveys, and in-person interviews.
- Based upon the above research and analysis, supplemented by extensive real estate experience, SKMG prepared market forecasts for the region and the Peninsula for each land use. In preparing these forecasts, historical growth, AMBAG forecasts, underlying economic fundamentals, and regional and local real estate trends were taken into consideration. In particular, the introduction of new institutions likely to

impact the local economy, such as the new California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) campus, satellite and new facilities for other educational and research institutions, and the planned University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology (UCMBEST) Center (a focus for university research technology transfer), have been taken into consideration.

- The capture potential for Fort Ord was then projected based upon SKMG's assessment of the property's competitive position within the regional and local markets. While the focus has been on employment-generating land uses, the market potential for housing was also explored.

Initial Assumptions

In conducting this research and analysis, SKMG adopted a number of critical assumptions. These assumptions have been examined for reasonableness. Thus, SKMG believes that these assumptions are realistically achievable. They are as follows:

- SKMG has relied heavily upon secondary source data, per our contract, such as that provided by the U.S. Census, on-line demographic services, California Department of Finance, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), on-line real estate sales data, and data provided by other consulting firms. SKMG does not warrant their accuracy. However, all data sources have been examined for reasonableness.
- This analysis provides forecasts regarding market conditions over the next 20 years. However, many events on a regional, national or international level could occur that are currently unforeseen and that could impact these forecasts. While economic cycles are expected during the next 20 years, with periods of both weakness and strength, SKMG has assumed that a prolonged and deep economic recession will not occur. Such a recession or other unforeseen major events will require a reconsideration of the forecasts provided in this study.
- In conducting this research, we have relied heavily upon the information provided to us by knowledgeable sources. To the extent possible, we have attempted to validate these data from other sources, and have scrutinized them for reasonableness. However, we cannot warrant the accuracy of the information that they have provided.
- The estimates and projections provided in SKMG's report reflect the firm's best unbiased opinions regarding future market conditions. However, we cannot guarantee that the future will occur as projected.

- An excellent land plan will be developed and implemented that provides an attractive environment and high-quality image for businesses and residents. In addition, planning controls are assumed to ensure a high level of quality of development at Fort Ord. Poor or mediocre planning and implementation will produce an image which will not be appealing to potential employers and residents alike. The failure to implement an excellent plan will make the forecasts provided in this report very difficult to achieve. Well executed planned communities nationally have facilitated market forces. Excellent examples include Irvine, Mission Viejo, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho California, Rancho Marguerita and Redwood Shores in California; Reston, Virginia; Woodlands and Las Colinas in Texas; and Highlands Ranch, Colorado.
- The Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA), or some other organization, will develop and implement an effective marketing program to facilitate the reuse of Fort Ord. Internal growth of existing businesses on the Monterey Peninsula is unlikely to be sufficient to demand forecasts indicated in this study. Thus, aggressive and effective marketing to firms located outside the area will be required to achieve projected capture.
- Government entities with jurisdiction over Fort Ord provide reasonable processes for development entitlements when projects are consistent with the plan. If the entitlement process for building approval is arduous, unpredictable, expensive and time-consuming, employers and developers are likely to seek opportunities elsewhere, and reuse of Fort Ord will not achieve forecast demand.
- California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB), and other educational institutions planned at Fort Ord, will be developed as planned. Projections for Fort Ord's reuse potential are based upon its role as a major educational center. While funding from the State of California for the development of the campus during the next 20 years is difficult to forecast, SKMG believes it is realistically achievable.
- The University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology (UCMBEST) Center will be implemented to provide a strong attraction to research and development firms. At the time of this study, the specific composition of the UCMBEST Center has not been fully defined, and studies are currently being initiated. Nevertheless, SKMG has assumed that programs and facilities will be developed that will facilitate the transfer of technologies developed at California universities to private enterprise. While SKMG recognizes that the successful implementation of the UCMBEST Center will be a major challenge, the consultants believe it is realistically achievable. The University of California has assembled an impressive team of experienced and dedicated professionals, and has sought the advice of excellent consulting firms, to conceptualize and implement this ambitious program.

- The two existing golf courses at Fort Ord will be a major asset to be leveraged. The consultants have assumed their continued excellent operation and maintenance. In particular, forecasts for upscale housing and resort development will be dependent upon these courses.
- Existing housing previously occupied by military families at Fort Ord will be renovated as high-quality and well-maintained, but affordable, housing. This housing will provide a positive impact by providing a diversity of housing opportunities for future employees on the reused base. However, it is important that this housing maintain a high-quality image in order to be compatible with potential nearby development. These homes, located in Patton, Creston, and Abrams parks, have the potential to serve a long and productive life, assuming renovation and ongoing maintenance. Some estimates have indicated that renovation costs averaging around \$30,000 per unit will be required for code compliance, installation of utility meters, rectifying deferred maintenance, and repairing damage incurred during a period of vacancy. Once an agreement can be achieved with the Army, these units should be brought onto the rental market as soon as possible. In the longer term, many of these units can be sold as condominiums. SKMG recommends affordable pricing for two-bedroom units in the \$95,000-to-\$160,000 range.
- A significant volume of new housing, particularly single-family homes in a moderate price range, are provided within or near Fort Ord in order to house potential future employees at Fort Ord. In particular, homes in the \$150,000-to-\$250,000 price range should be provided. Ideally, it would be desirable to provide housing for 70 percent or more of employees forecast at Fort Ord within the development.
- CSUMB will provide housing for most of its students on campus, and will accommodate a significant portion of its faculty and staff on campus. This is a major stated goal of the university administration. Given its location outside a major urban area, CSUMB is likely to attract a high proportion of resident students, with a relatively small proportion of commuter students. Given innovative funding and financing programs currently available to California's universities, and the availability of land, SKMG believes that a high proportion of CSUMB's students could reasonably be accommodated on campus.
- Sufficient transportation improvements are made to avoid excessive congestion within the Monterey Peninsula and to major inland destinations. Currently, transportation links with inland locations are poor and will require significant upgrading. In order to attract new firms from out of the area, such transportation linkage is essential. Transportation planners, concurrent with this effort, are modeling the future transportation needs of the Peninsula, assuming reuse of Fort Ord. Funding from local, state and federal sources for transportation improvements is difficult to predict over the next 20 years, and is currently quite limited in public

budgets. Nevertheless, California and the United States have had a strong history of providing transportation improvements as needed. SKMG believes that it is reasonable to assume that such commitments will continue to be made in the future.

- Infrastructure improvements, particularly streets, water and sewer, are adequately supplied in a timely fashion to support market demand. The next phase of the Consultant Team contract will be focused on planning for the phasing of real estate development and infrastructure that are balanced. This plan will provide for a sufficient supply of serviced land to accommodate projected development demand.
- McKinney Act housing at Fort Ord is sensitively integrated into the overall community. SKMG has assumed that such housing will be renovated and well maintained. Excellent operations are assumed to produce minimal negative impacts on adjacent uses.
- Finally, properties within Fort Ord are not burdened by excessive assessment fees or other cost burdens. Fort Ord must be highly competitive in terms of cost with alternative locations in Northern California. Thus, the development plan for the reuse of Fort Ord must provide land uses that balances revenue generated by proposed land uses with infrastructure costs and their timing. Future efforts of the Consulting Team will be focused upon optimal balancing between demand for serviced land and installation of infrastructure, to minimize these cost burdens.

Assets and Challenges

- The Monterey Peninsula offers many major assets that will assist in attracting real estate development to Fort Ord:
 - ▶ high quality of life, including the incomparable environmental setting;
 - ▶ educational institutions, including the California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB); Monterey Peninsula College; Golden Gate University; Monterey College of Law; Monterey Institute of International Studies; and the Naval Post-Graduate School, which will provide highly trained employees and continuing education for companies that locate to Fort Ord;
 - ▶ educational institutions will provide a substantial quantity of students living and studying at Fort Ord, providing considerable activity and support for retailing and services;
 - ▶ CSUMB will provide students who are available in the local workforce, either as part-time or full-time employees, generally at moderate wage costs;
 - ▶ research institutions, including marine biology, astronomy, the Naval institutions, and laboratories and technology transfer centers within the planned UCMBEST Center;

- ▶ the intellectual capital of the Peninsula, which comprises a highly educated workforce;
 - ▶ a particularly strong tourism, resort and meetings market that is nationally and internationally recognized; and
 - ▶ the agricultural industry, which continues to be an extremely important component of the Monterey County and Peninsula economy.
- The Monterey Peninsula, including Fort Ord, offers several major challenges that will need to be mitigated in order to successfully redevelop Fort Ord:
 - ▶ The mixture of housing on the Peninsula provides a substantial supply of multifamily and high-end single-family homes, but provides a modest supply of homes for middle-income families priced in the \$150,000-to-\$250,000 range.
 - ▶ This shortage of housing suitable for a majority of employees has been an obstacle to attracting firms to the Peninsula.
 - ▶ The Peninsula is poorly served by transportation, with no freeways providing linkages to inland areas such as Salinas and U.S. 101.
 - ▶ Finally, the economy of the Peninsula is relatively small and was heavily influenced by the military presence at Fort Ord; with the closure of the military base, this economy is currently even smaller.
 - ▶ Students are likely to occupy jobs in local businesses that otherwise might have been occupied by local residents.
 - In order to mitigate the above challenges and optimize economic development, a strategy will be required to provide moderately-priced single-family homes at Fort Ord in the early stages of development in order to make the area more attractive to prospective businesses. In particular, homes in the \$150,000-to-\$250,000 price range will be required. In addition, the transportation system will require gradual improvement to mitigate problems of congestion.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The following are SKMG's major findings and conclusions, which have been derived from the following report document.

Demographic and Economic Overview and Forecasts

- Prior to the closure of Fort Ord, the Monterey Peninsula housed about 33 percent of the County's population and 37 percent of its households, not including unincorporated areas such as the Carmel Valley.

- The number of persons and households on the Peninsula has been severely reduced by the closure of Fort Ord. From a peak of 121,200 in 1991, population has declined to 104,900 in 1995. Similarly, households declined from a peak of 42,200 in 1992 to 38,500 in 1995. The Salinas Valley, however, experienced a modest increase in population and employment during this period.
- Since a peak of nearly 160,000 wage and salary jobs in 1990, approximately 11 percent, or nearly 18,000 jobs, have been lost in Monterey County through 1995. Based upon figures provided by RKG Associates and the California Employment Development Department, SKMG estimates that the County lost between 20,000 and 21,000 jobs as a result of the closure of Fort Ord. Between 2,000 and 3,000 jobs were gained in other various sectors of the County's economy.
- SKMG estimates that wage and salary employment on the Peninsula totaled about 72,000 in 1990, declining to about 57,000 in 1995, reflecting 45 and 40 percent of County total employment, respectively. Thus, the Peninsula experienced a net loss of 15,000 jobs. With some probable job gains in tourism and other sectors, the Peninsula's employment loss from the closure of Fort Ord was likely greater than 15,000. Approximately 13,500 jobs were attributable to active duty military, and an additional 2,500 jobs were directly employed civilians. Additional losses were experienced in local service and retail jobs.
- AMBAG forecasts a net gain of 88,000 jobs between 1995 and 2015, of which about 90 percent, or 79,000 jobs, would be captured by Monterey County. After careful review, SKMG believes that these numbers are generally reasonable, assuming the aggressive marketing and development of Fort Ord. Although a substantial portion of this employment growth is likely to be captured in the Salinas Valley, which has a strong outlook for economic growth, Fort Ord has the potential to achieve a significant capture.
- Assuming successful redevelopment of Fort Ord, SKMG believes that the Monterey Peninsula has the potential to capture between 25 and 35 percent of County employment growth, or between 20,000 and 25,000 jobs between 1995 and 2015.

Real Estate Demand

- SKMG projections through 2015 are summarized by land use on Exhibit 2-1.
- Light industrial space, including that typically found in light industrial or business parks, has experienced a historical demand for between 125,000 and 175,000 square feet of space annually. Most of this demand has been captured in the Salinas Valley. Recent demand for such space has been quite weak, reflecting the recent national and

California recession and the closure of Fort Ord. Land prices are typically in the \$3.50 to \$5.00 per square foot range.

- SKMG forecasts that industrial space demand in Monterey County will gradually increase to an average of 165,000 square feet per year during the next five years to 300,000 square feet annually between 2011 and 2015. Fort Ord has the potential to capture 25 percent of this demand, for a total of over 1.1 million square feet through 2015. Land prices averaging between \$4.00 and \$5.00 per square foot in current 1995 dollars are assumed. *25% capture*
- Office and research and development (R&D) space has typically experienced a historical demand for about 150,000 square feet annually in Monterey County. Most of this demand has been captured on the Peninsula. Demand has been particularly weak in recent years, reflecting the recessed economy, and vacancy rates are relatively high at about 12 percent. A substantial supply exists of land in excellent office and R&D parks.
- Monterey County demand is projected to continue to average around 150,000 square feet annually during the next five years, increasing to 312,000 square feet annually between 2011 and 2015, as the Monterey County economy matures. SKMG believes that Fort Ord could capture 40 percent of this demand for a total of nearly 1.8 million square feet by 2015. In addition, SKMG believes that, with the development of the UCMBEST Center and aggressive and effective marketing, an additional 925,000 square feet of office and R&D space could be captured from Silicon Valley firms by 2015. Thus, over 2.7 million square feet of office and R&D space could be captured at Fort Ord by 2015. *40% capture*
- Absorption of new homes has historically averaged about 1,450 units annually in Monterey County. Of these, about 400 units, or 28 percent, have been captured on the Peninsula. In general, new home construction on the Peninsula has been for relatively expensive homes and multifamily housing, including subdivisions within the Marina, Monterey, and within unincorporated areas. However, there has been little construction on the Peninsula during the past three years. Within the Salinas Valley, numerous subdivisions have produced a strong volume of high-quality moderately-priced homes, priced in the \$100,000-to-\$250,000 range.
- SKMG forecasts a demand for an average of 1,900 new homes annually in Monterey County during the next five years, increasing to 2,800 units annually between 2011 and 2015, based upon population, household and employment forecasts. SKMG forecasts that 70 percent of this demand will support market-rate new housing. Approximately 15 percent of this demand could be captured at Fort Ord during the first 10 years of development, increasing to 20 percent during the 2006-through-2015 period. Thus, between 1996 and 2015, SKMG forecasts a capture potential of 6,250 new *15% capture to 20%*

housing units at Fort Ord. These include about 500 low-density homes priced in the \$300,000 range and provided on average 10,000-square-foot lots, or alternatively on smaller lots fronting around a golf course; 3,100 homes on 6,000-square-foot average lots priced in the \$200,000-to-\$275,000 range; 2,150 homes on small 4,500- to 5,000-square-foot lots priced in the \$150,000-to-\$200,000 range; 200 townhomes in the \$125,000-to-\$150,000 range; and 300 rental apartments. In addition, SKMG forecasts demand for the reuse of 1,522 units of existing housing, which could be temporarily leased, with some units eventually sold as condominiums for between \$95,000 and \$160,000 (after substantial rehabilitation).

- Retail sales volume in Monterey County has grown at a rapid rate through 1992, prior to closure of Fort Ord. While total sales have continued to grow in subsequent years, per capita sales have declined, reflecting a recessed economy. Despite a significant decrease in population, the construction of major new retail centers along with a resurgence in tourism on the Peninsula have minimized the decline in retail spending. The Peninsula houses one traditional regional retail center, one factory outlet center, substantial specialty and tourist-related retailing, and concentrations of promotional retailing, particularly in Sand City and Seaside.
- Convenience, neighborhood and community retail center development will be supported by capturing most local-serving on-site demand generated by residents, on-site employees, and students. During the first 20 years, SKMG forecasts a demand for approximately 554,000 square feet of such space. This equates to three neighborhood or community centers along with two or three small convenience retail centers.
- In general, the Monterey Peninsula has been extremely successful in attracting regional retailing, including traditional regional retail, promotional and outlet retailing, and tourist-oriented specialty retailing. However, SKMG believes that demand will support a regional entertainment retail center at Fort Ord, focused on serving local residents. This center could include new emerging retail concepts, a cineplex, restaurants, and specialty shops. SKMG forecasts demand for approximately 250,000 square feet of such space during the 2011-through-2015 period at Fort Ord. However, sufficient acreage should be allocated to allow for an eventual expansion to 500,000 square feet.
- The Monterey Peninsula contains 191 lodging facilities with about 9,200 rooms. In 1995, the Peninsula is expected to achieve an average occupancy rate of 75 percent and an average daily rate of \$153. These figures are reflective of very strong performance. SKMG surveyed 14 of the higher quality facilities on the Peninsula having 3,144 rooms. These hotels have experienced very strong performance, with particularly high room rates, attracting a strong meeting market both in resort settings and within downtown Monterey.

- SKMG forecasts that Fort Ord could capture 1,000 hotel rooms by 2015. These hotels should have excellent conference facilities and should generally be located on golf courses. However, there is also demand for a smaller focused corporate conference facility and/or spa of about 200 to 250 rooms.
- SKMG identified 16 golf courses in Monterey County available for public play. Most are located on the Peninsula and achieve strong rates and high volumes of play. The area contains several courses of world renown, which has made the Peninsula a major international golf destination.
- Two additional golf courses could be supportable at Fort Ord in the next 20 years, in addition to the two existing courses. Demand will be partially derived by the planned resort hotel/conference centers and on-site housing. In addition, an equestrian center would likely be supportable, assuming that it can be developed on property at below-market prices.

Development Strategy

At this stage in the planning process, the Fort Ord plan has not been tested for financial feasibility. Nevertheless, it is evident that substantial infrastructure costs will be probable in the reuse of the base. Therefore, it will be essential that a phasing plan be developed that optimizes the balance of revenues and costs in order to achieve development feasibility. In particular, the timing in which infrastructure costs are incurred relative to the receipt of revenue will be of particular concern. Thus, the Consulting Team will be focusing its future efforts on the development of a realistic and financially feasible phasing plan. At a later phase in this study, public finance mechanisms will be recommended that minimize costs both to the public jurisdictions and to the property owners and users.

An important assumption in developing the forecasts in this report is that utility, tax and other assessments at Fort Ord are competitive with nearby communities and other areas of California. To the extent that such costs are higher, land prices will require adjustment to compensate.

SKMG has assumed the development of CSUMB as planned. The introduction of this campus to Fort Ord will be a major asset to its development. Students, faculty and staff will support retail and service uses in the early phases of development, providing early amenities to employees and residents alike.

Another important underlying assumption in developing the forecasts in this report is that a significant supply of housing will be provided at Fort Ord in the early years of development. The provision of a diverse supply of new housing, particularly moderately-priced single-family homes, will be essential to attract a significant amount of new employment to Fort Ord. In general, homes priced in the \$150,000-to-\$275,000 range will help to attract this

employment to Fort Ord. This new supply of housing should include a modest component of upscale housing, in order to enhance the image of the overall Fort Ord redevelopment.

In the capture projections for office, research and development and light industrial/ business park uses, SKMG has assumed that an organization (FORA or a new organization) will develop an excellent and effective marketing plan that mobilizes the resources and energies of the various institutions and jurisdictions to attract businesses and market properties at Fort Ord.

VARIANCE WITH PREVIOUS STUDIES

Denise Duffy & Associates Study

SKMG has compared its findings and conclusions with those provided in the Denise Duffy & Associates (DD&A) study. The economic assessment section of this study was prepared by Keyser Marston & Associates (KMA), dated April 8, 1994. Given that the KMA and SKMG studies were conducted independently, and that the KMA study was completed more than one year earlier, their conclusions are remarkably similar. Neither of these studies was intended to be an in-depth market feasibility analysis per their respective contracts. However, there were significant differences in approach between the two studies (see Exhibit II-2 for summary comparison):

- Both studies rely upon both secondary source data and new survey research. However, the emphasis between these two research sources differs in the two studies. While both studies were intended as "market assessments," conducted with limited resources, the SKMG study was far more in-depth than the KMA study.
- The SKMG study is much more focused on market research of individual real estate uses. The KMA study relies largely on secondary source overview and anecdotal data. SKMG conducted substantial survey research regarding each land use examined and compiled data on historical and recent trends.
- KMA market forecasts were heavily based upon AMBAG forecasts of population and employment. AMBAG forecasts are heavily impacted by reuse plans for Fort Ord and are being continually revised. Thus, a heavy reliance upon their projections could be misleading. SKMG placed less emphasis on these forecasts, and relied more heavily upon historical trends, moderated by the firm's assessment of the area's outlook, given reuse plans for Fort Ord. Nevertheless, SKMG utilized AMBAG as the best available forecasts.
- In particular, KMA produced projections for office/R&D and industrial space primarily based upon employment forecasts. SKMG primarily utilized a historical

trend analysis, supplemented by employment forecasts and the firm's independent assessment of the future of the economy.

- In general, SKMG forecast more demand for employment center uses than did KMA. However, SKMG focused its demand on office/R&D, whereas KMA indicates stronger demand for industrial. KMA produced stronger forecasts than SKMG for residential, retail and hotel uses. The two firms agreed on golf course demand.
- KMA estimated a 40 to 50 percent capture of county demand for both office and business park (industrial) space through 2015 at Fort Ord. SKMG assumed a 25 percent capture of county demand for light industrial/business park space at Fort Ord. For office/R&D, SKMG assumed that Fort Ord could capture 40 percent of county demand.
- KMA projections for residential use were primarily based upon household formation forecasts provided by AMBAG. SKMG similarly utilized AMBAG forecasts, but adjusted them based upon historical trends and employment forecasts.
- KMA projects a Fort Ord capture of 16 percent of county demand during the first five years of development, increasing to 30 percent during the final 2010-to-2015 period. SKMG projects that Fort Ord could capture 15 percent of county demand during the first five years of development, increasing to 20 percent during the final 2010-to-2015 period.
- KMA and SKMG utilized very similar approaches to assessing the demand for retail space at Fort Ord. KMA projects that about 1.0 million square feet of retail space can be captured at Fort Ord, including 500,000 to 600,000 square feet of regional retail space by 2015, comprised of major value-oriented and promotional tenants. In addition, 150,000 to 298,000 square feet of convenience retail space, 50,000 to 83,000 square feet of eating and drinking space, and 150,000 to 200,000 square feet of entertainment and service and support retail would be supportable by 2015. These ranges indicate between 850,000 and 1,181,000 square feet of total demand. KMA's summary indicates total demand of 1.0 million square feet, approximately at a mid-point of this range. To some extent, the KMA forecasts reflect a larger number of residents forecast to reside on the Fort Ord property by 2015.
- For lodging facilities, KMA projects a Fort Ord capture over the next 20 years equating to between 10 and 15 percent increase in inventory, or between 1,000 and 1,500 rooms. KMA does not indicate a basis for this assumption, nor its assumptions regarding market area growth. If KMA has assumed a 100 percent capture of market area growth, this would equate to between a 0.5 and 0.8 percent annual growth rate during the 20-year period. SKMG and KMA produced similar demand forecasts for the Peninsula. SKMG forecast an annual increase in demand of 2 percent for first class

hotel rooms during the next 20 years (on a base of 3,000 rooms, compared with a 0.5 to 0.8 percent increase on 9,000 rooms forecast by KMA; these forecasts are approximately equivalent). However, SKMG forecast only a 50 to 55 percent capture of this hotel room demand at Fort Ord.

- KMA applied National Golf Foundation participation rates to the projected AMBAG population to determine golf course demand at Fort Ord. In addition, demand resulting from tourism growth was added, indicating demand for five additional golf courses by 2015. KMA projected a capture potential at Fort Ord of one to two of these golf courses. SKMG surveyed all major golf facilities in Monterey County which indicated high utilization rates and high fees. Based upon population and tourism growth forecasts, demand was forecast for two additional golf courses at Fort Ord. A substantial portion of their support will be derived from planned adjacent resort hotels.
- KMA projected 19,500 jobs at Fort Ord by 2015, not including jobs associated with the POM Annex. These projections were based upon a capture of about 32 percent of job growth in the county during the 1995-through-2015 period. SKMG projects between 13,000 and 18,000 jobs during this period. This represents between a 16 and 23 percent capture of county job growth during this period.

August 1995 Draft SKMG Forecast

At a Visioning Workshop held in August 1995, SKMG prepared a highly preliminary forecast of land use capture potential at Fort Ord. This forecast reflected highly preliminary research findings as well as highly preliminary analysis of the data. The preliminary forecasts were provided to assist discussion by providing "order of magnitude" market demand. Since August 1995, SKMG has completed its research and analysis which has resulted in somewhat modified demand projections.

**EXHIBIT II-1
FORT ORD DEVELOPMENT AND ABSORPTION POTENTIAL
1996 - 2016**

Land Use	FAR/ DU/AC	1996 - 2000		2001 - 2005		2006 - 2010		2011 - 2016		Total 1996 - 2016	
		Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres
Light Industrial/R&D/Office											
Light Industrial/Business Park	0.25 FAR	206,250	21	250,000	25	306,250	28	375,000	32	1,137,500	106
Office/R&D	0.25 FAR	300,000	28	382,000	35	488,000	45	624,000	57	1,794,000	165
Induced demand	0.25 FAR	0	0	250,000	23	300,000	29	375,000	34	925,000	86
Subtotal (Sq. Ft.)		506,250	49	882,000	83	1,094,250	102	1,374,000	123	3,856,500	357
Residential											
Reuse of Existing Units		1,522	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1,522	---
Reuse of Existing CSU Units		1,253	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1,253	---
Detached											
Low Density	4 DU/AC	50	13	100	25	150	38	200	50	500	125
Medium Density	6 DU/AC	600	100	800	133	800	133	900	150	3,100	517
High Density	8 DU/AC	350	44	600	75	600	75	600	75	2,150	269
Attached											
Low Density	10 DU/AC	0	0	0	0	100	10	100	10	200	20
High Density	20 DU/AC	0	0	0	0	100	5	200	10	300	15
Subtotal (Units)		3,775	156	1,600	233	1,750	261	2,000	295	9,025	945
Retail											
Neighborhood/Community	.25 FAR	191,000	18	99,000	9	114,000	10	131,000	12	535,000	49
Regional/Outlet	.25 FAR	0	0	0	0	0	25	250,000	25	250,000	50
Subtotal (Sq/ Ft.)		191,000	18	99,000	9	114,000	35	381,000	37	785,000	99
Lodging											
Conference Center	.20 FAR	0	0	200	15	0	0	0	0	200	15
Resort/Hotel (Golf-Oriented)	.25 FAR	300	20	0	0	300	20	200	15	800	55
Subtotal		300	20	200	15	300	20	200	15	1,000	70
Recreation											
Equestrian Center		0	0	---	15	0	0	0	0	---	15
Golf Course		0	0	0	0	---	160	---	160	---	320

Sources: Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\PROJECT4.WK4 / A [jde]

02:33 PM
10-Nov-95

Exhibit II-2

Comparison of Fort Ord Absorption Conclusions: 2015
SKMG and Denise Duffy & Associates

Land Use	SKMG	DD&A ¹
Industrial (sq.ft.)	1,137,500	2,200,000
Office/R&D (sq.ft.)	2,719,000	1,000,000
Residential (units) ²	6,250	8,700 ³
Retail (sq.ft.)	785,000	1,000,000
Hotel (rooms)	1,000	1,200
Golf Course (18-hole courses) ²	2	2
¹ Report published April 8, 1994 by Denise Duffy & Associates; economics provided by Keyser Marston & Associates. ² New construction only. ³ Assumes 1,600 of reuse housing included in projection. Sources: Denise Duffy & Associates; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.		

Section III DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC OVERVIEW

DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

SKMG first examined population trends within the region, which includes the counties of Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito. According to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the population of this region increased from 585,391 in 1990 to 605,227 in 1995, reflecting an average increase of 0.7 percent annually, a modest rate of growth. Monterey County grew at an average rate of 0.8 percent annually, a slightly stronger rate of growth, despite the closure of Fort Ord during this period. Monterey County clearly dominates the region, comprising 61 percent of its population in 1995.

For the purpose of this analysis, SKMG has divided Monterey County into two portions: (1) the Monterey Peninsula, which includes Fort Ord; and (2) the non-Peninsula communities, including the Salinas Valley. Demographically, the two areas are quite distinct, with the Peninsula representing a relatively affluent, high-cost, environmentally-sensitive and slow-growth area, and the Salinas Valley a vibrant and fast-growing area. As indicated in Exhibit III-1, the seven communities that generally comprise the Peninsula experienced population growth averaging 1.1 percent annually between 1980 and 1991, a moderate rate of growth. Approximately 70 percent of this growth was accommodated in the communities of Marina and Seaside, with only nominal growth in the other communities. Monterey Peninsula population peaked in 1991 and has declined in subsequent years, with modest declines in 1992 and 1993. With the downsizing and then closure of Fort Ord, the Peninsula as a whole lost substantial population in 1994 and 1995. Between 1991 and 1995, the Peninsula lost nearly 16,400 persons, about 13 percent of its 1991 population. Marina and Seaside lost an estimated 18,700 persons, while Monterey, Pacific Grove and Carmel experienced some modest growth. Overall, between 1980 and 1995, the Peninsula lost only approximately 2,100 persons, or 2 percent of its current population.

The Salinas Valley, on the other hand, has experienced strong population growth, averaging 2.5 percent annually between 1980 and 1995. During this period, nearly 83,000 persons were added to the population, of which 51 percent were accommodated in Salinas. Growth rates were particularly strong in the emerging south county communities of Soledad, Greenfield and Gonzales.

Household growth has mirrored patterns in population growth, as shown in Exhibit III-2. During the 1980-to-1991 period, an average of 441 households were added annually on the Peninsula, but 906 households were lost annually during the following four years. In the Salinas Valley, an average of 1,069 households were added annually between 1980 and 1995.

Overall, the county added an average of over 1,150 households annually during the past 15 years, despite the closure of Fort Ord.

The 1990 U.S. Census¹ provides some interesting data on the population characteristics of Peninsula residents, as follows:

- A small percentage of Peninsula households, or 1,084, are seasonal residents. About 58 percent of these households are located in Carmel (27 percent of Carmel's households); most of the remainder of the seasonal households reside in Pacific Grove and Monterey.
- Carmel houses a high proportion of retirees, with 35 percent of its population aged 65 and over. The percentage of residents aged 65 and over totals 19 percent in Pacific Grove, 16 percent in Del Rey Oaks, and 13 percent in Monterey.
- Average household size is smallest in Carmel, with 1.82 residents per household, but is also relatively small in Pacific Grove, Monterey, Sand City and Del Rey Oaks, with between 2.16 and 2.39 residents per household. Marina and Seaside tend to house a higher proportion of families with children, with household sizes averaging 3.05 and 3.10, respectively.
- The Monterey Peninsula's overall population is predominantly Caucasian (over 80 percent). However, in Marina, Seaside and Sand City, Caucasian residents comprise between 47 and 63 percent of the total. Marina's Asian and African American populations represent a significant proportion, Seaside houses significant African American and Latino populations, and the small community of Sand City contains a largely Latino population.
- Median household incomes in 1989 were highest in Del Rey Oaks, Carmel, Pacific Grove and Monterey (\$33,000 and over), and were lowest in Seaside and Marina (\$28,655 and \$29,043, respectively). Sand City's small population was particularly low in income (\$16,875).

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

SKMG examined regional employment trends for the Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties area. In 1990, the region accommodated 250,200 wage and salary employees. Monterey County clearly dominates the region, with 64 percent of this total employment.

¹The 1990 U.S. Census is the most recent data that provide detailed information on population and household characteristics.

AMBAG estimated a modest increase of 1.5 percent annually between 1990 and 1995 within the three-county region, or an average of 3,740 net additions annually. This produces a total of 268,900 jobs for the region in 1995. However, given losses experienced in Monterey County as a result of the closure of Fort Ord (discussed below), these employment increases would have necessarily been captured in Santa Cruz and San Benito counties. SKMG believes that AMBAG's regional 1995 estimates are somewhat high.

Wage and salary employment in Monterey County peaked in 1990 with an average of nearly 160,000 jobs, reflecting an average annual growth of 2.0 percent since 1980 (as indicated in Exhibit III-3). These figures include active duty military estimates provided by AMBAG, in addition to figures assembled by the California Employment Development Department (EDD). Employment generally held steady through 1992, with a slight decline in 1993. However, a more significant decline of 4.6 percent was experienced in 1994, reflecting the full down-sizing of Fort Ord and spin-off impacts. During the first seven months of 1995, with the closure of Fort Ord, employment has declined a further 5.8 percent. Thus, between 1992 and 1995, 17,700 jobs have been lost in the county. While the California Employment Development Department does not disaggregate these data for the Peninsula and the Valley, SKMG believes that the bulk of job growth between 1980 and 1992 was in the Valley. Between 1992 and 1995, most job losses were on the Peninsula. Although data are unavailable, it is likely that the Salinas Valley held steady during this period, and possibly experienced modest growth.

The largest employment sectors in Monterey County in 1995 are Agriculture (30,000 jobs); Services (28,300 jobs); Retail Trade (23,500 jobs); and federal, state and local government (25,100 jobs, not including active duty military). Wholesale Trade is the fastest growing employment sector, increasing its number of jobs by 55 percent over the 1980-to-1995 period. Mining, Manufacturing, Transportation and Public Utilities, and Federal Government are the only sectors that experienced an overall loss of jobs during this time period, except for the major losses experienced in active duty military jobs directly resulting from the closure of Fort Ord. Between 1992 and 1995, 13,500 active duty military personnel jobs were lost. It is estimated that active duty military personnel currently include 3,500 at the Defense Language Institute, 2,500 at the Naval Postgraduate School, and 500 at Fort Hunter Liggett near King City.

Based upon various estimates, SKMG believes that between 40 and 45 percent of county employment is located on the Peninsula. However, with the closure of Fort Ord, this figure is probably closer to 40 percent. Thus, 1995 wage and salary employment is estimated to total about 57,000 on the Peninsula.

According to RKG Associates, close to 21,000 jobs were anticipated to be lost as a result of the Fort Ord closure, which largely occurred in 1994 and 1995, as follows:



Active duty military	14,400
Directly employed civilians	2,500
Indirect civilians	<u>4,100</u>
Total:	21,000

These figures appear to be close to the losses actually incurred. Of the nearly 18,000 jobs lost in the county between 1992 and 1995, approximately 13,500 were attributable to active duty military. Assuming that there has been some nominal employment growth in the Salinas Valley and in the Peninsula's tourism industry, the secondary impacts of Fort Ord's closure exceed losses of 4,500 jobs (including directly employed civilians). As of July 1995, Monterey County's unemployment rate was a relatively high 9.3 percent.

DEMOGRAPHIC FORECASTS

For the three-county region, AMBAG forecasts population to grow from 605,200 in 1995 to 654,100 in 2000, reflecting an average annual growth rate of 1.6 percent, compared with the relatively anemic 0.7 percent annual growth rate achieved during the past five years. Between 2000 and 2015, AMBAG forecasts an annual rate of growth of 1.4 percent, for a total of 811,100 residents in 2015. Monterey County is expected to be increasingly dominant in the region during this period. While comprising 60 percent of regional population in 1995, the county is expected to represent 64 percent in year 2015.

Exhibit III-4 reflects AMBAG's forecasts for population growth in Monterey County. AMBAG's 1995 estimates are lower than those provided by the State Department of Finance on Exhibit III-1, which are based upon more recent data. Assuming the relative accuracy of the State data, the Peninsula has not suffered from population loss to the extent that was anticipated by AMBAG. As mentioned above, the State estimate is more recent than the AMBAG projection.

Nevertheless, AMBAG's forecasts of growth are of interest to this market analysis. Between 1995 and 2000, relatively modest growth is forecast for the Peninsula, with rather stronger growth in the Valley. This reflects the initial stages of recovery on the Peninsula following the closure of Fort Ord and continued strong growth in the Valley. During the following 2000-through-2015 period, however, AMBAG anticipates strong growth on the Peninsula, with an average annual growth rate of 2.61 percent. During this period, an average of nearly 3,300 persons are expected to be added annually to the Peninsula's population. Approximately 84 percent of this growth is anticipated to be accommodated in Marina and Seaside, reflecting a strong expected recovery from the redevelopment and reuse of the Fort Ord property, including the student, faculty and staff forecasts for the new CSUMB campus at Fort Ord.



The median age for Monterey County residents was 29.5 years in 1990, and is projected to increase slightly over the next several decades (see Exhibit III-5) to 30.6 years. During this period, relative increases will be experienced by youth under age 20 and middle-aged to older residents age 45 and above, while younger adults aged 20 to 44 will be declining. In 1990, the age cohort between 0 and 19 years comprised 31.3 percent of the population. By 2020, this age cohort is projected to comprise 32.8 percent of the county population, reflecting a modest increase. The age cohort aged 45 and above is forecast to experience a dramatic increase from 24.9 percent to 32.5 percent between 1990 and 2020. However, those aged between 20 and 44 are projected to decline from 43.7 percent of the population in 1990 to 34.7 percent in 2020. The age group projected to increase the most between 1990 and 2020 is the 55 to 64 years cohort. In 1990, this cohort accounted for 7.0 percent of Monterey County's population; by 2020, this cohort is projected to represent 10.6 percent of the overall population. This pattern generally reflects national trends but is accentuated by the Monterey Peninsula's appeal to pre-retirement and retirement households.

Since AMBAG does not provide household projections, SKMG has created such projections based on AMBAG's population projections, as reflected in Exhibit III-6. Because AMBAG population estimates for 1995 do not reflect more current State estimates, SKMG has utilized these more recent figures and applied AMBAG's growth projections to these base numbers. Non-household population in the Peninsula is projected to increase, reflecting the increasing number of students at CSUMB. For the Salinas Valley, only slight growth is projected. As indicated, SKMG forecasts an increasing average household size for the Peninsula as more families are accommodated on the Fort Ord property. In the Salinas Valley, a declining average household size is forecast in keeping with national trends. The results indicate the following growth projections:

- an increase of nearly 1,900 net new households annually between 1995 and 2000, of which only 16 percent would be accommodated on the Peninsula;
- the addition of over 2,800 new households annually between 2000 and 2005, of which 33 percent could be captured on the Peninsula;
- over 2,500 new households to be added annually between 2005 and 2010, of which 43 percent would be accommodated on the Peninsula; and
- an increase of nearly 2,800 new households annually between 2010 and 2015, of which 43 percent would be captured on the Peninsula.

In general, SKMG finds these projections to be reasonable. However, if a substantial supply of new housing can be developed on Fort Ord during the first few years of development (1995 to 2000), SKMG believes that the Peninsula could capture more than the projected 16 percent of county demand during this period.

EMPLOYMENT FORECAST

Within the three-county region, AMBAG forecasts that, between 1995 and 2000, regional employment will increase by an average of 1.1 percent annually, or a net addition of fewer than 3,000 jobs annually. Thus, during this period, employment will increase from 268,900 to 283,850. Between 2000 and 2015, nearly 3,500 net additional jobs are forecast annually, for an average annual increase of 1.1 percent. Thus, during this period, jobs are forecast to increase to 357,200. Between 1995 and 2015, employment is projected to increase by 88,300 in the region.

During this period, Monterey County is expected to capture much of the employment growth. In 1995, the county is estimated to accommodate about 53 percent of regional employment. In 2015, AMBAG projects the county will accommodate 62 percent of regional employment.

Within Monterey County, an imbalance has historically existed with respect to jobs and housing on the Peninsula relative to the Salinas Valley. The Peninsula provides a substantial number of jobs in its tourism and service-related industries, while providing a relatively limited number of homes for these workers. As a result, a substantial number of these workers commute from the Salinas Valley, Santa Cruz County, and San Benito County. The Valley commute is evidenced by high traffic volumes on Highway Route 68 between Monterey and Salinas. In addition, there is a substantial commute volume from the Peninsula to the Salinas Valley, as managerial personnel commute to their Valley jobs, which is also evidenced by commute volume. However, since the closure of Fort Ord, this numerical imbalance has been somewhat mitigated. Nonetheless, an imbalance remains in the type of housing offered. The Peninsula has an excellent supply of expensive, high-quality managerial housing, and a substantial supply of affordable rental housing. However, the area has a dearth of new moderately priced family housing. Such new housing development, generally offered in the \$150,000-to-\$250,000 price range, is being provided in abundant supply in Salinas. The construction of a significant supply of such housing at Fort Ord would assist greatly in attracting employers to the Peninsula.

According to recent AMBAG forecasts, county employment is expected to increase from 160,800 in 1990 to 221,600 in 2015 (see Exhibit III-7). Based upon current 1994 figures from EDD, recent trends and known employment loss estimates due to the closure of Fort Ord, SKMG estimates current total employment of about 147,000 in the county. Thus, this reflects a net loss of nearly 13,000 jobs during the 1990-to-1995 period. Given that the closure of Fort Ord was estimated to precipitate a total loss of over 20,000 jobs, Monterey County has clearly experienced job gains in other sectors.

Between 1995 and 2015, AMBAG forecasts the creation of 79,400 net additional jobs in Monterey County. This rate of growth would produce a net additional 4,000 jobs annually and an average annual growth rate of 2.2 percent. Such job growth would not only replace

the approximately 20,000-21,000 jobs lost as a result of the Fort Ord Closure, but would add 58,000-59,000 jobs (see Exhibit III-7).

Assuming successful redevelopment of Fort Ord,² SKMG believes that the Monterey Peninsula has the potential to capture between 25 and 35 percent of county employment growth, or between 19,850 and 27,790 jobs between 1995 and 2015.

² Assumes either the reuse plan currently being prepared by the Consulting Team.

**EXHIBIT III-1
HISTORICAL AND RECENT POPULATION
MONTEREY COUNTY
1980 -1995 (1)**

	1980	1985	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	Compound Growth Rate 1980-95
Monterey Peninsula									
Carmel-by-the-Sea	4,707	4,499	4,241	4,268	4,326	4,440	4,421	4,512	-0.3%
Del Rey Oaks	1,557	1,475	1,661	1,648	1,661	1,691	1,693	1,692	0.6%
Marina	20,647	24,797	26,436	26,830	25,864	26,298	19,625	18,356	-0.8%
Monterey	27,558	29,581	31,954	31,818	32,314	32,122	32,904	32,587	1.1%
Pacific Grove	15,755	16,007	16,117	16,166	16,382	16,793	16,841	17,406	0.7%
Sand City	182	193	192	194	192	195	198	198	0.6%
Seaside	36,567	37,247	38,901	40,288	39,979	38,785	31,558	30,102	-1.3%
Subtotal Monterey Peninsula:	106,973	113,799	119,502	121,212	120,718	120,324	107,240	104,853	-0.1%
Salinas Valley Communities									
Gonzales	2,891	3,586	4,660	4,833	5,309	5,549	5,794	6,108	5.1%
Greenfield	4,181	5,218	7,464	7,711	7,977	8,440	8,723	9,159	5.4%
King City	5,495	6,651	7,634	7,825	8,307	8,753	9,108	9,697	3.9%
Salinas	80,479	94,570	108,777	110,675	112,895	115,822	119,840	122,390	2.8%
Soledad	5,928	6,346	7,146	13,886	13,817	14,693	15,406	15,635	6.7%
Unincorporated	84,497	93,787	100,474	95,418	97,603	102,044	104,794	103,154	1.3%
Subtotal Salinas Valley Communities:	183,471	210,158	236,155	240,348	245,908	255,301	263,665	266,143	2.5%
Monterey County Total:	290,444	323,957	355,657	361,560	366,626	375,625	370,905	370,996	1.6%

Notes:

1. Figures for January 1 of each year, except for 1980 and 1990 which are April 1.

Sources: California Department of Finance; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\MNTRYPOP.WK4/A [jde]

12:42 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT III-2
TOTAL AND SEASONAL HOUSEHOLDS
MONTEREY COUNTY
1980 -1995 (1)**

	1980	1985	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	Compound Growth Rate 1980-95	Seasonal Units 1990	Percent of Total
Monterey Peninsula											
Carmel-by-the-Sea	2,560	2,411	2,321	2,315	2,333	2,350	2,352	2,359	-0.5%	628	27.1%
Del Rey Oaks	567	562	699	697	698	698	696	697	1.4%	14	2.0%
Marina	5,724	6,601	7,862	8,032	8,091	8,012	6,276	6,006	0.3%	53	0.7%
Monterey	11,208	11,938	12,682	12,796	12,814	12,848	12,786	12,652	0.8%	160	1.3%
Pacific Grove	7,196	7,244	7,345	7,349	7,398	7,440	7,448	7,453	0.2%	203	2.8%
Sand City	84	84	80	80	78	78	79	77	-0.6%	1	1.3%
Seaside	9,875	9,981	10,643	10,807	10,791	10,563	9,594	9,208	-0.5%	25	0.2%
Subtotal Monterey Peninsula:	37,214	38,821	41,632	42,076	42,203	41,989	39,231	38,452	0.2%	1,084	2.6%
Salinas Valley Communities											
Gonzales	852	900	1,098	1,138	1,237	1,275	1,296	1,359	3.2%	15	1.4%
Greenfield	1,115	1,262	1,807	1,850	1,881	1,952	1,964	2,041	4.1%	31	1.7%
King City	1,784	2,004	2,157	2,209	2,309	2,382	2,407	2,523	2.3%	12	0.6%
Salinas	26,857	29,046	33,093	33,653	33,827	34,061	34,284	34,682	1.7%	65	0.2%
Soledad	1,424	1,403	1,551	1,664	1,669	1,736	1,858	1,898	1.9%	8	0.5%
Unincorporated	26,488	28,346	30,993	31,577	32,097	32,687	32,419	32,052	1.3%	1,313	4.2%
Subtotal Salinas Valley Communities:	58,520	62,961	70,699	72,091	73,020	74,093	74,228	74,555	1.6%	1,444	2.0%
Monterey County Total:	95,734	101,782	112,331	114,167	115,223	116,082	113,459	113,007	1.1%	2,528	2.3%

Notes:

1. Figures for January 1 of each year, except for 1980 which is April 1.

Sources: California Department of Finance; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\MNTRYHSL.WK4\A [jde]

12:43 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT III-3
WAGE AND SALARY EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY (1)
HISTORICAL AND RECENT
MONTEREY COUNTY
1980 - 1995**

Category	1980	1985	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Agriculture	21,700	24,200	28,500	29,000	30,500	31,500	30,500	30,000
Mining	400	500	300	400	300	300	200	200
Construction	3,300	3,300	4,100	4,100	3,900	3,600	3,800	4,200
Manufacturing	8,900	8,800	9,500	8,600	8,900	9,100	9,000	8,300
Transportation & Public Utilities	5,200	4,700	4,700	4,700	5,100	5,100	4,800	4,500
Wholesale Trade	3,300	3,600	5,200	5,300	5,000	5,000	5,200	5,100
Retail Trade	19,400	23,400	24,900	24,000	23,800	23,800	23,600	23,500
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	4,400	4,500	6,000	6,300	6,300	6,700	6,700	6,500
Service	19,600	24,000	28,100	27,800	28,200	28,100	28,200	28,300
Government								
Federal	7,300	8,600	8,600	8,200	7,900	7,300	6,200	5,200
State & Local	16,600	17,200	19,100	19,700	20,000	19,700	19,800	19,900
Active Duty Military	20,500	23,100	20,900	20,000	20,000	18,000	13,000	6,500
TOTAL:	130,600	145,900	159,900	158,100	159,900	158,200	151,000	142,200

Notes:

1. All figures are for average annual employment.
2. Estimated annual average, based upon first seven months of year.

Sources: Economic Development Department, Annual Planning Information; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

D:\FORT_ORD\MNTRYEMP.WK4/ A [jde]

12:44 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT III-4
POPULATION PROJECTIONS
MONTEREY COUNTY
1995 -2015**

	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	Compound Growth Rate 1995-2015
Monterey Peninsula						
Carmel-by-the-Sea	4,350	4,671	4,791	4,846	4,930	0.6%
Del Rey Oaks	1,553	1,674	1,696	1,709	1,721	0.5%
Marina	16,595	18,950	28,040	36,590	43,688	5.0%
Monterey	31,378	32,727	34,193	34,826	36,419	0.7%
Pacific Grove	15,987	16,758	17,216	17,630	18,151	0.6%
Sand City	227	592	905	975	1,006	7.7%
Seaside	26,942	28,650	32,747	39,432	47,132	2.8%
Subtotal Monterey Peninsula:	97,032	104,022	119,588	136,008	153,047	2.3%
Salinas Valley Communities						
Gonzales	6,000	7,200	7,600	8,200	8,500	1.8%
Greenfield	9,301	10,800	11,500	12,000	12,600	1.5%
King City	9,450	10,190	10,730	11,140	11,840	1.1%
Salinas	124,702	141,521	160,448	175,995	194,765	2.3%
Soledad	18,290	20,380	21,300	22,200	23,400	1.2%
Unincorporated	96,673	100,058	109,129	113,080	115,817	0.9%
Subtotal Salinas Valley:	264,416	290,149	320,707	342,615	366,922	1.7%
Monterey County Total:	361,448	394,171	440,295	478,623	519,969	1.8%

Sources: Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\POPPROJ.WK4\A [jde]

12:44 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT III-5
ESTIMATED AND PROJECTED AGE DISTRIBUTION
MONTEREY COUNTY
1990 THROUGH 2020**

AGE DISTRIBUTION	1990		Projected July 1, 2000		Projected July 1, 2010		Projected July 1, 2020	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 10	61,098	17.0%	77,757	18.8%	80,141	16.5%	102,866	17.9%
10 to 19	51,323	14.3%	66,797	16.1%	83,081	17.1%	85,555	14.9%
20 to 24	34,795	9.7%	28,940	7.0%	41,351	8.5%	44,694	7.8%
25 to 34	70,041	19.5%	57,293	13.8%	65,552	13.5%	90,149	15.7%
35 to 44	52,194	14.5%	64,656	15.6%	56,453	11.6%	64,409	11.2%
45 to 54	29,689	8.3%	50,598	12.2%	63,267	13.0%	55,394	9.6%
55 to 64	25,037	7.0%	27,602	6.7%	48,363	10.0%	60,652	10.6%
65 to 74	20,574	5.7%	20,842	5.0%	24,250	5.0%	43,085	7.5%
75+	14,049	3.9%	19,529	4.7%	22,839	4.7%	27,278	4.8%
Total Population	358,800	100.0%	414,014	100.0%	485,297	100.0%	574,082	100.0%
Median Age	29.5		31.0		30.3		30.6	

Sources: Department of Finance; Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

D:\29694MONTDEMO.WK4 \Age ,sik, 6/95

10/24/95 09:46 AM

**EXHIBIT III-6
HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS
MONTEREY COUNTY
1995 - 2015**

	1990	1995 (1)	2000	2005	2010	2015
Monterey Peninsula						
Population	119,502	104,853	110,000	125,600	142,000	159,000
Non-Household Population (2)	11,800	11,000	13,000	15,000	17,000	18,000
Households	41,632	38,452	40,000	44,600	50,000	56,000
Persons per Household	2.58	2.44	2.45	2.48	2.50	2.52
Average New Households Annually (3)	562	(636)	310	920	1,080	1,200
Salinas Valley						
Population	236,155	266,143	291,900	322,500	344,400	368,700
Non-Household Population	9,500	9,500	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Households	70,699	74,555	82,400	91,900	99,200	107,000
Persons per Household	3.21	3.44	3.42	3.40	3.37	3.35
Average New Households Annually (3)	1,548	771	1,569	1,900	1,460	1,560
Monterey County						
Population	355,657	370,996	401,900	448,100	486,400	527,700
Non-Household Population	21,300	20,500	23,000	25,000	27,000	28,000
Households	112,331	113,007	122,400	136,500	149,200	163,000
Persons per Household	2.98	3.10	3.10	3.10	3.08	3.07
Average New Households Annually	2,110	135	1,879	2,820	2,540	2,760

Notes:

1. Utilizing State Department of Finance estimates and applying AMBAG growth projections to this base.
2. Includes CSUMB students.
3. For the prior 5-year period.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census; California Department of Finance; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

**EXHIBIT III-7
EMPLOYMENT FORECASTS
MONTEREY COUNTY
1990 - 2015**

1990	1995	2015	Percent Annual Increase	
			1990 - 1995	1995 - 2015

159,900	142,200	221,600	-2.3%	2.2%
---------	---------	---------	-------	------

Sources: California Department of Finance; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

Section IV MARKET ASSESSMENT

EMPLOYMENT CENTER USES

Industrial Market

Building permit data allow for the tracking of industrial building activity in Monterey County. These data also include some research and development (R&D) space due to reporting procedures, a market that will be analyzed later. As indicated in Exhibit IV-1, this activity has fluctuated substantially over the 15-year period from 1980 to 1994, as expressed in valuation. Between 1981 and 1985, strong construction activity produced between 741,600 and 1,038,300 square feet of new space, based upon industry standard valuations generally estimated to be between \$50 and \$70 per square foot. This activity reflects construction averaging between 148,300 and 207,700 square feet annually. However, the following five-year period reflects a relative slump in construction activity, with an average of between 104,300 and 146,000 square feet permitted annually. Between 1991 and 1993, a brief period of strong growth in industrial building activity resumed, producing an average of between 273,900 and 383,500 square feet annually. These data include 1991, during which year 540,000 to 755,000 square feet of space was constructed. However, in 1994, probably reflecting the down-sizing of Fort Ord and the economic recession in Northern California, only between 77,000 and 108,000 square feet were developed. Overall, between 1980 and 1994, an average of between 147,000 and 206,000 square feet of industrial and R&D space were constructed in Monterey County annually.

In general, the light industrial market in Monterey County is dominated by Salinas, due to its excellent highway and rail access. As the center of a major agricultural producing region, Salinas has become an important food processing and distribution center. A significant inventory of land is available for light industrial use, located both in informal industrial districts and in formal light industrial/business parks. In addition, Castroville, located in northern Monterey County, has captured a significant amount of light industrial demand, generally oriented to the agricultural industry. A modest amount of light industrial development has been accommodated on the Peninsula within Monterey County (south of Castroville).

SKMG estimates that Monterey County has captured between 125,000 and 175,000 square feet of industrial space construction annually during the past 15 years, net of R&D construction activity. This is based upon SKMG's estimate that construction for industrial and light industrial use comprised 85 percent of all industrial and R&D construction.

Existing Light Industrial/Business Parks

In Monterey County, light industrial, R&D and office space is generally provided in two types of locations: (1) business parks, which generally house light industrial users in office/warehouse space; and (2) office parks, which house office buildings and R&D users in higher quality space. Exhibit IV-2 identifies the most prominent such developments.

Currently on the Monterey Peninsula there are six business parks and three office parks, comprising a total of 645 acres. Although specific information for each of the business parks is limited, the breakdown of space use is approximately 76 percent light industrial and 24 percent research and development/flex space.

Thus far, of the total 303 acres in these business parks, 244 acres have been absorbed, accommodating 1,535,000 square feet of developed space. This reflects an overall coverage of about 15 percent. It is likely that some users have acquired land for future expansion in addition to current needs. The overall vacancy rate is extremely low, estimated at 2.7 percent. In addition to 59 vacant acres of improved land, the business parks' developers plan expansions that will total 136 acres. On average, these parks have experienced an absorption of 18 acres annually, with the construction of an average of about 100,000 square feet annually. Land prices range from around \$3.50 to \$5.00 per square foot. The least expensive land is generally found in Salinas and Castroville. The more expensive land is provided in two recently developed parks in Marina that are very modest in size. Reportedly, Marina Green Business Park has two lots of about one acre each with sales pending for \$5.00 and \$5.25 per square foot, respectively. Two earlier sales achieved an average rate of \$4.67 per square foot. Oakridge Business Park in Marina quotes prices of \$5.00 per square foot, in addition to assessment bond encumbrances. However, thus far, no lots have sold.

Existing Office and R&D Parks

SKMG has estimated office and R&D space inventory in Monterey County through survey research and discussions with knowledgeable commercial brokers. The figures presented previously for industrial and R&D building permit activity do not include office space development, as such space is classified as "Commercial" in building permit records. Unfortunately, such figures are not disaggregated between office, retail and other commercial space, and thus meaningful figures cannot be derived.

The Monterey County office and R&D markets are dominated by the Peninsula, with relatively little first-class office space located within the Salinas Valley. Thus, discussions and research have focused primarily on the Peninsula. As indicated in Exhibit IV-3, over 2.5 million square feet of office development in the area was identified, including Carmel, downtown Monterey and three major office parks. Occupancy rates average about 88 percent. Good quality space achieves monthly rents ranging from \$1.10 per square foot gross

in older buildings in the Garden Road area to \$1.20 per square foot net in Carmel and Ryan Ranch.

Three office/R&D parks were identified and presented in Exhibit IV-2, all of which maintain Monterey addresses (Laguna Seca is within an unincorporated area). Space within these parks is distributed between pure office (70 percent) and research and development/flex space (30 percent).

Of these parks, the Garden Road area adjacent to the Monterey-Salinas Airport is the most mature and has been under development since 1970. Its 90 acres are 76 percent developed at approximately 25 percent coverage, for a total of 725,000 square feet of building area. This space is 20 percent vacant, reflecting several vacated major single-user spaces. Land prices range from \$4.00 to \$6.00 per square foot.

Ryan Ranch is the most prominent of local office parks and is of an exceedingly high quality. Under development since 1980, the 230-acre development is 40 percent absorbed, with 138 acres remaining for sale. Approximately 650,000 square feet of space has been developed thus far, of which only 5 percent is vacant. The park is 90 percent office space and 10 percent R&D/flex. Land prices are around \$3.50 per square foot. The developer, Speiker Properties, is reportedly attempting to divest itself of the remaining property.

Laguna Seca Office Park is located immediately east of Ryan Ranch and immediately west of a residential and golf course community also known as Laguna Seca. This is a small office park of 22 acres, which is of a very high quality. Thus far, only five acres have been absorbed and 50,300 square feet have been developed. Buildings are 100 percent office use at gross rents of \$1.25 per square foot per month. However, there are no vacancies. All sales occurred immediately after opening in 1988 and 1989, and no sales have been consummated since the opening. Land prices are quoted at between \$8.00 and \$10.00 per square foot, but there is no evidence that such high prices are attainable.

SKMG estimates that office and R&D space absorption has averaged around 150,000 square feet annually on the Monterey Peninsula during the past 10 years, including space in Carmel and downtown Monterey. With an occupancy rate of about 88 percent, the local office market is likely to achieve healthy stabilized occupancy levels in the 93 to 95 percent range within about one year, assuming no additional competitive construction during this period. At the present time, SKMG has not identified any significant plans for new office development on the Peninsula. However, there is a substantial supply of land within high-quality office parks available. SKMG has identified 176 acres within three office parks that could support close to 2.0 million square feet of new space. This land will be quite competitive with that offered within the Fort Ord property.

RESIDENTIAL USES

Existing Housing Stock

According to the California Department of Finance and the U.S. Bureau of the Census, the housing stocks of Monterey County and the Monterey Peninsula are comprised approximately as follows:

	<u>County</u>	<u>Peninsula</u> ³
Single-family	67%	62%
Multifamily	28%	34%
Mobile homes	<u>5%</u>	<u>4%</u>
Total:	100%	100%

As shown, the Peninsula is somewhat more oriented to multifamily housing development than is the county as a whole. The breakdown by community on the Peninsula is provided in Exhibit IV-4. As indicated, multifamily housing particularly dominates in Monterey, comprising 49 percent of total units. Marina also has a strong concentration of multifamily units, comprising 40 percent of the total. On the other hand, single-family homes dominate in Carmel and Del Rey Oaks, comprising over 80 percent of their total units.

Residential Building Permit Activity

SKMG has investigated historical residential construction activity through building permit data, as shown in Exhibits IV-5 through IV-7 for single-family, multifamily and total units. As indicated, total units permitted averaged nearly 1,450 units annually between 1980 and 1994. Building activity in Monterey Peninsula cities has historically represented a relatively small percentage of total construction. Assuming that activity in unincorporated areas is divided one-fourth to the Peninsula and three-quarters to the Valley (data sources do not provide a distribution for this area), the Peninsula accounts for 28 percent of residential development in the county between 1980 and 1994, or an average of 406 units per year. The cities of Monterey, Marina and the unincorporated areas dominated this new construction activity.

On the Peninsula, unincorporated areas in which housing development has been occurring is generally located within Carmel Valley and along the Highway 68 corridor, including Hidden Hills and Corral de Tierra. Some of the county's most expensive housing is found in these areas. These areas are a major regional asset for high-quality managerial housing.

³Incorporated areas only.

Residential construction activity in the county has been cyclical, with especially strong volume between 1983 and 1989, during which period over 2,000 units were permitted annually on average. However, after a moderate performance in 1990 with nearly 1,200 units permitted, between 1991 and 1993 residential units permitted averaged only about 850 units annually. In 1994, activity rebounded to over 1,400 units.

Single-family construction predominated local residential construction, with an average of about 243 units (assuming that 25 percent of unincorporated area homes were constructed on the Peninsula) permitted on the Peninsula annually during the past 15 years, for 60 percent of the total. Marina, Monterey and the unincorporated areas have dominated this construction activity. Multifamily construction has averaged about 165 units annually, and most of these units have been constructed in Monterey and Marina.

Total housing construction has averaged over 400 units annually on the Peninsula during the past 15 years. However, very little new construction has occurred during the past three years. This construction slowdown is probably the result of various growth control measures on the Peninsula, in addition to economic uncertainties due to Fort Ord's closure.

Existing Home Values

Utilizing 1990 U.S. Census' data, SKMG investigated home values within the Monterey Peninsula and Monterey County, and summarized these findings in Exhibit IV-8. The Census of Housing encompasses a survey of a substantial percentage of total inventory, but does not include all homes. These data are the most current available and represent pricing near the peak of the market. Current values can be expected to be somewhat lower.

As shown, there is considerable variation between communities. Carmel had the most significant percentage of expensive homes, having a median value of \$434,700. Nearly 79 percent of these homes were valued at \$300,000 or above. Monterey offered the largest inventory of homes valued at \$300,000 and over, comprising nearly 38 percent of total. Its median value was nearly \$267,000. Pacific Grove maintained a similar composition, with 33 percent of its homes valued at \$300,000 or more, and with a median value of \$262,000. In Del Rey Oaks, only 4 percent of homes were valued at \$300,000 or higher, and the median value was \$221,000.

The remaining communities of Marina and Seaside are characterized by housing that is generally below the county average in value. Both communities have few homes priced at \$300,000 and above. Marina had a median housing value of nearly \$173,000 compared with a median of \$150,000 in Seaside. While SKMG believes that values have dropped since the Census was conducted, the general patterns are likely to have remained the same.

Utilizing an on-line data service provided by TRW-REDI, SKMG identified homes that sold on the Peninsula between June 1994 and September 1995. This is not a complete list of home

sales, but represents recorded and verified sales. Nevertheless, these sales provide a representative sample of sales activity. Listed in Exhibit IV-9, SKMG identified 92 sales. Of these, the greatest number, or 29 percent, were in Carmel and 21 percent were in Pacific Grove. Marina, Seaside, Monterey and Carmel Valley each captured between 11 and 12 percent. Only one sale was identified in Pebble Beach.

Of the 92 homes sales identified, 44 were priced at \$300,000 or above. However, none of these homes were in the communities immediately surrounding Fort Ord, including Marina, Seaside and Del Rey Oaks. During the past couple of years, SKMG believes that sales have been skewed toward the high end of the market. The highly desirable communities of Carmel, Carmel Valley, Monterey, Pacific Grove and Pebble Beach have continued to attract buyers, despite a general recession in housing sales. Moderate-priced housing on the Peninsula, including the communities of Marina and Seaside, experienced relatively little sales activity due to the decreased demand resulting from the closure of Fort Ord.

In terms of pricing, the most expensive home sales were in Carmel Valley, where two homes sold for over \$2 million and one home sold for \$1.05 million. In Pebble Beach, one home sold for \$1.7 million. The remaining Peninsula home sales were substantially more modest. However, all Carmel Valley home sales were \$300,000 and over. In Carmel, over half of all home sales were priced at over \$300,000, with the highest at \$685,000. In Pacific Grove, 68 percent of home sales were at prices exceeding \$300,000, with the highest at \$485,000. In Monterey, four homes out of 11 sold for over \$300,000, with the highest selling for \$625,000. The highest sale price in Marina was \$235,000, and the highest in Seaside was less than \$202,000.

SKMG also explored a sample of homes that have sold in Monterey County during the past five years, priced over \$300,000. These are sales reported by a data service, TRW/REDI, and do not represent a comprehensive list of such sales. As shown on Exhibit IV-10, SKMG identified five sales in 1991, two in 1992, 12 in 1993, 18 in 1994, and only one during the first part of 1995. Prices range up to \$3.5 million for a home at Pebble Beach.

Selected Residential Developments

Single Family. As indicated in Exhibit IV-11, SKMG surveyed recently developed residential subdivisions in Monterey County. Only one such development has been identified on the Monterey Peninsula and is located in Marina. This subdivision is comprised of two phases of Monterey Bay Estates, of which the first phase has sold out. The current phases offer units from 1,600 to over 2,700 square feet, priced from \$244,000 to \$295,000 on 6,000- to 8,500-square-foot lots. Thus far, of 74 units, only 16 have sold. Since sales began in February 1994, absorption has averaged about one unit per month. This slow sales pace reflects the recessed condition of the Marina market with the closure of Fort Ord. Monterey Bay Estates is also the subdivision with the highest base prices currently offered within Monterey County.

In contrast with the Peninsula, construction has been active within the Salinas Valley where SKMG has identified 15 active residential developments. In general, these developments can be divided into those within northern Salinas, which are relatively upscale, and those within the southern county area (Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, and Soledad), which are relatively affordable. Within this latter area, units from 1,000 to 1,800 square feet in size are provided on 5,000- to 7,000-square-foot lots, at prices ranging from \$101,000 to \$170,000. Absorption ranges from 0.5 to 5.3 homes per month, with most ranging from two to four per month. California Breeze in Gonzales, developed by Kaufman & Broad, has experienced particularly strong sales averaging 5.3 per month for homes priced from \$137,000 to \$170,000.

The eight active residential developments in Salinas offer a broader range of unit size and price, with units ranging from 860 to 3,300 square feet and priced from \$100,000 to \$339,000. Three small-lot products are offered on 4,000- to 4,500-square-foot lots, with homes priced from \$100,000 to \$170,000. Two of these subdivisions have been actively marketed, with vigorous sales of 4.6 and 4.8 per month. The remaining homes offered are on 5,000- to 13,000-square-foot lots, and are priced from \$170,000 to \$339,000. Except for Briarwood Park, which has experienced exceptionally slow sales, these subdivisions achieved absorption rates of between 3.2 and 5.4 sales per month.

SKMG also examined a few subdivisions that have sold out in Marina and Salinas in order to determine pricing trends. As indicated in Exhibit IV-12, two sold-out subdivisions in Marina and four subdivisions in Salinas have been identified. In the first phase of Monterey Bay Estates, 162 homes were sold at prices ranging from \$247,450 to \$268,450. Lots averaged 6,000 square feet and homes averaged 1,760 square feet. East Ridge Estates consists of 45 homes on lots ranging from 6,000 to 10,000 square feet. Prices ranged from \$197,000 to \$259,000 for 1,360- to 2,200-square-foot homes. Both subdivisions sold out prior to the announcement of the closure of Fort Ord.

The four subdivisions in Salinas offered homes on 4,200- to 9,000-square-foot lots, with homes ranging from 1,395 to 2,246 square feet. Pricing ranged between \$159,000 and \$235,000.

SKMG also examined a few upscale subdivisions in Monterey County to better understand the nature of that market. Corral de Tierra is a high-quality subdivision located along the Route 68 corridor that has been under development for many years. The community has a Salinas address. The private Corral de Tierra Country Club provides a strong amenity to the development, as does the attractive hilly environment. The most recent expansion, the Meadows, provides homes selling for between \$350,000 and \$450,000. Lots typically average 1.5 acres, and sell for about \$165,000. However, lots with direct golf course frontage have sold for as much as \$300,000, but typically average \$250,000. Las Palmas, a high-quality subdivision undertaken by Prudential on a hillside site closer to Salinas, provides smaller 8,000- to 10,000-square-foot lots. Sales began in the \$200,000s price range and experienced a strong response, but have slowed in recent years with prices in the \$300,000s.

Condominiums. SKMG identified no new residential condominium developments on the Peninsula. However, in Monterey, the Ocean Harbor House condominiums are currently being marketed. This project is comprised of 172 units on a beachfront location, and is a high-quality conversion of a rental project that originally opened in the 1972-to-1974 period. Following a lengthy approval process that included the Coastal Commission, the developers have extensively renovated and upgraded the project. The project opened in June 1993, with construction undertaken in phases. Thus far, 140 units have sold, for an average absorption rate of about 5.6 homes per month. Nearly all units have views of Monterey Bay. One-bedroom units, which originally sold for as low as \$120,000, are currently selling for as much as \$182,000 for small 430- to 450-square-foot units. The approximately 1,000-square-foot two-bedroom units sell for up to \$292,000. Approximately 65 percent of the units are one bedroom, and most of the remaining units are two bedrooms, except for a few three-bedroom units. About 60 percent of buyers are purchasing a second home.

In Marina, a number of condominium conversions are planned, in response to the vacation of rental apartments by military personnel. The city is encouraging the condominium conversion process. These are likely to be highly affordable units and not of particularly high quality, as most such developments were not constructed to condominium standards.

In general, the condominium and townhome markets have been thin on the Monterey Peninsula, and very few new units have been constructed during the past five to ten years, except for the expensive resort condominiums constructed at the Inn at Spanish Bay at Pebble Beach. In general, there has been little evidence of a strong condominium market on the Peninsula, particularly in high ranges of pricing. To some extent, this has been a demand issue where most buyers of homes have preferred a single-family detached configuration. However, it has also been a supply issue due to strict planning controls, and little land appropriately zoned in desirable locations for new product. Although difficult to prove, SKMG believes that there is a modest demand for moderately priced non-view townhomes in the \$125,000-to-\$150,000 range. Based upon our extensive experience in various residential markets, SKMG believes that townhomes are generally vulnerable to competition from detached single-family homes in cluster developments on very small lots of 4,000 or fewer square feet. These homes can often be produced nearly as inexpensively as townhomes, but achieve substantially greater market acceptance.

Rental Apartments. SKMG did not research the rental apartment market on the Monterey Peninsula as part of this study for several reasons:

- There is a large existing supply of rental apartments on the Peninsula, comprising over 30 percent of the area's housing inventory.
- Fort Ord personnel occupied many rental housing units in the area; with the closure of the base, apartment developments have been left with high vacancies.

- Nearly 2,900 units of existing multifamily housing, previously occupied by military families, is planned for reuse at Fort Ord, including those units under to ownership of CSUMB. A large percentage of these units will be on the rental market.
- Because Fort Ord will begin its reuse with a large number of multifamily units, including those described above and POM Annex units, SKMG believes it is important to balance this supply with more expensive single-family detached homes. Such a balance will help to produce a positive image of a diverse community that offers managerial as well as low-cost housing.

Planned and Proposed Projects

SKMG identified 15 residential projects in Monterey County that have been either proposed or have received tentative or final map approval (see Exhibit IV-13). As indicated, there are three projects with tentative map approval within the Peninsula area, totaling 937 homes. Montera is a 425-lot subdivision of two- to five-acre lots, located off Highway 68 adjacent to Monterey. The first of these lots will be available in 1996, at prices anticipated to range between \$300,000 and \$400,000. Ten percent of the homes will be targeted for moderate-income families. The second phase of the upscale Las Palmas Ranch, also located along Highway 68, is expected to be available this fall (although located between the Peninsula and the Valley, SKMG has included it in the Peninsula area). A total of 500 homes will be developed on 8,000- to 10,000-square-foot lots. Although pricing has not yet been disclosed, they are likely to be priced in the \$300,000s range. In Seaside, a small 12-home subdivision has been approved, but pricing is as yet unknown.

Within the Salinas Valley, SKMG has identified six developments with either tentative or final map approval, which will provide a total of 2,476 homes. Most of these subdivisions will offer moderately-priced homes priced less than \$200,000. In addition, Harden Ranch has approval for a total of 2,400 homes, and only a small portion of these have been constructed to date. Also Creekbridge, with permitted build-out of 2,600 homes, has remaining development potential (not included in table).

SKMG identified six major proposed residential developments in Monterey County. Within the Peninsula, the Bishop Ranch along Highway 68 is proposed for 257 very expensive homes; Pebble Beach proposes an additional 350 homes, also at very high prices; and Armstrong Ranch is proposed for 1,800 homes adjacent to Marina. This latter project will probably not be undertaken until reuse development of Fort Ord is well underway. Laguna Seca plans a second phase of development of 225 homes and an additional 18-hole golf course. Lots will range from 6,000 square feet to two acres, and home prices will be above \$300,000. The Rancho San Carlos, proposed for a major property south of Carmel Valley, is planned for 350 exceedingly expensive homes. Lots will average around five acres each, a golf course will be included, and 18,000 acres will be dedicated to open space. In Salinas, the Scornberg Ranch is proposed for 900 units of mixed single-family and multifamily housing.

Numerous other smaller projects are also proposed. In general, the Valley will continue to provide affordable housing relative to the more expensive Peninsula.

RETAIL USES

Retail Sales

Monterey County experienced strong growth in retail sales between 1980 and 1992, during which period sales grew at an average annual rate of 6.2 percent, based upon data compiled by the California Board of Equalization (see Exhibit IV-14). This sales growth was a result of both population growth and inflation. Per capita sales increased at an annual rate of 4.2 percent. Retail sales volume peaked in 1992 at \$2.63 billion, and declined by 2.1 percent in the subsequent two years. Per capita sales declined even further at 3.3 percent. These declines largely reflect a recessed economy during these years.

Retail sales on the Monterey Peninsula followed a similar pattern, but with slightly stronger overall growth, in spite of weak population growth and actual loss in recent years. Thus, between 1980 and 1992, sales grew at an annual average of 6.5 percent. Per capita sales grew at an annual average of 5.5 percent, reflecting increased household wealth on the Peninsula, increased purchases by tourists, and improved shopping opportunities. In 1992, per capita sales on the Peninsula exceeded those in the Salinas Valley by 46 percent. Between 1992 and 1994, sales on the Peninsula declined by 5.1 percent. However, per capita sales increased by 6.9 percent.

In general, Monterey Peninsula retail sales volume has been strong relative to its population. A breakdown of sales volume by retail category is provided for 1980 through 1994, as shown in Exhibit IV-15. Between 1980 and 1990, retail sales increased at an average of 7.4 percent annually compared with a population increase averaging 1.1 percent. During this period, apparel, general merchandise, food, eating and drinking, building materials and "other" retail sales performed particularly well. However, during the following four years, modest declines were experienced in all categories, with actual declining sales in several major categories such as apparel and general merchandise. During this period, overall retail sales declined by a negligible 0.1 percent annually, whereas population declined by an average of 2.7 annually. Considering this population decline, retail sales actually increased on a per capita basis during this period, despite an economic recession.

As indicated in Exhibits IV-16 and 17, Monterey Peninsula cities perform especially well relative to the county with respect to apparel stores, eating and drinking places, auto dealers and supply and "other" retail stores. The area performs about average or above average with respect to food stores and home furnishings and appliance outlets. Below average performance is achieved at building material and service station outlets.

SKMG conducted an analysis of retail sales leakage/attraction for 1994, as shown in Exhibit IV-18. In 1994, this analysis indicates that Peninsula residents spent an estimated \$728 million at retail outlets. This compares with actual sales achieved on the Peninsula of \$1.04 billion. SKMG concludes that sales from residents from outside the area (including visitors) substantially exceed purchases made by Peninsula residents outside the area. The Peninsula especially experiences net attraction at food and beverage outlets, auto dealers, and supply apparel and "other" retail outlets. The only retail categories that suffered sales leakage were building materials, food stores, and service stations.

Regional Retail Centers

SKMG identified five traditional regional retail centers in Monterey County, as displayed in Exhibit IV-19. These centers are defined as those anchored by a department store or stores, including a free-standing JCPenney store in downtown Monterey. They range in size up to 1,065,000 square feet at the Northridge Center in Salinas. In major retail markets, such as the San Francisco Bay Area, successful regional centers are anchored by at least three major department stores. Discount, promotional, food and drug stores are generally excluded. Monterey County, however, is a relatively small market. As a result, several centers that do not meet these criteria operate successfully. The most "pure" regional retail center in the market area is Northridge Center in Salinas. Anchored by an Emporium, JCPenney and Mervyn's, the center meets the regional center criteria of three department store anchors (although Mervyn's only marginally meets this definition). The center's cineplex also provides an excellent anchor, while the Payless Drugs is the only non-traditional anchor. Northridge Center is a successful center within the local market; approximately 4 percent of its non-anchor space is vacant.

On the Peninsula, the dominant regional retail center is Del Monte Shopping Center in Monterey. This two-anchor center offers Macy's and Mervyn's stores. This attractive outdoor center provides a relatively large amount of small tenant space. Of its 326,000 square feet, 9 percent is vacant. This is an indication of some weakness in the center.

Carmel Plaza, located within central Carmel, is a successful specialty center, anchored by a small 37,000-square-foot Saks Fifth Avenue. The remaining 78,000 square feet in the center is 96 percent occupied, reflecting a strong and highly desirable center. The remainder of pedestrian-oriented Carmel also serves as a specialty regional retail center but is focused on tourist sales.

Downtown Monterey also serves as a regional retail center, anchored by a small JCPenney store. While the downtown area has experienced improvements in recent years, it functions somewhat as a tourist- and convention-oriented center, with a substantial volume of food and beverage sales. Thus, it does not compete directly with Del Monte Shopping Center and Northridge Center.

The newest regional retail center in Monterey County is the Harden Ranch Shopping Center in Salinas, which opened in 1991. However, this is very much a hybrid center, with a total of 600,000 square feet. The center has only one traditional department store, a 99,000-square-foot Montgomery Ward. In addition, it has such promotional anchors as Home Depot, Target, Service Merchandise, Marshalls and Circuit City. It also features a large Safeway food store. The center has only a moderate amount of small tenant space totaling about 112,000 square feet. Of this space, about 2 percent is vacant.

Promotional and Outlet Retail Centers

There are four promotional and outlet retail centers located on the Monterey Peninsula, as indicated in Exhibit IV-20. The largest and most significant of the four centers is the Sand Dollar Shopping Center in Sand City, at 249,500 square feet. It is anchored by a Price Costco, Orchard Supply Hardware, Office Depot and a Marshalls. The center has an additional 30,000 square feet of smaller shops and, as of June 1995, the space was fully occupied. This center opened in 1990 and has had a major impact on Peninsula retailing. Since its opening, Monterey Peninsula residents have had less need to travel to Salinas to shop. The center's owners plan to expand the center with additional major national high-volume retailers. Reportedly, 325,000 square feet of space will be added, including Target, Circuit City and Pets Mart stores, and will open in 1996.

There are two other promotional retail centers on the Peninsula, both of which are anchored by Kmart stores. Marina Landing is a new retail center that opened in 1993. The 107,000-square-foot Kmart store is the first store to be built in this center. Since the center's construction was undertaken prior to the announcement of the closure of Fort Ord, the next phase of development has been indefinitely postponed. Reportedly, the Kmart store is performing only modestly. A second Kmart store is located in Seaside, and is currently undergoing expansion. A nearby Staples office supply store makes the two stores function somewhat like a retail center.

The American Tin Can Outlet Center in Pacific Grove was developed in 1988 with a total of 135,000 square feet in Monterey's Cannery Row area. This center has numerous popular factory retail outlets, including a Van Heusen, Bass, Bannister Shoes (Reebok), Joan & David and many others. The center has only 2,700 square feet of vacant space. Reportedly, the center has not performed as well as many freeway-oriented outlet centers in high-volume locations, such as those in Gilroy and Vacaville. Nevertheless, the outlet center draws from the substantial tourism to the Peninsula.

Neighborhood and Specialty Retail Centers

The Peninsula has numerous neighborhood, convenience, strip and specialty retail centers. SKMG identified and surveyed a few such centers, as indicated in Exhibit IV-21. Seacrest Plaza is a 109,000-square-foot retail center in Marina, anchored by a Lucky food store and

Payless Drugs. Even given the substantial loss in population in Marina since the closure of Fort Ord, this center has only 1,300 square feet of small shop space, or 3 percent, vacant. On the other hand, Olympia Plaza, with 80,000 square feet of space and no viable anchor, is largely vacant. The center's owners hope to lease a 16,000-square-foot space to a furniture store. In general, well-conceived and -anchored retail centers are continuing to perform well, whereas centers that have poor or no anchors are suffering.

Monterey and Carmel contain a significant supply of tourist-oriented specialty retail. Steinbeck Plaza is a new specialty retail center in Monterey's Cannery Row area, with 50,000 square feet of space. Completed in 1993, the center is still engaged in the lease-up process. However, the tourist-oriented retail market appears to be improving.

Entertainment Retail

Entertainment retailing is a use currently receiving wide attention in the United States. Typically, an entertainment retail center provides a strong focus on cinemas, restaurants and cafes, and nighttime establishments including bars and clubs. Often, these centers are hybrid forms of retailing, providing strong synergy with regional retail centers or with specialty centers. Because of the strong tourism focus of the Peninsula, particularly the communities of Monterey and Carmel, substantial entertainment and specialty retailing is already provided. For example, eating and drinking sales reached nearly \$88 million in 1988. The "other" retail category, which includes specialty retail shops, is also strong in these communities. Such retailing is in strong evidence in the downtown, Fisherman's Wharf and Cannery Row areas of Monterey, and in central Carmel. Because of the high volumes of tourists and meeting attendees, the Peninsula supports a supply of food and beverage and specialty retail outlets that would be unsupportable by its population. At the same time, however, there is some resistance by local residents to support these tourist-oriented areas.

SKMG has investigated the supply of cinemas on the Peninsula, as indicated in Exhibit IV-22. There are eight cinemas and cineplexes on the Peninsula, all of which are located within the communities of Monterey, Pacific Grove and Carmel. The bulk of the supply, however, is in Monterey, with 12 of the area's 20 screens. The Galaxy 6 Cinemas is the largest facility in the market. In addition, United Artists operates four theatres, including a three-plex in Monterey (the State Theatre), a two-screen facility in Carmel, and two single-screen theatres in the area. The Lighthouse Cinemas in Pacific Grove has four screens. The remaining theatres are independent one- or two-screen facilities.

LODGING FACILITY USES

Supply

According to the Monterey County Hospitality Association, the Monterey Peninsula and Big Sur area has a total of 191 lodging facilities with a total of about 9,200 rooms. Of these, Monterey offers the most rooms, or 51 percent of the total. Pacific Grove and Carmel also accommodate a large portion of the supply, with 12 percent and 11 percent of the total, respectively. A large number of rooms are provided in unincorporated areas as well, including the Carmel Valley and Big Sur areas. Marina and Seaside each have small inventories of rooms (each housing about 5 percent of the county's total supply), generally in the budget category. Seaside has the only new hotel under construction in the area – the prominent 225-room Embassy Suites Hotel. Several hotels have been proposed for construction in the area, including a proposed Sterling Suites in Sand City's coastal zone. This hotel has been approved by the city but has been involved in extended litigation. Two other hotels have also been proposed in Sand City's coastal zone and may alternatively be developed as condominium/time shares. None of these hotels are likely to proceed in the near future.

Historical Performance

SKMG examined historical data on average performance at Northern California lodging facilities, as indicated on Exhibit IV-23. Average daily room rates for lodging facilities in the Monterey/Carmel area have historically been higher than room rates in other Northern California submarkets, including San Francisco. As indicated, average room rates in Monterey/Carmel increased from 1987 to 1988, but declined in 1989 after the Loma Prieta earthquake, which disrupted highway access to the area and also discouraged visitors. However, the market fully recovered by 1991, and has steadily improved through 1995. During this period, room rates have increased by over 10 percent, and occupancy rates have increased by over 4 percent. This growth has occurred despite an economic recession in California during this period. The tourism and meeting business is traditionally highly sensitive to the economy. SKMG projects average daily room rates of \$153 in 1995, based on market performance during the first seven months of the year. This is a figure quite healthy by Northern California standards, and exceeds the comparable rate in San Francisco by over 40 percent. This achieved room rate reflects the area's popularity with affluent visitors and corporate meeting groups.

Average occupancy rates have also tended to be high within the Monterey/Carmel area compared with most of Northern California, but with similar rates found within the robust San Francisco market. SKMG's projections for 1995 indicate an average occupancy of 75 percent for the year. In general, hoteliers nationally consider average annual occupancy rates above the 70 to 75 percent range an indicator of excellent performance.

Selected Monterey Peninsula Lodging Facilities

SKMG surveyed 14 lodging facilities located on the Monterey Peninsula, totaling 3,144 rooms and suites, as described in Exhibit IV-24. In addition, two conference center facilities located in Santa Cruz County were also surveyed. These surveyed lodging facilities include a wide variety of facilities, including dedicated conference centers and resorts of the highest quality. Several of the nation's best-known and most desirable resort/conference centers are located within the area, including The Lodge at Pebble Beach, The Inn at Spanish Bay, Quail Lodge and Carmel Valley Ranch Resort. Room rates at these hotels exceed \$200 per night for their most basic rooms, although some of these hotels offer special rates during the winter. Preferred access is provided to adjacent world-class golf courses, and excellent meeting facilities are provided. In general, approximately 50 percent of room nights are generated by corporate meetings. Affluent tourists and weekend visitors from the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas comprise the remainder of demand. Pebble Beach and The Inn at Spanish Bay, due to their renown, attract visitors internationally. The Quail Lodge and Carmel Valley Ranch, on the other hand, are patronized primarily by Californians. The occupancy rates at these resorts tends to be superior to those for the market in general. For example, The Inn at Spanish Bay quotes an average occupancy rate of 85 percent. The Lodge at Pebble Beach is typically fully booked, although management would not release occupancy statistics.

In Monterey, there are four high-quality urban convention hotels. The City of Monterey has developed a small convention center in its downtown that has successfully promoted its meetings industry. In 1978, the 374-room Doubletree Hotel opened and is directly connected to the conference center. Later, the Monterey Marriott (originally a Sheraton hotel) opened with 341 rooms, followed by the high-quality Monterey Plaza Hotel with 285 rooms. In addition, Monterey has the Hyatt Regency with its 575 rooms on spacious grounds with a golf course, located outside the downtown area. These four hotels derive from 40 to 65 percent of their business from meetings, including both corporate and association meetings. These hotels report occupancies averaging between 60 and 75 percent.

There are several other notable lodging facilities on the Peninsula. The Highlands Inn is a classic hotel overlooking the ocean south of Carmel. The 142-room hotel maintains occupancy rates of over 60 percent, but achieves high room rates averaging well over \$200 per night. The facility has few meeting rooms, so most guests are vacationers. The Asilomar Conference Center, located overlooking the Bay in Pacific Grove, is in a spectacular setting. However, it is owned by the State Parks Department and is not well managed and maintained. Nevertheless, it provides excellent meeting facilities and 311 guest rooms. Seascape Resort and Conference Center is located north of the Peninsula in Aptos and provides excellent meeting facilities along with condominiums rented as hotel suites. Reportedly, 75 percent of bookings are for meetings, most of which are sponsored by Silicon Valley corporations. Remaining lodging facilities surveyed include more modest facilities in Monterey and Carmel, primarily oriented to transient tourists. In addition, the Travel Lodge in Marina,

located near Fort Ord has been surveyed. This budget facility attracts substantial business guests.

Conferences

Conferences are a major source of business for Monterey Peninsula hotels. Three facilities – including Asilomar in Pacific Grove, Seascape in Aptos and Chaminade in Santa Cruz – are dedicated conference center facilities, and nearly all business is derived from conferences. These facilities provide meeting rooms in tranquil environments for focused meetings. They range in size from 125 suites at Seascape to 311 rooms at Asilomar. Dedicated conference centers are an important niche in the lodging facilities market. While Asilomar achieves high occupancy rates and is in a spectacular setting, it does not have a particularly good reputation. It is state-owned and operated, and facilities are poorly maintained. Thus, it is primarily oriented to price-conscious religious and other organizations. Chaminade and Seascape are higher quality facilities. Within Northern California, Silverado resort in Napa provides excellent dedicated conference facilities.

Several of Monterey Peninsula's resort hotels derive a very substantial portion of their business from conference attendance, while also catering to individual vacationers. In particular, Carmel Valley Ranch, Hyatt Regency, The Inn at Spanish Bay, and Quail Lodge Resort derive 50 percent or more of their business from conferences. In addition, the Marriott and Doubletree in downtown Monterey adjacent to the Monterey Conference Center derive a substantial portion of their business from conference attendees.

Spa Hotels

SKMG surveyed several resort hotels and spa facilities that are located outside the Monterey Peninsula area. The spa segment of the lodging market is an expanding sector that SKMG identified as having potential in the established Monterey Peninsula resort market. Currently, this market contains no truly world-class spa facilities. Such facilities are located throughout the country in Northern and Southern California, Arizona, Hawaii, Florida, Massachusetts and elsewhere. As indicated on Exhibit IV-24, four western U.S. spa hotel/resorts were surveyed. In Northern California, the only spa hotel facility surveyed is the Sonoma Mission Inn. This well-known spa hotel achieves high occupancy and room rates for its 167 rooms. In addition, it provides small meeting facilities, and therefore attracts corporate boards and other high-level but small meetings. The Claremont Hotel and Spa in Oakland also provides world-class spa facilities, but as an urban hotel serves a different market and was not surveyed.

Other spa facilities surveyed include the Canyon Ranch Spa in Tucson, the Golden Door in Escondido, California, and the Marriott Desert Springs Resort and Spa near Palm Springs. The Canyon Ranch Spa has 135 rooms priced from \$240 and up plus spa treatments. During the winter season, the spa remains nearly 100 percent occupied but is slower during the

summer season. Similarly, the Marriott Desert Springs Resort and Spa is also in a desert setting and achieves strong occupancies in the winter and relatively weak occupancies in the summer. The resort maintains 895 rooms. In-season rates range from \$245, plus spa facilities. The Golden Door has 39 rooms and achieves a year-round average occupancy of 90 percent. Prices range from \$3,750 to \$4,250 per week at all-inclusive rates.

RECREATIONAL USES

SKMG has examined those recreational uses that are believed to have market potential at Fort Ord and that have substantial revenue and/or land requirements for planning purposes. Thus, a focus has been placed on the demand for golf courses and equestrian centers. Other uses that may have potential have not been examined due to the limited resources available in this study, and which have limited implications regarding the land planning efforts. For example, tennis courts or a tennis club are likely to generate some demand and will likely be included within golf course, resort hotel developments, and possibly in public parks. However, such facilities will have minimal land requirement and revenue implications. Similarly, fitness clubs are likely to be developed within Fort Ord, probably within retail centers and office and R&D parks. However, they have minimal land use and revenue implications.

Golf Courses

SKMG has identified 16 public golf course facilities in Monterey County, including Bayonet and Black Horse golf courses on Fort Ord. As demonstrated in Exhibit IV-25, the majority of these courses are 18-hole, although three courses offer 36 holes, and two courses are 9-hole. Thus, there are a total of 16.5 18-hole equivalent courses. Of these, 13.5 are on the Peninsula, one is in adjacent Santa Cruz County, and two are in the Salinas Valley.

These courses vary extensively in quality, from the world-famous Pebble Beach Golf Links to two functional 9-hole courses in the Salinas Valley. Most of the Peninsula's resort-oriented courses are quite expensive to play by both California and national standards. For example, non-hotel guests pay \$225 per round at Pebble Beach Golf Links and only somewhat less at the resort's The Links at Spanish Bay golf courses. The private membership Poppy Hills and Spyglass Hill at Pebble Beach also offer similarly high prices to non-members. The Carmel Valley Ranch Resort charges \$115 per round to non-guests. Relatively reasonable, the Del Monte Golf Course charges \$55 per round for non-hotel guests. The Pajaro Valley course charges \$55 on weekends but discounts to \$39 on weekdays.

Several non-resort-oriented golf courses also achieve strong fees. Rancho Canada in Carmel, with 36 holes, is priced at \$50 per round, Laguna Seca is priced at \$55 per round, and the Bayonet and Black Horse courses at Fort Ord are priced at \$50 per round on weekdays but are discounted to \$25 to \$40 during the week.

The Monterey Peninsula offers two relatively economical golf courses. The Pacific Grove Golf Course charges \$28 on weekends and \$24 on weekdays. The U.S. Naval Golf Course in Monterey charges \$18 per round for civilian play, with discounts offered to Naval personnel and for afternoon play. In addition, the Peter Hay course at Pebble Beach, a modest 9-hole facility, charges only \$10 per 9-hole round.

Golf courses in the Salinas Valley, by contrast, are quite economical. The most significant facility is the Salinas Fairways, a municipal facility, where weekend play is \$18 per round for non-residents. For Salinas residents, a fee of \$15 is charged. Lower fees are offered during the week. Sherwood Greens in Salinas and King City Golf Course in King City are only 9-hole courses and achieve modest fees that reach a maximum of \$10 and \$14 per 18-hole play, respectively.

For those courses providing information on the number of rounds played in 1994, the various courses range from 23,500 to 90,000, with an average of 55,000 rounds. The municipal Pacific Grove Golf Course, with its low fees, achieved the greatest number of rounds at 90,000. This is a substantial amount of play for an 18-hole course. Strong performance was achieved by Pebble Beach Golf Links at 75,000 rounds annually and at The Links at Spanish Bay and Poppy Hills, each with 60,000 annual rounds. Pajaro Valley and Salinas Fairways also achieved high volumes in the 70,000 annual rounds range. Most golf courses on the Peninsula achieve golf round volume in the 50,000 annual range per 18 holes, still considered a strong volume. These include Rancho Canada and the Fort Ord Courses, Laguna Seca, the U.S. Navy Golf Course, Spyglass Hill, and Del Monte. Only Carmel Valley Ranch Resort achieves a relatively low volume of 23,500 rounds annually. The nearby Golf Club at Quail Lodge (not included in table) achieves a similar modest volume, possibly reflecting the remote location of the Carmel Valley from most hotel rooms.

Equestrian Center

SKMG has identified five equestrian centers and stables located in Monterey County (see Exhibit IV-26). Four of the five stables (all located on the Peninsula) have occupancy rates of 80 percent or greater, including the Pebble Beach Equestrian Center, which typically has a six-month waiting list. The one facility located in the Salinas Valley maintains a lower occupancy level, with eight of its 20 stalls available. Boarding fees range from \$185 to \$430 per month, depending upon services and care provided. All include feed and clean shavings in the stall. Some also include grooming and daily care and turnout. Stables are generally between 5 and 20 acres in size and offer between 18 and 80 stalls for horses. The Holman Ranch in Carmel Valley has 400 acres of land and charges an additional \$150 per month for access to open pasture.

The Pebble Beach Equestrian Center hosts shows with its outdoor arena. It hosts an "A-rated" show, the *48th Annual Equestrian Classic*. Arena facilities are also provided at the Holman Ranch and at the Silvermist Training Center to assist in equestrian training.

It has generally been SKMG's experience that equestrian centers do not generate sufficient net revenue to support land values in most prime locations. As such, they are often viewed as amenities to surrounding communities. In a number of cases, these centers lease their land. In Monterey County, two of the equestrian centers lease the land on which they operate; the Silvermist Training Center leases five acres for \$2,000 a month. Unfortunately, the Pebble Beach Equestrian Center will not release its lease rate.

Four additional equestrian centers were identified and surveyed along the coast in San Mateo County (see Exhibit IV-27). These stables range from 5 to 13 acres in size and offer between 12 and 15 stalls. Occupancy rates are somewhat lower than the facilities in the Monterey vicinity, with three stables having rates of 60 percent or less. Boarding fees for stables in coastal San Mateo County are also lower than those in the Monterey vicinity, ranging from \$175 to \$200 per month. All have modest arena areas for training. Two of these four facilities lease their land. However, only the Kamrun Ranch in Montera released lease data, indicating payments of \$350 per month for three of its five acres (the other two acres are owned).

**EXHIBIT IV-1
INDUSTRIAL AND R&D BUILDING ACTIVITY
MONTEREY COUNTY
1980 - 1994**

Year	Building Permit Valuation (\$000's)	Estimated Sq. Ft. Equivalent (1)		Year as a Percent of Annual Average	Five Year Totals		Five Year Percent Change
		@\$70/sq.ft.	@\$50/sq.ft.		@\$70/sq.ft.	@\$50/sq.ft.	
1980	\$3,144	44,914	62,880	31%			
1981	11,933	170,471	238,660	116%			
1982	11,955	170,786	239,100	116%			
1983	4,686	66,943	93,720	46%			
1984	12,264	175,200	245,280	119%	628,314	879,640	
1985	11,077	158,243	221,540	108%			
1986	3,912	55,886	78,240	38%			
1987	9,816	140,229	196,320	95%			
1988	5,780	82,571	115,600	56%			
1989	8,604	122,914	172,080	84%	559,843	783,780	-10.9%
1990	8,392	119,886	167,840	81%			
1991	37,766	539,514	755,320	367%			
1992	5,645	80,643	112,900	55%			
1993	14,118	201,686	282,360	137%			
1994	\$5,382	76,886	107,640	52%	1,018,614	1,426,060	81.9%
Fifteen Year Total	\$154,474	2,206,771	3,089,480				
Annual Average	\$10,298	147,118	205,965				

Notes:

1. SKMG assumes average value range of new industrial space to be between \$50 and \$70 per square foot, based on Construction Industry Research Board (CIRB) figures. CIRB estimates construction costs to be approximately \$85 for R&D, \$70 for light manufacturing, and \$30 for warehouse. However, CIRB does not have estimates on the distribution of these types of space within Monterey County.

Sources: Construction Industry Research Board; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\CIRBDATA.WK4 / Page 1 [jde]

12:39 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT IV-2
EXISTING BUSINESS AND OFFICE PARKS
MONTEREY PENINSULA
AUGUST, 1995**

Park Name/ Location	Contact	First Year	Total Acreage	Sq. Ft. Built	Remaining Acreage	Future Exp.	Annual Absorption		Percent			Vacancy		Lease Rates		Land Value	Comments		
							Sq.Ft.	Acres	Light Ind.	Pure Office	R&D/ Flex	Sq.Ft.	%	Ind.	Office			Flex	
OFFICE PARKS																			
Ryan Ranch Monterey	Colleen Horn Speker Properties 649-5600 John Cooper BT Commercial 375-8000	1980	230.0	650,000	138.0	0	43,333	6.1	0%	90%	10%	32,500	5%	---	\$1.20 plus \$0.50 NNN	\$0.80 - \$0.85 \$0.12 NNN	\$3.50	John Cooper @ BT was able to identify approximately 66,000 sq. ft. of office/shop flex space. However, he noted that there may be additional flex space elsewhere in the park which BT does not track. Speker Properties does not track the percentage of flex space in the park.	
Laguna Seca Office Park, Monterey	Ernie Lostrom Lostrom & Co. 646-1000	1988	22.0 approx.	50,300	16.9	0	7,186 (see comments)	0.7	0%	100%	0%	0	0%	---	\$1.25 gross	---	\$8.00 to \$10.00	No lots have sold since 1989.	
Garden Road Monterey	Pete Erickson Mahoney Tancredi 646-1919	1970	90.0	725,000	21.6	0	29,000	2.7	0%	50%	50%	145,000 (see comments)	20%	---	\$0.50 to \$0.80 plus \$0.40 NNN	\$0.50 to \$0.8 plus \$0.12 NNN	\$4.00 to \$6.00	Flex percentage includes several large government single-use spaces. Says rents over \$1.00 are no longer possible.	
Total For Office Parks			342.0	1,426,300	176.5	0.0	79,519	9.6	0%	70%	30%	260,000	18%	---	\$0.90 to \$1.70 gross	\$0.62 to \$0.97 gross	\$3.60 to \$10.00	Land values from Laguna Seca may no longer reflect market.	
TOTAL OFFICE & BUSINESS PARKS			645.1	2,960,300	235.3	136.5	174,620	27.7	40%	34%	27%	301,260	10%	---	\$0.50 to \$0.62 gross	\$0.90 to \$1.70 gross	\$0.62 to \$0.97 gross	\$3.60 to \$10.00	Land values from Laguna Seca may no longer reflect market.

Notes:

1. For purposes of this survey, R&D includes any mixed office/shop or flex space.

Sources: Brokers listed above; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\SURVRSTC.WK4: A [jde]

12:40 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT IV-4
HOUSING STOCK BY TYPE
MONTEREY PENINSULA
1990**

Community	Single Family	Multifamily	Mobile Home	Total
Carmel-by-the-Sea	1,696	170	41	1,907
Del Rey Oaks	597	126	10	733
Marina	4,448	3,304	509	8,261
Monterey	6,748	6,567	182	13,497
Pacific Grove	5,319	2,398	199	7,916
Sand City	63	17	6	86
Seaside	8,240	2,377	621	11,238
Total	27,111	14,959	1,568	43,638

Sources: 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Bureau of the Census;
and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

**EXHIBIT IV-6
TOTAL NEW SINGLE RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS
MONTEREY COUNTY
1980 - 1994**

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	Average Annual 1980 - 1994
Carmel-by-the-Sea	6	15	0	4	11	19	13	11	41	38	27	18	16	6	N/A	15
Del Rey Oaks	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	0
Marina	59	17	0	71	18	14	37	128	12	198	10	1	8	27	66	44
Monterey	130	54	2	68	136	76	52	54	27	22	23	14	20	11	37	48
Pacific Grove	15	4	4	35	29	7	73	14	23	21	18	14	9	11	N/A	18
Sand City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seaside	15	8	0	4	9	14	20	105	54	35	15	9	7	2	10	20
Subtotal Monterey Peninsula Cities	225	96	7	182	203	130	195	312	157	314	93	56	60	57	113	147
Percentage of County	22.3%	18.4%	25.0%	19.3%	18.1%	11.6%	17.8%	28.1%	14.5%	17.3%	9.0%	7.9%	9.6%	7.5%	8.8%	
Unincorporated Areas	543	330	15	398	413	450	388	480	527	713	536	289	210	193	265	383
Percentage of County	53.9%	63.1%	53.8%	41.9%	36.9%	40.1%	35.4%	43.2%	48.6%	39.3%	52.0%	41.0%	33.5%	25.6%	20.8%	
Gonzales	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	43	33	6	1	26	31	25	118	8	19	70	25
Greenfield	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	14	202	20	44	65	155	130	33	29	59	80	55
King City	2	2	0	9	6	15	90	7	3	37	40	43	39	67	106	31
Salinas	235	83	6	352	402	269	395	282	303	454	194	180	197	275	587	279
Soledad	2	2	0	5	39	24	2	4	2	111	12	6	84	85	56	29
Subtotal Salinas Valley	240	97	6	366	504	543	514	318	400	788	401	390	357	505	899	420
Percentage of County	23.8%	18.5%	21.4%	38.8%	45.0%	48.4%	46.9%	28.6%	36.9%	43.4%	38.9%	51.1%	56.9%	66.9%	70.4%	
TOTAL MONTEREY COUNTY	1,008	523	28	944	1,120	1,123	1,097	1,110	1,084	1,815	1,030	705	627	755	1,277	950

Source: Economic Sciences Corporation; Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

**EXHIBIT IV-6
TOTAL NEW MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS
MONTEREY COUNTY
1980 - 1994**

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	Average Annual 1980-1994
Carmel-by-the-Sea	0	0	0	6	23	0	0	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Del Rey Oaks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Marina	71	0	0	0	21	208	281	182	26	20	0	0	0	0	0	54
Monterey	32	187	3	149	133	90	52	35	89	28	29	19	0	3	8	57
Pacific Grove	0	10	0	0	16	36	24	2	9	10	17	89	0	3	0	14
Sand City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Seaside	31	0	0	0	21	53	81	46	15	0	2	4	0	0	4	16
Subtotal Monterey Peninsula Cities	134	197	3	161	214	387	438	429	185	58	48	112	0	6	12	158
Percentage of County	58.8%	43.4%	5.9%	34.2%	22.8%	25.3%	27.1%	70.6%	41.5%	13.9%	30.4%	49.6%	0.0%	5.3%	7.6%	
Unincorporated Areas		35	0	56	6	6	59	7	56	15	24	53	15	26	12	26
Percentage of County	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	11.9%	0.8%	0.4%	3.8%	1.2%	14.1%	3.8%	15.2%	23.5%	13.8%	23.0%	7.6%	
Gonzales	0	0	0	0	15	107	0	0	12	42	2	6	2	0	3	13
Greenfield	0	0	0	0	5	24	71	47	20	13	17	6	38	4	0	16
King City	0	16	0	7	29	40	17	4	2	5	20	38	28	3	88	18
Salinas	92	206	48	247	670	958	952	121	140	258	11	11	26	34	62	256
Soledad	2	0	0	0	0	0	80	0	3	25	36	0	2	40	0	13
Subtotal Salinas Valley	94	222	48	254	719	1,138	1,120	172	177	343	86	61	94	81	133	316
Percentage of County	41.2%	48.6%	94.1%	53.8%	76.6%	74.3%	69.3%	28.3%	44.5%	82.5%	54.4%	27.0%	86.2%	71.7%	84.7%	
TOTAL MONTEREY COUNTY	228	454	51	471	939	1,531	1,617	608	398	416	158	226	109	113	157	498

Source: Economic Sciences Corporation; Sedway Kottin Mouchly Group.

**EXHIBIT IV-8
HOME VALUE AND INCOME DISTRIBUTION
MONTEREY PENINSULA AND MONTEREY COUNTY
1990**

	COMMUNITY							
	Carmel by-the-Sea	Del Rey Oaks	Marina	Monterey	Pacific Grove	Sand City	Seaside	Monterey County
Distribution of Home Values								
\$50,000 to \$99,999	9	-	29	38	38	1	66	579
Percent	0.7%	0.0%	1.4%	1.0%	1.2%	9.1%	1.9%	1.2%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	8	9	80	94	58	3	453	3,585
Percent	0.7%	2.0%	3.7%	2.4%	1.9%	27.3%	12.8%	7.7%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	13	35	407	249	163	5	1,247	8,537
Percent	1.1%	7.7%	19.0%	6.4%	5.3%	45.5%	35.2%	18.3%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	47	101	1,164	543	435	2	1,180	10,990
Percent	3.9%	22.1%	54.4%	13.9%	14.2%	18.2%	33.4%	23.5%
\$200,000 to \$299,999	180	292	440	1,510	1,354	-	551	11,554
Percent	14.8%	64.0%	20.6%	38.7%	44.2%	0.0%	15.6%	24.7%
\$300,000 or More	959	19	18	1,463	1,012	-	41	11,471
Percent	78.9%	4.2%	0.8%	37.5%	33.1%	0.0%	1.2%	24.6%
Total Homes Surveyed	1,216	456	2,138	3,897	3,060	11	3,538	46,716
Median Value	\$434,700	\$221,300	\$172,500	\$266,600	\$262,000	\$112,500	\$150,100	\$198,200
Distribution of Income								
Less than \$5,000	2.8%	0.0%	2.6%	1.7%	2.5%	N/A	1.9%	2.1%
\$5,000 to \$14,999	3.9%	4.7%	13.7%	6.4%	6.3%	N/A	11.0%	9.7%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	5.9%	8.2%	24.6%	10.7%	13.9%	N/A	23.4%	16.6%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	19.3%	12.1%	17.7%	17.3%	16.6%	N/A	19.5%	17.3%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	21.7%	26.0%	19.2%	26.6%	23.0%	N/A	24.2%	21.3%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	25.2%	31.1%	17.1%	23.3%	23.2%	N/A	16.1%	19.8%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	12.3%	13.3%	3.7%	6.9%	7.4%	N/A	2.7%	6.9%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	7.1%	4.3%	1.3%	4.4%	5.2%	N/A	1.1%	3.8%
\$150,000 to \$249,999	1.6%	0.4%	0.0%	2.0%	1.5%	N/A	0.1%	1.6%
\$250,000 or More	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	N/A	0.0%	0.8%
Median Household Income	\$36,900	\$49,300	\$28,800	\$43,500	\$33,700	N/A	\$28,800	\$33,600

Notes: N/A indicates data unavailable, however, Sand City data is included within county figures.

Sources: 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Bureau of the Census; Claritas; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

EXHIBIT IV-9
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE SALES
MONTEREY PENINSULA
JUNE 1994 - SEPTEMBER 1995

SITUS STREET	SITUS CITY	RECORDING DATE	SALES PRICE	LAND VALUE	IMPROV. VALUE	TOTAL ROOMS	BR's	BA's	HALFLOT BA'S SIZE	LOT SIZE	SQUARE FEET	YEAR BUILT	
1	24445 S SAN LUIS AV	CARMEL	09/12/95	\$185,000	\$35,200	\$41,523							
2	CARPENTER ST	CARMEL	01/11/95	\$195,000	\$150,000	\$100,000	5	2	1	A.09	4,000	1,013	50
3	CARPENTER ST	CARMEL	06/15/94	\$227,500	\$195,000	\$32,500							
4	2 AV	CARMEL	11/01/94	\$232,500	\$150,000	\$82,000	4	2	2	50X80	4,000	1,057	59
5	MONTEREY ST	CARMEL	06/16/94	\$250,000	\$200,000	\$50,000							
6	24376 SAN JUAN RD	CARMEL	09/02/94	\$268,500	\$150,000	\$118,500	4	2	1	1 A.44	19,500	1,100	68
7	LOBOS ST	CARMEL	08/24/94	\$272,500	\$175,000	\$96,150							
8	GUADALUPE ST	CARMEL	04/21/95	\$275,000	\$30,273	\$43,494							
9	CARPENTER ST	CARMEL	11/04/94	\$280,000	\$225,000	\$55,000							
10	SANTA FE ST	CARMEL	05/25/95	\$290,000	\$202,380	\$161,904							
11	24449 SAN JUAN RD	CARMEL	09/12/95	\$290,000	\$134,067	\$201,099	5	3	2	A.13	6,024	1,300	48
12	GUADALUPE ST	CARMEL	08/15/95	\$292,500	\$125,352	\$102,560				A.07	3,000		
13	LOBOS ST	CARMEL	03/30/95	\$318,500	\$32,658	\$42,042							
14	SANTA FE ST	CARMEL	08/11/95	\$320,500	\$182,070	\$260,100	5	2	2	A.09	4,000	1,377	
15	SANTA RITA ST	CARMEL	12/02/94	\$325,000	\$175,000	\$150,000							
16	24390 SAN MARCOS RD	CARMEL	09/15/95	\$335,000	\$128,481	\$150,825							
17	LOBOS ST	CARMEL	12/30/94	\$358,500	\$200,000	\$158,500							
18		CARMEL	02/24/95	\$361,000	\$200,000	\$161,000				A.23	10,200		
19	3155 CAMINO DEL MONTE	CARMEL	03/17/95	\$379,000	\$111,446	\$167,167	6	3	2	A.18	8,000	1,324	50
20	LOBOS ST	CARMEL	12/30/94	\$388,000	\$250,000	\$136,000							
21	3164 SAN LUCAS RD	CARMEL	12/23/94	\$390,000	\$250,000	\$140,000							
22	28100 ROBINSON CANYON	CARMEL	07/31/95	\$490,000	\$295,000	\$179,000							
23	24327 SAN JUAN RD	CARMEL	06/14/95	\$499,000	\$204,000	\$81,600	4	2	1	A.15	6,600	1,090	
24	2 NE 3	CARMEL	07/13/95	\$512,500	\$300,000	\$275,000	3	1	1	A.09	4,000	362	44
25	24220 SAN PEDRO LN	CARMEL	12/16/94	\$515,000	\$300,000	\$215,000	6	2	2	110X119	13,090	1,840	49
26	5 AV	CARMEL	11/10/94	\$530,000	\$400,000	\$130,000							
27	SANTA RITA ST	CARMEL	10/07/94	\$685,000	\$350,000	\$335,000							
28	40 MIRAMONTE RD	CARMEL VALLE	07/26/95	\$300,000	\$400,000	\$150,000							
29	11525 RANCHO FIESTA RD	CARMEL VALLE	08/01/95	\$306,000	\$117,932	\$164,286					1,512		73
30	9893 HOLT RD	CARMEL VALLE	06/02/94	\$329,000	\$150,000	\$179,000							
31	27185 LOS ARBOLES	CARMEL VALLE	06/23/95	\$380,000	\$250,000	\$150,000	7	4	3			2,523	
32	11571 HIDDEN VALLEY RD	CARMEL VALLE	08/02/94	\$404,500	\$175,000	\$229,500							
33	10178 OAKWOOD CI	CARMEL VALLE	08/25/94	\$540,000	\$162,365	\$318,044	8	4	3	1 A.09	3,876	2,500	91
34	16 VIA LAS ENCINAS	CARMEL VALLE	08/22/94	\$740,000	\$250,000	\$265,000							
35	30 MIRAMONTE RD	CARMEL VALLE	06/21/94	\$828,000	\$475,000	\$353,000					3,470		85
36	1 OAK MEADOW LN	CARMEL VALLE	09/16/94	\$1,050,000	\$875,000	\$175,000				A30.48	1,327,708		
37	300 COUNTRY CLUB HT	CARMEL VALLE	12/16/94	\$2,280,000	\$225,000	\$655,000				A15.84	689,990		
38	302 COUNTRY CLUB HT	CARMEL VALLE	12/16/94	\$2,280,000	\$225,000	\$600,000				A14.62	636,847		
39		MARINA	10/21/94	\$75,000	\$50,000	\$25,000							
40	140 PEPPERTREE PL	MARINA	06/13/94	\$148,000	\$65,000	\$83,000	6	3	2	A.16	7,000	1,232	72
41	235 PENINSULA DR	MARINA	10/04/94	\$148,000	\$65,000	\$82,580	6	3	1	65X103	6,695	1,174	62
42	3185 SUSAN AV	MARINA	03/17/95	\$151,500	\$11,711	\$29,470							

EXHIBIT IV-9
 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE SALES
 MONTEREY PENINSULA
 JUNE 1994 - SEPTEMBER 1995

SITUS STREET	SITUS CITY	RECORDING DATE	SALES PRICE	LAND VALUE	IMPROV. VALUE	TOTAL ROOMS	BR's	BA's	HALF LOT BA'S SIZE	LOT SIZE	SQUARE FEET	YEAR BUILT
86 2060 WARING ST	SEASIDE	09/20/94	\$147,500	\$70,000	\$77,500	4	2	1	A.12	5,400	940	43
87 1357 CIRCLE AV	SEASIDE	07/11/95	\$150,500	\$9,040	\$23,199							
88 1485 ALTA VISTA CT	SEASIDE	09/11/95	\$152,000	\$24,667	\$90,043	5	3	1	1 90X90	8,100	1,094	47
89 2020 WARING ST	SEASIDE	01/04/95	\$163,000	\$80,000	\$83,000							
90 2045 MENDOCINO ST	SEASIDE	05/17/95	\$179,000	\$25,609	\$59,980							
91 2060 MENDOCINO ST	SEASIDE	02/07/95	\$189,000	\$80,000	\$109,000							
92 1438 MILITARY AV	SEASIDE	11/22/94	\$201,800	\$100,000	\$102,000							
		Average Sales Price	\$376,063									
		Median Sales Price	\$290,000									

Sources: TRW REDi; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

D:\29694\SFR.WK4: A [sik]

10/24/95
 10:02 AM

**EXHIBIT IV-10
NEW HOME SALES ABOVE \$300,000
MONTEREY COUNTY
1991 - 1995**

APN	SITUS STREET	SITUS CITY	RECORDING DATE	SALES PRICE	LAND VALUE	IMPROV. VALUE	TOTAL VALUE	TOTAL ROOMS	BR's	BA's	HALF BA's	LOT SIZE	SQUARE FEET	YEAR BUILT	
1	007-564-008-000	1305 SHAFTER AV	PACIFIC GROVE	08/15/91	\$328,000	\$130,000	\$198,000	\$328,000	7	3	2	1	4,500	2,272	91
2	145-141-011-000	29185 CHUALAR CANYON RD	CHUALAR	02/05/91	\$339,000	\$212,242	\$153,993	\$368,235	6	3	2	1	4,356	1,954	91
3	161-851-001-000	14275 MOUNTAIN QUAIL RD	SALINAS	09/27/91	\$385,000	\$150,000	\$235,000	\$385,000	7	3	3	0	9,500	2,281	91
4	008-447-007-000	891 SPRUCE AV	PACIFIC GROVE	07/11/91	\$415,000	\$175,000	\$240,000	\$415,000	6	3	2	1	3,600	1,662	91
5	161-562-025-000	25305 CAMINO DE CHAMISAL	SALINAS	11/27/91	\$655,000	\$250,000	\$415,000	\$665,000	8	3	2	1	66,211	3,223	91
		1991 Averages:			\$424,400	\$183,448	\$248,399	\$431,847	7	3	2	1	17,633	2,278	
6	125-091-087-000	9320 KING RD	SALINAS	05/19/92	\$367,000	\$145,000	\$221,900	\$366,900	8	3	3	0	0	2,914	93
7	197-172-002-000	15513 VIA LA GITANA	CARMEL VALLEY	06/08/92	\$875,000	\$178,601	\$580,057	\$758,658	9	3	3	1	8,498	4,047	91
		1992 Averages:			\$621,000	\$161,801	\$400,979	\$562,779	9	3	3	1	4,249	3,481	
8	139-261-024-000	17845 RIVER RUN RD	SALINAS	07/23/93	\$305,000	\$115,000	\$190,000	\$305,000	8	4	3	0	6,550	2,603	91
9	139-271-034-000	17630 WINDING CREEK RD	SALINAS	04/20/93	\$310,000	\$110,000	\$190,000	\$300,000	8	4	3	0	5,259	2,417	91
10	009-021-014-000	24393 PORTOLA AV	CARMEL	09/30/93	\$330,000	\$200,000	\$130,000	\$330,000	4	7	2	0	9,921	1,200	91
11	127-411-018-000	5320 HIDDEN OAK CT	WATSONVILLE	12/23/93	\$400,000	\$172,000	\$228,000	\$400,000	7	3	2	1	154,202	3,068	93
12	416-601-002-000	24543 RIMROCK CN	SALINAS	04/09/93	\$430,000	\$200,000	\$230,000	\$430,000	8	4	3	0	0	2,830	93
13	010-232-045-000	4 END LOPEZ AV	CARMEL	04/01/93	\$565,000	\$300,000	\$265,000	\$565,000	5	3	2	1	4,000	1,606	93
14	416-181-018-000	25560 WHIP RD	MONTEREY	07/02/93	\$633,500	\$250,000	\$383,305	\$633,305	9	5	4	0	4,356	3,755	93
15	416-361-036-000	28155 RINCONADA RD	CARMEL VALLEY	06/04/93	\$637,500	\$250,000	\$387,500	\$637,500	6	3	2	0	0	2,920	91
16	416-542-035-000	10052 OAK BRANCH CI	CARMEL	09/03/93	\$650,000	\$275,000	\$375,000	\$650,000	8	4	4	1	5,750	3,500	83
17	103-122-003-000	3680 VIA MAR MONTE	CARMEL	07/16/93	\$700,000	\$250,000	\$450,000	\$700,000	7	3	4	1	435	3,588	92
18	157-092-002-000	7064 FAIRWAY PL	CARMEL	07/22/93	\$735,000	\$275,000	\$460,000	\$735,000	7	3	2	1	10,800	3,000	91
19	008-222-027-000	1491 BONIFACIO RD	PEBBLE BEACH	02/25/93	\$3,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,579,919	\$3,579,919	8	4	5	1	0	7,000	93
		1993 Averages:			\$766,333	\$283,083	\$489,060	\$772,144	7	4	3	1	16,773	3,124	
20	008-361-031-000	202 RIDGE RD	PACIFIC GROVE	04/07/94	\$347,500	\$3,795	\$163,393	\$187,188	7	3	2	0	6,278	1,995	94
21	008-348-008-000	235 WALCOTT WY	PACIFIC GROVE	05/27/94	\$364,000	\$115,000	\$142,598	\$257,598	7	4	2	1	3,600	1,770	94
22	006-325-007-000	315 GRANITE ST	PACIFIC GROVE	03/25/94	\$366,500	\$162,365	\$162,518	\$324,883	5	3	0	0	3,600	1,600	94
23	416-071-014-000	26070 ZDAN RD	CARMEL VALLEY	04/22/94	\$369,000	\$53,283	\$141,962	\$195,245	7	4	2	0	0	3,000	91
24	008-361-032-000	204 RIDGE RD	PACIFIC GROVE	04/14/94	\$379,000	\$3,795	\$171,372	\$175,167	7	3	2	0	6,108	1,950	94
25	416-196-015-000	10631 HIDDEN MESA PL	MONTEREY	12/09/94	\$525,000	\$250,000	\$400,000	\$650,000	9	4	3	1	0	3,422	91
26	010-015-018-000	CARPENTER ST	CARMEL CA	04/01/94	\$530,000	\$77,380	\$213,141	\$290,521	6	3	2	0	3,900	1,536	91
27	416-194-026-000	10580 HIDDEN MESA PL	MONTEREY	06/13/94	\$537,000	\$30,888	\$25,062	\$55,950	8	4	3	0	0	3,000	91
28	416-542-014-000	10178 OAKWOOD CI	CARMEL VALLEY	08/25/94	\$540,000	\$162,365	\$318,044	\$480,409	8	4	3	1	3,876	2,500	91
29	010-125-025-000	DOLORES AT THIRD AV	CARMEL	03/07/94	\$550,000	\$300,000	\$212,500	\$512,500	7	3	2	1	10,000	2,523	91
30	173-101-017-000	23735 SPECTACULAR BID LN	MONTEREY	07/06/94	\$625,000	\$135,744	\$322,524	\$458,268	8	4	3	1	0	3,563	94
31	416-181-023-000	25611 WHIP RD	MONTEREY	05/27/94	\$675,000	\$123,877	\$374,606	\$498,483	7	3	2	1	0	3,860	92
32	153-211-033-000	1644 BOSTON ST	SALINAS	12/16/94	\$703,000	\$80,000	\$108,900	\$188,900	7	3	2	1	7,000	1,863	92
33	153-194-001-000	783 PORTSMOUTH WY	SALINAS	12/16/94	\$703,000	\$80,000	\$134,388	\$214,388	8	5	3	0	6,300	2,384	91
34	153-211-018-000	1816 BOSTON ST	SALINAS	12/16/94	\$703,000	\$80,000	\$103,000	\$183,000	7	3	2	0	7,381	1,677	91
35	153-202-005-000	800 RIVERTON WY	SALINAS	12/16/94	\$703,000	\$80,000	\$136,500	\$216,500	8	5	3	0	5,500	2,384	91
36	153-213-001-000	1103 CHESHIRE WY	SALINAS	12/16/94	\$703,000	\$80,000	\$110,000	\$190,000	7	4	2	1	7,150	2,108	91
37	008-292-012-000	1253 PORTOLA RD	PEBBLE BEACH	06/28/94	\$1,700,000	\$579,101	\$737,188	\$1,316,289	9	3	3	1	68,824	3,950	91
		1994 Averages:			\$612,389	\$133,200	\$220,983	\$354,183	7	4	2	1	7,781	2,505	
38	006-683-014-000	953 14 ST	PACIFIC GROVE	02/28/95	\$350,000	\$153,000	\$260,100	\$413,100	7	4	2	1	8,598	1,938	91
		1991-1995 Averages			\$629,816	\$189,169	\$319,749	\$508,919	7	4	3	1	11,736	2,707	92

Source: TRW RED/Damar, Sedway Kolin Mouchly Group.

EXHIBIT IV-11
 SELECTED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS
 MONTEREY COUNTY
 JUNE 1995

	Total Units	Units Built	Average Lot Size (sf)	BR/BA	Unit Size (sf)	Price Range	Marketing Start Date	Number of Closed Sales	Monthly Absorption
MARINA									
Monterey Bay Estates II & III Duc Development	58	58	6,000 - 8,500	3-5/2-3	1,600 - 2,724	\$244,000 - \$295,000	Feb-94	41	2.6
GONZALES									
California Breeze Kaufman & Broad	317	84	6,000 - 7,000	3-5/2-3	1,100 - 1,843	\$137,000 - \$170,000	Feb-94	84	5.3
GREENFIELD									
Vista Paraiso Bullenbacher Kelton	105	25 (under construction)	6,000	3-5/2-3	1,100 - 1,700	\$120,000 - \$142,000	Oct-95	0	N/A
Palo Verde Nick Walton	19	10	6,000	3-4/2	1,220 - 1,490	\$129,000 - \$142,000	Jan-94	9	0.5
KING CITY									
Well Coach CJ Enterprises	300	218	5,000	3-4/1.5-2	988 - 1,345	\$101,000 - \$119,000	Apr-93	100	3.8
SALINAS									
Bella Vista	451	80	4,500	3-4/2	860 - 1,433	\$100,000 - \$140,000	May-94	60	4.6
Loma Series	180	45	5,200 - 5,500	3-4/2-3	1,410 - 1,780	\$138,000 - \$160,000	May-94	45	3.5
Brianwood Park	56	24	5,500 - 8,000	3-5/2-3	1,650 - 2,510	\$195,000 - \$243,000	Apr-94	8	0.6
California Villas Kaufman & Broad	60	0	4,000	3-4/2-3	1,100 - 1,600	\$150,000 - \$170,000	Jun-95	4 reservations	N/A
Canterbury Park Harrod Bros.	203	92	6,500 - 9,000	3-5/2-3	1,420 - 3,300	\$185,000 - \$339,000	Nov-93	60	3.2
Charlestown Heights Creekbridge, Inc.	156	57	4,000	3-5/2-3	1,200 - 1,700	\$134,000 - \$170,000	Jun-94	57	4.8
Falcon Meadows Award Homes	282	251	5,500 - 13,000	3-5/2-3	1,625 - 2,611	\$190,000 - \$220,000	Jun-91	218	4.5
La Paloma at Harden Ranch Ryder Homes	111	86	5,000	3-5/2-3	1,513 - 2,376	\$182,950 - \$229,950	Mar-94	77	5.1
Northfield Creekbridge, Inc.	550	250	5,500 - 7,000	3-5/2-3	1,600 - 2,500	\$169,600 - \$212,000	Aug-91	250	5.4
SOLEDAD									
California Highlands Kaufman & Broad	240	0	6,000	3-4/2	1,360 - 1,768	\$147,000 - \$167,000	Jun-95	N/A	N/A
La Cuesta Views Woodman Development	164	148	6,000	3-4/2-3	1,350 - 1,500	\$139,000 - \$165,000	Aug-92	68	2.0
Vineyard Estates Ed Messick	88	84	6,000	3-4/2	1,350 - 1,500	\$139,000 - \$165,000	Aug-92	68	2.0

Notes: N/A = Not Applicable

Sources: Respective Developments; Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

D:\20694\WEWHOMES.WK4\Developments.six, 6/95

09:35 AM
10/24/95

**EXHIBIT IV-12
SOLD OUT SUBDIVISION ACTIVITY
MARINA AND SALINAS
1992 - 1994**

	Total Units	Average Lot Size (sf)	BR/BA	Unit Size (sf)	Price Range	Marketing Start Date
<u>MARINA</u>						
Monterey Bay Estates Duc Development	162	6,000	3-4/2-3	1,760	\$247,450 - \$268,450	Aug-90
Eastridge Estates KWG Development	45	6,000 - 10,000	3-4/2-3	1,360 - 2,200	\$197,000 - \$259,000	Dec-92
<u>SALINAS</u>						
California Showcase Harden Ranch Kaufman & Broad	62	4,200	3-4/2.5	1,395 - 1,620	\$169,950 - \$189,950	Jul-93
Greenbriar Homes Woodman Development	39	5,500 - 9,000	3-4/2-3	1,782 - 2,246	\$208,000 - \$235,000	Jan-92
Ivy Park New Cities Development	36	4,500	3-5/2-3	1,770 - 2,163	\$205,000 - \$226,000	Nov-92
Sunflower Award Homes	29	4,500	3-5/2-3	1,660 - 1,690	\$159,000 - \$181,000	Jul-93

Sources: Respective developers; City planning departments; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

**EXHIBIT IV-13
PLANNED AND PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS
MONTEREY PENINSULA
JUNE 1995**

Project Type Project Name	Jurisdiction	Construction Start	Lot Size (s.f.)	Price Range	Number of Units	Unit Type	Status	
Residential Projects: Proposed								
Laguna Seca - II	Monterey County	Unknown	6,000 s.f. - 2 acres	Over \$300,000	225	Single Family	Proposed	
Bishop Ranch BMIF Investors	Monterey County	1996-97	Small and Large Lots	Not Available	257	Single/Multi- Family	Proposed	
Pebble Beach	Monterey County	Draft EIR being prepared	Large Lots	Not Available	350	Single Family	Proposed	
Armstrong Ranch	Marina	Not Available	Unavailable	Not Available	1,800	Single/Multi- Family + Golf	Proposed	
Scomberg Ranch	Salinas	Not Available	Unavailable	Not Available	900	Single/Multi- Family	Proposed	
Rancho San Carlos	Monterey County	Not Available	5 + Acres	Very High	350	Single Family + Golf	Proposed	
Total Proposed					3,882			
Residential Projects: Tentative Maps and Final Maps								
Montera Montera Ranch, Inc.	Monterey County	Early/Mid- 1996 383 market rate lots. 42 moderate income homes.	2 to 5 acres	\$300,000 - \$400,000 (lots only)	425	Single Family	Tentative Map	
Las Palmas Ranch/Phase II	Monterey County	Fall 1995	8,000 - 10,000	Unavailable	500	Single Family	Final Map	
Pacific Investment Group	Seaside	Unavailable	Unavailable	Unavailable	12	Single Family	Tentative Map	
Vista Soledad Woodman Development	Soledad	Late 1995	687 SFRs 43 SFRs	8,000 20,000	\$145,000 - \$185,000 \$205,000 - \$225,000	730	Single Family	Tentative Map
Greenfield Victorian Bob Thorp	Greenfield	October 1995	6,000	\$110,000 - \$125,000	47	Single Family	Tentative Map	
Greenleaf Estates B. Quinn	Greenfield	Unavailable	Unavailable	Unavailable	74	Single Family	Tentative Map	
Coventry Bullenbacher Kellton	Greenfield	Construction to begin after Vista Paraiso sells out.	6,000	\$120,000 - \$142,000	92	Single Family	Final Map	
Williams Ranch Flick, Inc.	Salinas	Phase I construction by Award Homes (Bella Vista).	Depends on developer	Unavailable	2,070	Single Family	Final/Tentative Maps	
Arcadia Development	Salinas	Unavailable	Unavailable	Unavailable	400	Single Family	Final Map, 200 units	
Total Projects with Approvals or Maps					3,413			
TOTAL PROJECTS PLANNED AND PROPOSED					7,295			

Sources: Respective Planning Departments and developers; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

**EXHIBIT IV-14
RETAIL SALES (\$000's)
TAXABLE SALES SUMMARY
1980 - 1994**

Area	1980	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	Percent Change 1990 - 94	Average Annual Growth Rate 1980 - 90	Average Annual Growth Rate 1990 - 94
TOTAL (\$000'S)									
Monterey County	\$1,272,190	\$2,458,591	\$2,522,236	\$2,628,235	\$2,544,783	\$2,572,414	4.6%	6.8%	1.1%
Peninsula Cities	\$514,756	\$1,048,424	\$1,094,993	\$1,098,793	\$1,055,725	\$1,043,054	-0.5%	7.4%	-0.1%
Salinas Valley	\$757,434	\$1,410,167	\$1,427,243	\$1,529,441	\$1,489,058	\$1,529,359	8.5%	6.4%	2.0%
PER CAPITA (\$'S)									
Monterey County	\$4,380	\$7,013	\$6,951	\$7,169	\$6,775	\$6,936	-1.1%	4.8%	-0.3%
Peninsula Cities	\$4,812	\$8,773	\$9,034	\$9,102	\$8,774	\$9,726	10.9%	6.2%	2.6%
Salinas Valley	\$4,128	\$6,102	\$5,907	\$6,220	\$5,833	\$5,800	-4.9%	4.0%	-1.3%

Sources: State Board of Equalization; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG); and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\RET2.WK4: Summary [jde]

12:28 PM
24-Oct-95

EXHIBIT IV-15
RETAIL SALES (\$000's)
TOTAL COASTAL MONTEREY: CARMEL, DEL REY OAKS, MARINA, MONTEREY, PACIFIC GROVE, SAND CITY, AND SEASIDE
1980 - 1994

Category	1980	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	Average Annual Growth Rate 1980 - 90	Average Annual Growth Rate 1990 - 94
Apparel	\$37,611	\$82,607	\$81,058	\$77,241	\$76,126	\$72,643	8.2%	-3.2%
General Merchandise	56,602	119,616	115,066	88,598	80,624	78,843	7.8%	-10.5%
Drug Stores (2)	15,811	20,874	21,231	23,677	24,754	22,944	2.8%	2.4%
Food Stores (2)	70,313	155,990	191,413	201,583	171,073	157,994	8.3%	0.3%
Packaged Liquor Stores	9,582	9,374	9,123	8,752	3,711	4,050	-0.2%	-18.9%
Eating & Drinking Places	82,305	178,141	180,507	183,029	180,632	180,656	8.0%	0.4%
Home Furnish. & Appliances	25,841	37,160	33,534	27,991	28,469	29,459	3.7%	-5.6%
Bldg. Matr. & Farm Implmnts.	21,441	46,960	45,609	44,907	46,274	39,567	8.2%	-4.2%
Auto Dealers & Auto Supplies	77,853	139,332	166,367	161,038	158,494	155,719	6.0%	2.8%
Service Stations	36,509	38,809	37,426	39,089	37,642	29,382	0.6%	-6.7%
Other Retail Stores	<u>\$80,887</u>	<u>\$219,561</u>	<u>\$213,658</u>	<u>\$242,888</u>	<u>\$247,925</u>	<u>\$273,797</u>	10.5%	5.7%
Total	\$514,756	\$1,048,424	\$1,094,993	\$1,098,793	\$1,055,725	\$1,043,054	7.4%	-0.1%
Population	106,973	119,502	121,212	120,718	120,324	107,240	1.1%	-2.7%

Notes:

1. Drug store and food store sales are adjusted by .7 and .3 respectively to account for untaxable sales.

Sources: State Board of Equalization; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG); and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\RET2.WK4: Total [jde]

12:31 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT IV-16
TOTAL RETAIL SALES VOLUME (\$000'S)
COASTAL MONTEREY COUNTY AND MONTEREY COUNTY
1994**

Retail Category	Monterey County	Peninsula
Apparel stores	\$134,394	\$72,643
Food stores (2)	583,210	157,994
Eating and drinking places	326,733	180,656
Home furnishings and appliance	82,223	29,459
Building Materials	207,094	39,567
Auto dealers and auto supply	333,330	155,719
Service station	154,754	29,382
Other retail stores (3)	\$750,676	\$377,634
Retail Stores Total	\$2,572,414	\$1,043,054

Notes:

1. All figures are expressed in constant 1994 dollars, based on year-end data from the State Board of Equalization.
2. Food store sales have been adjusted by .3 to account for non-taxable sales.
3. General merchandise, drug store, and packaged liquor store sales have been included in the "other retail stores" because their sales were not reported in several cities to avoid disclosure of confidential information.

Sources: California State Board of Equalization, "Taxable Sales in California 1994", & Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

D:\FORT_ORD\RETAIL1.WK4: A [jde]

12:50 PM

24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT IV-17
PER CAPITA SALES
COASTAL MONTEREY COUNTY AND MONTEREY COUNTY
1994**

Retail Category	Peninsula	Monterey County	Ratio of Peninsula to Monterey County
Apparel stores	\$677	\$362	186.9%
Food stores (2)	1,473	1,572	93.7%
Eating and drinking places	1,685	881	191.2%
Home furnishings and appliances	275	222	123.9%
Building Materials	369	558	66.1%
Auto dealers and auto supply	1,452	899	161.6%
Service station	274	417	65.7%
Other retail stores (3)	<u>\$3,521</u>	<u>\$2,024</u>	174.0%
Total	\$9,726	\$6,936	140%

Notes:

1. All figures are expressed in constant 1994 dollars, based on year-end data from the State Board of Equalization.
2. Food store sales have been adjusted by .3 to account for non-taxable sales.
3. General merchandise, drug store, and packaged liquor store sales have been included in the "other retail stores" because their sales were not reported in several cities to avoid disclosure of confidential information.

Sources: State Board of Equalization "Taxable Sales in California - 1994"; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

D:\FORT_ORD\RETAIL1.WK4: A [jde]

12:50 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT IV-18
RETAIL SALES LEAKAGE ANALYSIS
COASTAL MONTEREY COUNTY AND MONTEREY COUNTY
1994**

Type of Retailer	Per Capita			Total		
	Monterey County Sales	Peninsula Spending	Peninsula Sales	Peninsula Spending	Peninsula Sales	Attraction/ (Leakage)
Apparel stores	\$362	\$355	\$677	\$38,081,579	\$72,643,000	\$34,561,421
Food stores (2)	1,572	1,550	1,473	166,254,596	157,994,000	(8,260,596)
Eating and drinking places	881	864	1,685	92,692,338	180,656,000	87,963,662
Home furnishings and appliance	222	218	275	23,369,780	29,459,000	6,089,220
Building Materials	558	538	369	57,733,840	39,567,000	(18,166,840)
Auto dealers and auto supply	899	879	1,452	94,290,623	155,719,000	61,428,377
Service station	417	408	274	43,792,200	29,382,000	(14,410,200)
Other retail stores (3)	\$2,024	\$1,975	\$3,521	\$211,770,714	\$377,634,286	\$165,863,572
Total	\$6,936	\$6,788	\$9,726	\$727,985,671	\$1,043,054,286	\$315,068,615
Total Comparison Goods Attraction						\$355,906,252
Apparel stores						\$34,561,421
Eating and drinking places						87,963,662
Home furnishings and appliance						\$6,089,220
Auto dealers and auto supply						\$61,428,377
Other retail stores (3)						\$165,863,572
Total Comparison Goods Leakage						\$18,166,840
Building Materials						(18,166,840)

- Notes:
1. All figures are expressed in constant 1994 dollars, based on year-end data from the State Board of Equalization.
 2. Food store sales have been adjusted by .3 to account for non-taxable sales.
 3. General merchandise, drug store, and packaged liquor store sales have been included in the "other retail stores" because their sales were not reported in several cities to avoid disclosure of confidential information.

Sources: State Board of Equalization "Taxable Sales in California - 1994"; Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

12:50 PM
24-Oct-95

D:\FORT_ORD\RETAIL1.WK4: A [jde]

**EXHIBIT IV-19
REGIONAL RETAIL CENTERS
MONTEREY COUNTY
JUNE, 1995**

Name of Center	Leasing Agent/ Phone Number	City	Year Opened/ Exp/Reno	S.F. Total	Anchor Tenants		Side S.F.	S.F. Vacant	Percent Vacant
					Name	Anchor S.F.			
Del Monte Shopping Center	Grant Erhardt 408-373-2705	Monterey	1967 1984 1984	615,000	Macy's Mervyns	206,342 82,691	325,967	29,337	9%
J.C. Penney		Monterey	NA	17,000	---	---	---	---	---
Carmel Plaza	Steve Jacobs 415-449-7226	Carmel	1960 1974 1993	115,000	Saks Fifth Ave.	37,256	77,744	3,400	4%
Northridge Center	Jerry Anderson 408-449-7226	Salinas	1972 1986 1992	1,065,000	Emporium J.C. Penney Mervyns Northridge Cinemas Payless Drugs	165,510 149,062 59,777 51,585 30,932	608,134	24,325	4%
Harden Ranch	Fred Goldsmith 408-449-6672	Salinas	1991	600,000	Circuit City Home Depot Marshall's Montgomery Ward Safeway Service Merchandise Target	23,764 123,651 26,816 99,219 51,593 51,625 111,517	111,815	2,236	2%

Notes:

NA denotes information not readily available.

Source: Blackburn Marketing Services, Shopping Center Directory 1994; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\RETAIL1 WK4 / A [jde]

12:52 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT IV-20
PROMOTIONAL AND OUTLET RETAIL CENTERS
MONTEREY PENINSULA
JUNE, 1995**

Center	City	Year Opened/ Exp/Reno	S.F. Total	Anchor Tenants		Side S.F.	S.F. Vacant	S.F. % Vacant
				Name	Anchor S.F.			
KMart	Seaside	N/A	---	KMart Staples	---	---	---	---
Marina Landing	Marina	1993	107,267	KMart	107,267	0	---	---
American Tin Can Outlet Center	Pacific Grove	1988	135,000	Reebok Van Huesen Bass Carter's Children's Wear	10,000 < 10K < 10K < 10K	Approx. 110,000	2,700	2.0%
Sand Dollar Shopping Center	Sand City	1990	249,500	Marshalls Orchard Sply. Hdw. Price Costco Office Depot	25,000 47,500 117,000 30,000	30,000	0	0.0%

Source: Blackburn Marketing Services, Shopping Center Directory 1994; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\RETAIL2.WK4 / A [jde]

12:53 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT IV-21
NEIGHBORHOOD AND SPECIALTY RETAIL CENTERS
MARINA, MONTEREY, AND SEASIDE
JUNE, 1995**

Name/Location	Leasing Agent/ Phone Number	Type	Year Opened// Exp/Reno	S.F. Total	Anchor Tenants		Side S.F.	S.F. Vacant	Percent Vacant
					Name	Anchor S.F.			
Marina									
Seacrest Plaza	Sierra Pacific 510-427-3700	Neigh.	1987	109,225	Lucky Payless Drugs	36,160 30,026	43,039	1,291	3%
Monterey									
Steinbeck Plaza	Cannery Row Co. 408-649-6690	Specialty	1993	50,000	Center still engaged in the lease-up process.				
Seaside									
Olympia Plaza	408-899-2232	Neigh.	1965	80,000	Gold's Gym Vacant (negotiating w/ a furniture store)	7,000 16,000	57,000	22,800	40%

Source: Brokers listed above; Blackburn Marketing Services, Shopping Center Directory 1994; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\RETAIL3.WK4 / A [jde]

12:54 PM
24-Oct-95

**EXHIBIT IV-23
LODGING FACILITY UTILIZATION RATES
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
JUNE 1995**

Area	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995 (1)
Average Daily Room Rate										
Monterey / Carmel	\$104	\$113	\$96	\$112	\$139	\$139	\$143	\$144	\$150	\$153
San Francisco	\$99	\$121	\$104	\$109	\$102	\$102	\$101	\$104	\$106	\$109
Oakland / East Bay	\$65	\$64	\$64	\$72	\$69	\$69	\$68	\$70	\$71	\$75
North Coast Counties	\$58	\$60	\$59	\$71	\$75	\$75	\$76	\$73	\$76	\$77
Total Northern California	\$85	\$91	\$80	\$88	\$83	\$83	\$82	\$85	\$88	\$92
Average Occupancy Rate										
Monterey / Carmel	71%	71%	69%	68%	72%	72%	71%	73%	74%	75%
San Francisco	74%	72%	72%	70%	69%	69%	68%	68%	70%	75%
Oakland / East Bay	60%	62%	66%	66%	63%	63%	62%	63%	67%	69%
North Coast Counties	63%	64%	67%	67%	65%	65%	66%	63%	62%	64%
Total Northern California	69%	68%	69%	68%	66%	66%	66%	67%	70%	73%

Notes:

(1) Based on first seven months of the year, seasonally adjusted.

**EXHIBIT IV-24
SELECTED HOTEL / RESORT / CONFERENCE CENTERS
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN U.S.
JUNE 1995**

Area Name Location	Date Opened	Size (Acres)	Rooms (Suites)	No. of Employ.	Room Rates (Daily)	In-Room Amenities	Major Resort Amenities and Services	Busy Season	% Occup. (by Season)	% Occup. (Avg. Annual)	Residency of Visitors	Composition of Business	Conference Center Capacity (1) & Sq. Footage	Users	Comments
Monterey County Market Area															
Asilomar Conference Center Pacific Grove, CA	NA	107	311 Approx.	265	\$76 to \$127	To a great extent, it depends on the specific room	Asilomar State Beach; forested walkways; pool; State Park Ranger tours and information, eating halls.	Apr - Nov		88%	Primarily come from a 180 mile radius.	Large corporate retreats and conferences, religious retreats	Eleven sites for meetings and conferences. Capacity for 5 - 1,000 person meetings (2,600 total capacity).	Large corporate retreats and conferences, religious retreats	Asilomar is a unit of the California State Park System. That is why rates are so inexpensive and why accommodations are not very "luxurious"
Carmel Valley Ranch Resort Carmel, CA	1987	1,700	100 (all suites)	225	\$225 to \$700	Two TVs; three phones; fireplace; decks; some private spas	Golf, pool; twelve tennis courts; five whirlpools; horseback riding, bike rentals; jogging, hiking	Apr - Nov	NA	NA	NA	50% of bookings are corporate	NA	NA	NA
Doubletree Hotel Monterey, CA	1978	NA	374 (15)	300+	\$125 to \$650	Renovated rooms; alarm clocks; individual climate control; chocolate chip cookies	Three restaurants and bars; heated pool and spa; bike and kayak rentals; Monterey Sports Center nearby	Jun - Aug	Busy mid 70%'s Slow 40%'s	60% range	California	40% of bookings are for conferences	1,500 person capacity at hotel and 6,000+ person capacity at Monterey Conf. Center	NA	19,000 square feet of meeting rooms at hotel and 58,000 sq ft. at Monterey Conf. Center
Highlands Inn Carmel, CA	1916	13 (3)	142 (105)	230	\$265 to \$650	Deck/balcony; fireplace; VCR and cable TV; spa baths; full kitchens	Golf, horseback riding, free mtn bikes; three restaurants.	Apr - Oct	NA	60% range (same rate as area in general)	65%-70% of visitors from CA. 75% of CA visitors are from No. CA, 25% are from So. CA	Overwhelming majority is transient business (4)	Only a few meeting rooms. No conference facilities.	NA	General Manager is also President of the Monterey Peninsula Convention and Visitors Bureau.
Hyatt Regency Monterey, CA	1969	22.5	575 (38)	450	\$150 to \$190	Two phones w/ dataports; cable TV; pay-per-view; safes	Old Del Monte Golf Course; three full bars & restaurants; hair salon; tennis pro shop; concierge; acres of lakes	Feb - Mid Nov	Busy 90-100% Slow 20-80%	70%	Vast majority from CA; most CA visitors from Bay Area	65% of bookings are with large corporate groups.	27,437 sq. ft. with 2 board rooms and 4 dividable assembly areas. 13,000 sq. ft. & 6,800 sq. ft. ballrooms.	All types: retreats, private parties & corporate conventions	Since the conference center has so many types users, there's never a slow season 80%-100% utilized at all times of the year
The Inn at Spanish Bay Pebble Beach, CA	1988	NA	270 (16)	450	\$245 to \$1,650	Standard amenities	Golf, tennis; fitness center; equestrian trail; biking; hiking; kayaking	Apr - Nov	Busy 90-100% Slow 50-80%	85%	Majority from California, but many visitors from U.S., Europe & Asia.	Approx. 50% of bookings are corporate groups.	10,000 sq. ft. Capacity: 10-300 people.	Almost 100% corporate.	Spanish Bay and Pebble Beach are owned by the same company, so even though they each have their own conf centers, they have sharing agreements with each other.

Continued.

**EXHIBIT IV-24
SELECTED HOTEL / RESORT / CONFERENCE CENTERS
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN U.S.
JUNE 1995**

Area Name Location	Date Opened	Size (Acres)	Rooms (Suites)	No. of Employ.	Room Rates (Daily)	In-Room Amenities	Major Resort Amenities and Services	Busy Season	% Occup. (by Season)	% Occup. (Avg. Annual)	Residency of Visitors	Composition of Business	Conference Center		
													Capacity (1) & Sq. Footage	Users	Comments
La Playa Hotel Carmel, CA	1920's	NA	80	125	\$116 to \$215	Standard amenities	Restaurant, lounge; two blocks away from the beach	Mid June - Oct	NA	80%	Northern and Central California.	30-35% of bookings for meetings.	100 person capacity 5 function rooms	60% of users are banquets and 40% are meetings	NA
The Lodge at Pebble Beach Pebble Beach, CA	1920	NA	161 (10)	400	\$295 to \$1,800	Balcony/patio with views; cable TV, fireplace; two phones	Golf, swimming; equestrian center; tennis, biking; hiking, kayaking; fitness center; four restaurants; retail shops; Post Office; pro shop	Jun - Aug	Busy: 100% 100% Slow: 50% 50% (Nov-Jan)	NA	Majority are from CA. Very few from Monterey Area.	NA	5,000 sq ft dividable room.	Business users from across CA	Very little emphasis placed on conference center. Emphasis is definitely on resort & golf
Monterey Beach Hotel Monterey, CA	1963	NA	196	272	\$99 to \$189	Standard amenities	Restaurant, pool, hot tub; sauna, lounge; pets allowed	Jun - Oct	NA	64%	Majority are from California	70% of bookings are tourists and transients	500 person meeting capacity	NA	NA
Monterey Marriott Monterey, CA	Mid-1980's	NA	341	300+	\$159 to \$179	Radio, cable TV, phone & v-mail, alarm clock, refrigerator	Three restaurants, hot tub/sauna; fitness facilities; pool, concierge; valet parking; pets allowed	Only slow time is Nov and Dec	Busy 90-100% Slow 60-80%	70-80%	Majority are from California	50% of bookings are group and 50% are transient	500 person capacity at hotel plus 6,000+ capacity at the Monterey Conf. Center.	Tradeshows, banquets and conferences	11,781 square feet of meeting rooms at the hotel
Monterey Plaza Hotel Monterey, CA	1988	NA	285 (7)	200	\$155 to \$250	NA	Ocean front meeting space, restaurant, health club; outdoor function space	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	350 person capacity	NA	NA
Quail Lodge Resort and Golf Club Carmel, CA	1965	850 (resort is 10 acres)	100 (rooms & villas)	190	\$205 to \$1,720	Private deck & patios, view of lakes, golf course and gardens	Golf; two pools; four tennis courts; hot tubs; hiking; dogs welcome;	May - Oct	Busy: 90-100% Slow: 25-80%	50-80% (unable to be more precise)	Vast majority are within a two to three hour drive.	50% of bookings are group bookings. Most are also repeat visitors.	Up to 200 people	Corporations; associations; incentive-based groups popular too	Housing devlp located on grounds
Seascape Resort and Conference Center Aptos, CA	1993	40	125 (all are suites)	213	\$165 to \$325	Standard amenities	Pool, tennis; golf, beach; bicycles; volleyball	May - Oct	Conference aspect of resort has constant business	65%	San Francisco Bay area; Central Valley	75% of bookings are conference-related	300 person capacity for banquet; 14,000 square feet.	Silicon Valley corporations	NA
Stonepine Carmel, CA	1983	330	13	50	\$300 to \$750	To a great extent, depends on individual rooms	Equestrian facilities, polo fields; swimming, tennis; hiking; mountain biking	May - Nov	NA	60%	Southern CA; Europe; Bay Area.	55% of bookings and 45% are individual.	250 person capacity with outdoor tent.	Weddings, small corporate events	NA

Continued

**EXHIBIT IV-24
SELECTED HOTEL / RESORT / CONFERENCE CENTERS
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN U.S.
JUNE 1995**

Area Name Location	Date Opened	Size (Acres)	Rooms (Suites)	No. of Employ.	Room Rates (Daily)	In-Room Amenities	Major Resort Amenities and Services	Busy Season	% Occup. (by Season)	% Occup. (Avg. Annual)	Residency of Visitors	Composition of Business	Conference Center			
													Capacity (1) & Sq. Footage	Users	Comments	
Travel Lodge Marina, CA	1990	NA	84	21	\$42 to \$89	Standard amenities	Complimentary continental breakfast	Aug - Oct	NA	NA	Business people from local corporations.	Vast majority are transient.	25 person capacity.	local business uses for small meeting	NA	
Other Northern California and Western U.S. Conference Centers / Spas																
Auberge du Soleil Napa, CA	Restaurant 1981 Inn 1985	33	50 (19)	170	\$175 to \$800	Fireplace; terrace/balcony	Tennis; pool; steam room; Jacuzzi; hiking; massage	Sept - Nov	Busy 100% Slow 25%	74%	Bay Area and very large national corporations.	Small mktg budget; word of mouth	"Board Room" 40 people max.	Executives for large corporations	They get very high-profile visitors (i.e. Lexus, Chrysler, Pharmaceutical cos) who "don't care how big the bill is." Most Bay Area visitors are on weekend trips	
The Chaminade Santa Cruz, CA	1985	80	152 (10)	140	\$295 to \$1,800 (2)	Wired for PC's; two phones; cable and closed circuit TV	Four tennis courts; pool; natural trails; 14,000 sq. ft. fitness center; three Jacuzzis; view of Bay; three restaurants	Apr - Nov (Conf. business doesn't fluctuate as much as resort business)	Busy: 90-100% Slow: 25-50%	50-75%	Majority are from Silicon Valley.	50-75% of bookings are corporate	12,506 sq. ft. divided into 12 meeting rooms of various sizes	Mostly high tech. firms, but many other industries also	Natural disasters affect business more than economic downturns. If high tech takes a nose-dive, they concentrate on other industries that can afford to hold conferences	
Canyon Ranch Spa Tucson, AZ	1979	70	135 Approx	750 Approx	\$240 to \$570	4 different types of rooms ranging from very basic to luxurious	Desert location; health and healing services; spa and sports services; spiritual awareness education.	End of Dec. - Mid Jun	Busy: 95-100% Slow: 50-80%	85-95%	East coast visitors from Oct. to May. & West coast visitors in the summer.	100% vacations.	No conference or meeting facilities	This company operates 2 centers, the other is in Massachusetts		
Desert Springs Resort and Spa Palm Desert, CA	1987	400	895 (51)	NA	\$145 to \$785	Whirlpool/hot tub, VCR, kitchen, fireplace	Two 18 hole golf courses; twenty tennis courts; three pools; 27,000 sq. ft. health spa; beauty salon; ten restaurants and lounges	Evenly busy at all times except slow during Summer months	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Golden Door Escondido, CA	1959	177	39	156	\$3,750 to \$4,250 (weekly, all-inclusive rates)	Private baths; centuries-old Japanese art, private gardens and courtyards	Visits personally tailored to individual needs, "Inner Door" program; hiking, fitness & exercise programs, spa services	Oct - Nov	Busy: 100% Slow 80%	90%	East coast and Bay Area	100% vacation and tourism	No conference or meeting facilities	Most meals are served using food grown on-site. Voted best spa 1993 by Conde-Nast Traveler Guide. Most weeks are reserved for women only		

Continued

EXHIBIT IV-24
 SELECTED HOTEL / RESORT / CONFERENCE CENTERS
 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN U.S.
 JUNE 1995

Area Name Location	Date Opened	Size (Acres)	Rooms (Suites)	No. of Employ.	Room Rates (Daily)	In-Room Amenities	Major Resort Amenities and Services	Busy Season	% Occup. (by Season)	% Occup. (Avg. Annual)	Residency of Visitors	Composition of Business	Conference Center Capacity (1) & Sq. Footage Users Comments		
Silverado Napa, CA	Golf 1953 Resort 1966 Conf. Cntr 1980	1,244	420 (290)	550	\$190 to \$1,200	Fireplace, kitchen, private patio/ balcony	Two 18 hole golf courses; twenty tennis courts, nine pools; bike rentals; volley- ball, basketball, seven restaurants	Mid Mar. - Mid Nov	Busy: 100% Slow 60%	85%	50%-80% are from Bay Area	75-80% of bookings are conference- related.	14,000 sq. ft. (5,600 sq. ft. Grand Ballroom, 14 breakout rooms; 500 sq. ft. outdoor deck)	Corporate users from the Bay Area	Convention business isn't as seasonal or "flighty" as tourist business
Sonoma Mission Inn Boyes Hot Springs, CA	1927	7	167 (3)	425	\$165 to \$650	In-room wine fireplace, view of courtyard	Spa and fitness facilities; two tennis courts; pool, aerobics classes; weight room; three restaurants	Jun - Oct	Busy: 100% Slow: 80%	85-90%	San Francisco; East Bay; South Bay	NA	Meeting rooms only 250 people maximum.	Corporations	NA

Notes:

- (1) Capacity will vary greatly depending on specific use of facility
- (2) Price is all inclusive Complete Meeting Executive Package
- (3) Acreage of resort area only Total size of area unknown
- (4) A "transient" visitor is usually defined as a business traveler staying at a hotel for only a short amount of time

Sources: Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce and Visitors and Convention Bureau, Resort managers; Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group
 D:\17894\RESORTS1.WK4 [dir]

01:53 PM
 10/24/95

EXHIBIT IV-25
PUBLIC GOLF COURSES
MONTEREY COUNTY
JUNE 1995

Location Facility	Location	Year Opened	Number of Holes	1994 Rounds	1995 Green Fees	Comments:
MONTEREY PENINSULA						
Rancho Canada	Carmel	1970	36	100,000	\$50 before noon \$10 after noon	
Ft. Ord Golf Courses (Bayonet and Black Horse)	Fort Ord	1954/1972	36	100,000	\$25 Mon. - Thur. \$40 Fri. \$50 Weekend	
Pajaro Valley	Watsonville		18	70,000	\$39 Weekday \$55 Weekend \$250 Annual Pass, reduced fees	
Poppy Hills	Pebble Beach	1986	18	60,000	\$45 members \$105 non-members \$20 NCGA membership fee	
Laguna Seca	Monterey	1970	18	52,000	\$10 after 3 p.m. \$27 between 2-3 p.m. \$55 before 2 p.m. \$250 mini membership, reduced rates	
U.S. Navy Golf Course	Monterey	1962	18	52,300	\$18 before noon, civilian \$13 afternoon, civilian	
Spyglass Hill	Pebble Beach	1966	18	53,500	members \$175 non-members	
Del Monte Golf Course	Monterey	1987	18	50,000	\$45 Hyatt guests \$55 non-Hyatt users	
Pacific Grove Golf Course	Pacific Grove		18	90,000	\$24 Mon. - Thurs. \$28 Fri. - Sun. \$600 One-time, annual	
Pebble Beach Golf Links	Pebble Beach	1919	18	75,000	\$195 resort guests \$225 non-guests	
The Links at Spanish Bay	Pebble Beach	1986	18	60,000	\$135 resort guests \$145 non-guests	
Peter Hay Golf Course	Pebble Beach		9	12,000	\$10 all day	
Carmel Valley Ranch Resort	Carmel	1981	18	23,500	\$100 resort guests \$115 non-guests	
Monterey Peninsula Average				61,408		
SALINAS VALLEY						
King City Golf Course	King City	1953	9	17,000	\$11 9 holes \$14 18 holes	
Salinas Fairways	Salinas		18	72,000	\$15 Weekday, non-resident \$18 Weekend, non-resident \$475 Annual Pass, non-resident \$13 Weekday, resident \$15 Weekend, resident \$560 Annual Pass, resident	
Sherwood Greens Golf Course	Salinas		9	35,000	\$5 9 holes, resident \$7 18 holes, resident \$7 9 holes, non-resident \$10 18 holes, non-resident	
Salinas Valley Average				41,300		
Monterey County Average				57,600		

Sources: "California Golf, The Complete Guide"; and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group

EXHIBIT IV-26
EQUESTRIAN CENTERS AND STABLES
MONTEREY COUNTY
JULY 1995

Facility	Location	Acreage	Number of Box Stalls/ Covered Stalls	Occupancy/ Waiting List	Boarding Fees	Shows	Leased	Rate
Cypress Stables	Carmel	5	18	95% occupancy	\$350 per month. Includes feed, shavings, grain, cleaning, and daily turnout. \$150 for open pasture.	No shows. Lights for night rides only.	No.	Not Applicable.
Rancho Laureles	Carmel Valley	20	38	80 % occupancy	\$350 per month. Includes feed, shavings, grain, cleaning, and daily turnout. \$150 for open pasture.	No shows. Lights for night rides only	No.	Not Applicable.
The Holman Ranch	Carmel Valley	400	20	95% occupancy.	\$350 per month. Includes feed, shavings, grain. \$150 per month for open pasture.	Lighted arena.	No.	Not Applicable.
Pebble Beach Equestrian Center Portola Road and Alva Lane	Pebble Beach	15 (approx.)	80	6 + months typical wait list.	\$430 per month. Includes feed, shavings, grain.	Outdoor arena, not lighted. Jumping derby. A-rated show, "48th Annual Equestrian Classic."	Yes.	10 percent of gross receipts, less any capital improve- ments. Lessee pays for maintenance.
Silvermist Training Center 556 Leslie Drive	Salinas	5	20	60 % occupancy, 8 openings.	\$185 - \$225 per month. Includes feed, shavings, and grooming.	Arena, lit facilities. Does not put on any shows.	Yes.	\$2000/month or \$400/ acre/ month
Silvershod Stables	Hollister	8	16	93% occupancy, 2 openings	\$190 per month. Includes feed, shavings, and grooming.	Arena, lit facilities. Does not put on any shows.	No.	Not Applicable
Carmel Valley Ranch/ Ventana Widerness Ranch	Carmel Valley	1,700		Will start boarding in Winter 1995.	\$180 per month. Includes feed, shavings, and grooming	No shows. Focus on trail rides and pack trips.	No.	Not Applicable.

Sources: Respective facilities, and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group

D:\29694\HORSE WK4 Monterey [sik]

08 12 AM
24-Oct-95

EXHIBIT IV-27
EQUESTRIAN CENTERS AND STABLES
COASTAL SAN MATEO COUNTY
JULY 1995

Facility	Location	Acreage	Number of Box Stalls/ Covered Stalls	Occupancy/ Waiting List	Boarding Fees	Shows	Leased	Rate
Seahorse Ranch Highway 1 North of Half Moon Bay	Half Moon Bay	10	15	50% occupied.	\$200 per month, large stall. \$175 per month, small stall.	Small, lit arena.	No.	Not Applicable.
Friendly Acres Ranch Highway 1 North of Half Moon Bay	Half Moon Bay	13	15	50% occupied.	\$200 per month, large stall. \$175 per month, small stall.	Small, lit arena.	No.	Not Applicable.
Kamrun Ranch 1387 Ivy	Montera	5	5 covered 10 semi-enclosed	60 % occupancy. Had wait list prior to closure of Hwy. 1	\$200 per month. Includes food, shavings.	Lighted, dressage area.	Owens 3 acres. leases 2 acres.	\$350/month or \$175/ acre/ month
Moon Valley Ranch 1411 Sunshine Valley Road	Moss Beach	6.5	12	83% occupancy.	\$185 per month. Includes food, shavings.	Arena, no lights.	Yes.	Will not disclose.

Sources: Respective facilities, and Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.



Section V REAL ESTATE IMPACTS OF PUBLIC CONVEYANCE USES

INTRODUCTION

SKMG has examined the impact of the numerous public conveyance uses upon the marketability of potential land uses at Fort Ord. In general, these fall into the following categories:

- McKinney Act housing reuse;
- municipal airport;
- public facilities;
- colleges and universities;
- university research park
- public and private schools;
- continued military use; and
- parks and open space.

Each category is examined separately below.

MCKINNEY ACT HOUSING REUSE

Under provisions of the McKinney Act, homeless person housing providers have had the opportunity to request existing housing units on Fort Ord. A total of 196 transitional housing units and 36 emergency housing units have been requested and are likely to transfer under the McKinney Act. These units are scattered throughout the existing housing developments on Fort Ord.

The impact of this housing on the marketability of surrounding potential land uses depends upon the following:

- the projected image of the housing provider;
- the quality of operation of the provider;
- the condition to which the housing units are renovated and maintained;
- traffic generated by the use; and
- proximity of adjacent uses.

For those housing providers who minimize negative impacts through careful attention to the above issues, the impacts upon surrounding uses will be minimized. However, in the case of operators who are less careful regarding these factors, the impacts could be substantial on the marketing of adjacent uses.

MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

The transfer of the former Fritzsche Field to the City of Marina to operate as a municipal small aircraft airport will provide a strong impact on adjacent light industrial and business park uses. This impact has been considered in our absorption forecasts.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

A number of properties and buildings at Fort Ord have been requested for transfer for public facility use by municipalities and public agencies, as follows:

- corporation yards for Marina and Monterey;
- desalination plant;
- police training academy; and
- transit center.

In general, these are essential public service uses. The corporation yards, facility for the transit district, and desalination plant will require careful screening and attention to traffic access in order to minimize impacts on adjacent uses. The police training facility could have serious impacts on adjacent uses, particularly if live fire is used in training. On the other hand, the academy will generate some positive economic impacts from visiting police officers.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The various colleges and universities planned at Fort Ord are major assets for attracting development. California State University at Monterey Bay (CSUMB) will particularly have a strong impact, with its eventual 25,000 full-time equivalent students and 3,200 full-time equivalent faculty and staff.

Monterey Peninsula College, Golden Gate University, Monterey College of Law, Monterey Institute of International Studies, and Monterey Institute for Research in Astronomy are each planning small satellite campuses at Fort Ord and will have a lesser, but positive, impact.

These colleges and universities have been a major consideration in the formulation of demand projections for real estate uses at Fort Ord. SKMG has found that the presence of a university is a major consideration for employers seeking site locations. In particular, the training of well-educated future employees nearby, along with facilities for continuing education, are seen as major locational advantages.

As part of the CSUMB public benefit conveyance, 1,253 units of existing housing in Schoonover and Fredericks parks have been conveyed. These units will be utilized for university faculty, staff and students.

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE CENTER

The University of California is planning to develop a major university-oriented research and enterprise center known as the Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology (UCMBEST) Center. Considerable planning has occurred for this 438-acre property, and substantial additional market research and a strategic plan are being undertaken.

The UCMBEST Center is intended to house a focus of research activities, to complement and draw from the strengths of many existing research and educational organizations in the Monterey Bay region. This specifically includes the new California State University at Monterey Bay. The goal is to facilitate interaction between these educational and research institutions, government agencies and private enterprise in such areas as the following:

- environmental science;
- technology and instrumentation (emphasis on coastal applications);
- biotechnology (emphasis on agricultural and marine applications);
- information science and technologies; and
- education and entertainment materials.

If the UCMBEST Center can achieve some of these goals, this research park has the ability to become a major economic driver of Fort Ord development and the region. Therefore, the excellent implementation and marketing of the center is key to the future of Fort Ord.

Currently, the University of California is initiating a "Market Niche" study in order to identify potential research institutions that will likely be interested in a presence at the UCMBEST Center. In addition, a "Business Development Plan" is soon to be initiated, in which a master plan will be prepared using business planning parameters.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Schools, both public and private (the York School), will be essential to serving the future population at Fort Ord. As such, these uses will be highly compatible and contributory to the successful development of the property. The proposed school district headquarters will also be highly compatible with the development program at Fort Ord, particularly if located within a commercial or mixed-use area.

CONTINUED MILITARY USE

The principal continued military use at Fort Ord will be the Presidio of Monterey Annex, which is primarily comprised of housing for personnel and students. This reuse of existing housing units will be a highly compatible use at Fort Ord.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

A large percentage of the Fort Ord property will be dedicated to habitat management through the Bureau of Land Management, most of which will be accessible to the public. In addition, some property will be set aside for public parks, including a Youth Camp to be operated by the County Parks Department. These parks and open space will be major amenities to other potential uses at Fort Ord.

Section VI MARKET CONCLUSIONS

SKMG has summarized its absorption conclusions on Exhibit VI-1. A more detailed discussion is provided below.

LIGHT INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK

SKMG has prepared forecasts of light industrial and business park performance for Monterey County through 2015. As previously discussed, historical absorption has averaged between 125,000 and 175,000 square feet annually. For the purposes of this study, SKMG utilizes a mid-point of 150,000 square feet annually for historical absorption.

SKMG based its future forecasts upon an assumption of moderate economic growth in the county, particularly with the reuse and development of Fort Ord. As previously discussed, AMBAG forecasts the creation of about 79,000 additional jobs in the county between 1995 (after Fort Ord's closure) and 2015. This reflects a projected strong growth rate of 2.2 percent annually (this is slightly greater than the high rate of growth experienced in the county during the 1980s). SKMG assumes a somewhat higher future rate of growth in overall demand for light industrial and business park space through 2015, given stronger levels of demand anticipated for key industrial sectors. As previously discussed, this forecast assumes that an effective reuse plan is implemented at Fort Ord. Utilizing a 4 percent annual growth rate in demand, projections of demand total approximately:

- 165,000 square feet annually from 1996 to 2000;
- 200,000 square feet annually from 2001 to 2005;
- 245,000 square feet annually from 2006 to 2010; and
- 300,000 square feet annually from 2011 to 2015.

Thus, SKMG forecasts a total addition of approximately 4.55 million square feet of light industrial/business park space in Monterey County during the next 20 years.

The majority of industrial and business park space in Monterey County has historically been captured in Salinas and in Castroville. Relatively little has been captured in the Peninsula area due to limited land supply at competitive prices. Recent strong response to a small business park development in Marina at relatively high prices is encouraging for the prospects of Fort Ord to capture such space. In addition, a small business park in Del Rey Oaks has largely sold out.

SKMG estimates that current supply of light industrial and business park space is approximately equally divided between the Salinas Valley and the Castroville-Peninsula area. With a large supply of serviced land available in both areas, SKMG forecasts an approximately equal capture between the two areas during the next 20 years. Thus, the Castroville-Peninsula area has the potential to capture over 2.27 million square feet of light industrial/business park space during the next 20 years.

SKMG believes that Fort Ord has the potential to capture 50 percent of Castroville-Peninsula demand, or 25 percent of county demand, assuming substantial improvements in infrastructure (especially road connections to inland areas), availability of a wide range of site sizes and locations, moderately-priced housing availability (especially single-family homes in the \$150,000-to-\$275,000 price range), and the development of attractive business parks. Fort Ord will primarily compete with Castroville for this demand. To a lesser extent, small business parks in Marina will provide some competition. Thus, SKMG forecasts the following distribution of projected future light industrial business park space in Monterey County:

- 50 percent of demand captured in Salinas Valley;
- 25 percent of demand captured outside of Fort Ord within the Castroville-Peninsula area; and
- 25 percent of demand captured by Fort Ord.

In order to achieve this capture rate, substantial high-quality light industrial/business park properties will have to be developed within Fort Ord comprising at least 150 acres during the first 20 years of development. Such acreage would equal the size of the Castroville Industrial Park, the county's largest industrial park. Thus, by achieving 50 percent of Castroville-Peninsula demand, Fort Ord would approximately achieve its "fair share" capture. Given the anticipated supply of competitive land and the attributes of competitive locations, SKMG believes this to be a reasonable capture rate. Based upon this capture rate, the following total of industrial and business park demand could be captured at Fort Ord:

- 206,000 square feet between 1996 and 2000;
- 250,000 square feet between 2001 and 2005;
- 306,000 square feet between 2006 and 2010; and
- 375,000 square feet between 2011 and 2015.

Thus, a total of 1,137,000 square feet of space could be captured at Fort Ord through 2015. In order to achieve this capture, highly competitive land prices must be offered. In current 1995 dollars, a land charge of between \$4.00 and \$5.00 per square foot has been estimated, assuming no major assessment fees.

OFFICE AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Projected Demand

Office and R&D projections are based upon Monterey County's recent and historical office absorption, which has averaged approximately 150,000 square feet annually. For the period 1996 through 2000, SKMG projects continuing demand for 150,000 square feet of new space per year. There is currently a significant inventory of vacant space to be filled, and efforts to draw significant firms, such as major R&D firms, will await the development of a critical mass of research activity at the UCMBEST Center and elsewhere in the county.

As the Fort Ord and Peninsula economies mature, as the UCMBEST Center is developed, CSUMB becomes better established, and a "critical mass" of R&D activity emerges, SKMG projects approximately 5 percent annual growth in county-wide demand for office and R&D space, beginning in year 2001 through 2015. This assumes relatively strong growth in employment sectors that generate office and R&D demand, and the maturation of the Monterey Bay economy as an increasing number of services are provided locally versus dependence upon San Francisco Bay Area firms. Thus, SKMG projects that Monterey County will capture office and R&D space per year as follows:

- 150,000 square feet from 1996 to 2000;
- 191,000 square feet from 2001 to 2005;
- 244,000 square feet from 2006 to 2010, and
- 312,000 square feet from 2011 to 2015.

Thus, the county is projected to generate demand for nearly 4.49 million square feet of office and R&D space during the next 20 years. With an existing inventory of high-quality office space of approximately 2.5 million square feet, this addition will nearly triple the county's supply of office and R&D space during the next 20 years. Submarkets that could potentially capture this future supply are identified as follows:

- Carmel — there are limited additional development opportunities in this submarket.
- Downtown Monterey — sites could be assembled for new office development, but these are likely to be expensive and heavily regulated. Thus, SKMG forecasts little capture by this submarket.
- Garden Road Area — with only about 14 acres remaining, this area has little ability to capture future demand.

- Ryan Ranch — the highest quality office/R&D park in Monterey County, and with 138 available acres, Ryan Ranch will be the major competitive influence within the county during the next 20 years.
- Laguna Seca Office Park — this high-quality park is small, with only about 17 undeveloped acres. Thus, Laguna Seca will provide little competitive space.
- Salinas — thus far, Salinas has provided little high-quality office space. However, this is likely to change in the future.

Although Salinas has captured little office or R&D demand in the past, SKMG forecasts that the city will capture around 10 percent of county demand during the next 20 years, for a total of nearly 449,000 square feet. Thus, the remaining 4.036 million square feet of space is forecast to be captured on the Peninsula. Assuming that Fort Ord is able to deliver 250 to 300 acres of high-quality and well-located office/R&D park land during the next 20 years, SKMG believes that this property can compete aggressively with Ryan Ranch. Fort Ord could potentially capture 45 percent of this Peninsula demand, as follows:

- Ryan Ranch has the potential to capture 40 percent of demand, or about 1.61 million square feet. This is likely to require some expansion of the existing development.
- Other locations on the Peninsula, including Laguna Seca and new park developments, have the potential to capture 15 percent of demand, or over 605,000 square feet of space during the next 20 years.
- Fort Ord has the potential to capture approximately 45 percent of Peninsula demand, or nearly 1.8 million square feet over a 20 year period. This capture equates to a 40 percent capture rate for Monterey County.

Thus, SKMG forecasts a Fort Ord capture as follows:

- 300,000 square feet between 1996 and 2000;
- 382,000 square feet between 2001 and 2005;
- 488,000 square feet between 2006 and 2010; and
- 624,000 square feet between 2011 and 2015.

Thus, SKMG projects a total capture of 1,794,000 square feet of office/R&D space at Fort Ord during the next 20 years.

This capture rate is based upon a somewhat limited new supply of suitable property for office/R&D development on the Peninsula and the development of excellent quality product at Fort Ord. This analysis further assumes substantial improvements in infrastructure

(particularly road connections to Salinas and Highway 101), affordable and managerial housing availability, and the provision of attractive and desirable office and R&D parks. According to preliminary plans, these parks will be provided within strategic locations around the Fort Ord property.

In Exhibit VI-2, SKMG has projected a distribution of supply and demand for office and R&D space on the Monterey Peninsula. As indicated, Fort Ord is projected to capture 45 percent of demand. Existing space and existing land inventory in Ryan Ranch, Laguna Seca Office Park, and in the Garden Road area could accommodate most of the non-Fort Ord Peninsula demand. SKMG has assumed that these parks will be expanded or new office/R&D parks will be developed. Users are typically very specific in their space and land requirements. Therefore, substantial excess inventory of land will be required both on and off Fort Ord to capture this projected demand.

Additional Demand

SKMG believes that the potential exists to attract additional R&D users to Fort Ord, over and above the projections provided above. This assumes (1) an aggressive and concerted regional marketing effort; (2) the development of research laboratories and/or other venues for facilitating university and private sector joint research and technology transfer; and (3) the attraction of prominent faculty to Fort Ord, through either of the universities.

As the world's pre-eminent center of technology research, nearby Santa Clara County is a likely source to target firms that could benefit from a Fort Ord location. SKMG has monitored the Santa Clara County market for R&D space and its trends for many years. These research figures indicate that Santa Clara County firms have absorbed an annual average of between 2.5 and 3.0 million square feet of R&D space within the county between 1980 and 1995. Successful firms are continually evolving, requiring new space for their changing needs and setting up new divisions that can operate away from corporate headquarters. SKMG estimates that between internal "Silicon Valley" expansion and relocation of portions of the firm outside the area, Santa Clara County firms generate a demand for between 3.0 and 4.0 million square feet annually. As indicated below, the majority of expansions are local.

Santa Clara County was targeted for several major reasons:

- The county is the closest major employment center to the Monterey Peninsula, located less than two hours distant by automobile.
- The county is the largest generator of new economic activity in the State of California, and possibly the United States. Forecasts indicate that this is likely to continue to be the case for the foreseeable future.

- Economic sectors in which the Peninsula is likely to have an economic advantage, particularly with the establishment of the UCMBEST Center, are heavily concentrated in Santa Clara County.

SKMG has extensively studied and analyzed the Santa Clara County economy and believes that it has an extremely promising future during the next decade. Its prospects have seldom been as favorable as they are currently. Local industries are extremely dynamic and responsive to market changes, are high cost competitive, and have attracted many of the world's best researchers. Reliable forecasts beyond the next ten years are more problematic in today's dynamic economic climate. Nevertheless, SKMG maintains a strong confidence in Santa Clara County to remain a major economic center in the future.

When selecting sites for expansion or locating new or expanded divisions, most high-technology firms prefer to remain local. However, given high costs associated with Santa Clara County and adjacent county locations (land costs, salaries, and taxes), firms sometimes seek locations that are within two to three hours driving distance, or within two hours flight distance. In order to remain within two to three hours driving distance from headquarters, some firms have sought locations in the Sacramento, Santa Rosa and Scotts Valley areas. However, most firms relocating a division have chosen to locate out-of-state, where significant cost reductions can be achieved. Favored locations include Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, Idaho and Utah. Some firms tolerate more distant locations such as Texas. Thus, to capture a significant portion of Santa Clara County spin-off demand will be difficult and highly competitive. Fort Ord will need to offer significant advantages, including the following:

- opportunities for joint university, institute, and private sector research (possibly also with government research involvement);
- a defined and operative program for technology transfer;
- access to major research activity in California;
- access to convenient, diverse and moderately-priced housing; and
- good transportation to corporate headquarters.

With well-conceived and aggressive marketing efforts, SKMG believes that Fort Ord could capture some of this R&D demand from the Silicon Valley. Based on SKMG's estimate of demand for 1.0 million square feet of space out-of-county annually, Fort Ord could capture a significant share of this demand. Assuming that a critical mass of R&D users are attracted and research activity at UCMBEST Center is established by 2000, a capture is forecast of 4.0 percent annually between 2001 and 2005; 5.0 percent annually between 2006 and 2010; and 6.0 percent annually between 2011 and 2015. Thus, over this 15-year period, SKMG forecasts a capture of an additional 750,000 square feet of R&D demand generated by Santa Clara County firms.

SKMG has identified Santa Clara County as the strongest potential source of demand for R&D space at Fort Ord. This is due to several factors, including the vibrancy and growth of the electronics, software and technology economy centered there, the attraction that CSUMB and the UCMBEST Center will provide for such industries, and its proximity. While industries are scattered throughout the country that might find Fort Ord to be an attractive location, distance will be a strong deterrent. In addition, few industries are likely to relocate into California. Nonetheless, SKMG believes that industries located in Southern California and elsewhere will find Fort Ord an attractive location. SKMG estimates that these out-of-area firms will generate between 20 and 25 percent of additional demand. Thus, demand is forecast for approximately 925,000 square feet of out-of-area space by 2015.

RESIDENTIAL USES

Residential development will be critical at Fort Ord to achieve the employment-generating development capture rates projected above. As a result, SKMG has focused considerable attention on its market potential.

SKMG has examined and reviewed the existing 1,522 units of family housing in Marina that have been identified as having potential for reuse. These units, located in Patton, Creston and Abrams parks, could either be used as rental or for-sale condominium units. Currently, they are vacant and deteriorating rapidly. Since conveyance of these units by the Army is still in the distant future, the most probable immediate reuse would be to refurbish the units and operate them as rental units under an agreement with the Army. However, in the future after conveyance, many of these units could be sold as condominiums. With a high-quality renovation, these units could sell in the broad price range as low as \$95,000 for two-bedroom units in Patton Park to over \$160,000 for the largest units in Preston and Abrams parks. SKMG assumes that these units can be rented in a phased approach to prevent flooding the private market. Over a ten-year period, the rental program could be reduced as large clusters of units are sold to private developers for conversion to condominiums. Some units might most appropriately remain as rental units. While the leasing program should be implemented during the first five years to avoid deterioration of the units, SKMG projects that a substantial sales program could be effectively implemented over a ten-year period.

The 1,253 units in Schoonover and Fredericks parks are now under the ownership of CSUMB. As a result, it is assumed that the university will renovate these units to house faculty, staff and students.

Based upon projections by AMBAG, and also reflecting employment projections, SKMG forecasts demand for about 1,900 residential units annually in Monterey County between 1996 and 2000, as previously discussed and presented in Exhibit III-6. This demand is projected to increase to 2,800 units annually between 2001 and 2005, decline slightly to 2,500 units annually between 2006 and 2010, and resume the 2,800 units annual level between 2011

and 2015. Of this demand, about 70 percent is estimated to support market-rate new home construction (not including the affordable reuse units at Fort Ord discussed above).

SKMG has forecast the capture potential for new homes on the Monterey Peninsula. Historically, the Monterey Peninsula has captured nearly 28 percent of county demand for new homes between 1980 and 1994. In recent years, this capture has been substantially less, averaging less than 20 percent annually during the past five years. However, the Peninsula has been constrained in terms of land supply available for housing development. In addition, the new employment centers forecast at Fort Ord will generate additional housing demand. During the next 20 years, SKMG believes that the Peninsula will increase its capture of new market rate homes from recently achieved rates, capturing about 25 percent annually between 1996 and 2000, increasing to about 35 percent annually between 2011 and 2015. This forecast increased capture is due to the assumed reuse of Fort Ord. Thus, Peninsula demand would average as follows:

- 335 homes annually between 1996 and 2000;
- 490 homes annually between 2001 and 2005;
- 525 homes annually between 2006 and 2010; and
- 685 homes annually between 2011 and 2015.

Thus, the Peninsula is forecast to capture over 10,000 new market rate homes during the next 20 years.

SKMG forecasts that Fort Ord has the potential to capture a substantial share of Monterey Peninsula housing demand and a considerable share of county demand. This forecast is due both to the large supply of land that will be available for housing development and to the proposed major new employment centers at Fort Ord. SKMG forecasts that Fort Ord could capture about 15 percent of the county's new housing demand during the early years, or about 60 percent of Peninsula demand. This capture is forecast to increase to 20 percent of county demand in the later years of development during the 2006-through-2015 time frame SKMG believes Fort Ord can capture housing demand as follows by time period:

- 1996 to 2000 — Fort Ord has the potential to capture 15 percent of the county's new home demand, for an average of about 200 units per year. This equates to a capture of about 60 percent of Peninsula demand. Thus, a total of about 1,000 new units could be captured during this period. Only 5 percent of these homes should be "upscale," or priced in the \$300,000 and above range. The remainder should be priced in the \$150,000-to-\$299,000 range, at densities of six to eight units per acre.
- 2001 to 2005 — Fort Ord has the continued potential to capture 15 percent of county new home demand, for an average of about 300 units per year. This equates to a capture of about 61 percent of Peninsula demand. Thus, a total of

about 1,500 new units could be captured during this period. Only about 7 percent of these homes should be "upscale," or priced in the \$300,000 and above range. The remainder should be priced in the \$150,000-to-\$299,000 range, at densities of six to eight units per acre.

- 2006 to 2010 — Following more substantial employment growth, Fort Ord has the potential to achieve an increased capture of 20 percent of county new home demand, for an average of about 350 units per year. This equates to a capture of about 67 percent of Peninsula demand. Thus, a total of about 1,750 new units could be captured during this period. Only about 9 percent of these homes should be "upscale," or priced in the \$300,000 and above range. Between 10 and 12 percent should be multifamily, including a combination of rental apartments and townhome condominiums. The remainder should be priced in the \$150,000-to-\$299,000 range, at densities of six to eight units per acre.
- 2011 to 2015 — During this period, strong employment growth should be attained, and Fort Ord will have the potential to achieve a continued capture of 20 percent of county new home demand, for an average of about 400 units per year. This equates to a Peninsula capture of about 58 percent. Thus, a total of about 2,000 new units could be captured during this period. About 10 percent of these homes should be "upscale," or priced in the \$300,000 and above range. Approximately 15 percent should be multifamily, including a combination of rental apartments and townhome condominiums. The remainder should be priced in the \$150,000-to-\$299,000 range, at densities of six to eight units per acre.

In summary, SKMG forecasts a capture of 6,250 new homes at Fort Ord, representing a capture of about 18 percent of market rate new home demand in the county and 63 percent of demand on the Peninsula. These capture rates are reasonable in view of historical patterns, available developable residential land, commute patterns, the desirability of new home communities planned at Fort Ord, and new employment centers forecast for Fort Ord.

In general, low-density single-family detached homes are defined as custom or semi-custom homes on lots averaging around 10,000 square feet. These upscale homes will be best received if offered on sites having particularly high environmental quality, including either distant, open space or golf course views. Homes along golf course frontages could achieve high prices with lots smaller than 10,000 square feet. Pricing in the range of \$300,000 and higher could be achieved on a number of sites at Fort Ord.

Medium-density single-family detached homes, comparable to several production home subdivisions in northern Salinas, would be priced at an average of between \$200,000 and

\$275,000 on average 6,000-square-foot lots. This product will have the strongest demand at Fort Ord.

High-density (small-lot) single-family detached homes on 4,500- to 5,000-square-foot lots would be priced at an average of between \$150,000 and \$200,000. This product would likely have a stronger demand than indicated in SKMG's recommended capture. However, SKMG has strived to provide a "balance" of housing types at Fort Ord.

Townhome products are recommended to be introduced to Fort Ord after 2005 in order to avoid burdening the market with too much multifamily product, including the reuse of existing military housing. Pricing should average between \$125,000 and \$150,000.

Rental housing is not recommended during the first ten years of development at Fort Ord due to the abundance of this housing type existing in local jurisdictions. However, after 2005, demand will exist for new high-quality rental product. Nevertheless, only a modest amount of rental product is likely to be needed through 2015.

Of the new housing potential at Fort Ord forecast by SKMG, 8 percent of units are forecast at prices of \$300,000 and above. According to the U.S. Census, in 1990, 0.8 percent of homes in Marina, 1.2 percent of homes in Seaside, and 4.2 percent of homes in Del Rey Oaks were valued at \$300,000 or higher. Values have declined during the past five years, however. Carmel, Monterey and Pacific Grove have decidedly higher percentages of homes in this price range, but their established environments, prestige and image will be difficult to duplicate. However, the forecast capture of expensive homes at Fort Ord will substantially increase the supply of homes in the \$300,000 and above price range in their respective communities.

As discussed above, the largest number of homes forecast for development at Fort Ord, comprising 50 percent of the total, is projected to be priced in the \$200,000-to-\$275,000 range. A mid-point of this range is about \$235,000. This compares with a 1990 median value of \$172,500 in Marina, \$150,000 in Seaside, and \$221,000 in Del Rey Oaks. As previously discussed, values have declined in recent years. Thus, the bulk of new housing projected for Fort Ord will be priced at levels substantially above the medians for existing homes in communities immediately surrounding Fort Ord.

Much of the residential demand at Fort Ord will be derived from employment generated on the property. SKMG forecasts total employment between 13,400 and 22,900 at Fort Ord by 2015. A mid-point average totals 18,172 employees. In Exhibit VI-3, SKMG has produced a profile of average wages by projected land use. As a result, an average income of nearly \$27,100 is forecast in 1995 dollars. This wage compares with a Monterey County average of \$22,800.

A single-wage household earning an average wage at Fort Ord is unlikely to be able to afford a home priced much above \$90,000, unless that household has accumulated savings that would cover more than a 10 percent down payment.⁴ However, at least 50 percent of households are likely to contain a second wage earner. Given two average incomes totaling \$54,200 annually, a home of about \$190,000 would be affordable. Assuming an income at a mid-point between these two extremes of about \$40,000, a home of about \$140,000 would be affordable. In summary, these three income points relative to home prices are as follows:

<u>Annual Income</u>	<u>Affordable Home Price</u>
\$27,000	\$90,000
\$40,000	\$140,000
\$54,000	\$190,000

In higher priced home categories, buyers are typically "move-up" households, having sold a home prior to the move. As a result, these households have typically built up equity that can be used as a down payment on a new home. This equity then increases the value of home that can be afforded over that which would be justified by income alone.

SKMG has recommended a program of home prices that responds to projected employment at Fort Ord. Homes in the \$90,000-to-\$160,000 range would be provided through reuse of military homes on the property, and townhomes would also be affordably priced in the \$125,000-to-\$150,000 range. The majority of homes recommended would be priced in the \$150,000-to-\$299,000 range, affordable to most two-income households.

RETAIL

Convenience, neighborhood and community retail center development will be supported by capturing most local-serving on-site demand generated by residents, on-site employees and students. During the first 20 years, SKMG forecasts a demand for approximately 535,000 square feet of such space. This equates to three neighborhood or community centers along with two or three small convenience retail centers.

To determine this neighborhood and community retail center capture, SKMG has assumed:

- an average of 2.8 persons per household at \$3,500 per capita annually for convenience goods expenditures (from taxable sales data);

⁴Assumes 90 percent financing at 8 percent for 30 years, and that 30 percent of income is available for housing costs including property taxes.

- an average expenditure of \$1,000 annually for each employee at Fort Ord on retail and eating and drinking near work, utilizing a mid-point projection of about 18,000 (based on a study by the International Council of Shopping Centers);
- an average off-campus expenditure of \$1,000 annually per student for convenience goods and entertainment;
- a Fort Ord capture of 90 percent for convenience goods; and
- supportable sales volume of \$200 per square foot.

This calculation indicates a demand for 535,000 square feet of local-serving retail space.

The Monterey Peninsula has been highly successful in attracting retail sales from regional customers, including those from Santa Cruz County, as well as tourists. Expansion of regional "value-oriented" retailing has been substantial in recent years. However, with a small population base, moderate population growth, and near-term plans for the expansion of a regional power retail center in Sand City, there is little additional demand for regional retailing on the Peninsula.

Although Monterey, Carmel and Pacific Grove provide a substantial supply of specialty and entertainment retailing, much of this is tourist-oriented. SKMG believes that demand will support a regional entertainment retail center at Fort Ord, focused on serving local residents. This center could include new emerging retail concepts, a cineplex, restaurants, and specialty shops. SKMG forecasts demand for approximately 250,000 square feet of such space during the 2011-through-2015 period at Fort Ord. However, sufficient acreage should be allocated to allow for an eventual expansion to 500,000 square feet.

As previously discussed, the population of the Monterey Peninsula is forecast to increase by a total of 56,000 between 1995 and 2015. Using a commonly-used industry demand standard of one cinema screen per 10,000 population, the Peninsula should be able to support an additional 5.6 screens by 2015. Thus, the potential cineplex at Fort Ord could potentially accommodate four to five screens.

Fort Ord could possibly capture more than SKMG's forecast 250,000 square feet of regional and entertainment retailing by 2015. Regional retailers are constantly changing. In addition, there is a potential for a factory outlet center. However, given demand projections, additional regional retail capture would likely be at the expense of existing retailing on the Peninsula, including high-volume promotional centers in Sand City and Seaside, and an existing factory outlet center in Monterey.

LODGING FACILITIES

First-class hotels and conference centers on the Monterey Peninsula have a total of over 3,000 rooms. Including smaller and more economical, but good quality, establishments, there are over 9,000 rooms. Tourism to the Peninsula and particularly demand for conference facilities have been increasing, largely driven by economic activity in California. As previously discussed, room rates have been increasing at an annual rate of around 2.5 percent, and occupancy rates have been increasing at an annual rate of 1 percent. As California emerges from its recent recession, demand for rooms on the Peninsula is likely to increase significantly. Utilizing a 2 percent annual increase in the demand for first-class hotels during the next 20 years, SKMG forecasts a demand for an additional 1,500 rooms in high-quality hotels on the Peninsula.

SKMG believes that Fort Ord could capture about 750 to 800 of these rooms, or between 50 and 53 percent of total demand. These hotels should have excellent conference facilities, and the bulk of the rooms should be located in golf course-oriented facilities. SKMG forecasts a substantial capture of demand, considering that few new hotels are otherwise likely to be developed on the Peninsula. Other than a few highly controversial hotels proposed in the Coastal Zone in Sand City and Marina, few other new facilities are likely to be developed.

In addition, SKMG believes that there is also demand for a smaller focused corporate conference facility and spa. There is a small and growing niche market for such facilities, and the Monterey Peninsula currently lacks such a facility. Its resort orientation, reputation and environment make it an ideal location.

RECREATION

Recreational amenities should be developed at Fort Ord to support other activities. SKMG projects that two additional golf courses could be supportable at Fort Ord during the next 20 years, if offered in conjunction with residential communities and hotel/conference centers. Currently, golf course demand is high, with all Peninsula facilities achieving a high volume of rounds and high fees. As visitation and population increase on the Peninsula, there will be a corresponding increase in demand for golf courses.

A high-quality equestrian center, which offers boarding, training and show activities, could be accommodated. As such facilities are typically unable to support market land costs, an equestrian center might best operate under a ground lease. A professionally operated facility, providing training, shows and events in addition to boarding, can be a profitable operation.

An equestrian center is not a traditional market-driven use. Typically, operations cannot support capital and land costs. Thus, such facilities are typically either subsidized by a

developer as an amenity to a community, operators seek locations where land is inexpensive, or sites are obtained on land lease at favorable rates. In this analysis, SKMG assumes that an equestrian center can be self-sustaining on land obtained at below-market lease rates. SKMG's investigations indicate that a well-managed facility can achieve sufficient revenue to cover capital and operating costs, assuming land costs are inexpensive. Nevertheless, successful implementation of a profitable equestrian center is a major challenge. However, an equestrian center would serve as an amenity to Fort Ord's hotels and residents.

EMPLOYMENT

SKMG has estimated the employment-generating impacts of reuse of Fort Ord, as indicated in Exhibit VI-3. Utilizing standard industry factors for various land uses, an estimate of between 13,400 and 23,000 jobs are projected to be generated by 2015. These figures do not include off-base multiplier employment.

This projected employment reflects jobs that will be occupied by current Monterey County residents and by new residents who will be attracted to the area by these jobs. Some of these jobs will be occupied by CSUMB students, working either part-time or full-time.

**EXHIBIT VI-1
FORT ORD DEVELOPMENT AND ABSORPTION POTENTIAL
1996 - 2015**

Land Use	FAR/ DU/AC	1996 - 2000		2001 - 2005		2006 - 2010		2011 - 2015		Total 1996 - 2015	
		Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres	Sq. Ft./Units	Acres
Light Industrial/R&D/Office											
Light Industrial/Business Park	0.25 FAR	206,250	21	250,000	25	306,250	28	375,000	32	1,137,500	106
Office/R&D	0.25 FAR	300,000	28	382,000	35	488,000	45	624,000	57	1,794,000	165
Induced demand	0.25 FAR	0	0	250,000	23	300,000	29	375,000	34	925,000	86
Subtotal (Sq. Ft.)		506,250	49	882,000	83	1,094,250	102	1,374,000	123	3,856,500	357
Residential											
Reuse of Existing Units		1,522	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1,522	---
Reuse of Existing CSU Units		1,253	---	0	---	0	---	0	---	1,253	---
Detached											
Low Density	4 DU/AC	50	13	100	25	150	38	200	50	500	125
Medium Density	6 DU/AC	600	100	800	133	800	133	900	150	3,100	517
High Density	8 DU/AC	350	44	600	75	600	75	600	75	2,150	269
Attached											
Low Density	10 DU/AC	0	0	0	0	100	10	100	10	200	20
High Density	20 DU/AC	0	0	0	0	100	5	200	10	300	15
Subtotal (Units)		3,775	156	1,500	233	1,750	261	2,000	295	9,025	945
Retail											
Neighborhood/Community	.25 FAR	191,000	18	99,000	9	114,000	10	131,000	12	535,000	49
Regional/Outlet	.25 FAR	0	0	0	0	0	25	250,000	25	250,000	50
Subtotal (Sq/ Ft.)		191,000	18	99,000	9	114,000	35	381,000	37	785,000	99
Lodging											
Conference Center	.20 FAR	0	0	200	15	0	0	0	0	200	15
Resort/Hotel (Golf-Oriented)	.25 FAR	300	20	0	0	300	20	200	15	800	55
Subtotal		300	20	200	15	300	20	200	15	1,000	70
Recreation											
Equestrian Center		0	0	---	15	0	0	0	0	---	15
Golf Course		0	0	0	0	---	160	---	160	---	320

Sources: Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.
D:\FORT_ORD\PROJECT4.WK4 / A [jde]

02:54 PM
10-Nov-95

Exhibit VI-3
 Projected Average Wages by Land Use
 Fort Ord

	Number of Employees ¹	Average Wage ²
Light Industrial/Business Park	2,370	\$31,576 ³
Office/R&D	9,517	\$31,018 ⁴
Retail	1,787	\$15,053
Lodging	1,000	\$16,751
Recreation	153	\$15,053 ⁵
Institutional	3,345	\$22,832 ⁶
Total/Weighted Average	18,172	\$27,094
¹ Employment at build-out; average of projected range. ² Adjusted by CPI (wage earners, 10-county area) from County Business Patterns 1992 for Monterey County. ³ Average of construction; manufacturing; transportation; communication and utilities; and wholesale trade. ⁴ Average of finance, insurance and real estate; business services; legal services; engineering services; and electronics. ⁵ Assumed same as retail. ⁶ Assumed same as average for all jobs.		

ASSUMPTIONS AND GENERAL LIMITING CONDITIONS

Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group (SKMG) has made extensive efforts to confirm the accuracy and timeliness of the information contained in this study. Such information was compiled from a variety of sources, including interviews with government officials, review of City and County documents, and other third parties deemed to be reliable. Although SKMG believes all information in this study is correct, it does not warrant the accuracy of such information and assumes no responsibility for inaccuracies in the information by third parties. We have no responsibility to update this report for events and circumstances occurring after the date of this report. Further, no guarantee is made as to the possible effect on development of present or future federal, state or local legislation, including any regarding environmental or ecological matters.

The accompanying projections and analyses are based on estimates and assumptions developed in connection with the study. In turn, these assumptions, and their relation to the projections, were developed using currently available economic data and other relevant information. It is the nature of forecasting, however, that some assumptions may not materialize, and unanticipated events and circumstances may occur. Therefore, actual results achieved during the projection period will likely vary from the projections, and some of the variations may be material to the conclusions of the analysis.

Contractual obligations do not include access to or ownership transfer of any electronic data processing files, programs or models completed directly for or as by-products of this research effort, unless explicitly so agreed as part of the contract.

This report may not be used for any purpose other than that for which it is prepared. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this study shall be disseminated to the public through publication advertising media, public relations, news media, sales media, or any other public means of communication without prior written consent and approval of Sedway Kotin Mouchly Group.

Appendix E

Fort Ord Regional
Transportation Study

FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY

DRAFT REPORT

Prepared for:
Transportation Agency for Monterey County

Prepared by:
JHK & Associates
2000 Powell Street, Suite 1090
Emeryville, CA 94608
(510) 428-2550

January 6, 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY *i*

1. INTRODUCTION 1-1

2. FORT ORD PLANNING PROCESS 2-1

 2.1 Past Activities 2-1

 2.2 Current Activities 2-4

3. SETTING 3-1

 3.1 Existing Transportation Network 3-1

 3.2 Socio-Economic Setting and Forecasts 3-11

 3.3 Land Use and Transportation 3-13

4. FUNDING SOURCES 4-1

 4.1 Existing and Secured Funding Sources 4-1

 4.2 Potential Revenue Sources 4-5

 4.3 Financing For Transit System Development and Operations 4-14

 4.4 Roadway Maintenance 4-15

 4.5 Conclusions 4-16

5. TRAVEL DEMAND FORECASTS 5-1

 5.1 Land Use Inputs 5-1

 5.2 Trip Generation and Distribution 5-4

 5.3 Network Definition 5-6

 5.4 Scenario Descriptions and Results 5-7

 5.5 Alternative Strategy Impacts 5-20

6. MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM 6-1

 6.1 Roadway System 6-1

 6.2 Transit System 6-3

 6.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian System 6-6

 6.4 Transportation Demand Management 6-7

 6.5 Land Use Plan 6-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
7. FINANCING STRATEGY	7-1
7.1 Cost Assessment	7-1
7.2 Dedicated and Expected Funding	7-4
7.3 Preliminary Nexus Analysis	7-5
7.4 Relationship to Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan	7-8
7.5 Potential Financing Sources	7-11
 APPENDIX A: Development Densities for Monterey County	 A-1

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Figure E-1: Existing Transportation Network	ii
Figure E-2: Fort Ord Analysis Districts	iii
Figure E-3: Financially Unconstrained Scenario - 2015 Transportation Network	xvi
Figure E-4: Proposed Bicycle Network	xvii
Figure E-5: Impact Study Area	xix
Figure 2-1: FORIS Proposed Ultimate Roadway Network	2-3
Figure 3-1: Existing Transportation Network	3-2
Figure 3-2: Existing Transit Service	3-9
Figure 4-1: Value of Land	4-8
Figure 5-1: Fort Ord Analysis Districts	5-2
Figure 5-2: Forecasted 2015 Trip Ends Between Core Fort Ord Reuse Area and Primary Destinations	5-5
Figure 5-3: Financially Unconstrained Scenario - 2015 Transportation Network	5-14
Figure 5-4: Impact Study Area	5-21
Figure 7-1: Total Cost Breakdown	7-3
Figure 7-2: Capital Cost Impact Shares by Project Type	7-9
Figure 7-3: Capital Cost Distribution by Impact Share Category	7-10
Table E-1: 2015 Fort Ord Land Use Characteristics	iv
Table E-2: Monterey County Socio-Economic Data County Wide and Subarea	vi
Table E-3: Forecasted 2015 Daily Person Trip Distribution	vi
Table E-4: 2015 Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Summary	viii
Table E-5: Off-Site Regional Facilities Summary	ix
Table E-6: Fort Ord Arterial Facilities Summary	xii
Table E-7: 2015 Financially Unconstrained Scenario Capital Cost Estimate Summary	xviii
Table E-8: Transit Improvement Summary	xxi
Table E-9: Potential Funding Strategies	xxiii
Table 3-1: Existing (1993/94) Condition Level-of-Service Analysis	3-5
Table 4-1: Summary of Sources of Financing For Transportation Improvements	4-2
Table 4-2: Transportation Impact Fees in Monterey County	4-11
Table 5-1: 2015 Fort Ord Land Use Characteristics	5-3
Table 5-2: Forecasted 2015 Daily Person Trip Distribution	5-6
Table 5-3: 2015 Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Summary	5-9
Table 5-4: Off-Site Regional Facilities Summary	5-11
Table 5-5: Fort Ord Arterial Facilities Summary	5-13
Table 6-1: Roadway Capital Improvement Costs	6-2
Table 6-2: Roadway Improvement Cost Summary	6-3
Table 6-3: Transit Improvement Summary	6-8
Table 6-4: Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements/Policies	6-9
Table 7-1: Breakdown of Estimated Costs by Improvement Type	7-2
Table 7-2: Estimated Costs, Expected Funding and Shortfalls	7-5
Table 7-3: Preliminary Nexus Analysis Results	7-7
Table 7-4: Summary of Preliminary Nexus Analysis Cost Share Allocation by Improvement Type	7-8
Table 7-5: Potential Funding Strategies	7-14

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This report represents the results of the Fort Ord Transportation Study being conducted for the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC). The purpose of the TAMC Study was to develop a multimodal transportation system that could serve expected traffic conditions through the year 2015 based on the *1994 Regional Population and Employment Forecast* prepared by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) and the draft *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* prepared by the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA). A secondary purpose was to examine issues related to the financing of proposed transportation improvements. The costs of individual transportation projects needed to meet LOS standards will be estimated, and the equitable share of the cost will be attributed to proposed development within and beyond the geographic boundaries of former Fort Ord.

Most recurring congestion on the regional roadway system (depicted in Figure E-1) is attributable to commutes occurring during the peak hour. This study attempts to minimize the impact of these weekday peak-hour auto trips on the regional transportation system. Projects promoting the use of alternative modes of transportation (e.g., transit, rail, car pool and bike) were included in this study that could delay or eliminate expensive roadway projects and minimize costs and environmental impacts. Alternative transportation projects utilizing transit and rail service were emphasized along the most congested corridors. However, given the current reliance on auto use, the transportation system developed for this study attempts to find a balance between optimistic shifts to alternative modes of transportation and historical data.

LAND USES

In order to assess the regional transportation needs, it is important not only to study the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan, but understand existing and future regional land use characteristics. That is, residents on former Fort Ord are not obligated to work on former Fort Ord, therefore most commute trips associated with the reuse of Fort Ord will be generated throughout Monterey County. The following land uses were input to the Monterey County Transportation Analysis Model (MCTAM) to forecast traffic conditions. MCTAM results are subsequently the basis for the preliminary nexus analysis which assigned financial responsibility for the proposed transportation projects.

Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan: By the year 2015, the draft Reuse Plan calls for more than 18,000 jobs and 13,500 housing units (inclusive of 2,550 on-campus housing units). For Fort Ord, this represents a growth of 7,400 housing units, but a decrease of 2,000 jobs versus 1990 when the site was a military base. To aid in the analysis of Fort Ord's travel demand and transit potential, the reuse area was divided into six districts representing distinct geographical areas and common land uses. These districts are illustrated in Figure E-2 while the housing, employment and typical residential development density characteristics of each district are presented in Table E-1. A summary of each Fort Ord district follows.




Figure E-1
Existing Transportation Network




Figure E-2
Fort Ord Analysis Districts

Source: JHK, 1996

**Table E-1
2015 FORT ORD LAND USE
CHARACTERISTICS**

DISTRICT	HOUSING UNITS	JOBS	HOUSING DENSITY (dwelling units per acre)	DAILY TRIP ENDS GENERATED
1. Airport/MBEST	0	7,640	NA	63,940
2. Northern Residential	4,112	69	8-10	32,760
3. Central Core/CSUMB	3,650*	6,983	8-10	104,690**
4. Southern Residential	5,751	1,198	4-8	67,840
5. South Gate (Comm. & Ind.)	0	1,392	NA	10,820
6. East Garrison	0	1,058	NA	23,170
TOTAL	13,513	18,340	--	303,220

* Includes 2,550 on-campus student housing units.

** Includes 12,310 school trip ends for students housed on-campus.

Source: FORA Reuse Plan

Fort Ord Analysis Districts

1. **Airport/MBEST** - This district represents a major employment center within Fort Ord, attracting employees from throughout the region. By the year 2015, this district is expected to generate more than 60,000 trips per day with more than 15% work trips. It will be important to serve commuter needs from residential areas within Fort Ord, as well as major employee source locations (Salinas, Marina, Seaside, Peninsula) in the county. With nearly 60% of trips being non-home-based, connections to other non-residential centers are also important. Within these trips, a large number between MBEST and the CSUMB campus are expected.
2. **Northern Residential** - This largely medium density residential district is forecast to generate a moderate number of trips. This district is expected to include low income, social, and seniors housing areas. It will be important to serve mobility needs of these residents with service to key employment and shopping centers. A specific need for these districts is a connection between the designated CSUMB housing area along Inter-garrison and the campus. This particular connection is being served by the CSUMB shuttle.
3. **Central Core/CSUMB** - The central core consists of the CSUMB campus, as well as areas of proposed higher-density, mixed use development. Although the mixed-use nature of this district suggests a large number of intra-district trips, it is important to recognize that the district will also become a major multi-purpose activity center for the region. It will be important to provide a system that meets a variety of trip purposes and locations.

4. **Southern Residential** - For this largely residential district it is important to provide access to major employment and commercial areas. With the inclusion of the POM Annex, there is also the specific additional need to provide connections to other military facilities in the region. However, the lower densities and higher-cost housing outside the POM Annex indicate that transit may have limited effectiveness.
5. **South Gate Commercial/Industrial** - This district contains a mix of lower density commercial and industrial uses. There is no current activity in this area, and only 20% of development is expected by 2015.
6. **East Garrison** - Lower-density, mixed use development is proposed for the East Garrison district. This district is expected to be approximately one-quarter developed by 2015. Like the South Commercial/Industrial district, there is no current activity at East Garrison.

AMBAG 1994 Regional Population and Employment Forecast: To assess the regional transportation needs it is important to understand existing and future land use characteristics of the region. According to Census data, Monterey County had a population of 355,000 in 1990. By 2015, Monterey County is expected to grow to a population of 520,000, or 46 percent. A majority of this growth is expected to occur within the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas areas (75% of housing and 70% of the employment growth). The draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan indicates a population of approximately 39,000 (7.5 percent of County total) will reside within the Fort Ord reuse area by 2015. A summary of the socio-economic characteristics of the county, Monterey Peninsula, Salinas, and Fort Ord is provided in Table E-2.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FORECASTS

The land uses reported above were input to the MCTAM computer model to forecast the number of trips that would likely use the regional transportation network in the year 2015. These "person trips" are summarized in Table E-3. Currently 98 percent of the person trips in this region end up using an auto (e.g., car pool, drive alone), while 2 percent use non-auto modes of transportation (e.g., transit, bike). The MCTAM results indicate that almost three million person trips will require the use of the transportation network each weekday by the year 2015. By the year 2015, the MCTAM forecasts that more than 280,000 residents in Monterey County will drive their auto to work each day (based on current mode splits of 2 percent and commute trips representing 10 percent of the daily traffic). Furthermore, almost 16,000 Fort Ord residents will commute to work each day in autos, while more than 14,000 autos will be used to shuttle workers to jobs on the former Fort Ord.

**Table E-2
MONTEREY COUNTY SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA
COUNTY WIDE AND SUBAREA**

	1990 Census		2015 Forecast		1990-2015 Growth (% Growth)	
	Housing Units	Employment	Housing Units	Employment	Housing Units	Employment
Monterey Peninsula	35,900	50,000	45,500	66,000	9,600 (27%)	16,000 (32%)
Salinas	35,000	49,000	61,000	79,000	26,000 (74%)	30,000 (61%)
Fort Ord (includes CSUMB)	6,100	20,000	13,500	18,000	7,400 (121%)	(2,000) (-10%)
Other	43,000	42,000	50,000	61,000	7,000 (16%)	19,000 (45%)
Monterey County	120,000	161,000	170,000	224,000	50,000 (42%)	63,000 (39%)

Sources: AMBAG 1994 Regional Population and Employment Forecast, Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan

**Table E-3
FORECASTED 2015 DAILY PERSON TRIP DISTRIBUTION**

ORIGIN	DESTINATION						TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
1. Fort Ord	65,622	11,435	14,304	26,356	17,995	24,449	160,161
2. Salinas	19,949	478,152	5,188	4,819	5,876	143,414	657,398
3. Marina	23,863	7,514	18,770	11,140	8,802	19,381	89,470
4. Seaside/DRO/ Sand City	15,838	2,600	3,999	49,106	40,558	27,294	139,395
5. Monterey & Pacific Grove	11,210	2,649	2,237	32,857	134,893	54,228	238,074
6. Other	18,883	64,143	6,815	26,195	59,678	1,433,925	1,609,639
TOTAL	143,055	566,493	51,313	150,473	267,802	1,702,691	2,881,827

Congestion on the regional roadway network is typically reported as level of service (LOS) ranging from LOS=A through LOS=F. LOS=A generally depicts uncontested conditions, while each letter degradation reflects increased congestion until LOS=F is reached indicating bumper-to-bumper traffic. In general, a roadway section is "deficient" and needing congestion relief once LOS=E has been reached.

Service levels on regionally significant roadways were determined for existing conditions, as well as a number of future year scenarios. The future year scenarios reflect forecast conditions for the year 2015 assuming different sets of roadway improvements. A list of the projects assumed in each of the scenarios examined in this study is included in Table E-4. The LOS results¹ for regional roadways under Existing Conditions and two of the future year scenarios (Financially Constrained, and Financially Unconstrained) are summarized in Table E-5. Forecast service levels for key roadways within the former Fort Ord are presented in Table E-6.

Existing Conditions: This scenario reflects traffic conditions based on data reported for the regional network when most roads were last monitored for the Congestion Management Program (CMP) in 1993. The following roadway sections had exceeded the LOS=E threshold in 1993:

- ▶ Highway 1 north of Castroville
- ▶ Highway 68
- ▶ Highway 156
- ▶ Highway 183
- ▶ Del Monte Avenue in Monterey
- ▶ Reservation Road in Marina
- ▶ Blanco Road
- ▶ Davis Road in Salinas

¹All LOS data in this report is based on an arterial level of service analysis using the 1994 Florida DOT methodology which is consistent with the Highway Capacity Manual.

Table E-4
 2015 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY

FACILITY	SEGMENT		IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION	SCENARIO			
	From	To		Financially Unconstrained	Financially Constrained	Fort Ord Source Only	Impact Study Area Source Only
Off-Site Roadway Improvements							
Hwy 1 - Hatton Canyon Highway 1	Carpenter	Carmel River	Construct new roadway
	Santa Cruz County Line	Castroville	Upgrade from 2-lane hwy to 4-lane freeway/expy
	Fremont	Del Monte	Widen to 6 lanes - extend aux. lanes
U S 101 - Prunedale By-Pass U S 101 Interchanges	Echo Valley	Espinosa	Construct new freeway
	Boronda	Airport	Improve interchanges
Highway 68	Highway 1	Highway 218	Upgrade to 4-lane freeway
	Highway 218	San Benancio	Construct 4-lane ByPass freeway
Highway 156	Castroville	U.S. 101	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (expy)
Highway 183	Near Salinas	Castroville	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (expy)
Highway 218	North-South	Hwy 68	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
Davis Road	U S 101	Rossi	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes
	Rossi	Blanco	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
	Blanco	Reservation	4-lane Bridge - to avoid wash-outs
Blanco Road	Reservation	Alisal	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (to Davis) Widen from 3 to 4 lanes (to Alisal) Bridge
Reservation Road	Highway 1	Del Monte	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
	Del Monte	Crescent	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes
	Fort Ord Boundary	Blanco	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes
	Blanco	Inter-garrison	Construct new 4-lane connection
	Inter-garrison	Watkins Gate	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (create couplet)
Del Monte	Davis	Highway 68	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
	In Seaside/Monterey	Highway 1 I/C	Widen from 4/5 to 6 lanes
	2nd Avenue	See 2nd Avenue	See 2nd Avenue
Hwy 1/Fremont I/C	Highway 1 - South	Reservation	Widen to 6 lanes
			Reconstruct
On-Site Roadway Improvements							
12th/Imjin	Highway 1	California	Construct 4-lane arterial (exc. Gateway)
	California	Reservation	Widen to 4 lanes
	Reservation	Blanco	Construct new 4-lane connector
8th Street	Highway 1 Overcrossing	2nd Avenue	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial
	2nd Avenue	Inter-garrison	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial
Inter-Garrison	8th St Cutoff	Reservation	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial
Lightfighter	North-South Road	Hwy 1	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes
Gigling	North-South Road	DFAS	Upgrade as 4-lane arterial
	DFAS	Eastside	Construct new 4-lane arterial

Table E-4
2015 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY

FACILITY	SEGMENT		IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION	SCENARIO			
	From	To		Financially Unconstrained	Financially Constrained	Fort Ord Source Only	Impact Study Area Source Only
2nd Avenue	Del Monte	12th	Construct as 4-lane arterial
	12th	Lightfighter	Widen from 2 to 4-lane arterial
North-South Road	Normandy	Coe	Widen to 4 lanes
	Coe	Broadway	Reconstruct as 2-lane arterial
	Broadway	Highway 218	Reconstruct to 2-lane arterial
California	3rd	8th Street	Construct 2-lane arterial
Eastside Road	Imjin	Inter-garrison	Construct 2-lane arterial
	Inter-garrison	Gigling	Construct 2-lane arterial
Airport/MBEST Loop Road			Construct 2-lane collector
Misc Rehab/Safety & Minor Street Improvements			
Transit Capital Improvements							
Multimodal Rail	Salinas	Highway 1	Construct Heavy Rail Link - Post-2015 Reserve ROW within Fort Ord
Fleet Purchase and Replacement			Vehicles to serve new development (30) Replacements for existing fleet
Intermodal Centers			Construct center for bus and future rail
			P'n'R lot - 12th/Imjin
			P'n'R lot - 8th/Gigling
On-Site Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements							
			Include sidewalks on all reconstructed or new roadways
			Include bike paths on all reconstructed or new arterial roadways

**Table E-5
OFF-SITE REGIONAL FACILITIES LOS SUMMARY**

Roadway	Segment	Daily Volume/LOS		
		Existing (1993/94) Condition	Financially Constrained	Financially Unconstrained
State Highway 1	State Highway 68 to Del Monte Blvd (Seaside)	56,000/D	65,000/E	65,000/E
	Del Monte Blvd (Seaside) to State Highway 218	60,000/D	72,200/F	71,900/D
	State Highway 218 to Fremont Blvd	59,000/D	87,500/F	89,000/D
	Fremont Blvd to Main Gate	75,000/D	101,200/E	99,700/E
	Main Gate to 12th Street	65,000/C	80,200/D	79,700/D
	12th Street to S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd)	71,000/C	75,100/D	75,600/D
	S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd) to Reservation Road	35,500/C	48,400/D	48,900/D
	Reservation Road to N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd)	35,500/C	47,400/C	47,600/C
	N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd) to State Highway 156	37,500/C	53,800/D	52,800/D
State Highway 156 to Santa Cruz County line	30,000/E	60,200/F	70,700/F	
State Highway 68	State Highway 1 to State Highway 218	22,800/F	36,300/F	38,700/C
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio Road (Highway)	20,600/F	30,200/F	10,000/B
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio (Freeway Bypass)	N/A	N/A	21,900/B
	San Benancio Road to Reservation Road	25,000/B	36,000/C	34,600/C
	Reservation Road to E. Blanco Road	29,500/B	43,900/C	42,500/C
State Highway 156	Hwy 1 to 0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd.	22,000/B	35,600/C	30,900/B
	0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd. to US 101	25,000/E	26,500/E	35,500/C
State Highway 183	US 101 to Davis Road	29,500/E	37,900/F	38,900/F
	Davis Road to Espinosa Road	16,000/C	32,900/F	30,700/B
	Espinosa Road to State Highway 156	22,000/D	53,300/F	50,900/D
State Highway 218	State Highway 1 to Fremont Boulevard	14,000/D	19,700/D	22,600/D
	Fremont Boulevard to North-South Road	10,850/B	10,900/B	12,200/C
	North-South Road to Hwy 68	10,850/B	16,500/B	17,800/B

Table E-5 OFF-SITE REGIONAL FACILITIES LOS SUMMARY				
Roadway	Segment	Daily Volume/LOS		
		Existing (1993/94) Condition	Financially Constrained	Financially Unconstrained
Del Monte Boulevard	El Estero to Highway 1	34,300/F	50,000/F	49,300/D
	State Highway 1 to Broadway Ave	27,026/D	29,500/D	29,400/D
	Broadway Ave to Fremont Blvd	9,757/C	9,400/C	10,000/C
	State Highway 1 (S. Marina) to Reservation Road	28,836/D	29,700/D	29,600/D
	Reservation Road to State Highway 1 (N. Marina)	4,825/A	10,800/B	9,800/B
Fremont Blvd	State Highway 1/State Highway 68 to Broadway Ave	25,166/D	27,200/D	27,500/D
	Broadway Ave to State Highway 1	16,363/C	31,300/F	28,200/D
Broadway Avenue	Del Monte Blvd to Noche Buena Street	13,895/C	16,800/C	16,800/C
	Noche Buena Street to North-South Road	8,742/C	15,100/C	15,000/C
Reservation Road	Hwy 1 to Del Monte Boulevard	10,205/B	14,800/D	14,800/D
	Del Monte Boulevard to Crescent Ave	26,046/E	31,600/D	30,000/D
	Crescent Ave to Imjin Road	22,874/B	32,300/D	32,300/D
	Imjin Road to Blanco Road	N/A	47,500/D	29,700/C
	Blanco Road to Inter-garrison Road	3,700/A	22,700/B	15,600/B
	Intergarrison Road to Davis Road	4,700/A	24,200/E	16,000/C
Blanco Rd	Davis Road to State Highway 68	6,200/A	9,600/B	12,100/B
	Reservation Road to Davis Road	20,252/E	18,300/D	35,700/C
Blanco Rd/ Sanborn Rd	Davis Road to State Highway 68	18,836/B	18,400/B	23,700/B
	State Highway 68 to US 101	26,600/C	31,100/C	30,700/D
Davis Road	Reservation Road to Blanco Road	7,500/A	23,800/E	15,700/C
	Blanco Road to Rossi Street (Hwy 183)	24,000/E	29,000/E	26,300/B
	Rossi Street (Hwy 183) to US 101	34,829/F	35,900/F	38,300/B

REG-511687unrep16ic-57

**Table E-6
FORT ORD ARTERIAL FACILITIES SUMMARY**

Roadway	Segment	Daily Volume/LOS	
		Financially Constrained	Financially Unconstrained
12th/Imjin	State Highway 1 to California Avenue	20,800/D	19,900/D
	California Avenue to Eastside Road	12,800/B	12,500/B
	Eastside Road to Reservation Road	19,400/B	7,400/B
Blanco/Imjin Connector	Eastside to Reservation	N/A	10,800/B
8th Street	State Highway 1 Overpass to 2nd Avenue	300/C	300/C
	2nd Avenue to Inter-garrison	2,800/C	2,500/C
Inter-garrison Road	8th Street to Gigling Connector	3,500/B	3,000/B
	Gigling Connector to Reservation Road	13,100/C	7,400/A
Lightfighter	State Highway 1 to North-South Road	24,400/D	23,500/D
Gigling	North-South Road to Eastside	16,900/B	15,200/B
2nd Avenue	Del Monte Blvd to 12th Street	3,900/C	3,900/C
	12th Street to Lightfighter	12,100/D	11,800/D
North-South Road	Lightfighter to Gigling	19,700/D	18,400/D
	Gigling to Coe/Eucalyptus	16,900/B	16,200/B
	Coe to Broadway	15,500/E	14,900/D
	Broadway to State Highway 218	5,500/A	5,400/A
California Avenue	Reservation Road to 12th Street	9,600/D	13,200/D
	12th Street to 8th Street	1,700/D	2,100/D
Eastside Road	Imjin to Gigling	9,900/B	12,100/C

\\j\cd\50068\1\inrep\tblE-6\

Financially Constrained: This scenario is consistent with the EIR for the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan. Transportation projects included in this model run reflect currently committed funds, plus limited funds generated from a flexible development-related financing program implemented on former Fort Ord. The Fort Ord financing program is defined to fund only projects within Fort Ord and those directly adjacent to the base and where improvements are needed primarily as a result of base reuse. The following roadway sections are expected to exceed the LOS=E threshold by 2015 under this funding scenario:

- ▶ Highway 1 north of Castroville
- ▶ Highway 1 from Highway 68 to Fort Ord Main Gate Entrance
- ▶ Highway 68
- ▶ Highway 156
- ▶ Highway 183
- ▶ Del Monte Avenue
- ▶ Fremont Boulevard in Seaside
- ▶ Reservation Road adjacent to former Fort Ord
- ▶ Davis Road adjacent to former Fort Ord
- ▶ Davis Road in Salinas
- ▶ North-South Road in former Fort Ord

Fort Ord Source Only: This scenario was not included in the EIR and assumes Fort Ord generated funding to the level indicated in the Fort Ord PFIP. The proposed fee equates to an \$8,199 per EDU (source: draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan PFIP). The regional improvements added in this scenario are those deemed most important to base reuse and include Highway 156 upgrade; widening of Blanco Road and Reservation; a new bridge on Davis; and the extension of California Avenue. Under this scenario, it can be expected that the service levels on these improved roadway segments would be higher than those found under the Financially Constrained scenario. Additionally, these facilities would likely attract trips from other unimproved and congested routes. The net result being the potential for reduced congestion on some unimproved routes. For example, Highway 68 is likely to benefit from the improvements to Blanco, Davis and Reservation. However, in this case, it is still likely to operate at LOS F. Other poorly operating road segments where no direct or parallel route improvements are made, including Highways 1 and 183, would be expected to remain at LOS F as forecast under the Financially Constrained scenario.

Financially Unconstrained: This scenario is generally consistent with the *Optimistic Financing Scenario* reported in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan and EIR. Transportation projects included in this model run reflect a goal to achieve acceptable LOS in the year 2015 on all roads impacted by Fort Ord Reuse. However, the Financially Unconstrained scenario used in the TAMC Study includes the following two projects that were not included in the costs reported in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan: 1) widening of Highway 1 between Highway 68 and Fremont Boulevard interchange

in Seaside, and 2) widening of Davis Road in Salinas. The following roadway sections are expected to exceed the LOS=E threshold by 2015 under this funding scenario²:

- ▶ State Highway 1 north of Castroville
- ▶ State Highway 183

TRANSIT/RAIL USE

The reuse of Fort Ord will place increased demands on the internal and regional transportation systems. Mass transit (rail/transit) will play a vital role in meeting these demands, both as a primary mode of travel for those without access to autos (transit dependent), and as an alternative to the auto travel for those that have a choice (discretionary travelers). From a regional perspective, transit may help accommodate travel and minimize congestion pressures along key regional roadway corridors leading to and around Fort Ord.

Land use and urban form are important factors contributing to the design and effectiveness of transit service. In general, transit is most effective in urban settings where densities are higher, and where development occurs along a corridor. With its large area and low population, Monterey County is largely rural in character. According to the land use data reported above, current densities in the Peninsula and Salinas areas are low to moderate for urban settings and may be typical of a suburban location outside a major metropolitan center, although there are areas of concentrated housing and employment development. These densities, however, are expected to increase significantly by the year 2015, up to 40% on average in Salinas.

Based on the MCTAM results and the land use characteristics for each Fort Ord Analysis District, the primary inter-regional travel corridors are defined as:

- ▶ Fort Ord-Marina,
- ▶ Fort Ord-Salinas (Blanco, Davis, and Reservation Roads), and
- ▶ Fort Ord-Seaside-Monterey Peninsula (Highway 1, Broadway, and Del Monte Boulevard).

These corridors represent prime candidates for high-quality transit service. The above assessment indicates that the Fort Ord districts with the highest transit potential are the Airport/MBEST and Central Core/CSUMB districts. Proposed development densities and levels of activity are highest in these districts. The Northern Residential district may also be a key transit area because it lies between these two districts, and thus could be served by a transit route connecting MBEST and CSUMB. The Southern Residential district, although generating a higher number of trips than the Northern Residential district, may have only moderate potential due to its lower densities and higher-priced housing stock.

²The draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR indicates Davis Road in Salinas and sections of State Highway 1 between Highway 68 and Fort Ord Main Gate Entrance are expected to exceed LOS=E conditions under the Financially Optimistic Scenario.

Bus transit service typically sustains relatively higher operation and maintenance costs than does rail. However, rail service requires relatively higher capital costs compared to equivalent bus service. Ridership on rail lines must be relatively high before the capital costs are justified, and it becomes a more cost effective service than bus service. Rail is thought to be a feasible alternative once the bus headways on a given route or along a corridor approach 4 trips per hour.

Based on the previous information, Highway 1 between Monterey and Fort Ord is a candidate corridor for rail service. If rail is implemented between Monterey and Fort Ord, bus routes along this corridor could be realigned to serve as feeder lines to the rail stops. The proposed rail line along this corridor could potentially eliminate or delay the need to widen Highway 1 between Highway 68 and Marina. TAMC has a long term goal for rail service connecting Salinas, Fort Ord and Monterey. A crucial part of this plan is the implementation of rail service between Monterey and Fort Ord. Rail service to Fort Ord may initially terminate at CSUMB and eventually extend to the MBEST Center. Rail connection from MBEST to Salinas is expected to be a viable alternative to widening Blanco Road beyond the 4-lane expansion called for in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan by the Year 2015.

PROPOSED REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The proposed regional transportation system generally reflects the Financially Unconstrained Scenario explained in the previous section of this report. The proposed 2015 transportation network is illustrated in Figure E-3, and the bicycle network is illustrated in Figure E-4. In addition to the roadway improvements described previously, the proposed transportation includes several transit-related improvements. Proposed improvements include the construction of three intermodal centers within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord, and the expansion of bus service to accommodate the demand generated by projected growth in Fort Ord and the surrounding region. However, this system reflects a worst case scenario in terms of cost because it assumes historical use of alternative modes of transportation. Transit and rail service is expected to reduce the number and cost of the proposed roadway projects.

The estimated costs for the individual roadway and transit capital improvements are listed in Table E-7. It must be recognized that this table does not include all potential transportation projects within the region through the year 2015. It includes only major improvements to the regional system and those within the former Fort Ord.




Figure E-3
Financially Unconstrained Scenario — 2015 Transportation Network




Figure E-4
Proposed Bicycle Network

EDAW, Inc. March, 1996

Source: JHK, 1996

Table E-7
2015 FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY
PRELIMINARY NEXUS ANALYSIS RESULTS

FACILITY	ESTIMATED COST	DEDICATED/EXPECTED FUNDING (1)		UNFUNDED COST ALLOCATION(2)		
		Amount	Source	Fort Ord Development	Impact Study Area Development	PUBLIC(3)
Regional Highway Projects						
Highway 1 - Hatton Canyon	\$36,000,000	\$36,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	\$0
Highway 1 - North of Castroville	\$60,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$60,000,000
Highway 1 - Seaside/Sand City	\$20,000,000	\$0		\$6,400,000	\$13,600,000	\$0
U.S. 101 - Prunedale By-Pass	\$236,000,000	\$107,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	\$129,000,000
U.S. 101 Interchanges	\$63,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$63,000,000
Highway 68 - Bypass Freeway	\$177,000,000	\$0		\$18,054,000	\$138,768,000	\$20,178,000
Highway 156 Widening	\$50,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$50,000,000
Highway 183 Widening	\$59,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$56,050,000	\$2,950,000
Highway 218 - North-South to Hwy 68	\$3,590,000	\$0		\$1,629,860	\$1,960,140	\$0
Expected STIP County Minimum Funds (4)	\$0	\$56,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	(\$56,000,000)
SUBTOTAL	\$704,590,000	\$199,000,000		\$26,083,860	\$210,378,140	\$269,128,000
Off-Site Arterial Improvements						
Davis Road - Widening w/o Blanco	\$10,000,000	\$0		\$5,570,000	\$3,720,000	\$710,000
Davis Road - New bridge	\$5,000,000	\$0		\$2,030,000	\$2,970,000	\$0
Blanco Road - Widening and bridge	\$12,378,000	\$0		\$6,337,536	\$5,520,588	\$519,876
Reservation Road - Widening	\$12,664,400	\$0		\$9,068,973	\$3,431,417	\$164,010
Del Monte - Seaside/Monterey	\$10,000,000	\$0		\$3,420,000	\$3,460,000	\$3,120,000
Del Monte - Marina	\$5,576,300	\$0		\$4,488,922	\$1,087,379	\$0
California	\$2,460,000	\$0		\$697,500	\$1,162,500	\$600,000
Crescent	\$720,000	\$0		\$720,000	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$58,798,700	\$0		\$32,332,931	\$21,351,884	\$5,113,886
On-Site Improvements						
Gateway and Misc Safety Improvements/Rehab	\$20,300,364	\$9,780,000	IDCAG	\$10,520,364	\$0	\$0
Abrams	\$603,000	\$0		\$603,000	\$0	\$0
12th/Imjin	\$9,065,000	\$0		\$4,532,500	\$4,532,500	\$0
Blanco/Imjin Connector	\$4,080,000	\$0		\$4,080,000	\$0	\$0
8th Street	\$3,821,900	\$0		\$3,248,615	\$573,285	\$0
Inter-Garnson	\$4,480,000	\$0		\$3,808,000	\$672,000	\$0
Gigling	\$4,537,800	\$0		\$3,221,838	\$1,315,962	\$0
2nd Avenue	\$7,232,500	\$0		\$5,398,068	\$1,834,432	\$0
North-South Road	\$6,160,600	\$0		\$3,326,724	\$2,833,876	\$0
California	\$2,769,200	\$0		\$1,038,450	\$1,730,750	\$0
Salinas Ave	\$2,412,000	\$0		\$2,412,000	\$0	\$0
Eucalyptus Road	\$2,880,000	\$0		\$2,880,000	\$0	\$0
Eastside Road	\$6,020,000	\$0		\$4,358,480	\$1,661,520	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$74,362,364	\$9,780,000		\$49,428,039	\$15,154,325	\$0
Transit Capital Improvements						
Transit Vehicle Purchase & Replacement	\$15,000,000	\$0		\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
Intermodal Centers	\$3,800,000	\$0		\$3,800,000	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$18,800,000	\$0		\$8,800,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS/SHARES	\$856,551,064	\$208,780,000		\$116,644,830	\$251,884,349	\$279,241,886

U:\50066\transp\table-7.xls

- (1) Includes \$56 million in expected STIP funds not yet allocated. Does not include traffic impact fees already collected that may be used for some of these projects.
- (2) Allocation of costs based on a "Nexus" assessment of individual improvements. Fort Ord and Impact Study Area Development shares based on relative contribution to traffic volume growth on subject facility.
- (3) "Public" includes share for existing congestion and portion of traffic growth attributable to trips outside the study area. (Note: in some instances where the percentage of trips with one or both ends are external to Fort Ord and the study area is significant, the Nexus requirement cannot be met and the full cost must be covered by non-development sources.)
- (4) Assume that STIP County Minimum funds will be allocated to highway improvements. Specific projects not yet specified.

To support the possible implementation of a development-related financing mechanism, a preliminary nexus analysis of the proposed improvements was conducted. The purpose of this analysis was to identify the "fair share" of each proposed improvement that could be allocated to future development. As part of this process, dedicated or expected funding for each improvement was identified, and the remaining balance distributed between Fort Ord development, non-Fort Ord development and public shares. These shares were determined based upon the projected relative contribution to the demand for an improvement. The preliminary nature of this analysis is reflected in the use of only two "zones" for the nexus determination - inside the boundaries of Fort Ord versus outside (see Figure E-5). Prior to the implementation of a development-related financing mechanism, a more detailed nexus analysis involving multiple zones outside Fort Ord would likely be required. The results of the preliminary nexus analysis for individual capital projects are presented in Table E-7. A summary of these results is presented below:

Costs of Proposed Transportation System:

▶ Existing funds (\$143 + \$56 M from STIP; \$9.8 M from DCAG):	\$209 million (24%)
▶ Unfunded On-Base transportation capital ³ improvements:	\$73 million (9%)
▶ <u>Unfunded Off-Base transportation capital⁴ improvements:</u>	<u>\$574 million (67%)</u>
▶ Total Cost of Proposed Transportation Capital Improvements:	\$856 million (100%)


Funds Expected to be Generated From Revenue Sources:

▶ Existing funds (\$143 + \$56 M from STIP; \$10 M from DCAG):	\$209 million (24%)
▶ Ford Ord Development:	\$116 million (14%)
▶ Study Area Development (Cities/County Outside of Fort Ord):	\$252 million (29%)
▶ <u>Unfunded (additional Fed/State funds or sales tax):</u>	<u>\$279 million (33%)</u>
▶ Total:	\$856 million (100%)

In order to implement a successful transit service, operation and maintenance costs must be included in the financing discussions. The estimated cost to implement adequate transit service to former Fort Ord and other proposed growth throughout the region is listed in Table E-8. In terms of cost breakdown over the next 20 years, the capital costs for regional improvements to the transit system are expected to exceed \$18 million, while the incremental 20-year operations and maintenance costs are estimated to equal \$112 million (or \$5.6 million per year). Capital improvements represent 14 percent of the anticipated transit improvement costs, while operation and maintenance will represent 86 percent of the costs to provide the proposed transit service.

³Includes purchase of 15 new busses to serve Fort Ord over 20 years, but does not include operations & maintenance costs to run busses.

⁴Includes purchase of 15 new busses to serve regional development over 20 years, but does not include operations & maintenance costs to run busses.



LEGEND	
	U.S. Highway
	State Highways

Figure E-5
Impact Study Area

50068 TAMC Impact Study

Table E-8
2015 FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY

Improvement Description		Estimated Cost
Capital Costs		
Vehicle Purchase and Replacement	Vehicles to Serve New Development	\$10,000,000
	Replacement Vehicles	\$5,000,000
Intermodal Centers	Construct Bus/rail Center on Fort Ord	\$1,800,000
	Construct Park and Ride Lot North of CSUMB	\$900,000
	Construct Park and Ride Lot South of CSUMB	\$1,100,000
Capital Cost Subtotal		\$18,800,000
Operational Costs		
Expand Transit service within Former Fort Ord		\$56,000,000
Expand Regional Transit Service		\$56,000,000
Operational Cost Subtotal		\$112,000,000
TOTAL TRANSIT COSTS		\$130,800,000

The capital costs for the proposed regional transit service listed in Table E-8 were included in the nexus analysis. It is the consultant's opinion that operating and maintenance funds for public mass transit systems should rely on a funding mechanism other than development impact fees. In general this conclusion was reached because the nexus test is difficult to defend for transit projects.

As the cost and expected funding assessments indicate, there is a potential \$724 million (including a \$76 million shortfall for transit operations) funding shortfall for the set of transportation system improvements identified in this study; a number that does not include minor improvements to the regional system nor local improvement projects. Options for filling this shortfall include securing additional funds from traditional federal and state programs, or establishing new revenue-generating mechanisms. Potential new funding programs include local-option taxes, development-related financing, and tax increment financing.

In trying to match the identified funding sources with the suggested improvements, there are two facts that are important to consider. First, some sources, both existing and potential, are constrained with respect to the types of projects that may be funded from that source. For example, funds from sources may only be used for roadway capital projects, while those from other sources may only be used for transit operational expenditures. Second, development-related financing, identified as a likely potential source of funding, is limited in the amount or share of

a project's cost that it may cover. Development-related financing typically may only be used to cover that portion or share of a project's costs consistent with the share of a project's need attributed to that development. Additionally, development-related financing cannot be used when a large percentage of new trips start or end outside the assessment area and, therefore, would not be charged. Thus, improvements to major facilities serving a high percentage of inter-regional trips cannot be included in a development-related fee program. These constraints greatly impact the amount that can be generated through such programs, and how the funds may be used.

Knowledge of these limitations or constraints, combined with the cost allocation and nexus analysis presented previously, may be used to identify potential funding sources or strategies for the transportation system presented in this report. Consistent with these limitations, the potential funding strategies may be differentiated according to the type of improvement: roadway capital, transit capital, and transit operational. A summary of the potential funding strategies is provided in Table E-9. In reviewing these strategies, it must be recognized that the intent of this study was to identify the funding needs and options. The implementation of any potential financing program is beyond the scope of this study

(j:\ncdfile\project\50068\prod\inrep\exec.w51)

Table E-9
POTENTIAL FUNDING STRATEGIES

Improvement Type	Costs/ Expected Funding	Unfunded Share/Potential Funding Level		
		Public	Fort Ord Development	Other Development
ROADWAY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS Total Estimated Costs <u>\$209 million</u> Funds from Expected Sources Shortfall Potential Funding Sources/Strategies: Increased federal/state funding (Demonstration funds, STIP) Local option Tax Development-related Financing Program Tax Increment Financing	\$838 million <u>\$209 million</u> \$629 million	 \$274 million ✓ ✓	 \$108 million ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	 \$247 million ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS Total Estimated Costs <u>\$0</u> Funds from Expected Sources Shortfall Potential Funding Sources/Strategies: Increased federal/state funding (Section 3, TCI, TDA) Local option Tax Development-related Financing Program Tax Increment Financing	\$19 million <u>\$0</u> \$19 million	 \$5 million ✓ ✓	 \$9 million ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	 \$5 million ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
TRANSIT OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS Total Estimated Costs <u>\$36.1 million</u> Funds from Expected Sources Shortfall Potential Funding Sources/Strategies: Increased federal/state funding (FTA Section 9, LTF, TDA) Local option Tax	\$112 million <u>\$36.1 million</u> \$75.9 million	 \$0 ✓ ✓	 \$38.5 million ✓ ✓	 \$37.5 million ✓ ✓

(j:\cd\proj\500687\inr\rep\161E-9)

1. INTRODUCTION

This report represents the Draft Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study being conducted for the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC). The purpose of this study was to define the transportation system needs within the northern portion of Monterey County, and to identify feasible funding sources. The study considered regional growth through the Year 2015 defined by the AMBAG 1994 Regional Population and Employment Forecast, which is consistent with the current draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan. In particular, this study focused on the portions of the regional system most impacted by the reuse of Fort Ord.

The Regional Transportation Study followed the development of the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan for the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA). This sequencing was necessary because the land use element of the draft Reuse Plan was a critical input to this transportation planning study. It should be noted, however, that the transportation analysis was conducted concurrently for both studies, to the extent possible. This ensured a maximum level of consistency in the assumptions and results used in both efforts. A difference between the studies was that the draft Reuse Plan focused on the transportation needs within the former Fort Ord, whereas the Regional Transportation Study focused on the regional system outside of the fort's boundaries. Furthermore, the Regional Transportation Study reflects the evolution of the regional transportation plan that has occurred, in part, in response to the comments received on the draft Reuse Plan.

At its peak, Fort Ord was home to 17,700 military personnel and employed 2,700 civilians from the neighboring communities. Access to the base was limited to a small number of gates, and the internal road system was a collage of roadways and parking facilities scattered about to serve the Army's unique needs. The proposed reuse plan for the former Fort Ord includes approximately 45,000 jobs and over 22,000 housing units at buildout, as well as a 25,000-student California State University at Monterey Bay (CSUMB) campus. By the year 2015, 18,000 jobs, 13,000 housing units, and 12,500 CSUMB students are expected to occupy the former Fort Ord area.

It is clear that the redevelopment of the former Fort Ord, combined with growth throughout the remainder of Monterey County and the region, will significantly increase the demand placed on the region's transportation infrastructure and services. These increases in travel demand may be managed by building or improving transportation facilities, as well as through a variety of concepts and strategies intended to minimize the demand for vehicle trips as an alternative to increasing roadway capacity. This multi-strategy approach is reflected in both the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan and this study. The resulting transportation plan is comprised of several key elements: increasing capacity on existing and new roadway facilities, enhancements to the regional transit/rail system, development of an extensive on-base bicycle and pedestrian network, and a demand management program. Furthermore, the draft Reuse Plan incorporates several land-use-related concepts that are intended to minimize the transportation impacts of base reuse. The approach taken seeks to balance these components to achieve a transportation system that is both financially feasible and operationally acceptable.

The plan presented in this paper expands on the results from the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan, and focuses on the regional roadway network for the year 2015. This forecast year was chosen because it represents the latest year for which regional land use data and network forecasts are available. These forecasts, along with similar information for the former Fort Ord, were used to model travel demand for 2015 and estimate performance levels of the regional network. This plan includes an overview of the key links in the transportation network and the improvements needed to meet the forecasted demands. This plan also examines the implications of the uncertainty in the funding of transportation improvements.

The findings, results and recommendations presented in this report are derived from a series of working papers prepared for this study. These papers included:

- #1: Literature Review and Study Database
- #2: Funding Sources Available for Transportation Projects
- #3: Roadway Transportation Plan for Year 2015
- #4: Public Transportation Issues

Presentations were made on these working papers to the TAMC Board, TAMC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), TAMC Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC), FORA Infrastructure TAC, and FORA Administrative Committee. These documents are available for public review at the TAMC office. This report pulls together information from these working papers, and reflects revisions made in response to the comments received.

The following chapter provides a summary of previous Fort Ord planning activities and describes the relationship between the current FORA draft Reuse Plan and TAMC Transportation Study efforts. Chapter 3 provides background information on the current socio-economic and transportation setting, as well as on the projected socio-economic changes for the year 2015. The relationship between land use and transportation is also discussed, including the land use element of the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The preferred transportation plan is described in Chapter 6, while the financing requirements for this plan are discussed in Chapter 7. Issues requiring further discussion or study are presented in Chapter 8.

(50068/prod/finrep/chap1.d2)

2. FORT ORD PLANNING PROCESS

The current TAMC Study builds upon previous work conducted as part of the closure and reuse of former Fort Ord. A number of efforts have been undertaken by a variety of parties, including community groups, local jurisdictions and the U.S. Army. This chapter provides an overview of the recent planning efforts for Fort Ord, with an emphasis on transportation.

2.1 PAST ACTIVITIES

Plans for the closure of Fort Ord were first announced in January 1990. In response, a community task force composed of county supervisors, mayors, and community members with special knowledge of the area was appointed to review the recommendations. The task force, led by retired General James Moore, produced a sixty-page report on March 23, 1990, recommending against closure of the base. Later in 1990, the Base Closure Commission was established by Congress to review the Department of Defense recommendations for base closures. In April 1991, the Commission recommended over 100 bases across the country be closed and Fort Ord was again included among those bases. The original task force that had been appointed to review the base closure recommendation was reorganized into seven advisory groups to cover the following topics:

- Land Use
- Economic Development
- Education
- Housing
- Health and Human Services
- Utilities and Infrastructure
- Pollution Cleanup

The work by these subgroups culminated in a publication of a 760-page *Fort Ord Community Task Force Strategy Report* in June 1992.

On October 1, 1992, the Fort Ord Reuse Group (FORG) was formed, composed of the cities of Marina, Seaside, Del Rey Oaks, Sand City, and Monterey, and Monterey County. A working group was organized consisting of the planners of the represented jurisdictions with the charge to formulate the initial base reuse plan and ultimately a final plan. The initial base reuse plan was approved by all of the jurisdictions in April 1993 and became the basis for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared by the U.S. Army and completed in July 1993. After completion of the EIS by the Army, FORG prepared a revised reuse plan that was completed in October 1993.

One of the significant activities of FORG was the preparation of an evaluation of the infrastructure needs that matched the base reuse plan that was emerging. In October 1993, the Fort Ord Reuse Infrastructure Study (FORIS) was initiated. The study resulted in the FORIS report (Reimer Associates, September 1994). Included within the scope of the FORIS was


evaluation of the transportation infrastructure needs of the reuse plan. The transportation plan was developed by CCS Planning and Engineering, Inc. (CCS Planning, June 1994) with supporting engineering analysis and documentation by HMM, Inc. (HMM, Inc., 1993, February 1994, and May 1994). Six major transportation alternatives were evaluated in the CCS study, and a recommended highway network was identified. The ultimate roadway network proposed in the FORIS is illustrated in Figure 2-1.

Because of limited funding and the limited capabilities of the special travel demand model runs, no evaluation of transit or demand management alternatives were included in the FORIS transportation analysis. However, the networks presented in this study did include a fixed guideway to link the reuse area and Salinas. Two alignment options are shown in each roadway network map: Blanco-Imjin and Davis-Inter-garrison-Gigling. No discussion of this fixed guideway service are provided in the FORIS report.

In a parallel effort, TAMC initiated an effort to identify and design a multimodal corridor to link the Fort Ord reuse area with U.S. 101. The study, begun in February 1993, was completed in July 1993 (Wilbur Smith and Associates, July 1993). Five major corridors were evaluated in the study. The study included alternative routings for a Westside Bypass of the City of Salinas and alternative routings from the south end of Salinas into and through the reuse area. The study identified Blanco/Gigling and Blanco/Imjin corridors as having the highest ranking with no fatal flaws. The study's authors found that it was impossible to clearly identify a preferred alternative between these two without a final land use plan. They also could not produce a final recommendation for alignment of the Westside Bypass on the basis of information available at the time of the study.

Both the TAMC and FORG studies documented a significant deficiency in the existing roadway network of the county for providing access to the reuse area. Wilbur Smith & Associates states:

There is unacceptable congestion today on most roads serving northern Monterey County travel demand. Highways 1, 101 and 183 operate at level-of-service (LOS) D, Highway 68 at level-of-service E, and Highway 156 at level-of-service F. Interchanges and intersections on these roads operate at even lower levels of service. Local roads such as Blanco, Davis, and Reservation Roads are convenient local routes between Highways 1 and 101, and some sections of these routes operate at LOS F today. (page ES-3ff)



LEGEND	
	Freeway
	Expressway
	6-Lane Arterial
	Fixed Guideway
	Interchange
	Major Intersection

Source: CCS Planning & Engineering Inc.
Transportation Planning Study, June 4, 1994, part of the
Fort Ord Reuse Infrastructure Master Plan Working Paper
prepared by Reimer and Associates, September 1994

Figure 2-1
FORIS Proposed Ultimate Roadway Network

2.2 CURRENT ACTIVITIES

In May 1994, the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) was established as a successor to FORG in response to state legislation sponsored by Senator Henry Mello. FORA was charged with the responsibility to prepare, adopt, finance, and implement a plan for the land occupied by Fort Ord. The FORA Act authorized the FORA Board to prepare and adopt a Reuse Plan for the former Fort Ord. Key elements of the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan include land use, transportation, conservation, recreation, and a five-year capital improvement program. In May 1995, work on the draft Reuse Plan began using the FORG-initiated Interim Base Reuse Plan as a foundation. This effort has led to the development of an updated plan that has been documented in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan (May 1996) and Environmental Impact Report (May 1996). Both the Plan and EIR have been distributed and are undergoing public review. As described in the introduction of this report, the Regional Transportation Study expands on the results from the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

The planning process for these two studies involved a number of key steps. First, as part of the draft Reuse Plan activity, a number of land use and design characteristics were incorporated into the draft Reuse Plan with the goal of reducing demand placed on regional transportation system. The demand generated by the resulting land use plan was then modelled to identify needs and improvements based on existing mode choice levels. This analysis formed the basis for both studies.

While consistency in the transportation analysis was emphasized, differences in the two studies must be recognized. The first, affecting primarily format rather than content, is that the draft Reuse Plan focused on the transportation needs within the former Fort Ord, whereas the Transportation Study focuses on the regional system outside of the fort's boundaries. Second, the Transportation Study includes a more detailed examination of where transit might be most effective and how it might eliminate or delay the need for roadway improvements. Third, the Transportation Study reflects the evolution of the regional transportation plan that has occurred, in part, in response to the comments received on the draft Reuse Plan and the working papers that preceded this report.

(50068/prod/finrep/chap2.d2)

3. SETTING

The primary goal of this study was to identify a set of transportation improvements and strategies that would help accommodate future travel demand in the most efficient and effective manner. To accomplish this goal it, is important to have an understanding of the existing transportation system and its operating condition. It is equally important to understand the socio-economic characteristics that drive travel demand, both currently and the future. In addition to these topics, this chapter addresses the transportation-land use connection, with particular emphasis on how these concepts were incorporated into the land use element of the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

3.1 EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Accessibility and mobility in the region depend primarily upon a system of regionally significant roadways and transit services. This system, along with an internal network that includes bicycle and pedestrian facilities, is critical to the reuse of Fort Ord. Figure 3-1 illustrates the primary existing roadway facilities within Fort Ord, as well as the elements of the regional roadway network considered most relevant to Fort Ord. This regional network includes state highways and major arterial roads that serve intra- and inter-regional travel needs of the former Fort Ord and northern Monterey County. Key features of the existing roadway, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle networks are described below.

3.1.1 Internal Roadway Network

The existing road system is a collage of roadways and parking facilities scattered about to serve the Army's unique needs. This roadway network consists of a mix of arterial and local roads that generally fall into one of four types: 2-lane Rural Local, Residential Local, Urban Arterial and Rural Arterial. The 2-lane rural roads primarily serve the artillery ranges and remote areas of the Base. These roads are paved but not engineered to any specific standard. The residential streets serve permanent housing areas as well as several mobile home park facilities such as Marshall Park Family Housing and Patton Park Family Housing. Urban arterials are multi-lane facilities having curbs and, in some cases, sidewalks and a median. Rural arterials have no curbs, sidewalks, or medians.

The current road system was developed by the Army as the base expanded over the past fifty years. In many instances, the land use patterns created by the Army do not produce the same types of traffic patterns as those that might be found in a civilian urban population. Thus, the existing roadway network is, in some cases, not compatible with the proposed civilian land uses.




Figure 3-1
Existing Transportation Network

In other cases, however, existing roadways provide the foundation for planning the future network within the reuse area. The key existing arterial roadways within Fort Ord include 2nd Avenue, Light Fighter Drive, Gigling Road, Imjin Road, Inter-garrison Road, North-South Road, and 12th Street.

Another important characteristic of the internal network is its connectivity with the regional system. As a military installation, access into Fort Ord was limited to a small number of entry gate locations. Since the closure of the base, many of the gates have remained closed, further limiting access into the Fort Ord area. As the transition to civilian use has begun, some of the gates have been reopened. The gates that are most relevant to the reuse of the former Fort Ord include those on Lightfighter Drive (Main Gate), 12th Street, Imjin Road, Inter-garrison Road (East Garrison), North-South Road north of Highway 218, Broadway Avenue, and Ord Avenue.

3.1.2 Regional Roadway Network

For this study, the regional network is comprised of all major arterials and state facilities included in the CMP network in the vicinity of the Fort Ord area. This network is vital to the area's mobility and serves both intra- and inter-regional travel. State Highway 68 runs along the south and east sides of the base connecting Salinas with the Monterey Peninsula. Reservation Road extends through the base on the north between Marina and East Garrison. Blanco and Davis Roads intersect Reservation Road, providing connections to Salinas. Entrances to Fort Ord are provided off of Highway 1 and Reservation Road, as well as Fremont, Broadway, and State Highway 218. The major regional roadways within the impact study area are summarized below.

State Highway 1 - State Highway 1 is a major north-south roadway that roughly follows the Pacific Coast from Northern California to Los Angeles and points south. The roadway is aligned immediately to the west of Fort Ord, providing access to Watsonville and Santa Cruz (to the north) and Monterey and Carmel (to the south). State Highway 1 is a limited access (freeway) facility from Castroville to just north of Carmel. In the project vicinity, there are freeway interchanges at Reservation Road, Del Monte Boulevard, 1st Ave (12th Street Gate), Light Fighter Drive (Main Gate), and Fremont Boulevard in Seaside. The primary entrances to Fort Ord are accessed from State Highway 1.

State Highway 68 - Within the study area, State Highway 68 is aligned to the south and east of Fort Ord, from State Highway 1 to Salinas. State Highway 68 primarily provides access from Salinas to Monterey and areas south of Seaside. Further to the south, State Highway 68 extends west of State Highway 1 into Pacific Grove and is known as Holman Highway.

State Highway 156 - State Highway 156 links State Highway 1 (north of Marina) with U.S. 101 to the northeast.

State Highway 183 - State Highway 183 is aligned roughly east-west to the north of Fort Ord.

State Highway 218 - State Highway 218 starts at State Highway 1 in Sand City and provides access through Del Rey Oaks to the southeast where it joins State Highway 68. State Highway 218 is an alternative route to the westernmost segment of Route 68. It also serves areas on the south side of the City of Seaside.

U.S. 101 - The U.S. 101 freeway is a major north-south route in California. It is aligned to the east of State Highway 1, through Prunedale and Salinas in the vicinity of Fort Ord.

Del Monte Avenue/Boulevard - Del Monte Avenue/Boulevard is a non-continuous roadway, roughly parallel to State Highway 1, extending from Washington Avenue in Monterey to the interchange with State Highway 1 on the north side of Marina.

Fremont Street/Boulevard - Fremont Street/Boulevard is a key four-lane arterial providing an important link through Seaside. It runs north-south, roughly parallel to State Highway 1, and has interchanges with State Highway 1 at either end.

Broadway Avenue - Broadway Avenue is a four-lane arterial that provides an east-west connection between Del Monte Boulevard, Fremont Boulevard, and North-South Road.

Reservation Road - This facility is aligned approximately east-west, from State Highway 1 past the northern boundary of Fort Ord to State Highway 68 south of Salinas. It is currently classified as a rural highway east of Imjin Road, and a signalized arterial from Imjin Road west to State Highway 1.

Blanco Road - Blanco Road is an east-west route north of Fort Ord that provides a connection between Highway 101 and Reservation Road. This facility currently provides an important link between Fort Ord and Salinas.

Davis Road - Davis Road is an arterial between Salinas and Reservation Road, aligned approximately parallel to State Highway 68.

3.1.3 Current Roadway Operating Conditions

With the closure of Fort Ord as a military base, roadways within Fort Ord carry only low volumes of traffic. For this reason, level-of-service (LOS) analysis of current conditions on these roadways was not performed. However, many of the regional roadways that provide access to and from Fort Ord continue to carry high volumes of traffic. The existing (1993/94) daily volumes and LOS for the relevant regional road segments are presented in Table 3-1. The LOS analysis was based on traffic volumes obtained from TAMC.

Table 3-1 EXISTING (1993/94) CONDITION LEVEL-OF-SERVICE ANALYSIS							
Roadway	Segment	Roadway Attributes					L O S
		Facility Type	Lanes	Div/Und	Left Turn Bays? ⁽¹⁾	Daily Volume	
State Highway 1	State Highway 68 to Del Monte Blvd (Seaside)	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	56,000	D
	Del Monte Blvd (Seaside) to State Highway 218	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	60,000	D
	State Highway 218 to Fremont Blvd	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	59,000	D
	Fremont Blvd to Main Gate	Freeway	6	N/A	N/A	75,000	D
	Main Gate to 12th Street	Freeway	6	N/A	N/A	65,000	C
	12th Street to S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd)	Freeway	6	N/A	N/A	71,000	C
	S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd) to Reservation Road	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	35,500	C
	Reservation Road to N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd)	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	35,500	C
	N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd) to State Highway 156	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	37,500	C
State Highway 156 to Santa Cruz County line	Highway	2	U	Y	30,000	E	
State Highway 68	State Highway 1 to State Highway 218	Arterial-Class Ia	2	U	Y	22,800	F
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio Road	Arterial-Class Ia	2	U	Y	20,600	F
	San Benancio Road to Reservation Road	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	25,000	B
	Reservation Road to E. Blanco Road	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	29,500	B
State Highway 156	Hwy 1 to 0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd.	Freeway	4	N/A	N/A	22,000	B
	0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd. to US 101	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	25,000	E

Table 3-1 EXISTING (1993/94) CONDITION LEVEL-OF-SERVICE ANALYSIS							
Roadway	Segment	Roadway Attributes					L O S
		Facility Type	Lanes	Div/ Und	Left Turn Bays? ⁽¹⁾	Daily Volume	
State Highway 183	US 101 to Davis Road	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	29,500	E
	Davis Road to Espinosa Road	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	16,000	C
	Espinosa Road to State Highway 156	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	22,000	D
State Highway 218	State Highway 1 to Fremont Boulevard	Arterial- Class II	4	D	Y	14,000	D
	Fremont Boulevard to State Highway 68	Arterial- Class Ia	2	U	Y	10,850	B
Del Monte Boulevard	El Estero to State Highway 1	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	34,300	F
	State Highway 1 to Broadway Ave	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	27,026	D
	Broadway Ave to Fremont Blvd	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	9,757	C
	State Highway 1 (S. Marina) to Reservation Road	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	28,836	D
	Reservation Road to State Highway 1 (N. Marina)	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	4,825	A
Fremont Blvd	State Highway 1/State Highway 68 to Broadway Ave	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	25,166	D
	Broadway Ave to State Highway 1	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	16,363	C
Broadway Avenue	Del Monte Blvd to Noche Buena Street	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	13,985	C
	Noche Buena Street to North- South Road	Arterial- Class Ib	4	D	Y	8,742	C

Table 3-1 EXISTING (1993/94) CONDITION LEVEL-OF-SERVICE ANALYSIS							
Roadway	Segment	Roadway Attributes					L O S
		Facility Type	Lanes	Div/Und	Left Turn Bays? ⁽¹⁾	Daily Volume	
Reservation Road	Hwy 1 to Del Monte Boulevard	Arterial-Class Ia	2	U	Y	10,205	B
	Del Monte Boulevard to Crescent Ave	Arterial-Class II	4	D	Y	26,046	E
	Crescent Ave to Blanco Road	Arterial-Class Ia	4	D	Y	22,874	B
	Blanco Road to Intergarrison Road	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	3,700	A
	Intergarrison Road to Davis Road	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	4,700	A
	Davis Road to State Highway 68	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	6,200	A
Blanco Road	Reservation Road to Davis Road	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	N	20,252	E
	Davis Road to State Highway 68	Arterial-Class Ia	4	U	Y	18,836	B
Blanco Rd/Sanborn Rd	State Highway 68 to US 101	Arterial-Class Ia	4	U	Y	26,600	C
Davis Road	Reservation Road to Blanco Road	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	7,500	A
	Blanco Road to Rossi Street	Uninterrupted Arterial	2	U	Y	24,000	E
	Rossi Street to US 101	Arterial-Class Ia	4	D	Y	34,829	F

50068/prod/hn/rep/tb/5-17

Note:

⁽¹⁾ Roadway segments with very few or no left turn movements have been classified as having left turn bays.

As shown in the table, most segments on the regional network operate at LOS D or better with a few notable exceptions. Roadway segments currently operating at LOS E or worse include: State Highway 1 north of Castroville (LOS E), State Highway 68 from State Highway 1 to San Benancio Road (LOS F), State Highway 156 (LOS E), State Highway 183 in Salinas (LOS E), portions of Del Monte Boulevard in Monterey (LOS F), Reservation Road in Marina (LOS E), Blanco Road (LOS E), and Davis Road in Salinas (LOS E and F).

3.1.4 Transit System

Public transit service in Monterey County is provided by Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST). MST's service area includes Fort Ord as well as Seaside, Monterey, Marina, Carmel, and other Peninsula cities. MST also provides connecting service to Santa Cruz County (Watsonville). Service originates from two primary locations: the Monterey Transit Plaza in central Monterey, and the Salinas Transit Center in downtown Salinas. In general, service is designed to meet the needs of both commute and mid-day, non-work travelers. Almost all routes begin service around 6:00 or 7:00 A.M., with the majority ending service around 6:00 or 7:00 P.M. and operate with one-hour headways.

MST's current ridership is 11,000 boardings per day. This represents approximately 2.2 % of all daily trips within MST's service area. Information supplied by MST indicates that approximately 33% of these boardings are work trips, 12% are school-related, with the remainder (55%) being a variety of trip purposes. The MST Ridership Survey completed this year indicates that MST's biggest markets are Monterey-Seaside and East Salinas-Downtown Salinas. The most successful route connects Monterey, Seaside, Marina and Salinas. The success of this route may be attributable to the fact that it connects the predominantly residential areas of Seaside and Marina with the employment and commercial areas of Monterey and Salinas.

At present, two MST routes provide service to portions of Fort Ord. Line 7 provides service between Monterey and Marina. In October 1995, this line was modified to include service to Fort Ord, including the POM Annex, the Commissary/PX, and CSUMB. This route operates with hourly headways. Line 20 provides connecting service between Monterey and Salinas via Marina, with a stop located near the airport. Service along this route is provided every hour, with additional runs in the mornings before 9:00 A.M.

In addition to the MST bus service, CSUMB has begun operating a shuttle service connecting points on campus with the faculty/staff housing area to the east. The shuttle operates weekdays from 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. There is also limited service on weekends that includes a connection to Seacrest Plaza in the City of Marina. The bus and shuttle routes serving Fort Ord are illustrated in Figure 3-2.




Figure 3-2
Existing Transit Service

The region also features limited rail service and paratransit service. Passenger train service is currently only available through Amtrak's Coast Starlight Service in Salinas, with connections to the San Francisco Bay Area and beyond. RIDES is a countywide paratransit program for persons with disabilities and elderly people who cannot ride MST.

3.1.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks

Sidewalks currently exist on some Fort Ord roadways, but a comprehensive network of pedestrian facilities is not in place. Also, on many Fort Ord roadways, there are no shoulders or parking lanes, so vehicular traffic may pass close to pedestrians even where sidewalks do exist. The limited pedestrian infrastructure is due to the development of the Fort Ord to meet the needs of Army personnel and not civilians.

As with vehicular access, pedestrian access to Fort Ord from adjacent communities was limited to the entry gates described previously. The location of these gates served to further restrict pedestrian access, as many of the gates are located off of roadway facilities, such as State Highways 1, 218, and 68, which are not designed for pedestrian use. In addition, most gates are located where there is little or no development nearby to which pedestrian trips may be attracted. The two best gates for pedestrians are the Imjin Gate (on Imjin Road south of Reservation Road) that provides access to Marina; and the Broadway Gate (on Broadway Avenue west of North-South Road) that provides access to Seaside. Unfortunately, there are no sidewalks in Fort Ord on the main roads (Imjin Road and North-South Road) in the vicinity of these gates.

As defined in the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*, there are three types of bikeways (bikeway is the general term for any marked bicycle facility):

- **Class I (Bike Path):** Bicycles travel on a right of way completely separated from any street or highway.
- **Class II (Bike Lane):** Bicycles travel in a one-way striped lane on a street or expressway.
- **Class III (Bike Route):** Bicycles share the road with pedestrians and motor vehicle traffic. Bike routes are marked only with signs.

Currently, there are no separate bicycle facilities within Fort Ord or connecting to Marina or Seaside. TAMC has developed a General Bikeways Plan (January, 1994), which describes current and proposed bicycle facilities in Monterey County. There are a limited number of high class bicycle facilities in the vicinity of Fort Ord. The most significant is the Caltrans Pacific Coast Bikeway, which roughly follows the coastline. It is aligned along Del Monte Boulevard through Marina, and then it follows State Highway 1 past Fort Ord and into Seaside and Sand City. There are, however, no connections to the Pacific Coast Highway from Fort Ord. Outside of Fort Ord in Marina and Seaside, there are no Class I facilities; however, both cities have designated bicycle networks and efforts have been made to accommodate bicycles. There are also current planning activities underway to enhance the bicycle networks in these communities.

3.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC SETTING AND FORECASTS

3.2.1 Fort Ord

At its peak, Fort Ord was home to 17,700 military personnel and employed 2,700 civilians from the neighboring communities. As of 1994, most facilities within the base were closed, the exceptions being some housing for the DLI, limited office space for FORA, the Commissary, and the Post Exchange. In September of 1995, California State University - Monterey Bay (CSUMB) began operation with enrollment of approximately 600 students.

The proposed land use plan for Fort Ord includes approximately 45,000 jobs and over 22,000 housing units at buildout. Within this plan, the Army will retain roughly 2,000 acres near the existing golf courses for its Presidio of Monterey (POM) Annex to support the Defense Language Institute, the Naval Graduate School, and the Coast Guard and troops in the area. The California State University system has received approximately 1,300 acres to establish a campus for the Monterey Bay area. CSUMB is expected to have 25,000 full-time equivalent students at buildout (12,500 by the year 2015), with on-campus housing for 80% of these students. University of California at Santa Cruz plans to redevelop roughly 1,100 acres near the airport to establish a technology center - the Monterey Bay Engineering, Science and Technology Center (MBEST). Of the remaining acreage, approximately 2,000 acres will be available for private commercial development and 16,000 acres will be committed to nature preserves and habitat resource management.

By the year 2015, the Fort Ord Reuse plan calls for over 18,000 jobs and 13,500 housing units (inclusive of 2,550 on-campus housing units). For Fort Ord, this represents a growth of 7,400 housing units but a decrease of 2,000 jobs versus 1990. Although the number of jobs associated with the Fort Ord area decreases, it is important to recognize the shift from military to civilian land uses significantly alters the types of jobs and associated travel characteristics. With the reuse of Fort Ord, the Peninsula will eventually become one contiguous urban area from Marina to Pacific Grove.

3.2.2 Regional

According to Census data, Monterey County had a population of 355,000 in 1990. A majority of the county's development is concentrated in two areas: the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas. Defined for this study as running from Pacific Grove to Marina and including Fort Ord, the greater Monterey Peninsula had a population of 115,000 in 1990. Salinas, Monterey County's largest city, had a population of nearly 110,000. Both the County and Peninsula numbers include a population of over 28,000 within Fort Ord which was serving as a fully-operating military base at the time.

By 2015, Monterey County is expected to grow to a population of 520,000. In addition, Monterey County is forecast to grow by 50,000 housing units and over 60,000 jobs between 1990 and 2015. These numbers include the reuse of the former Fort Ord, and reflect the job and population loss due to its post-1990 closure. A majority of this growth is expected to occur

within the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas areas (75% of housing and 70% of the employment growth). The countywide forecast includes a population of approximately 39,000 within the Fort Ord reuse area by 2015. A summary of the socio-economic characteristics of the county, Monterey Peninsula, Salinas, and Fort Ord is provided in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2
MONTEREY COUNTY SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA
COUNTYWIDE AND SUBAREA

	1990 Census			2015 Forecast		
	Population	Housing Units	Employment	Population	Housing Units	Employment
Monterey County	355,000	120,000	161,000	520,000	170,000	224,000
Monterey Peninsula	115,000	42,000	70,000	148,000	59,000	84,000
Salinas	109,000	35,000	49,000	195,000	61,000	79,000
Fort Ord* (includes CSUMB)	28,600	6,100	20,000	39,000	13,500	18,000

*Fort Ord numbers are included in both the County and Peninsula values.

Sources: 1994 Regional Population and Employment Forecast, AMBAG
Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan

In addition to size, density and urban form are important factors contributing to the design and effectiveness of a transportation system. For example, transit is most effective where densities are higher and where development occurs along a corridor. With its large area and low population, Monterey County is largely rural in character. Development, however, is concentrated in two urban centers -- the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas. Development densities for these two areas are presented in Appendix A. In general, densities in the Peninsula and Salinas areas are low to moderate for urban settings and may be typical of a suburban location outside a major metropolitan center, although there are areas of concentrated housing and employment development. These densities, however, are expected to increase significantly by the year 2015, up to 40% on average in Salinas.

With respect to urban form, the land use pattern in Monterey County does not specifically follow a corridor form. Additionally, the size and density of development in Monterey County does not reach those levels typically found along major transit corridors in urban locations. However, one may view Salinas-Fort Ord-Seaside-Monterey as a loose corridor with lower density development. This corridor would link Monterey County's two largest cities and connect to several additional trip generators. Equally important is the mix of land uses (e.g., residential, employment, shopping, etc.) within this area.

**Table 4-1
SUMMARY OF SOURCES OF FINANCING FOR
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS**

Fund Source	Eligible Projects	Key Criteria
FEDERAL FUNDS		
Surface Transportation Program (STP)	Roads, transit, bike, pedestrian, bridges, safety, etc.	Congestion relief, Maintenance needs, Cost-effectiveness, Regional objectives
Transportation Enhancements Activities (TEA-part of STP. above)	Pedestrian, bicycle, historic preservation, scenic/aesthetic beautification, water mitigation	Local support, one-time opportunity, degree of problem/opportunity, degree of solution/enhancement of opportunity
Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)	Projects and programs that will improve air quality	Emissions reduction, congestion relief, regional objectives
Regional Traffic Signalization/Operations Program (RTSOP - part of CMAQ. above)	Signalization projects	Signals on arterials, projects involving two-plus jurisdictions, "low-cost" projects.
Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 3 a) Fixed Guideway b) Bus and Bus Facilities c) New Rail Starts	Rail vehicles, guideways, and other equipment Buses and other transit equipment Rolling stock, guideways, and other transit	Maintenance of existing system, efficiency, regional goals Accessibility, improved suburban mobility, efficiency FTA cost-effectiveness (cost per new rider)
FTA Section 9	Transit operating assistance; transit capital projects	Maintenance of existing system, efficiency, regional goals
FTA Section 16 (b) (2)	Paratransit services	Need, coordination efforts, project effectiveness
FTA Section 18	Rural transit service	Maintenance of existing system, efficiency, regional goals
STATE FUNDS		
Flexible Congestion Relief (FCR) - National Highway System - Interstate Completion - State STP - State Highway Account (- Proposition 108)	Roads, transit (traditionally, other modes eligible)	Degree of congestion relief on transportation system. Inclusion in the STIP
State Transit Assistance (STA) - Revenue Based	Operating and capital support of fixed-route service, paratransit, interprete coordination, and integrated fares	Funds programmed according to the revenues generated by the transit operators
State Transit Assistance (STA) - Population Based	Paratransit operations and capital, regional coordination, productivity improvement, intercity service, unmet capital replace	First apportioned to Northern/Southern counties based on population; remaining funds go to paratransit operations and capital
Transit Capital Improvement (TCI)	Rail transit capital projects; ferry; bus rehabilitation; right-of-way. Largely used for Section 9.	Statewide value; County minimum shares; California Transportation Commission multi-year agreements

Table 4-1 SUMMARY OF SOURCES OF FINANCING FOR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS		
Fund Source	Eligible Projects	Key Criteria
Transportation Development Act (TDA)	Transit operations; capital improvements, ped/bike improvements, local streets/roads, community transit	Allocated to Local Transportation Fund based on population within counties
Transportation Systems Management (TSM) - Match	CMAQ eligible projects - no roadway rehabilitation or projects increasing single-occupancy vehicles	CMAQ eligibility, see above, - limited by Article XIX (no transit vehicles)
Transportation Systems Management (TSM) - Residual	After CMAQ (and STP eligible) match, for system management projects, such as signalization, TOS	TSM; Traffic congestion relief; roadway time travel savings
Bridge Replacement & Rehab. Program	Bridge replacement, rehabilitation, seismic retrofit, rail replacement, and painting	Inclusion on the federal deficient bridge list
State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)	Bridge/highway rehabilitation, seismic retrofit and capital safety improvements	Programmed according to rehabilitation need; must have a project study report
State Local Partnership Program (SLPP)	Roadway and transit projects with roadway improvements	No criteria. All funds divided up proportionately to all who apply.
Inter-Regional Road System (IRRS)	Road/highway improvements outside urbanized areas of over 50,000 population	Capacity improvements for inter-regional travel only - not due to growth
Prop. 116	Railroad right-of-way, grade separations, terminals, stations, rolling stock, maintenance facilities, paratransit, and bike projects	Most projects defined in the Bond Act.
Environmental Enhancement	Projects to mitigate environmental impacts of transportation facilities.	Projects must cost less than \$500,000
AB 2766	Ridesharing, clean fuel buses, shuttles, traffic management, rail/bus integration, regional transit information, various demonstration projects.	Projects must reduce air pollution
Subvention (Portion of State fuel tax returned to cities and counties)	Local streets and roads maintenance and rehabilitation	Local priorities

(j/tcd/50068/finrep/tb14-1)

Source: This exhibit was excerpted from [Oakland, CA: Metropolitan Transportation Commission.] *Transportation Funding Sources in the Bay Area (Draft)*. June, 1995.

4.1.1 Conventional Federal and State Funding

Financing for roadway projects made available by the federal government and the State of California is generated primarily by the tax on motor fuel. This source of financing is allocated by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The allocation is included in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In spite of a significant recent increase in the fuel tax rate in 1990, competition for funding from the STIP is extreme. Current estimates of funds available reveal a significant shortfall between pre-existing commitments in prior-year STIPs and current funds available. Public officials in Monterey County are striving aggressively to receive CTC support for the Prunedale Bypass and to protect other projects now in the STIP. Additional requests to CTC may dilute these efforts.

Although every effort should be devoted to securing federal and state financing, a conservative assumption should be made that funding from these sources may be limited to that currently identified within the STIP for the Hatton Canyon and Prunedale projects, plus annual county minimum allocation.

4.1.2 Federal Demonstration Projects

Financing for "demonstration" projects from the federal government can be allocated directly through the Congressional budget process. No state or local matching funds are required. There are currently no federal demonstration projects that would provide additional capacity to serve the region and Fort Ord. Availability of funding from federal demonstration projects is highly unpredictable and depends entirely on the political process.

The Federal Government is describing Fort Ord as a model to be emulated nationally and political support for projects serving the area may be strong. Monterey County representatives are encouraged to pursue federal demonstration funding. However, success is unpredictable and, therefore, demonstration funds were not considered an expected source for the purposes of this study.

4.1.3 Local Share of Fuel Tax

A portion of the fuel tax collected by the State of California is shared with cities and counties based on a statutory formula. It is increasingly common in California that the local share of the fuel tax is consumed by requirements to maintain and rehabilitate existing roads. Further, since the fuel tax rate is levied per gallon, and not tied to any price or cost index, improved gasoline mileage puts a downward pressure on funding available per vehicle miles traveled. It can be anticipated that existing maintenance demands will more than consume the local share of fuel tax in Monterey County.

4.1.4 Conclusions About Existing Sources

Discussions with key sources in transportation finance throughout California gave no reason whatsoever to be optimistic about increased availability of existing conventional sources of financing. The situation in Monterey County is such that there will be extreme competition for existing sources of financing to pay for existing deficiencies and for projects throughout the region. The recommendation was made previously that the financing plan for increased capacity to serve Fort Ord should offer certainty. Accordingly, financing for transportation will depend on the potential revenue sources as described in the subsequent section.

4.2 POTENTIAL REVENUE SOURCES

A number of potential new sources of revenue are described in the following sections. These sources are presented in the general order of the relative certainty that they could be enacted.

4.2.1 Development-Related Financing

The term "development-related financing" refers to any source of financing where revenues are directly generated by growth and development. There are three basic forms of development-related financing currently used on California: impact fees, benefit assessments and special taxes.

A **development impact fee** is a fee collected from a developer at or near the time of development, e.g. when a building permit or an occupancy permit is being issued. Before a development impact fee can be levied, a jurisdiction must make certain findings specified in Government Code 66001 (a) and (b). These findings generally require that a reasonable relationship be demonstrated between a land development project and the demand for a public improvement project. Determination of this relationship is referred to as a nexus analysis. Under this analysis, the demand for an improvement must be defined, and then shares assigned to all land development or sources that contribute to this need. The fee assessed to an individual land development project must be in direct proportion to its share of the public improvement project's demand. This analysis must recognize that a portion of a project's cost must be funded by non-development sources, if the project is needed, in part, to address an existing deficiency.

Development impact fees are collected under the general legal power of cities or counties to regulate land use. Development impact fees must be used for the purposes established when the fee is enacted, and must not be used for general governmental purposes. In other words, revenues generated from development impact fees must be used only for those improvements for which the nexus analysis was conducted.

Benefit assessments have been used in California for generations. The theory is that the land that benefits from a particular public improvement is charged for the cost of that improvement in proportion to benefit received. There is extensive case law holding that:

- The special benefit to an individual parcel of land must be clear and demonstrable.
- All land that benefits from the improvement must be within the assessment district and there is virtually no room for exceptions.

However attractive a land development project may be (e.g. a project that would bring economic development and a stronger tax base), if the property benefits from improvement, the property must be assessed.

A more recent financing innovation in California is the use of a **special tax** to finance public improvements. A jurisdiction that authorizes a special tax must make a finding that all the properties within the taxing district benefit in a general way from the improvement. The strict finding of a rational nexus (as required for a development impact fee) or special benefit (as required for a special assessment) is not required for the implementation of a special tax.

With a special tax, there is also great flexibility in setting the tax rate for different categories of land use. The flexibility to set a special tax at a rate other than that required by strict nexus findings is very useful. If the burden on one or another land use category is excessive compared to the value of the land, it is possible to lower the rate for one category and raise the rate for another. In practice this shifting of burden is frequently done to attract an economically desirable land use by offering a lower tax rate for that land use.

The most common form of financing with a special tax involves the formation of a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District. If the financing district is not inhabited, the landowners can approve the special tax with a two-thirds majority vote.

4.2.1.1 The Economics of Development-Related Financing

There is a finite economic limit on the extent to which development-related sources of financing will be available for funding transportation improvements. This limit is established by the realities of the real estate marketplace.

An initial principle of economics must first be established. In terms of the final incidence of the economic burden, there is little basic difference between a development impact fee collected at the time of development and a development-related tax or assessment collected over many years to repay bonded debt. The ability to pay an impact fee or pay an annual assessment/special tax depends on there being economic use of land for which public improvements are being provided.

In the most simple economic model, development-related charges, whether impact fees, assessments, or special taxes, are capitalized by the marketplace in terms of a lower value of undeveloped land. The reasoning is as follows:

- In a perfect market, with perfect information, the value of land ready for development is set by the marketplace. Competing land development projects throughout the region (whether or not they are burdened by development charges) establish market value.
- Both financial capital and entrepreneurial skills are highly mobile. A developer has no incentive to accept reduced profit margins at any one location if other development locations are available.
- Accordingly, sophisticated developers will buy land at a price that permits them to pay development-related charges, maintain profit margins, and sell land in a ready-to-build state at the prevailing market price.

This simple economic model is summarized in Figure 4-1. The residual value of the land is the market value minus the costs that must be incurred to make the land marketable. Market values of land in a ready-to-build state are set by market forces, not by wishes. Costs to achieve this ready-to-build state are statements of fact, once a level of service for transportation and other public services has been established. Thus, the Residual Land Value (RLV) is the value of the land after subtracting from the market value an allowance for profit, a sales commission, allowance for on-site development costs, and all forms of development-related financing that will be imposed to pay for infrastructure and other public improvement.

There is an absolute upper limit to the total financing capacity available from development-related financing for all public improvements that are competing for development-related financing. That upper limit is the amount of financing that would drive the Residual Land Value down to zero. In most circumstances, neither the market place nor political realities would permit a financing plan that literally consumes the residual market value of undeveloped land. In the special case of Fort Ord, however, it may be practical to devote all or virtually all of the value of undeveloped land to finance the public improvements that will make the reuse of Fort Ord possible. The need to do so is being determined as part of the ongoing Fort Ord Reuse Plan effort being conducted by FORA.




Figure 4.1
Value of Land

4.2.1.2 *Timing of Cash Flow*

Financing for public improvements is generally of two types. First, “pay as you go” financing refers to a financing plan where the source of revenue is used directly to pay for the public improvement. A classic example is a development impact fee. Impact fees can be accrued in a special account until funding for a particular improvement has been accumulated. A special tax can also be used on a “pay as you go” basis. The tax is levied once, at or near the time of development. In economic terms the special tax is used exactly the same way as a development impact fee.

If major public improvements are necessary early in a capital improvement plan, then “pay as you go” financing becomes impractical. The cash simply isn’t there yet when demand for the improvement first occurs. An alternative is for a public agency to issue municipal bonds that are sold to bond holders. The proceeds of the bond sale are then used to construct the public improvement. The bond holders are paid back by a benefit assessment or a special tax that is collected annually over a number of years. (A common bond term is 25 years).

The distinction being made is that “pay as you go” financing involves a one-time collection of money. Bond financing, sometimes referred to as “pay as you use” financing involves a collection of monies over a number of years to repay bond holders who initially advanced funds. The fact that monies are collected over a number of years does not alter the requirements for the use of the revenue. A benefit assessment collected over a number of years must meet the strict test of special benefit. There is much greater flexibility regarding a special tax.

Development impact fees (particularly water and sewer connection fees) are frequently mentioned as a source of repayment of bonded debt. However, the bond market will not accept the uncertainty as to when development will occur. Development impact fees are not usable solely as security to repay bonds. A fall-back source of repayment, (e.g. the rate base of a water or sewer agency), is necessary to secure water or sewer bonds. There is no such source for repayment for transportation projects. Accordingly transportation impact fees can be used only for “pay-as-you-go” financing.

4.2.1.3 *Competing Demands for Development-Related Financing*

The TAMC Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study is concerned exclusively with the planning and financing the transportation improvements. It is an unfortunate fact of life, however, that there is significant competition for funds if development-related financing is used. The same reasoning that leads to dependence on development-related financing for roadway improvements also applies to other classes of public improvements such as water supply and distribution, wastewater collection and treatment, drainage, parks, etc. This competition for financing from development-related sources can greatly limit the funding available for transportation improvements.

4.2.1.4 *Establishing The Impact Fee Area*

As noted earlier, a key requirement in California for a development impact fee is that a valid nexus exists (in this case) between a transportation capital improvement and all of the development that contributes to the demand for this improvement. It may be reasonably assumed that major transportation projects to serve the territory within Fort Ord are not necessarily located physically within the boundaries of what was Fort Ord. Similarly, transportation facilities that are located physically on Fort Ord may also serve new development in other jurisdictions (i.e. off the Fort Ord territory) in northern Monterey County. Accordingly, if development impact fees are to be used to finance transportation improvements both within and outside Fort Ord, it will be necessary to establish a Cities-County development impact fee involving the participation of all the cities in northern Monterey County and Monterey County itself.

A cooperative Cities-County impact fee has precedent in California. A cooperative arrangement exists between Stanislaus County and its cities to collect a road impact fee designed to mitigate impacts on both county roads and city streets. This precedent does not translate into a statement that a Cities-County fee program can be implemented easily. Monterey County and a total of eight cities must each approve such a development impact fee.

4.2.1.5 *Special Taxes Levied Only on Territory Within Fort Ord*

Although it is preferred that all new development pay its share, a city-county fee may be difficult to implement, or there may be pre-existing agreements that effectively invalidate the necessary nexus between transportation demand and responsibility to pay. In this situation, the special circumstances surrounding Fort Ord allow that some form of development-related financing may still be implemented. It would be possible for FORA under its own authority to enact a Mello-Roos Special Tax applicable only to development on the territory formerly within Fort Ord. This tax could be set at a rate to pay for many or all of the transportation projects, inside and outside of the base's boundaries, deemed necessary to support the reuse of the former Fort Ord without depending on a charge against development elsewhere. This tax could also be used if a Cities-County Transportation Impact Fee is accepted, but if there is the issue cited above regarding pre-existing development agreement. The tax would be used to replace the funds that would otherwise have been paid by exempt projects.

As noted earlier, there are critical differences between a special tax and a development impact fee that make a Fort Ord-only tax viable. Whereas for a development impact fee to be valid there must be a strict nexus between the demand for capacity created by new development and the responsibility to pay for this capacity, a special tax requires only that a finding of general benefit be established for the governing body that will levy the tax. This tax can then be used to finance all of the transportation improvements that would otherwise be charged in part to development at Fort Ord and in part to new development outside of Fort Ord.

The second difference is the flexibility to set a special tax at a rate other than that required by strict nexus findings. Shifting the burden of a tax from one land use category to

another may appear inequitable. In the special circumstance of Fort Ord the inequity of levying a tax on new development within Fort Ord that is used to pay someone else's share is significantly more apparent than real. First, the Fort Ord Reuse Authority's planning team has already concluded that certain roadway improvements outside the jurisdiction of Fort Ord are absolutely essential to the successful redevelopment of Fort Ord. If the roadway improvement does not occur, the reuse of Fort Ord may not occur, at least not as visualized in the current draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan. Secondly, as noted above, the home buyer or other purchaser is not directly involved in the payment of the Mello-Roos tax. It is collected at the same time and in exactly the same manner as a development impact fee.

4.2.1.6 Transportation Impact Fees In Monterey County

The existing levels of transportation impact fees in Monterey County and in the cities are summarized in Table 4-2. In theory, comparisons among jurisdictions are of limited use. As noted elsewhere, an impact fee can be calculated almost deterministically, once a Level of Service Standard/Timing Standard and a Capital Improvement Plan have been adopted. Theoretically, fee levels in adjoining jurisdictions should have no effect on this calculation.

In practice, impact fee comparisons between jurisdictions are almost inevitable because of concerns about aversion impact on economic development if development impact fees are adopted or appear excessive compared to other jurisdiction in the market area.

**Table 4-2
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEES IN MONTEREY COUNTY**

Agency	Existing Transportation Impact Fee (Per Single-Family Residence or Equivalent) ¹
Carmel-by-the-Sea	none
Del Rey Oaks	none
Marina	none
Monterey	none
Pacific Grove	none
Salinas	\$1,230
Sand City	none
Seaside	none
Monterey County	
Carmel Valley Master Plan Area	\$16,000
- Expanded Area	\$8,000
Los Palmas	
- High 68	\$792
- River Road	\$1,732
Bishop Ranch	\$9,750
Montera Ranch	\$3,900

Notes: 1) Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) amounts are as of June 1996

4.2.2 Tax Increment Financing

California has decades of experience with a form of financing that is particularly applicable to areas undergoing redevelopment. Total property tax collected in Monterey County is shared between the applicable city (if the area is in a city), Monterey County, the applicable school districts, and a number of Special Districts. A complex formula, developed after Proposition 13 was passed, controls the manner in which annual change in taxable value and resulting property tax is shared among the taxing agencies.

Redevelopment tax increment is based on the following sequence of steps:

- At a given point in time (normally when a redevelopment area is established), the allocation of property tax revenues among the taxing entities is noted. The amounts to each agency are referred to as the "frozen base".
- From that point forward, any increase in total property tax revenues goes not to the various local governments but to a redevelopment agency. The redevelopment agency then uses this tax increment to accomplish the purposes of the agency's redevelopment plan. Normally, twenty percent of revenues must be allocated to housing programs.

There is an apparent particular advantage to the use of redevelopment tax increment to finance roadways and other public improvements on Fort Ord. The property tax base is currently zero because the land is owned by a federal agency. If a redevelopment area is formed prior to a sale to a private owner or other entity subject to property taxation, the entire property tax revenue (measured from a frozen base of zero) would apparently be available for purposes of the redevelopment agency.

This apparent strength is, in fact, a weakness. The redevelopment agency may indeed have a fruitful stream of tax increment to use for redevelopment purposes, but the other local governments continue to be responsible to provide for ongoing operations. There are numerous examples in California where a city with a redevelopment agency finds itself to be facility-rich and program-poor. For example, funding may be adequate to finance a new police station, but funding is scarce to pay the police officers who staff this new station.

4.2.3 Local-Option Taxes

TAMC has recently devoted extensive effort to evaluating alternative sources of additional funding for transportation. The TAMC's *Transportation Options Ad-hoc Committee* has considered both conventional source (a local option sales tax) and innovative sources (e.g. a tax based on vehicle miles traveled) to augment available financial resources. The Ad-hoc committee has made estimates of the amount of additional funding that would be produced by rates of additional taxation that would be politically realistic. It now appears clear that revenues produced by a local-option tax would be more than consumed by transportation projects that are necessary to serve the existing Monterey County population. A successful effort to produce a local option tax may be crucial to the successful reuse of Fort Ord. For example, improvements to Route 156

and construction of the Prunedale Bypass are both very important if the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan is to be implemented successfully. Unfortunately the cost of the share of these improvements that would fairly be attributable to the existing population would consume the additional available resource. There will be no additional funds to serve growth at Fort Ord.

4.2.4 Toll Roads

Interest has been increasing recently in the use of toll roads in California, in part because of interest in congestion pricing and in part because of the increasing practicality of automatic fare collection. After the California Legislature passed enabling legislation, it became possible in California for a private sector firm to finance a toll road and recover costs and a reasonable profit from fare collections. Examples of toll roads that are now in operation include the Foothill Corridor project in Orange County and a project in State Route 91 in Orange and Riverside Counties. This latter project involves the ability of a single-occupant vehicle to use a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane if a toll is paid.

Toll roads become financially feasible when there are large numbers of motorists traveling a particular route who are willing to pay a toll in order to save travel time. The amount of the toll collected must be sufficient to finance the construction cost and the operating and maintenance costs of the toll facility. Since there are always alternate routes available, the toll route must offer a significant travel time advantage to motorists in order to be utilized. Toll routes can provide significant travel time advantages under the following conditions:

- The toll roadway provides a shorter, more direct route for travelers than alternate routes. In this case, travelers could save time and travel distance by using the toll roadway.
- The toll roadway provides an alternative to roadways which are free, but experience significant traffic congestion. In this case, travelers could save time by using the toll roadway and avoiding traffic congestion.
- The toll roadway provides a high-speed facility in comparison to alternative roadways which are traveled at slower speed. The most common example is a multi-lane limited access toll roadway which parallels a two-lane free roadway. The limited access tollway allows travelers to save travel time by allowing significantly higher travel speeds.

The determination of whether a particular toll roadway is financially feasible is dependent upon local conditions related to the cost of the toll roadway, the travel time advantage ^{it provides} ~~in provided~~, and the willingness of local travelers to pay a toll in order to save travel time. Currently available studies in the State of California have shown that toll roads are financially feasible only in densely-developed urban areas, with a high degree of traffic congestion.

4.3 FINANCING FOR TRANSIT SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATIONS

At present, the primary form of public transportation in Monterey County is bus transit. Financing for bus transit is provided by a combination of federal funding, state funding, and farebox revenues. It is now well understood that, with certain very specialized exceptions, it is impossible to support the operations of a transit system from farebox revenues, let alone provide financing capacity for purchase or replacement of the vehicle fleet and other required capital facilities. Financial support in addition to farebox revenues now comes from federal funds administered by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds administered by the state of California, State Transit Assistance (STA), and a portion of the locally-collected retail sales tax administered under the Transportation Development Act (TDA). As a practical matter, the ability to finance expanded bus transit operations is limited by the ability to finance operating expenses.

Key sources interviewed for this project expressed great pessimism about the long term future of transit operating subsidies from the federal government. These sources, however, were confident that both STA and TDA were dependable and steady sources of revenue for transit operations and fleet replacement. Based upon this input and an assessment of recent trends, it is assumed that the total funds available for transit operations per capita, measured in terms of real purchasing power, will equal the per capita levels that are budgeted for the 1996/97 fiscal year. Furthermore, it is assumed that future farebox recovery rates will remain near current levels. The practical results of these assumptions are reflected in the following estimates of transit service costs and funding that were provided by TAMC and MST:

- the annual cost to operate a bus is \$320,000;
- a farebox recovery of 30% is expected to reduce funds needs for operating costs;
- the per capita transit funding from LTF was assumed for this study to remain constant at \$22;
- LTF funds generated by Fort Ord population growth to the year 2015 is forecast to be \$703,736, while that generated by off-site growth is \$1,793,540;

In addition to funds directed at bus transit, limited and project-specific financing for rail transit capital investment is available through the bond measure approved as Proposition 116. This proposition includes \$6.0 million for capital improvements related to rail facilities on Fort Ord. Ability to finance rail transit operations will be limited by availability of subsidies for rail transportation.

At this time, expectations for new funding sources, especially those for transit operations, is very limited. A Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF) to fund transit operation as well as the purchase of the initial fleet of vehicles¹ has passed judicial scrutiny in California. However, the fact situation of this case pertains specifically to downtown San Francisco where transit ridership by office employees is quite high. It is questionable whether facts necessary to support Russ Building-type findings could be made for the Monterey Peninsula. Further, a transit impact fee imposed on employment-generating uses might be perceived as an impediment to successful use of Fort Ord.

Develop-related financing has greater potential for application to transit capital improvements. The Capital Improvement Plan that will be an element of the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan includes funding for the acquisition of 15 buses and financing for an intermodal transit center and Park and Ride facilities. The intent is to include the capital financing needs of the first increment of transit service in the Fort Ord CIP. It is assumed that these improvements will be financed from some form of development-related financing. There is no provision, however, for the operation of these busses.

As a supplement to public bus and rail service, a modest amount of privately-supported transit service may emerge within the Fort Ord area. Typically, such a service will connect a major activity center with the nearest transit stop or station. In instances where the activity center covers a large area, these services will also transport passengers between internal locations. Within Fort Ord, CSUMB has already implemented such service. The CSUMB shuttle connects the campus core with an MST transit stop to the west, and to the faculty/staff housing area to the east off of Abrams/Inter-garrison. A similar shuttle service has also been discussed in relation to the MBEST Center. These discussions have included proposed service between MBEST and the CSUMB campus.

4.4 ROADWAY MAINTENANCE

In addition to the financing of capital improvements, financing of facility maintenance must be considered. Financing for the new roadway capacity required to meet the travel demand generated by regional growth and the reuse of Fort Ord should not be at the expense of the existing road network. Further, recognition must be given to the fact that roadway capacity added to serve the region will itself require maintenance during the planning period through 2015/16. It is recommended that the current level of road maintenance be continued. This current level would be measured in expenditures per lane/mile in each of the relevant jurisdictions and would consider both the maintenance requirements for added roadway capacity and the necessity to maintain the purchasing power of expenditures for maintenance.

¹ For a discussion of the relevant cases, see Abbott, William W., Marian E. Moe, and Marilee Hanson. *Public Needs and Private Dollars: A Guide to Dedications and Development Fees*. Solano Press Books. Point Arena: July 19, 1993. pages 65-68. The citations to the cases are as follows: *Russ Building Partnership v. City and County of San Francisco* (1st Dist. 1987) 199 Cal.App.3d 1496 [246 Cal.Rptr.21] and *Russ Building Partnership v. City and County of San Francisco* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 839 [244 Cal.Rptr.682].

The maintenance requirement should be financed "off the top" of the local fuel tax, before an estimate is made of whether fuel tax revenues are available to finance capital improvements. Experience with fiscal studies that have been done previously by the consulting team in Monterey County leads to pessimism about whether fuel tax revenues will be available or sufficient to finance capital improvements.

4.5 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has provided an overview of the many existing and potential funding sources for the financing of transportation improvements. While there are a number of existing funding programs or sources that may provide funds for the types of improvements identified within this study, an assessment of these existing sources suggests a limited capacity for financing future improvements. This review suggests that available funding will be limited to that currently dedicated through the STIP and DCAG programs, as well as reasonably expected funds generated through the STIP County Minimum program, the LTF program and transit farebox revenue.

For roadway improvements, currently dedicated funds include \$143 million in the STIP for Highway 1 - Hatton Canyon and the Prunedale By-Pass, plus \$10 million in DCAG funds for various improvements within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord. In addition to these dedicated funds, the county is expected to continue receiving its' STIP County Minimum allocation. As estimated by TAMC, this allocation is expected to be \$4 million per year for a total of \$80 million over the twenty year planning horizon for this study. However, revenues for the next 6 years are already committed, leaving only \$56 million excess funds for allocation to the improvements identified in this study. It is also assumed for this study that funds received through state gas tax revenues are expected to cover roadway maintenance costs, and will not provide a significant contribution to the financing of the proposed improvements. With respect to transit operations and maintenance, expected funds for service improvements include those derived from the population-based LTF program, and from farebox revenues. These sources, however, are expected to cover less than one-third of projected operations and maintenance costs.

Recognizing the limited levels of dedicated and expected transportation funds in the region, additional sources will almost certainly be needed to finance desired and needed improvements over the next 20 years. As a first step, efforts to secure additional federal and state transportation monies should be undertaken. However, discussions with key sources in transportation finance throughout California gave no reason whatsoever to be optimistic about increased availability of existing conventional sources of financing. The situation in Monterey County is such that there will be extreme competition for existing sources of financing to pay for existing deficiencies and for projects throughout the region. Accordingly, potential new revenue sources for financing transportation improvements may also be necessary. Potential financing mechanisms described in this chapter include development-related financing, local-option taxes, tax increment financing, and toll roads.

(50068/prod/finrep/chap4.d2)

5. TRAVEL DEMAND FORECASTS

Development of the transportation plan presented in this report required the preparation of future year travel demand forecasts. Future year conditions in this study were forecasted using the Monterey County Traffic Analysis Model (MCTAM), maintained by TAMC. It covers the Monterey Bay region but is focused specifically for Monterey County.

As with all travel demand forecasting models, the MCTAM uses forecasts or assumptions regarding future year land uses and the transportation network as inputs to estimate future travel demand. Using a set of mathematical formulas, the number of trips generated by each traffic analysis zone (TAZ) is calculated. These trips are then distributed to destination zones based on their relative "attractiveness" (for example, a zone with a significant amount of housing would produce a large number of work trips, while a zone with a large number of jobs would attract such trips). The trips are then assigned to the transportation network.

To reflect the planned development of Fort Ord, a number of modifications or enhancements were made to the existing 2015 MCTAM. These included revisions to the network and zone structures, as well as the land use or zonal database. For Trip Generation, a number of new special generators within the former Fort Ord were added. Minor adjustments to the Trip Distribution process were also made. A more detailed discussion of these modifications was presented in Appendix A of Working Paper #3.

5.1 LAND USE INPUTS

Land use inputs for MCTAM include the number of households and jobs by TAZ. A TAZ is a small geographic area, often bounded by major roadways. Because MCTAM is a regional model, these land use inputs were required for TAZs both inside Fort Ord and the region. Land use forecasts for the area outside Fort Ord were provided by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG).

Land use forecasts for the former Fort Ord were derived from the land use element of the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan. For residential uses, the dwelling unit values provided in the draft Reuse Plan were distributed among the appropriate TAZs and entered into the model. For non-residential uses, the acre and square footage values in the Plan were converted to number of employees. Buildout of Fort Ord is expected to occur in the year 2040, and, ideally, transportation conditions for this year would be modeled. However, regional land use forecasts from AMBAG were not available for the Year 2040, only for 2015. By the year 2015, approximately 13,000 housing units and 18,000 jobs are expected on Fort Ord.

To aid in the analysis of Fort Ord's travel demand and transit potential, the reuse area was divided into six districts representing distinct geographical areas and common land uses. These districts are illustrated in Figure 5-1 and described below, while the housing, employment and typical residential development density characteristics of each district are presented in Table 5-1.




Figure 5-1
Fort Ord Analysis Districts

Source: JHK, 1996

**Table 5-1
2015 FORT ORD LAND USE
CHARACTERISTICS**

DISTRICT	HOUSING UNITS	JOBS	TYPICAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (dwelling units per acre)	DAILY TRIP ENDS GENERATED
1. Airport/MBEST	0	7,640	NA	63,940
2. Northern Residential	4,112	69	8-10	32,760
3. Central Core/CSUMB	3,650*	6,983	8-10	104,690**
4. Southern Residential	5,751	1,198	4-8	67,840
5. South Gate Commercial/Industrial	0	1,392	NA	10,820
6. East Garrison	0	1,058	NA	23,170
TOTAL	13,513	18,340	--	303,220

* Includes 2,550 on-campus student housing units.

** Includes 12,310 school trip ends for students housed on-campus.

1. **Airport/MBEST** - This district represents a major employment center within Fort Ord and includes the airport, related industrial uses, a proposed industrial/office park and the MBEST. This district will have a high concentration of jobs, attracting employees from throughout the region. By 2015, this district is expected to reach approximately one-third of its ultimate development level. At present, the airport is operating, but there is limited additional activity in this area.
2. **Northern Residential** - Located adjacent to existing City of Marina areas, and between the airport and central core of Fort Ord, this district is primarily medium to high density residential. The draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan calls for housing developments with 8-10 dwelling units per acre. Key components of this district include the CSUMB-related housing area east of campus, and the low income, social, seniors housing areas along California Avenue between the central core and the City of Marina. This district is forecast to be largely built out by 2015, with some additional in-fill after this time. Only a small portion of the housing in this district is currently being used.
3. **Central Core/CSUMB** - The central core of Fort Ord consists of the CSUMB campus, mixed-use "villages" to the north and south, and a high-density retail/office/residential area to the west near Highway 1. For the year 2015, housing developments with densities of 8-10 dwelling units per acre are expected. Higher density residential development is planned for beyond 2015. The mixed-use nature of this development, combined with the large percentage of students expected to live on-campus, suggests a large number of intra-district trips for all purposes. It is important to recognize, however, that the district will

also become a major employment/commercial/education center for the region. By 2015, both the university and private development in this district are expected to reach roughly one-half of full buildout levels. In 1995, CSUMB began operation with approximately 850 full-time and part-time students. Other current activity in this district includes the POM Annex commercial services and the DFAS Center.

4. **Southern Residential** - This largely residential district envelopes the existing Fort Ord golf courses and includes the POM Annex residential area. It consists primarily of low to medium density residential development (4-8 dwelling units per acre). The POM Annex represents a specific service center. Although the Seaside portion of this district will be largely built out by 2015, development in the County portion will result in a near doubling of dwelling units in the ultimate plan. At this time, activity is limited to the POM Annex residences and the golf courses.
5. **SouthGate Commercial/Industrial** - This district contains a mix of lower density commercial and industrial uses. There is no current activity in this area, and only 20% of development is expected by 2015.
6. **East Garrison** - Lower-density, mixed use development is proposed for the East Garrison district. This district is expected to be approximately one-quarter developed by 2015. Like the South Commercial/Industrial district, there is no current activity at East Garrison.

In general, Fort Ord development densities for 2015 are consistent with those in the surrounding area. However, the mixed-use villages, CSUMB, and MBEST do represent significant, concentrated activity centers.

5.2 TRIP GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION

For the year 2015, Fort Ord reuses are forecast to generate over 300,000 daily trip ends. In developing a transportation system to accommodate these trips, it is important to know not only the number, but also the distribution of these trips. To provide this information, the daily person trip table from the model was compressed to look at the volume of trips between key groups of zones or districts. These districts represent portions of the urbanized areas in Monterey County, including Fort Ord, where development and trip generation is most concentrated. Additional districts were created consisting of the less developed and external zones. A total of twenty-three districts were initially created for this analysis. As part of this step, the first four of Fort Ord districts were combined (the South Gate Commercial/Industrial and East Garrison districts were excluded because of their spatial separation from the other districts in Fort Ord). A summary of the trip interactions between these district groups is provided in Table 5-2. Figure 5-2 illustrates the trip volume between the north-central portion of Fort Ord and selected communities in Monterey County.




Figure 5-2
Forecasted 2015 Trip Ends Between Core
Fort Ord Reuse Area and Primary Destinations

Source: JHK, 1996

**Table 5-2
FORECASTED 2015 DAILY PERSON TRIP DISTRIBUTION**

ORIGIN	DESTINATION							TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1. Central Fort Ord ¹	54,944	6,306	9,924	13,381	24,981	16,782	22,553	148,871
2. Other Fort Ord ²	3,678	694	1,511	923	1,375	1,213	1,896	11,290
3. Salinas	15,557	4,392	478,152	5,188	4,819	5,876	143,414	657,398
4. Marina	21,033	2,830	7,514	18,770	11,140	8,802	19,381	89,470
5. Seaside/DRO/ Sand City	13,125	2,713	2,600	3,999	49,106	40,558	27,294	139,395
6. Peninsula ³	9,197	2,013	2,649	2,237	32,857	134,893	54,228	238,074
7. Other	15,132	3,751	64,143	6,815	26,195	59,678	1,433,925	1,609,639
TOTAL	120,356	22,699	566,493	51,313	150,473	267,802	1,702,691	2,881,827

Notes: 1. Includes Airport/MBEST, North Residential, Central Core/CSUMB and South Residential districts.
 2. Includes Southgate and East Garmon districts.
 3. Includes Cities of Monterey and Pacific Grove.

It is important to note that over 43% of the daily trips generated by base reuses are expected to be captured internally. The communities with which Fort Ord is forecast to have the highest level of interaction are Seaside and Marina, although the Peninsula and Salinas represent larger activity centers. A key element of this finding is recognition that trips to these communities, as well as internally in Fort Ord, would also be well served by pedestrian and bicycle networks. Based on the trip results presented in Table 5-2, the trip end pairs with the greatest transit potential include:

- internal;
- Fort Ord to adjacent communities (Marina, Seaside);
- Fort Ord - Peninsula; and
- Fort Ord - Salinas.

5.3 NETWORK DEFINITION

Within the MCTAM, the transportation network is limited to the roadway network. Thus, assumptions regarding the transportation network include the location, number of lanes, free flow speed and capacity of roadways. The model network does not contain every roadway in Monterey County but does include most collectors, as well as all arterials, highways and freeways. The transit, bicycle and pedestrian networks are not explicitly modelled within the MCTAM, however assumptions regarding the use of these modes, based on historical mode choice, are built into the model.

Enhancements to include direct consideration of alternative modes was not possible for this study. Thus, the travel demand forecasts prepared for this study are based on relatively low levels of alternative mode use. In this manner, the resulting forecasts may be considered "auto-oriented" or "worst case" with respect to identifying future roadway improvement needs.

The definition of the roadway network involved two primary steps. The first step involved the definition of the internal arterial network needed to serve base reuses. This step was conducted concurrently with the development of the land use element for the draft Reuse Plan. Consideration was given to providing sufficient access to areas expected for redevelopment, maximizing the use of existing roads and alignments, and ensuring consistency between roadway class and adjacent land uses.

The second step involved "sizing" (defining the number of lanes) the internal network and identifying improvement to the regional network. The primary goal for this step was to define the roadway network to meet minimum level-of-service requirements while minimizing total infrastructure costs.

Public transportation is planned to be an important element of the multimodal transportation system serving Fort Ord and the adjacent region. It is especially important for the elderly, students, the disabled, and others who cannot drive or who do not have access to an automobile. Also, it can be an attractive transportation alternative for those who want to avoid the cost, stress, and delays of driving, and the nuisance of parking. Transit vehicles are generally less polluting on a per passenger basis, and can help to lessen roadway congestion. Transit use can delay or eliminate the need for costly roadway capacity improvements.

Financial constraints also played a critical role in determining network improvements. The implementation of transportation improvements to serve the demand created by reuse of the former Fort Ord, combined with growth throughout the region, will involve considerable cost. It is generally agreed that a portion of the costs for future improvements will be derived from fees levied on base reuses. However, there are many uncertainties regarding the availability of funding for transportation infrastructure and service improvements.

The total costs for the year 2015 transportation plan, and the former Fort Ord's share of these costs, are addressed throughout the remainder of this report. However, some uncertainty regarding funding sources remains. For this reason, this study has included the assessment of alternative scenarios that reflect differing funding levels. These scenarios, in turn, reflect differing network assumptions, consistent with the funding levels.

5.4 SCENARIO DESCRIPTIONS AND RESULTS

The primary focus of this study was the development of a transportation plan that adequately and efficiently meets the needs of base reuse and regional growth through to the year 2015. In doing so, numerous 2015 alternatives were modeled reflecting differing roadway network and land use assumptions. The result of this effort was the development of a financially unconstrained, or preferred, transportation plan. In addition, three alternative scenarios have been developed in order to define the

implications of different funding levels. Each of these scenarios includes land use assumptions consistent with the preferred plan, but differing roadway network assumptions.

A summary of the specific regional and on-site improvements contained in each scenario is provided in Table 5-3. It should be noted that this includes only major improvements to the regional CMP network. Minor and local improvements that were not expected to influence the travel forecasts are not included. Forecasted 2015 volumes and service levels for key regional roadway segments under the Financially Constrained and Unconstrained scenarios are presented in Table 5-4. Year 2015 volumes and service levels for on-site facilities under these same scenarios are presented in Table 5-5. The two partial funding scenarios were not modeled, thus volume and LOS results for these are not provided.

5.4.1 Financially Unconstrained Scenario

This scenario, with the most optimistic funding assumption, represents the preferred transportation plan for 2015. In defining the network for this scenario, improvements to the internal and regional systems were added in order to achieve service and cost-efficiency goals. Internally, an arterial roadway system designed to meet the Fort's needs for 2015 was incorporated into the network. Outside Fort Ord, a number of major improvement projects that address existing system deficiencies and/or improve access to Fort Ord were added to the model network. A number of alternatives were modeled to identify the preferred roadway network.

The proposed 2015 roadway network under the Financially Unconstrained scenario, including the number of lanes on key facilities, is illustrated in Figure 5-3. From a regional perspective, the proposed network includes a number of major improvement projects with varying levels of relationship to the reuse of the former Fort Ord. In some instances, these improvements address existing system deficiencies. Others are proposed with the intent of improving access to the former Fort Ord, recognizing the environmental and financial constraints. Improvements to the state highway system include the widening of State Highway 1 in Carmel (Hatton Canyon), Seaside/Sand City and north of Castroville, State Highway 156 east of Castroville, State Highway 183 north of Salinas, and State Highway 218 south of Seaside. Major new state facilities include the State Highway 68 By-pass Freeway and the Prunedale By-pass. Off-base arterial improvements include the widening of Blanco Road west of Salinas, Reservation Road in from Del Monte to Inter-garrison, Davis Road north of Blanco, and Del Monte Boulevard in Monterey/Seaside and in Marina. With the exception of the Davis Road widening, these proposed improvements are consistent with those contained in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan. A description of the proposed improvements to regionally significant roadways outside the base boundaries is provided below, along with Fort Ord's forecasted contribution to growth on these roadways.

Table 5-3
 2015 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY

FACILITY	SEGMENT		IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION	SCENARIO				
	From	To		Financially Unconstrained	Financially Constrained	Fort Ord Source Only	Impact Study Area Source Only	
On-Site Roadway Improvements								
Hwy 1 - Hatton Canyon	Carpenter	Carmel River	Construct new roadway	•	•	•	•	
Highway 1	Santa Cruz County Line	Castroville	Upgrade from 2-lane hwy to 4-lane freeway/expy	•			•	
	Fremont	Del Monte	Widen to 6 lanes - extend aux. lanes	•				
U S 101 - Prunedale By-Pass	Echo Valley	Espinosa	Construct new freeway	•			•	
U S 101 Interchanges	Boronda	Airport	Improve interchanges	•	•	•	•	
Highway 68	Highway 1	Highway 218	Upgrade to 4-lane freeway	•	•	•	•	
	Highway 218	San Benancio	Construct 4-lane ByPass freeway	•				
Highway 156	Castroville	U S 101	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (expy)	•		•	•	
Highway 183	Near Salinas	Castroville	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (expy)	•				
Highway 218	North-South	Hwy 68	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	•	•	•	•	
Davis Road	U S 101	Rossi	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	•				
	Rossi	Blanco	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	•				
	Blanco	Reservation	4-lane Bridge - to avoid wash-outs	•		•	•	
Blanco Road	Reservation	Alisal	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (to Davis)	•		•	•	
			Widen from 3 to 4 lanes (to Alisal)	•		•	•	
Reservation Road	Highway 1	Del Monte	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	•				
		Del Monte	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	•	•	•	•	
		Fort Ord Boundary	Blanco	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	•	•	•	•
		Blanco	Inter-garrison	Construct new 4-lane connection	•	•	•	•
		Inter-garrison	Watkins Gate	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (create couplet)	•	•	•	•
		Davis	Highway 68	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	•	•	•	•
Del Monte	In Seaside/Monterey	2nd Avenue	Widen from 4/5 to 6 lanes	•	•	•	•	
		Highway 1 UC	See 2nd Avenue	•				
		Reservation	Widen to 6 lanes	•				
Hwy 1/Fremont UC			Reconstruct					
On-Site Roadway Improvements								
12th/Imjin	Highway 1	California	Construct 4-lane arterial (exc. Gateway)	•	•	•	•	
		California	Widen to 4 lanes	•	•	•	•	
		Reservation	Blanco	Construct new 4-lane connector	•		•	•
8th Street	Highway 1 Overcrossing	2nd Avenue	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
		Inter-garrison	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
Inter-Garrison	8th St Cutoff	Reservation	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
Lightfighter	North-South Road	Hwy 1	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes					
Gigling	North-South Road	DFAS	Upgrade as 4-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
		Eastside	Construct new 4-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
2nd Avenue	Del Monte	12th	Construct as 4-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
		Lightfighter	Widen from 2 to 4-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
North-South Road	Normandy	Coe	Widen to 4 lanes	•	•	•	•	
		Broadway	Reconstruct as 2-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
		Highway 218	Reconstruct to 2-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	
California	3rd	8th Street	Construct 2-lane arterial	•	•	•	•	

Table 5-3
2015 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY

FACILITY	SEGMENT		IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION	SCENARIO			
	From	To		Financially Unconstrained	Financially Constrained	Fort Ord Source Only	Impact Study Area Source Only
Eastside Road	Imjin	Inter-garrison	Construct 2-lane arterial	•	•	•	•
	Inter-garrison	Gigling	Construct 2-lane arterial	•	•	•	•
Airport/MBEST Loop Road			Construct 2-lane collector	•	•	•	•
Misc Rehab/Safety & Minor Street Improvements				•	•	•	•
Transit Capital Improvements							
Multimodal Rail	Salinas	Highway 1	Construct Heavy Rail Link - Post-2015	•	•	•	•
			Reserve ROW within Fort Ord	•	•	•	•
Fleet Purchase and Replacement			Vehicles to serve new development (30)	•	•	•	•
			Replacements for existing fleet	•	•	•	•
Intermodal Centers			Construct center for bus and future rail	•	•	•	•
			P'nR lot - 12th/Imjin	•	•	•	•
			P'nR lot - 8th/Gigling	•	•	•	•
On-Site Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements							
			Include sidewalks on all reconstructed or new roadways	•	•	•	•
			Include bike paths on all reconstructed or new arterial roadways	•	•	•	•

Roadway	Segment	Daily Volume/LOS		
		Existing (1993/94) Condition	Financially Constrained	Financially Unconstrained
State Highway 1	State Highway 68 to Del Monte Blvd (Seaside)	56,000/D	65,000/E	65,000/E
	Del Monte Blvd (Seaside) to State Highway 218	60,000/D	72,200/F	71,900/D
	State Highway 218 to Fremont Blvd	59,000/D	87,500/F	89,000/D
	Fremont Blvd to Main Gate	75,000/D	101,200/E	99,700/E
	Main Gate to 12th Street	65,000/C	80,200/D	79,700/D
	12th Street to S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd)	71,000/C	75,100/D	75,600/D
	S. Marina (Del Monte Blvd) to Reservation Road	35,500/C	48,400/D	48,900/D
	Reservation Road to N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd)	35,500/C	47,400/C	47,600/C
	N. Marina (Del Monte Blvd) to State Highway 156	37,500/C	53,800/D	52,800/D
	State Highway 156 to Santa Cruz County line	30,000/E	60,200/F	70,700/F
State Highway 68	State Highway 1 to State Highway 218	22,800/F	36,300/F	38,700/C
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio Road (Highway)	20,600/F	30,200/F	10,000/B
	State Highway 218 to San Benancio (Freeway Bypass)	N/A	N/A	21,900/B
	San Benancio Road to Reservation Road	25,000/B	36,000/C	34,600/C
	Reservation Road to E. Blanco Road	29,500/B	43,900/C	42,500/C
State Highway 156	Hwy 1 to 0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd.	22,000/B	35,600/C	30,900/B
	0.1 miles East of Castroville Blvd. to US 101	25,000/E	26,500/E	35,500/C
State Highway 183	US 101 to Davis Road	29,500/E	37,900/F	38,900/F
	Davis Road to Espinosa Road	16,000/C	32,900/F	30,700/B
	Espinosa Road to State Highway 156	22,000/D	53,300/F	50,900/D
State Highway 218	State Highway 1 to Fremont Boulevard	14,000/D	19,700/D	22,600/D
	Fremont Boulevard to North-South Road	10,850/B	10,900/B	12,200/C
	North-South Road to Hwy 68	10,850/B	16,500/B	17,800/B

Table 5-4 OFF-SITE REGIONAL FACILITIES SUMMARY				
Roadway	Segment	Daily Volume/LOS		
		Existing (1993/94) Condition	Financially Constrained	Financially Unconstrained
Del Monte Boulevard	El Estero to Highway 1	34,300/F	50,000/F	49,300/D
	State Highway 1 to Broadway Ave	27,026/D	29,500/D	29,400/D
	Broadway Ave to Fremont Blvd	9,757/C	9,400/C	10,000/C
	State Highway 1 (S. Marina) to Reservation Road	28,836/D	29,700/D	29,600/D
	Reservation Road to State Highway 1 (N. Marina)	4,825/A	10,800/B	9,800/B
Fremont Blvd	State Highway 1/State Highway 68 to Broadway Ave	25,166/D	27,200/D	27,500/D
	Broadway Ave to State Highway 1	16,363/C	31,300/F	28,200/D
Broadway Avenue	Del Monte Blvd to Noche Buena Street	13,895/C	16,800/C	16,800/C
	Noche Buena Street to North-South Road	8,742/C	15,100/C	15,000/C
Reservation Road	Hwy 1 to Del Monte Boulevard	10,205/B	14,800/D	14,800/D
	Del Monte Boulevard to Crescent Ave	26,046/E	31,600/D	30,000/D
	Crescent Ave to Imjin Road	22,874/B	32,300/D	32,300/D
	Imjin Road to Blanco Road	N/A	47,500/D	29,700/C
	Blanco Road to Inter-garrison Road	3,700/A	22,700/B	15,600/B
	Intergarrison Road to Davis Road	4,700/A	24,200/E	16,000/C
Blanco Rd	Davis Road to State Highway 68	6,200/A	9,600/B	12,100/B
	Reservation Road to Davis Road	20,252/E	18,300/D	35,700/C
Blanco Rd/ Sanborn Rd	Davis Road to State Highway 68	18,836/B	18,400/B	23,700/B
	State Highway 68 to US 101	26,600/C	31,100/C	30,700/D
Davis Road	Reservation Road to Blanco Road	7,500/A	23,800/E	15,700/C
	Blanco Road to Rossi Street (Hwy 183)	24,000/E	29,000/E	26,300/B
	Rossi Street (Hwy 183) to US 101	34,829/F	35,900/F	38,300/B

100-5066-1-10-16-1

**Table 5-5
FORT ORD ARTERIAL FACILITIES SUMMARY**

Roadway	Segment	Daily Volume/LOS	
		Financially Constrained	Financially Unconstrained
12th/Imjin	State Highway 1 to California Avenue	20,800/D	19,900/D
	California Avenue to Eastside Road	12,800/B	12,500/B
	Eastside Road to Reservation Road	19,400/B	7,400/B
Blanco/Imjin Connector	Eastside to Reservation	N/A	10,800/B
8th Street	State Highway 1 Overpass to 2nd Avenue	300/C	300/C
	2nd Avenue to Inter-garrison	2,800/C	2,500/C
Inter-garrison Road	8th Street to Gigling Connector	3,500/B	3,000/B
	Gigling Connector to Reservation Road	13,100/C	7,400/A
Lightfighter	State Highway 1 to North-South Road	24,400/D	23,500/D
Gigling	North-South Road to Eastside	16,900/B	15,200/B
2nd Avenue	Del Monte Blvd to 12th Street	3,900/C	3,900/C
	12th Street to Lightfighter	12,100/D	11,800/D
North-South Road	Lightfighter to Gigling	19,700/D	18,400/D
	Gigling to Coe/Eucalyptus	16,900/B	16,200/B
	Coe to Broadway	15,500/E	14,900/D
	Broadway to State Highway 218	5,500/A	5,400/A
California Avenue	Reservation Road to 12th Street	9,600/D	13,200/D
	12th Street to 8th Street	1,700/D	2,100/D
Eastside Road	Imjin to Gigling	9,900/B	12,100/C

y/tcd/50068/finrep/tbl5-5)




Figure 5-3
Financially Unconstrained Scenario — 2015 Transportation Network

U.S. 101 - No improvements directly related to the reuse of the former Fort Ord are required, but the proposed network does include the Prunedale Bypass. Funding for this improvement is expected to come from sources other than the development-related financing programs on Fort Ord.

State Highway 1 - This scenario includes the assumption of three improvement projects along State Highway 1. The first is the completion of the Hatton Canyon improvements in the Carmel area. The second project includes the widening of the Highway from four to six lanes between the Fremont Boulevard interchange in Seaside to the Del Monte Boulevard interchange in Seaside. This segment is immediately south of the former Fort Ord and is expected to become significantly congested if unimproved. It should be noted that this segment, along with Del Monte Boulevard in Monterey, forms a primary transit corridor that is considered a candidate for potential rail service. The implementation of high level transit service between Fort Ord and the Monterey Peninsula may eliminate or delay the need for roadway widening. The preferred scenario in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips on this segment to be 32% in the period to 2015.

The third project is the upgrade of Highway 1 north of Castroville to a 4-lane expressway. The Fort Ord share of traffic growth on this segment was found to be insignificant (less than 2%).

State Highway 68 - For the 2015 network, it is assumed that the Highway 68 By-Pass freeway will be built. This four-lane facility will run through the southern portion of the former Fort Ord. The preferred scenario in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 6.5% in the period to 2015.

State Highway 156 - This highway is considered a vital link between the Peninsula, and the former Fort Ord in particular, and the San Francisco Bay Area. Under the proposed network, the two-lane portion of Highway 156 would be upgraded to a four-lane expressway by the year 2015. As a result, this facility would operate at LOS C and would attract trips that otherwise divert to alternative routes in Northern Monterey County. The preferred scenario in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 11.7% in the period to 2015. However, the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan calls for base reuse to contribute over 60% of the necessary funding to reflect the importance of this link.

State Highway 183 - This roadway provides the most direct connection between Salinas and points north on Highway 1 including Castroville and Santa Cruz. To alleviate congestion and provide relief to other routes (U.S. 101 and Highway 1), the proposed network includes widening of Highway 183 to four lanes between Castroville and Salinas by the year 2015. The preferred scenario in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 1.5% in the period to 2015.

State Highway 218 - This facility will be improved between State Highway 68 and North-South Road. The preferred scenario in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 44% in the period to 2015.

Reservation Road - The preferred plan for 2015 includes improvements along Reservation Road from Del Monte Boulevard to Davis Road. In general, these improvements include the widening of Reservation by 2 additional lanes (from 2 to 4, or from 4 to 6). The upgrading of Reservation between

Davis and Inter-garrison, combined with the reconstruction of the Davis Road bridge, is proposed with the intent of establishing this route as an attractive alternative to Blanco between the former Fort Ord and Salinas. The objective of this approach is to lessen the magnitude and impact of improvements along both corridors. The projected contribution of the former Fort Ord to added trips on Reservation varies from 50% near Del Monte to over 80% west of Blanco.

Blanco Road - Upgrading of this facility between Davis and Reservation is proposed, although improvements to other portions of the network (notably Davis, Reservation and Inter-garrison) are intended to provide attractive alternatives and lessen demand on Blanco. The preferred scenario in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 60% in the period to 2015.

Davis Road - South of Blanco, improvements to Davis Road are limited to the construction of a new bridge over the Salinas River. This new bridge is intended to ensure that this route will remain open as an alternative to Blanco road. The preferred scenario in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 40% in the period to 2015.

North of Blanco Road, the widening of Davis to 4 lanes between Blanco and Rossi, and to 6 lanes between Rossi and U.S. 101 is proposed. This improvement addresses an existing deficiency and provides significant capacity for future growth. It was assumed that the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips on this portion of Davis was consistent with that on Blanco Road. It should be noted that this improvement, and associated cost, were not included in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

Del Monte (Monterey) - This facility provides the primary link between the Peninsula and points to the east including Highway 1 and the former Fort Ord. Improvements to sections of this roadway are underway. The 2015 network includes widening of this facility to six lanes from Monterey to Highway 1. The preferred scenario in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan projects the former Fort Ord's contribution to added trips to be 50% in the period to 2015. The City of Monterey is currently undertaking a project to widen Del Monte Boulevard to 4 and 5 lanes. The City has stated a preference against further widening, and in support of using development-related financing as a transit in-lieu fee.

This transportation plan also includes the designation of the arterial roadways that will provide circulation within the reuse area. In general, this system of major roads provides access to the regional network via the existing entrance locations at 12th Street, Main Gate (Light Fighter), Imjin Road, Inter-garrison Road, Broadway Avenue and North-South Road at State Highway 218 as well as a new access point via 2nd Ave. Within the base, these roads connect the entrance points and provide for internal circulation. The arterial component of the roadway element within the former Fort Ord consists of the facilities described below.

12th Street/Imjin Road - This remains a key corridor between State Highway 1 and Reservation Road in Fort Ord. For the 2015 proposed network, this facility will be four lanes from State Highway 1 to Reservation Road.

Blanco/Imjin Connector - This scenario also includes a new arterial connection within the former Fort Ord boundaries. A new two-lane roadway is proposed connecting the Reservation/Blanco intersection

with Imjin near the Eastside Road intersection. This roadway, termed the Blanco/Imjin Connector, would provide direct access onto the former Fort Ord from Blanco.

Gigling Road/Inter-garrison Connector - Gigling Road would serve as the major roadway serving the area immediately south of the CSUMB campus. In the 2015 proposed network, this facility would exist as a four lane arterial from North-South Road to Eastside Road.

Inter-garrison Road/8th Street - This facility is intended to be more attractive to drivers for accessing the southern portion of the reuse area from the east, thus reducing the demand on Blanco Road and the 12th Street/Imjin Road corridor. West of the connection to Eastside Road, however, Inter-garrison Road would be de-emphasized as major vehicular route with greater emphasis placed on pedestrian and bicycle traffic. This entire facility is two lanes in the 2015 proposed network and four lanes in the ultimate buildout network. Eighth Street would possess design features (i.e., intersection and signal spacing) that reflect an urban, circulatory character.

2nd Ave./North-South Road - This corridor would serve as the north-south spine through the reuse area. It will provide a connection from Del Monte Boulevard in Marina to State Highway 218 in Del Rey Oaks. To do so, Del Monte Boulevard will be extended southward from Marina to 2nd Avenue within Fort Ord. The 2nd Avenue portion of this corridor would serve the key commercial and mixed-use development areas within Fort Ord. This facility would be designed to emphasize its role in serving as the primary circulation and access route for these areas, and de-emphasize it as an alternative to State Highway 1. For the 2015 proposed network, this facility will be two lanes on the 2nd Ave segment from Del Monte to 12th street and on the North-South Road segments from Coe/Eucalyptus to State Highway 218. The remaining segments of 2nd Ave and North-South Road will be four lanes.

Eastside Road - For 2015, a new two lane facility is proposed between Imjin and Gigling along the eastern portion of the primary redevelopment area in Fort Ord. Access to State Highway 68 would be via State Highway 218 and the existing North-South Road. Improvements to each of these segments are proposed to support this circulation pattern. In its ultimate form, this facility would provide a four lane connection between the proposed State Highway 68 freeway, around the east side of the CSUMB campus, to Imjin Road. Eastside Road would serve as a primary southwest-northeast corridor. In this manner, it would serve to reduce demand along State Highway 1, 12th Street and the Del Monte/2nd/North-South corridor.

California Avenue - In the 2015 proposed network, California Ave would be extended south from Marina as far as 8th Street as a two lane arterial. For buildout, this facility will be upgraded to a four lane arterial to serve as a key access and circulatory route in the Marina Village area.

Right-of-Way Reservation - The draft Reuse Plan includes the preservation of right-of-way for possible improvements beyond the year 2015. These include the widening of various facilities and the extension of Eastside Road from Broadway to State Highway 68. Another feature is the reservation of right-of-way along Blanco Road, Imjin Road, 8th Street and 1st Avenue for a high-capacity transit corridor, referred to as the Multimodal Corridor.

As a result of these roadway network improvements, most regional roadway segments are expected to operate at LOS D or better despite handling traffic volumes that are higher than existing levels. Portions of Highways 68 and 156 improved from existing LOS E/F to LOS D or better. Reservation, Fremont and Davis also experienced similar improvement. Segments of Highway 1, Highway 183, and Davis Road remain at or fall to LOS E or F due to constraints limiting improvements to these facilities. All on-site arterials are forecast to operate at LOS D or better.

This scenario was used to identify the internal transportation system (a system that would operate at LOS D or better), and to identify the full set of regional improvements. It was also used for the "nexus" assessment described previously and, in turn, to determine the Fort Ord development, non-Fort Ord development and non-development shares of the total improvement costs. This cost assessment is described in detail in Chapter 7. However, because this cost breakdown is used for defining the funding level assumptions in the remaining scenarios, a summary of these results is provided below.

Roadway improvements contained in the Financially Unconstrained scenario are estimated to cost over \$838 million. This number includes roadway capital improvements within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord totaling \$74 million. The nexus analysis indicates that the shares for the total costs break down as follows:

Dedicated/Expected Funding:	\$209 million
Fort Ord Development:	\$108 million
Study Area Development Outside Fort Ord:	\$252 million
Public:	\$279 million

Within the Funded category, \$143 million in STIP funds and nearly \$10 million in DCAG grants have already been secured for various projects. Secured funds include STIP funds for Highway 1 - Hatton Canyon and the Prunedale By-Pass, and DCAG grant funds for improvements on-site. In addition, \$56 million in STIP County minimum funds are expected over the next twenty years.

5.4.2 Financially Constrained Scenario

This scenario was defined as part of the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan and assumes the most severe funding constraints. Available funding includes currently committed funds, plus limited funds generated from base reuses through a flexible, development-related financing program that allows for this funding to be used to cover the entire cost of selected improvements. This scenario is defined in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR and assumes that Fort Ord-generated funds will be implemented to fully finance the internal network, while off-site improvements are limited to those regional facilities directly adjacent to the base and where improvements are needed primarily as a result of base reuse. It is important to note that this Fort Ord-generated fund does not equate to the fair share of contributions established from the nexus test.

Committed off-site improvements included in this scenario are the upgrade of Highway 1/ Hatton Canyon, and the widening of State Highway 68 in Monterey and Del Monte Boulevard in Monterey/Seaside. Off-site improvements assumed to be funded by Fort Ord-generated sources include

the widening of State Highway 218 south of Seaside, and Reservation Road in Marina. Changes to the internal network were contemplated as a response to possible shifts in traffic volumes caused by congestion on unimproved regional facilities. However, the internal network remained unchanged from the previous scenario. This scenario identifies the impact of the base's reuse and forecasted regional growth on the regional system if this system remains largely as it currently exists.

The reuse of the former Fort Ord contributes to increased volumes on many of the region's roadways. The addition of an arterial network on Fort Ord, however, results in traffic decreases on some roadways, notably Del Monte and Reservation in Marina. Service levels of LOS D or better are forecast for these segments. Acceptable service levels on the widened segments of Highway 68 and Highway 218 are also achieved. Roads forecast to operate at LOS E/F include: State Highway 1 in Seaside and north of Castroville, State Highway 68 south of Fort Ord, State Highway 183 north of Salinas, Del Monte Boulevard in Monterey, Davis Road, Fremont Boulevard in Seaside and Reservation Road from Inter-garrison Road to Davis Road. The internal network was designed such that all internal arterials would operate at LOS D or better. Because acceptable service levels were still achieved, the internal roadway network remained unchanged.

5.4.3 Funding from Fort Ord Source

For this scenario, it is again assumed that the funding for improvements is limited to that from committed sources, and that derived from a flexible, development-related program in the former Fort Ord. However, it is further assumed that the funding derived the Fort Ord financing program is increased to a level consistent with the Fort Ord share determined by the nexus analysis. Funding from this program would cover the costs of all internal improvements, as well as an expanded set of off-base, regional improvements.

The funds from this program would be used to cover the entire cost of selected improvements, with the total contribution remaining similar to that determined by the nexus test in the Financially Unconstrained scenario. The regional improvements added in this scenario are those deemed most important to base reuse and include all on-site improvements; Highway 156 upgrade; widening of Highway 213, Blanco Road, and Reservation; new bridge on Davis; and the extension of California Avenue.

Under this scenario, it can be expected that the service levels on improved roadway segments would be higher than those found under the Financially Constrained scenario. Additionally, these facilities would likely attract trips from other unimproved and congested routes. The net result being the potential for reduced congestion on some unimproved routes. For example, Highway 68 is likely to benefit from the improvements to Blanco, Davis and Reservation. However, in this case, it is still likely to operate at LOS F. Other poorly operating road segments where no direct or parallel route improvements are made, including Highways 1 and 183, would be expected to remain at LOS F as forecast under the Financially Constrained scenario.

This scenario is used to illustrate the limits of what fees from Fort Ord development may be reasonably expected to pay for, and the magnitude of the unfunded regional transportation improvements considered necessary to serve the area through 2015. Although the total Fort Ord

contribution to these improvements exceeds that determined by the nexus test, this would leave approximately \$500 million in unfunded improvements.

5.4.4 Funding from Impact Area Source

Under this scenario, it is assumed that a flexible, development-related financing program is expanded to include the entire impact study area illustrated in Figure 5-4. Funds generated from Fort Ord development is assumed to be allocated to those projects identified in the previous scenario. Funds generated from development outside Fort Ord are used to fully finance the unfunded portion of additional regional projects identified in the Financially Unconstrained scenario.


The amount of funding expected to be generated by non-Fort Ord development is assumed to be that of the non-Fort Ord growth share determined by the nexus analysis. Thus, an additional \$252 million is expected to be generated under this scenario. Recognizing that these funds would be insufficient to finance all of the identified improvements, the potential funds were allocated first to those projects identified as being of top priority to the region in the RTP. The additional projects that could be funded include: construction of the Prunedale By-Pass, widening and upgrade of Highway 1 north of Castroville, and the partial funding of the Highway 68 freeway. A portion of these funds may also be used for transit capital expenditures, notably the purchase of additional vehicles needed to serve new development.

Under this scenario, it can be expected that the service levels on improved roadway segments would be higher than those found under the previous scenario. However, these facilities would likely attract trips from other unimproved and congested routes. The result being the potential for reduced congestion on some unimproved routes, and service levels on improved segments that may not be as high as those achieved under the Financially Unconstrained scenario. For example, Highway 68 is likely to benefit from the improvements to Blanco, Davis and Reservation. However, in this case, it is still likely to operate at LOS F. Other poorly operating road segments, such as Highway 183, would be expected to remain at LOS F as forecast under the Financially Constrained scenario.

This scenario illustrates the shortfall in transportation funding that would still exist in the region, even if a development-related fee program was implemented within the entire impact study area (i.e. the northern portion of Monterey County including Fort Ord). Improvements for which complete funding would not be available include those to Highway 68, Highway 183, Del Monte Boulevard. It is important to note that the intent of this study and associated analysis was not to define the specific funding mechanism that would be used for this scenario.

5.5 ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY IMPACTS

The MCTAM is limited in its ability to assess the full range of strategies transportation-related. While it provides valuable information regarding future travel demand and the impacts of roadway improvements, it does not directly measure the impacts of transit, pedestrian, bicycle and TDM strategies. Because land use projections are an input to the model, it does reflect the benefits of various land use-related strategies in trip generation and distribution.



LEGEND	
	U.S. Highway
	State Highways

Figure 5-4
Impact Study Area

Jobs/housing balance and mixed-use developments concepts are reflected in the model through the number of trips forecast to stay within an individual zone or within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord. Of the 300,000 daily ends forecast to be generated by Fort Ord reuses in the year 2015, nearly 45% are forecast to be for trips completely within the boundaries of the reuse area. As a result, the impact of Fort Ord reuses on the regional transportation system is reduced.

Pedestrian and bicycle measures are an important component of the circulation element for the draft Reuse Plan. These measures are intended to increase the percentage of travel made by these modes. Because trips using these modes are typically short in length, these measures will primarily affect internal trips and those to nearby, adjacent communities. For this reason, the increased use of these modes is not expected to significantly impact the travel demands placed on the regional system.

As with the pedestrian and bicycle measures, transit measures are intended to result in the higher use of this mode. From a regional perspective, higher transit use can significantly affect the demands placed on the regional transportation. In some areas or corridors, where the land use and transit characteristics allow, transit mode shares in the range of 10 to 15 percent may be achieved. This is considerably higher than the current share of approximately 2%. The impact of this shift would be a lessening of the vehicular demands placed on regional roads. The limitation that these high transit mode shares may only be achieved in the most highly travelled corridors suggests that the need for roadway improvement may not be eliminated, but may be delayed. Conversely, achieving these transit shares would require that various transit improvements be implemented.

TDM programs can affect travel demand in 3 primary ways: 1) shift trips to alternative modes, including carpools, 2) eliminate trips completely; and 3) shift trips to different time periods. In the first two cases, the number of vehicle trips generated would be reduced. In turn, the demands placed on both the regional and internal roadways network would be reduced. These programs however, primarily affect only work trips. Reductions in work vehicle trips of 15 to 20% may be achieved at some sites. The overall impact, in terms of daily trips for the entire reuse area is much less significant. The shifting of trips to different period will not impact the number daily trips are forecast by the model, but will impact the number of trips expected to occur during the most congested periods of the day. Again, work trips are the most likely to be affected.

(50068/prod/finrep/chap5.d2)

6. MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The redevelopment of Fort Ord, combined with growth throughout the region, will increase the demand for transportation infrastructure and services both within the base area and the region. The Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study defines a long-term, comprehensive vision for the movement of people, goods, and vehicles within and through Fort Ord. This transportation plan includes strategies and improvements for the system within the base, as well as for those regionally significant facilities and services that provide access to Fort Ord. It focuses on the system of freeways, arterial, bus and rail transit, and bicycle and pedestrian routes to determine the most effective design possible while enhancing the community and protecting the environment. This plan also recognizes the close relationship between the transportation system and land use plan.

The transportation system described in this chapter consists of several elements: streets and roads, public transit, pedestrian, bicycle, demand management, and linkages to land use plans. This system is intended to serve the long-range needs of Fort Ord and surrounding region. While the roadway and transit elements of the system necessarily incorporate the entire region, the policies and programs related to the pedestrian, bicycle, TDM and land use elements apply principally to the area within the former Fort Ord. Each of these elements within the proposed system is described separately in the following sections.

6.1 ROADWAY SYSTEM

Streets and roads form the basic element of the transportation system. This element consists not only of streets within Fort Ord, but also key regional roads that provide access to and from Fort Ord. This regional network includes state highways and major arterial roads that serve intra- and inter-regional travel needs of Fort Ord and Monterey County.

In developing the roadway network for this transportation plan, there were two basic requirements:

- to define an internal arterial network that would support base reuses; and
- to identify improvements needed to achieve an acceptable level of service.

Table 6-1 provides a listing the roadway improvements identified as necessary to achieve the stated LOS objective for the year 2015. It must be recognized that this table does not include all potential roadway projects within the region. It includes only major improvements to the regional system and those within the former Fort Ord. Included in this table are cost estimates for each of the improvements. The total cost for the proposed roadway improvements is nearly \$838 million. A breakdown of these costs by facility type and geographic location is provided in Table 6-2.

Table 6-1
2015 FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
ROADWAY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT COSTS

FACILITY	SEGMENT		IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED COST
	FROM	TO		
STATE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS				
Highway 1	Carpenter	Carmel River	Construct new Hatton Canyon expressway	\$36,000,000
	Santa Cruz County Line	Castroville	Upgrade from 2-lane hwy to 4-lane freeway/expy	\$60,000,000
	Fremont	Del Monte	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes - extend aux. lanes	\$20,000,000
U.S. 101	Echo Valley	Espinosa	Construct Prunedale ByPass	\$236,000,000
	Boronda	Airport	Improve interchanges	\$63,000,000
Highway 68	Highway 1	San Benencia	Construct 4-lane ByPass freeway	\$177,000,000
Highway 156	Castroville	U.S. 101	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (expy)	\$50,000,000
Highway 183	Near Salinas	Castroville	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (expy)	\$59,000,000
Highway 218	North-South	Hwy 68	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (including ROW)	\$3,590,000
SUBTOTAL				\$704,590,000
OFF-SITE ARTERIAL IMPROVEMENTS				
Davis Road	U.S. 101	Rossi	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$5,000,000
	Rossi	Blanco	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	\$5,000,000
	Blanco	Reservation	4-lane Bndge - to avoid wash-outs	\$5,000,000
Blanco Road	Reservation	Alisal	Widen to 4 lanes incl. bndge/ROW	\$12,378,000
Reservation Road	Del Monte	Crescent	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$1,491,000
	Fort Ord Boundary	Blanco	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	\$4,011,000
	Blanco	Watkins Gate	Construct new 4-lane connection	\$7,162,400
Del Monte	In Seaside/Monterey		Widen from 4/5 to 6 lanes or transit alternative	\$10,000,000
	2nd Avenue	Highway 1 I/C	See 2nd Avenue	
	Highway 1 - South	Reservation	Widen to 6 lanes (including ROW)	\$5,576,300
California	Reservation	3rd	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial, and ROW	\$2,460,000
Crescent	Reindollar	Abrams	Extend as 2-lane local street	\$720,000
SUBTOTAL				\$58,798,700
ON-SITE IMPROVEMENTS				
Misc Improvements				\$11,100,364
Gateway Improvements				\$9,200,000
Abrams	2nd Ave/Del Monte	Patton School	Extend as 2-lane Arterial	\$603,000
12th/Imjin	Highway 1	Reservation	Construct 4-lane arterial (exc. Gateway)	\$9,065,000
	Abrams	Reservation/Blanco	Construct new 4-lane connector	\$4,080,000
8th Street	Highway 1 Overcrossing	Inter-gamson	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial	\$3,821,900
Inter-Gamson	8th St Cutoff	Reservation	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial	\$4,480,000
Lightfighter	North-South Road	Hwy 1	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes (part of Gateway improvements)	\$0
Gigling	North-South Road	Eastside	Upgrade as 4-lane arterial	\$4,537,800
2nd Avenue	Del Monte	Lightfighter	Construct as 4-lane arterial, and demolition	\$7,232,500
North-South Road	Normandy	Coe	Widen to 4 lanes	\$2,640,600
	Coe	Highway 218	Reconstruct as 2-lane arterial	\$3,520,000
California	3rd	8th Street	Construct 2-lane arterial	\$2,769,200
Salinas Ave	Reservation	Abrams	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial	\$2,412,000
Eucalyptus Road	North-South	End	Upgrade as 2-lane arterial	\$2,880,000
Eastside Road	Imjin	Gigling	Construct 2-lane arterial	\$6,020,000
SUBTOTAL				\$74,362,364
TOTAL ROADWAY COSTS				\$837,751,064

50086/PRODFINREP/TBL6-1.WK4

Table 6-2
2015 FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT COST SUMMARY

Facility Type	Estimated Cost
State Highways	\$704,590,000
Arterials Outside Fort Ord	\$58,798,000
Arterials / Other Roadways within Fort Ord	\$74,362,364
Total	\$837,751,064

6.2 TRANSIT SYSTEM

Public transportation is planned to be an important element of the multimodal transportation system serving Fort Ord and the adjacent region. It is especially important for the elderly, students, the disabled, and others who cannot drive or who do not have access to an automobile. Also, it can be an attractive transportation alternative for those who want to avoid the cost, stress, and delays of driving, and the nuisance of parking. Transit vehicles are generally less polluting on a per passenger basis, and can help to lessen roadway congestion. Transit use can delay or eliminate the need for costly roadway capacity improvements.

Public transportation can take many forms, but may be divided into three basic types of services: rail/fixed guideway transit, bus transit and paratransit. In general, rail services are medium to high capacity systems that operate primarily on right-of-ways separate from automobile traffic, and serve high density or volume corridors. Bus transit is the most common type of transit service. Buses typically operate within the existing street system thus limiting capital costs, but making buses subject to congestion delays. The lower operating speeds and smaller vehicle sizes often result in operating costs greater than that for rail services. Paratransit typically refers to the specialized transit services provided for persons with disabilities and elderly people who cannot ride regular bus transit. All three have potential application to Fort Ord, however this report focuses on rail and bus transit. In all cases, these services can be supported by the construction of various transit facilities ranging from bus shelters to transit transfer centers.

Ideally, transit service would be provided to all areas within Fort Ord, with efficient connections to other communities within the region. In practice, however, funding constraints require that transit service be focused on those areas with the greatest need and potential. It is important to recognize that many factors contribute to the effectiveness of transit. Typically, transit is most effective when tailored to the types of land use and the density of population, employment and commercial development in the areas it serves. Transit's competitiveness with auto travel and the quality of service are also keys to transit's effectiveness.

The planning of transit services and facilities has been an integral part of this study and the draft Reuse Plan. Additionally, TAMC is currently engaged in study that is exploring a range of rail service options for Monterey County, including a proposal to implement service between Monterey and Fort Ord-Marina. This proposed service would make use of existing track, and may include additional track to extend the existing Fort Ord spur further into the reuse area and closer to the CSUMB campus.

Individual jurisdictions within Monterey County are not directly responsible for transit; instead they rely on MST. Thus, the draft Reuse Plan, which provides policies and programs only for land use jurisdictions within Fort Ord, emphasizes actions that these jurisdictions can take to support transit activities. The draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan states that each jurisdiction with lands at Fort Ord shall:

- coordinate with MST to provide regional bus service and facilities to serve the key activity centers and key corridors within Fort Ord;
- assist in identifying key activity centers and key corridors, coordinating with MST to identify bus routes that could serve Fort Ord, and supporting MST to provide service responsive to the local needs;
- develop a program to identify locations for bus facilities, including shelters and turnouts;
- identify the need for transit/paratransit services for the elderly and disabled and coordinate with and support MST to implement the needed transit services;
- support TAMC and other agencies to provide passenger rail service that addresses transportation needs for Fort Ord, including assisting TAMC and other agencies to assess the need, feasibility, design and preservation of rights-of-way for passenger rail service that addresses transportation needs at Fort Ord;
- shall support the establishment of intermodal centers and connections that address the transportation needs at Fort Ord; and
- shall coordinate with and support TAMC and MST to identify the need, location, and physical design of intermodal centers and regional and local transportation routes to connect with the intermodal centers.

Although the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan does not contain specific service proposals, the related Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP) does include the purchase of 15 buses by the year 2015 in support of service to and within Fort Ord. Furthermore, it states that facilities such as shelters and pullouts shall be funded and constructed through new development and/or other programs in order to support convenient and comprehensive bus service. The Plan also incorporates construction of an intermodal center on 1st Avenue south of 8th Street, and of two park-and-ride lots (at 12th & Imjin, and 8th & Gigling) by the year 2015. The costs for constructing these facilities are included in the Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP).

Within this study, a further examination of was conducted to identify the primary transit needs and potential within Fort Ord. This examination took into account the forecasted land use and travel demand characteristics, existing services, current rail service proposals, transit capital expenditures identified within the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan, and the reality of funding constraints. For the most part, specific routes were not defined, rather only the corridors or endpoints to be connected were identified.

From the perspective of serving Fort Ord's travel demand, the proposed Monterey-Marina service responds to the need for a connection between the central core of Fort Ord and the Peninsula. With respect to other areas of Fort Ord, direct bus service to the Peninsula would appear to be more efficient than requiring a transfer for the relatively short trip to Monterey. In the long-term, as rail service is expanded, feeder bus service may be more feasible. For this rail to be effective in serving the Fort Ord-Monterey market, however, frequencies and operating hours would need to reflect the needs of the area. Recommendations related to rail service in the Fort Ord area include:

- Continue to explore short-term rail options, notably a connection between Monterey and Fort Ord-Marina, with the emphasis in the shorter-term being placed on connections that utilize existing tracks.
- Pursue a rail connection between Fort Ord and Salinas as a long-term option.

Bus transit provides greater routing flexibility and lower start-up costs than rail transit. For these reasons it is more practical to view bus service as the primary transit mode serving Fort Ord during the first phases of reuse. As the reuse of Fort Ord continue to the year 2015 and beyond, numerous improvements to the bus service in Fort Ord will be needed to respond to the increased demand and to attract new riders. In general, the desired improvements include providing new or more direct connections, and increasing service frequencies. Based on the assessment of potential transit markets and estimated transit mode shares, suggested enhancements to the bus service include:

- add direct service within Fort Ord, most notably between MBEST and other areas;
- add service between the central portion of Fort Ord and Salinas (this could include stops at MBEST, and could be part of a line running from the Peninsula, through Seaside and Fort Ord);
- enhance service between Marina and central Fort Ord (potential to route along Del Monte and California extensions); and
- enhance service levels on all routes, particularly in peak periods.

More general improvements include adding more stops, and encouraging private services such as CSUMB shuttle and proposed MBEST shuttle.

Improvements to transit service beyond the boundaries of the former Fort Ord will also be required by the year 2015. These include:

- purchase of replacement vehicles for the existing fleet;
- initiation of additional service to meet the needs of growth outside of Fort Ord; and
- purchase of new vehicles to meet the requirements of expanded service.

Table 6-3 provides a summary of specific transit-related improvements identified as part of this study and the draft Reuse Plan. This table does not include all policies and programs, but rather focuses on specific actions or improvements. Estimates of the funding requirements for expanding service to Fort Ord and other new development in the region, as well as non-Fort Ord vehicle costs, were provided by MST.

6.3 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM

Non-motorized modes of travel are an important focus for the Fort Ord circulation system. The two most common non-motorized modes of travel are walking (pedestrian) and bicycling. Both pedestrian and bicycle travel are non-polluting, do not contribute to roadway congestion, and are healthy alternatives to vehicular travel. People often find walking and bicycling to be pleasant experiences when they have clearly defined facilities and feel safe using them.

There are a number of transportation and land use factors that influence the use of bicycles and walking as travel modes. These include: availability of facilities, mixture of land uses, supporting design environment, and supporting programs. The influence of these factors may vary depending on whether the entire trip is taken by bicycle/walking, or if the bicycle/pedestrian mode is the access mode to transit. The current Fort Ord Reuse planning activity incorporates many elements related to these factors.

The design standards for roadways within Fort Ord include rights-of-way for both pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Design standards included as part of the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan show that Class I bikeways should be incorporated into all arterial roadways. Figure E-4 illustrated the proposed Class I bikeway system for Fort Ord. On collector and local roads, Class II bike routes should be striped and marked where designated on an integrated bikeway master plan. Other two-lane local streets and all rural roadways should include shoulders adequate for bicycle use. Additional bicycle amenities that could be provided include racks or lockers at activity and transit centers, and racks on transit vehicles. Sidewalks are to be constructed along all urban roadways. To maximize the effectiveness of these facilities, connecting sidewalks and bikeways in adjacent areas should be pursued. One means of ensuring this is to apply the same design standards when arterials outside of Fort Ord are constructed or upgraded.

A critical factor in promoting pedestrian activity is to have land uses that permit trips that can be easily and safely walked. The primary example of pedestrian-friendly land uses are a mixture of uses located in proximity to one another. Like walking, bicycle trips are usually shorter in length and, thus, are also more likely in areas with a mixture of land uses that result in residences being in close proximity to employment, commercial and recreational opportunities.

The land use plan included in the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan includes the creation of two mixed-use villages located north and south of the CSUMB campus, as well as a higher-density, mixed area to the west along Highway 1. Within these areas, residences will be able to access a range of goods, services and jobs within a short distance. The land use plan also incorporates several neighborhood shopping areas within or adjacent to the larger residential districts.

Site design characteristics that encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity include landscaping, minimal building setbacks in commercial areas, and shower facilities at the workplace. TDM programs at job sites, such as financial incentives for non-auto commuting, can also be developed to encourage commuting by bicycle and walking. Another way to support pedestrian and bicycle travel is to ensure that these modes are included in planning efforts. Each of these concepts are promoted within the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan recommends that TDM programs be promoted at work sites and other activity centers, and that all Fort Ord jurisdictions prepare Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plans. These plans are to be coordinated with adjacent land use jurisdictions, FORA, and appropriate school entities.

Table 6-4 provides a summary of the bicycle and pedestrian-related improvements or policies recommended as part of the Fort Ord reuse. Costs for these measures are assumed to be incorporated into the cost estimates for larger improvements (e.g. the cost for an arterial bike lane is incorporated into the cost for the roadway improvement), or are unavailable, or are not applicable.

6.4 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

To some extent, the increases in travel demand created by Fort Ord and regional development will be managed by building or improving transportation facilities, but there also exists a variety of concepts and objectives that can be used to minimize the demand for vehicle trips as an alternative to increasing roadway capacity. TDM attempts to reduce the number of people who drive alone, and to increase the number of people who walk and who use carpools, vanpools, transit, and bicycles. The approach being taken as part of the Fort Ord Reuse transportation planning activity seeks to balance these two elements to achieve a transportation system that is both financially feasible and operationally acceptable.

Traditionally, TDM programs have focused on the work site. Some measures that can be pursued at the work site include: compressed work weeks, staggered/flexible work hours, telecommuting, on-site ridesharing, public transit subsidies, bicycle facilities, and parking pricing. Other strategies for implementation include promoting TDM programs at residential developments, retail centers, and other major activity centers, requiring new development to incorporate design features that will promote TDM programs, and enforcing CMP trip reduction programs.

**Table 6-3
2015 FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY
TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT SUMMARY**

Improvement Description		Estimated Cost
Capital		
Transit Vehicle Purchase and Replacement	Vehicles to serve new development	\$10,000,000
	Vehicles to replace existing fleet	\$5,000,000
Intermodal Centers	Construct center for bus and future rail	\$1,800,000
	Construct park-n-ride lot 12th/Imjin	\$900,000
	Construct park-n-ride lot 8th/Gigling	\$1,100,000
Subtotal		\$18,800,000
Operational		
Expand bus service in Fort Ord		\$56,000,000
Expand regional bus service		\$56,000,000
Subtotal		\$112,000,000
Total Transit Costs		\$130,800,000

(\\cedfile\0068\4\arep\616-3)

Table 6-4

**2015 FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE IMPROVEMENTS/POLICIES**

Construct sidewalks on all urban roadways
Construct Class I bikeways on all arterials
Construct Class II and III bikeways on designated collector, local and rural roads
Develop mixed-use, higher-densities areas
Promote pedestrian and bicycle-friendly site designs
Promote TDM programs
Prepare Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plans

There is no existing transportation demand management (TDM) program in place for Fort Ord, however the draft Reuse Plan states that TDM programs should be promoted at work sites and other activity centers. Further, TAMC has developed a trip reduction program as part of the CMP.

6.5 LAND USE PLAN

Local land use planning is another method of managing regional traffic growth as well as local traffic problems. The draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan includes land use policies aimed at providing Fort Ord with a cohesive community through:

- identifiable centers to add focus to the larger area;
- diversity and choice to enhance opportunity and interaction;
- alternative transportation that stresses access vs. speed and encourages a pedestrian-friendly environment;
- housing diversity in type, density, and location; and
- natural and preserved areas that link all sectors together in a seamless way.

The policies listed above can be found in the Land Use Element of the draft Reuse Plan, along with a specific description of the existing land use conditions.

The relationship between the transportation system and land use planning is an interactive one. As stated above, one of the policies of the land use element is to support alternative transportation use. The transportation system can support this goal by providing the infrastructure necessary to use alternative transportation modes, and by not oversupplying infrastructure oriented to the use of the automobile, particularly single-occupant vehicles. Additionally, the land use element presented in the Reuse plan supports this goal by providing jobs/housing balance and mixed-use development.

Providing a jobs/housing balance is intended to encourage employers to locate in areas where there are significantly more residents than jobs and to add housing development near employment centers. In a mixed-use development, a variety of compatible land uses are located in proximity to one another. If a mixed-use development includes commercial uses that serve offices and/or residences, employees and residents can patronize the commercial uses without making a vehicle trip. Increasing the density of a mixed-use development results in a decrease in the distances between uses, further encouraging walking and reducing vehicle travel. In single-use developments, higher densities can mean greater opportunities for carpooling and transit service.

As noted in Section 3.3 of this report, other land use-related concepts that impact transportation include the design of the street network, transit-oriented design (TOD). A grid networks can reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by reducing the distance that needs to be traveled between two points (as compared to networks where cul-de-sacs predominate). A grid network also provides more direct routes for pedestrians and bicyclists. TOD is a deliberate alteration of post-World War II suburban patterns. It assumes a sizeable parcel of developing/redeveloping land (at least one-third of a mile in radius) centered on a current or planned major transit station. Development in a TOD would include a range of housing densities and mix of land uses. Pedestrian facilities are provided to the transit station and between the land uses to make it convenient for residents and employees to walk and bicycle. Vehicle travel is reduced within the TOD as a result of the clustering of land uses. Regionally, transit use would be increased as a result of more residences and employment sites being located near a transit station.

(50068/prod/finrep/chap6.d2)

7. FINANCING STRATEGY

The proposed transportation system presented in the previous chapter includes approximately \$920 million in capital and operational improvements to address existing deficiencies, and to serve future development in the former Fort Ord and the region. A primary constraint to the implementation of the proposed system is the ability to fund these improvements.

A number of existing and potential funding sources for transportation were discussed in Chapter 4 of this report. While there are a number of existing funding programs or sources that may provide funds for the types of improvements identified within this study, funding for most, if not all, of these improvements is not yet secured. Furthermore, an assessment of these existing sources suggests a limited capacity for financing future improvements. Implementation of the improvements proposed in this study will, undoubtedly, require new funding sources.

The following sections represent the initial steps in addressing the issue of financing the improvements suggested as part of this study. The following section provides a breakdown of improvement costs by type (e.g. roadway versus transit, state versus local roadway, etc.). The second section summarizes the conclusions regarding currently dedicated or expected funding from existing sources as discussed in Chapter 4. The results from a preliminary nexus analysis are presented in the third section. This analysis includes a breakdown of the demand for individual improvements attributable to Fort Ord development, non-Fort Ord development, and to public/non-development sources. This is followed by a discussion of the differences between the cost and nexus information presented in this report versus that presented in the Fort Ord Reuse plan. The final section of this chapter provides a discussion of potential sources that may be pursued to cover unfunded portions of the proposed improvements.

7.1. COST ASSESSMENT

The transportation improvements presented in this report include a mixture of projects covering various transportation modes and types of facilities. A summary of individual project cost estimates is presented in the previous chapter. A breakdown of these project costs, according to type of improvement, is presented in Table 7-1 and illustrated in Figure 7-1. The purpose of this breakdown is to provide direction regarding the types of funding sources that may be applicable for financing the suggested improvements. Some sources, both existing and potential, are constrained with respect to the types of projects that may be funded from that source. For example, funds from sources may only be used for roadway capital projects, while those from other sources may only be used for transit operational expenditures. It must be recognized that this table does not include all potential transportation projects within the region through the year 2015. It includes only major improvements to the regional system and those within the former Fort Ord.

**Table 7-1
BREAKDOWN OF ESTIMATED COSTS BY IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

Improvement Type	Estimated Cost	Percent Share
Total Capital Costs	\$857 million	88%
Highway Capital Improvements	\$705 million	73%
Regional Arterial Capital Improvements	\$59 million	6%
On-Fort Ord Arterial Improvements	\$74 million	8%
Transit Capital Improvements	\$19 million	2%
Transit Service Expansion (Operations and Maintenance)	\$112 million	12%
Service Expansion for Fort Ord	\$56 million	6%
Service Expansion for Other Growth Areas	\$56 million	6%
Total Transportation Costs	\$ 969 million	100%

Roadway improvements contained in the proposed transportation plan include measures such as the widening or extension of existing roads, as well as the construction of new roads and bridges. Impacted roadways include a number of state highways within Monterey County, as well as arterials that are part of the CMP network or form the proposed arterial network on Fort Ord. Proposed transit capital improvements include both the purchase of new vehicles and the construction of intermodal facilities. The operational improvements reflect the costs to expand service to meet the needs created by the redevelopment of Fort Ord and projected growth throughout other areas of the region.

As shown in Table 7-1, capital improvements account for nearly 88% of the total transportation costs associated with the proposed transportation system. Within the proposed capital improvements, costs for state highway improvements represent the most significant share at \$705 million, or 73% of all transportation costs. Only 8% of the total costs are for roadway capital improvements within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord. Transit capital improvements account for only 2% of the total costs. Increased transit operational and maintenance costs, however, represent 12% of the total costs.

taxes, and toll roads. To support this assessment of potential sources, a preliminary nexus analysis was conducted. The results of this analysis are presented in the following section.

**Table 7-2
ESTIMATED COSTS, EXPECTED FUNDING AND SHORTFALLS**

Improvement Type	Costs/ Expected Funding
ROADWAY CAPTIAL Total Estimated Costs Expected Sources: STIP DCAG STIP County Minimum Total Shortfall	\$838 million \$143 million \$10 million \$56 million \$209 million \$629 million
TRANSIT CAPTIAL Total Estimated Costs Expected Sources: Shortfall	\$19 million \$0 \$19 million
TRANSIT OPERATIONS Total Estimated Costs Expected Sources: LTF Farebox Revenue Total Shortfall	\$112 million \$2.5 million \$33.6 million \$36.1 million \$75.9 million
ALL IMPROVEMENTS Total Estimated Costs Funding from Expected Sources Shortfall	\$969 million \$245.1 million \$723.9 million

7.3. PRELIMINARY NEXUS ANALYSIS

Two important conclusions may be derived from the discussion of funding sources in Chapter 4 and the previous section. First, current funding sources are expected to only partially fund a few of the proposed improvements by the year 2015. Second, a development-related financing mechanism represents a potential funding source that warrants further consideration.

It is important to note, however, the constraints related to development-related financing. First, the amount contributed must be proportional to the share of the improvement's need that is created by new development. The need for an improvement may be generated by the reuse of the former Fort Ord, by growth within the study area but outside the former Fort Ord, and by the desire to correct existing deficiencies. Second, development-related financing cannot be used when a large percentage of new trips start or end outside the assessment area and, therefore, would not be charged. Thus, improvements to major facilities serving a high percentage of inter-

Table 7-3
2015 FORT ORD REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY
PRELIMINARY NEXUS ANALYSIS RESULTS

FACILITY	ESTIMATED COST	DEDICATED/EXPECTED FUNDING (1)		UNFUNDED COST ALLOCATION(2)		
		Amount	Source	Fort Ord Development	Impact Study Area Development	PUBLIC(3)
Regional Highway Projects						
Highway 1 - Hilton Canyon	\$36,000,000	\$36,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	\$0
Highway 1 - North of Castroville	\$60,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$60,000,000
Highway 1 - Seaside/Sand City	\$20,000,000	\$0		\$6,400,000	\$13,600,000	\$0
U.S. 101 - Prunedale By-Pass	\$236,000,000	\$107,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	\$129,000,000
U.S. 101 Interchanges	\$63,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$63,000,000
Highway 68 - Bypass Freeway	\$177,000,000	\$0		\$18,054,000	\$138,768,000	\$20,178,000
Highway 156 Widening	\$50,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$50,000,000
Highway 183 Widening	\$59,000,000	\$0		\$0	\$56,050,000	\$2,950,000
Highway 218 - North-South to Hwy 68	\$3,590,000	\$0		\$1,629,860	\$1,960,140	\$0
Expected STIP County Minimum Funds (4)	\$0	\$56,000,000	STIP	\$0	\$0	(\$56,000,000)
SUBTOTAL	\$704,590,000	\$199,000,000		\$26,083,860	\$210,378,140	\$269,128,000
Off-Site Arterial Improvements						
Davis Road - Widening n/o Blanco	\$10,000,000	\$0		\$5,570,000	\$3,720,000	\$710,000
Davis Road - New bridge	\$5,000,000	\$0		\$2,030,000	\$2,970,000	\$0
Blanco Road - Widening and bridge	\$12,378,000	\$0		\$6,337,536	\$5,520,588	\$519,876
Reservation Road - Widening	\$12,664,400	\$0		\$9,068,973	\$3,431,417	\$164,010
Del Monte - Seaside/Monterey	\$10,000,000	\$0		\$3,420,000	\$3,460,000	\$3,120,000
Del Monte - Marina	\$5,576,300	\$0		\$4,488,922	\$1,087,379	\$0
California	\$2,460,000	\$0		\$697,500	\$1,162,500	\$600,000
Crescent	\$720,000	\$0		\$720,000	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$58,798,700	\$0		\$32,332,931	\$21,351,884	\$5,113,886
On-Site Improvements						
Gateway and Misc Safety Improvements/Rehab	\$20,300,364	\$9,780,000	DCAG	\$10,520,364	\$0	\$0
Abrams	\$603,000	\$0		\$603,000	\$0	\$0
12th/Imjin	\$9,065,000	\$0		\$4,532,500	\$4,532,500	\$0
Blanco/Imjin Connector	\$4,080,000	\$0		\$4,080,000	\$0	\$0
8th Street	\$3,821,900	\$0		\$3,248,615	\$573,285	\$0
Inter-Gamson	\$4,480,000	\$0		\$3,808,000	\$672,000	\$0
Gigling	\$4,537,800	\$0		\$3,221,838	\$1,315,962	\$0
2nd Avenue	\$7,232,500	\$0		\$5,398,068	\$1,834,432	\$0
North-South Road	\$6,160,600	\$0		\$3,326,724	\$2,833,876	\$0
California	\$2,769,200	\$0		\$1,038,450	\$1,730,750	\$0
Salinas Ave	\$2,412,000	\$0		\$2,412,000	\$0	\$0
Eucalyptus Road	\$2,880,000	\$0		\$2,880,000	\$0	\$0
Eastside Road	\$6,020,000	\$0		\$4,358,480	\$1,661,520	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$74,362,364	\$9,780,000		\$49,428,039	\$15,154,325	\$0
Transit Capital Improvements						
Transit Vehicle Purchase & Replacement	\$15,000,000	\$0		\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
Intermodal Centers	\$3,800,000	\$0		\$3,800,000	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL	\$18,800,000	\$0		\$8,800,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS/SHARES	\$856,551,064	\$208,780,000		\$116,644,830	\$251,884,349	\$279,241,886

(\750058\prod\trrep\2017-3 wr4)

- (1) Includes \$56 million in expected STIP funds not yet allocated. Does not include traffic impact fees already collected, that may be used for some of these projects.
- (2) Allocation of costs based on a "Nexus" assessment of individual improvements. Fort Ord and Impact Study Area Development shares based on relative contribution to traffic volume growth on subject facility.
- (3) "Public" includes share for existing congestion and portion of traffic growth attributable to trips outside the study area. (Note: in some instances where the percentage of trips with one or both ends are external to Fort Ord and the study area is significant, the Nexus requirement cannot be met and the full cost must be covered by non-development sources.)
- (4) Assume that STIP County Minimum funds will be allocated to highway improvements. Specific projects not yet specified.

Figure 7-2 - Capital Cost Impact shares by Project Type

Finally, the cost shares presented in the previous section reflect the direct results of the nexus analysis for all roadway improvements. Within the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan, a portion of the costs for improvements to Highway 156 was allocated to the Fort Ord share. The share shown in the draft Reuse Plan was not based on the nexus analysis, but rather based on the importance of this highway in providing a link between future development on Fort Ord and the San Francisco Bay Area. From the strict nexus perspective, the significant percentage of trips on this link with one end outside the study area suggests that development-related financing may not normally be applied. For this reason, the results shown in this report reflect the full burden on non-development sources.

7.5. POTENTIAL FINANCING SOURCES

As the cost and expected funding assessments indicate, there is a potential \$724 million funding shortfall for the set of transportation system improvements identified in this study; a number that does not include minor improvements to the regional system nor local improvement projects. Options for filling this shortfall include securing additional funds from traditional federal and state programs, or establishing new revenue-generating mechanisms. Potential new funding programs include local-option taxes, development-related financing, and tax increment financing. Chapter 4 of this report contains a discussion of these existing and potential funding sources for transportation improvements.

In trying to match the identified funding sources with the suggested improvements, there are two facts that are important to consider. First, some sources, both existing and potential, are constrained with respect to the types of projects that may be funded from that source. For example, funds from sources may only be used for roadway capital projects, while those from other sources may only be used for transit operational expenditures. Second, development-related financing, identified as a likely potential source of funding, is limited in the amount or share of a project's cost that it may cover. Development-related financing typically may only be used to cover that portion or share of a project's costs consistent with the share of a project's need attributed to that development. Additionally, development-related financing cannot be used when a large percentage of new trips start or end outside the assessment area and, therefore, would not be charged. Thus, improvements to major facilities serving a high percentage of inter-regional trips cannot be included in a development-related fee program. These constraints greatly impact the amount that can be generated through such programs, and how the funds may be used.

Knowledge of these limitations or constraints, combined with the cost allocation and nexus analysis presented previously in this chapter, may be used to identify potential funding sources or strategies for the transportation system presented in this report. Consistent with these limitations, the following discussion of potential funding strategies is broken up according to three types of improvements: roadway capital, transit capital, and transit operational. A summary of the potential funding strategies is provided in Table 7-5 at the end of this chapter. In reviewing these strategies, it must be recognized that the intent of this study was to identify the

funding needs and options. The implementation of any potential financing program is beyond the scope of this study

7.5.1 Roadway Capital Funding

The future transportation system described in this report contains nearly \$840 in roadway capital improvements. Many of the sources identified in Chapter 4 can be used for funding roadway capital improvements. Those traditionally used to finance major roadway projects include federal STP funds and state fuel tax revenues. These funds are typically programmed for specific projects through the STIP process. As noted earlier, \$143 million in STIP funds are currently dedicated for projects in Monterey County. An additional \$56 million is expected to be available through the STIP County Minimum program over the next 20 years. Expected funding for roadway projects identified in this study includes that provided through the federal DCAG grant program for improvements on Fort Ord. These dedicated or expected funds, however, are projected to leave a shortfall of \$629 million for roadway capital improvements.

One option for overcoming this shortfall is to secure additional funds through current federal and state programs. Because the most significant cost element of the proposed transportation system is that for state highway improvements, efforts to obtain additional STIP funding is a logical course of action. Another current program is the federal demonstration program. Given Fort Ord's significance to the base reuse program, the potential exists to secure such funding. Funds from these existing sources can be used to cover improvements needed to address both existing deficiencies and future demand, but would likely cover only highway and not arterial improvement costs.

If these sources prove insufficient, a potential new source is a local-option tax. Revenues from such a tax may be used for any roadway improvement, and may be used to cover both the public and "development" cost shares as defined in the preliminary nexus analysis. Development-related and tax increment financing mechanisms also represent potential sources, but may only be used to cover the "development" portion of the estimated costs as indicated in the nexus analysis.

As noted previously, an assumption has been made that the local subvention of the fuel tax revenue will be sufficient to cover future roadway maintenance costs.

7.5.2 Transit Capital Funding

Proposed transit capital expenditures include both the purchase of transit vehicles and the construction of intermodal facilities. Nearly \$19 million in improvements of this nature are included in the proposed transportation system. Current funding sources for transit capital expenditures include federal Section 3 funds, and state TCI and TDA funds. The expectation is that these sources will continue to provide funding for the capital needs of the existing transit

system. The assessment of these sources, however, suggests that at current levels, funding would not be available to cover the improvements identified in this study.

As with roadway capital projects, the first step to overcome the expected shortfall may be to pursue additional funding from the traditional federal and state sources. Local-option taxes, develop-related financing, and tax increment financing represent potential new sources for funding transit capital improvements. Because the transit capital expenditures highlighted in this study are directed toward future development needs, the opportunity exists to cover a majority of these costs through a development-related financing program. Indeed, the draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan contains a provision for the financing of the intermodal facilities and the Fort Ord share of transit vehicle costs through a Fort Ord development financing program.

7.5.3 Transit Operations and Maintenance Funding

Funds for transit operations and maintenance are derived through a combination of sources including federal Section 9 funds, state STA and TDA funds, and farebox revenues. Compared to roadway maintenance, however, the situation for the funding of transit operations and maintenance is quite different. First, operating costs, particularly for a bus system, represent a much higher portion of total costs in comparison to the roadway system. Second, it can not be assumed that existing sources will provide sufficient funding to cover future transit operating and maintenance costs. Many sources believe that funding levels will decrease creating shortfalls in the funding of existing service. If it is assumed, however, that funding from these sources will be sufficient to cover existing service levels, an additional \$112 million would be required to finance the transit service expansion proposed to address growth in Fort Ord and throughout the region. Existing sources expected to increase directly with this growth and expansion are LTF funds and farebox revenues. Regardless, a shortfall of nearly \$76 million is still projected.

Remedies for this shortfall are limited, because many potential funding sources, including development-related and tax increment financing, are viewed as being limited to capital expenditures. Flexible programs, such as local options tax, do provide ability to generate funds for operations and maintenance. Increased federal and state funding from existing sources also represent an option for financing for covering projected shortfalls.

(j/tcd/proj/50068/finrep/chap7.d2)

**Table 7-5
 POTENTIAL FUNDING STRATEGIES**

Improvement Type	Costs/ Expected Funding	Unfunded Share/Potential Funding Level		
		Public	Fort Ord Development	Other Development
ROADWAY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS Total Estimated Costs Funds from Expected Sources Shortfall Potential Funding Sources/Strategies: Increased federal/state funding (Demonstration funds, STIP) Local-option Tax Development-related Financing Program Tax Increment Financing	\$838 million <u>\$209 million</u> \$629 million	 \$274 million	 \$108 million	 \$247 million
TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS Total Estimated Costs Funds from Expected Sources Shortfall Potential Funding Sources/Strategies: Increased federal/state funding (Section 3, TCI, TDA) Local-option Tax Development-related Financing Program Tax Increment Financing	\$19 million <u>\$0</u> \$19 million	 \$5 million	 \$9 million	 \$5 million
TRANSIT OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS Total Estimated Costs Funds from Expected Sources Shortfall Potential Funding Sources/Strategies: Increased federal/state funding (FTA Section 9, LTF, TDA) Local-option Tax	\$112 million <u>\$36.1 million</u> \$75.9 million	 \$0	 \$38.5 million	 \$37.5 million

(/1cd/proj/50068/inr/p/tbl7-5.d2)

Appendix A
DEVELOPMENT DENSITIES FOR MONTEREY COUNTY

Table A-1
 MONTEREY COUNTY SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA
 BY CENSUS TRACT

Tract	Area (acres)	1990						2015			
		Population	Pdensity	Household	Hdensity	Employment	Edensity	Population	Pdensity	Employment	Edensity
1	3,792.1	9232	2.4	2810	0.7	152	0.0	24150	6.4	2715	0.7
2	398.4	5700	14.3	1791	4.5	912	2.3	7832	19.7	1084	2.7
3	305.4	4012	13.1	1516	5.0	559	1.8	6024	19.7	779	2.6
4	497.6	4907	9.9	2011	4.0	1687	3.4	6527	13.1	1966	4.0
5	931.1	9255	9.9	2342	2.5	990	1.1	11346	12.2	1201	1.3
6	264.8	5904	22.3	1425	5.4	318	1.2	6828	25.8	481	1.8
7	290.3	11272	38.8	2617	9.0	261	0.9	13053	45.0	397	1.4
8	250.7	4637	18.5	1229	4.9	266	1.1	6627	26.4	615	2.5
9	1,287.1	4663	3.6	1250	1.0	2296	1.8	13354	10.4	4362	3.4
10	3,064.8	512	0.2	150	0.0	13923	4.5	7330	2.4	23817	7.8
11	384.6	3245	8.4	1310	3.4	3241	8.4	5522	14.4	5241	13.6
12	306.9	3182	10.4	1299	4.2	515	1.7	4518	14.7	1924	6.3
13	223.7	2316	10.4	819	3.7	4780	21.4	3213	14.4	7541	33.7
14	308.3	2628	8.5	1114	3.6	2357	7.6	3615	11.7	3143	10.2
15	1,160.1	5751	5.0	2523	2.2	4055	3.5	9574	8.3	4745	4.1
16	209.8	2780	13.2	1017	4.8	205	1.0	3615	17.2	389	1.9
17	210.3	3523	16.8	1292	6.1	255	1.2	4719	22.4	445	2.1
18	1,054.6	7269	6.9	2479	2.4	2466	2.3	10037	9.5	3262	3.1
101.98	14,445.0	7397	0.5	1944	0.1	3919	0.3	8462	0.6	4948	0.3
102.01	7,530.6	3791	0.5	963	0.1	570	0.1	4560	0.6	1104	0.1
102.02	10,047.3	3747	0.4	1154	0.1	928	0.1	4270	0.4	1558	0.2
103.01	11,255.5	8451	0.8	2888	0.3	1211	0.1	9120	0.8	1617	0.1
103.02	19,304.8	1858	0.1	682	0.0	4174	0.2	2070	0.1	5600	0.3
104	646.5	5272	8.2	1320	2.0	1267	2.0	7480	11.6	2819	4.4
105.01	16,604.0	6252	0.4	2022	0.1	1636	0.1	13000	0.8	5028	0.3
105.02	7,983.6	12174	1.5	4527	0.6	2995	0.4	23011	2.9	3551	0.4
106.01	72,052.9	5273	0.1	1596	0.0	5055	0.1	20297	0.3	9769	0.1
106.02	591.2	6698	11.3	1291	2.2	1145	1.9	9338	15.8	1260	2.1
107	47,831.2	8101	0.2	2999	0.1	157	0.0	10720	0.2	402	0.0
108		4660						8500			
108.98	100,198.5	3221	0.0	2004	0.0	3763	0.0	4260	0.0	5675	0.1
109	888.0	6223	7.0	52	0.1	1266	1.4	8420	9.5	3266	3.7
110	121,326.0	5559	0.0	2496	0.0	1315	0.0	6240	0.1	1558	0.0
111	150,390.9	8649	0.1	2230	0.0	2259	0.0	16540	0.1	3323	0.0
112	61,813.7	9076	0.1	2387	0.0	3520	0.1	13645	0.2	5039	0.1
113	296,385.0	11616	0.0	3708	0.0	5161	0.0	16610	0.1	6332	0.0
114.02	261,072.5	454	0.0	109	0.0	35	0.0	1110	0.0	37	0.0
114.98	646,082.2	2740	0.0	1186	0.0	782	0.0	3000	0.0	868	0.0
115	161,988.4	1391	0.0	763	0.0	115	0.0	1600	0.0	157	0.0
116	35,783.6	6982	0.2	3480	0.1	3039	0.1	8720	0.2	4016	0.1
117	1,460.5	4667	3.2	2405	1.6	160	0.1	4800	3.3	186	0.1
118	610.3	3946	6.5	3162	5.2	5554	9.1	4550	7.5	5955	9.8
119	5,214.1	5069	1.0	2739	0.5	1481	0.3	6040	1.2	1836	0.4
120	272.4	3583	13.2	1480	5.4	630	2.3	3861	14.2	670	2.5
121	273.4	2286	8.4	1112	4.1	437	1.6	2390	8.7	438	1.6
122	217.8	2832	13.0	1259	5.8	396	1.8	3070	14.1	397	1.8
123	144.6	2104	14.6	1094	7.6	800	5.5	2490	17.2	873	6.0
123.01	342.7	942	2.7	338	1.0	4	0.0	980	2.9	4	0.0
124.01	195.2	1958	10.0	1204	6.2	1672	8.6	2380	12.2	1836	9.4
124.02	698.9	3354	4.8	1773	2.5	1405	2.0	3960	5.7	1404	2.0
125	398.6	5729	14.4	2670	6.7	4728	11.9	6300	15.8	7211	18.1
126	398.2	2867	7.2	99	0.2	4187	10.5	2900	7.3	4198	10.5
127	158.9	3015	19.0	1476	9.3	242	1.5	3300	20.8	325	2.0
128	1,058.6	5505	5.2	2472	2.3	2360	2.2	6665	6.3	3185	3.0
129	233.2	609	2.6	341	1.5	9362	40.2	830	3.6	10916	46.8
130	790.3	3122	4.0	2000	2.5	5405	6.8	3450	4.4	6121	7.7
131	323.3	3397	10.5	923	2.9	380	1.2	3450	10.7	565	1.7
132	10,030.6	3650	0.4	1397	0.1	2817	0.3	5439	0.5	6818	0.7
133	1,308.7	5857	4.5	2907	2.2	4483	3.4	6330	4.8	6063	4.6
134	312.5	1661	5.3	733	2.3	332	1.1	1721	5.5	400	1.3
135	333.5	5103	15.3	1783	5.3	192	0.6	6465	19.4	155	0.5
136	237.0	3874	16.3	1452	6.1	907	3.8	4957	20.9	855	3.6
137	177.7	4057	22.8	1388	7.8	1150	6.5	5172	29.1	983	5.5
138	301.9	5637	18.7	1693	5.6	162	0.5	7004	23.2	162	0.5
139	265.3	2697	10.2	1007	3.8	281	1.1	3664	13.8	282	1.1
140	707.1	2168	3.1	865	1.2	3932	5.6	3377	4.8	6048	8.6
141	27,664.8	28602	1.0	6471	0.2	20461	0.7	44268	1.6	15985	0.6
142	639.7	9865	15.4	3470	5.4	1172	1.8	10200	15.9	1453	2.3
143.01	2,716.9	3562	1.3	1320	0.5	238	0.1	5300	2.0	3732	1.4
143.02	3,467.6	3566	1.0	1396	0.4	962	0.3	5800	1.7	612	0.2
TOTAL		355667		121224		159842		519969		221702	

Salinas Area

Tract	Area		1990						2015			
	(sq. feet)	(sq. mi.)	Population	Pdensity	Household	Hdensity	Employment	Edensity	Population	Pdensity	Employment	Edensity
2	17,355,590.0	0.6	5700	9,154.9	1791	2,876.6	912	1,465.0	7832	12,580.3	1084	1,741.2
3	13,302,510.0	0.5	4012	8,407.1	1516	3,176.7	559	1,171.5	6024	12,625.7	779	1,632.6
4	21,674,140.0	0.8	4907	6,310.9	2011	2,586.4	1687	2,169.9	6527	8,394.8	1966	2,528.8
5	40,559,570.0	1.5	9255	6,360.6	2342	1,609.6	990	680.5	11346	7,798.7	1201	825.5
6	11,533,160.0	0.4	5904	14,269.6	1425	3,444.1	318	768.7	6828	16,504.3	481	1,162.7
7	12,643,610.0	0.5	11272	24,851.4	2617	5,769.7	261	575.5	13053	28,781.2	397	875.4
8	10,921,700.0	0.4	4637	11,834.9	1229	3,136.7	266	679.0	6627	16,915.7	615	1,569.8
9	18,688,927.0	0.7	4663	6,955.8	1250	1,864.6	2296	3,425.0	13354	19,920.7	4362	6,506.8
11	16,754,610.0	0.6	3245	5,398.8	1310	2,179.5	3241	5,392.8	5522	9,188.9	5241	8,720.6
12	13,368,210.0	0.5	3182	6,635.0	1299	2,708.6	515	1,074.0	4518	9,422.7	1924	4,012.4
13	9,742,917.0	0.3	2316	6,626.2	819	2,343.2	4780	13,677.5	3213	9,193.9	7541	21,577.8
14	13,428,390.0	0.5	2628	5,455.3	1114	2,312.5	2357	4,893.3	3615	7,504.4	3143	6,525.1
15	50,535,980.0	1.8	5751	3,172.2	2523	1,391.7	4055	2,237.0	9574	5,281.4	4745	2,617.6
16	9,139,603.0	0.3	2780	8,479.1	1017	3,101.9	205	625.3	3615	11,025.9	389	1,186.6
17	9,158,660.0	0.3	3523	10,722.5	1292	3,932.3	255	776.2	4719	14,364.9	445	1,354.6
18	45,936,860.0	1.6	7269	4,410.6	2479	1,504.2	2466	1,496.6	10037	6,091.4	3262	1,979.7
106.02	25,751,700.0	0.9	6698	7,248.6	1291	1,397.1	1145	1,239.6	9338	10,109.1	1260	1,364.1
TOTAL	340,496,137.0	12.2	87742	7,183.9	27325	2,237.3	26308	2,154.0	125742	10,295.3	38835	3,179.6


Average person per household: 3.21

Appendix F

The Land Use - Air Quality
Linkage

California Environmental Protection Agency

 **Air Resources Board**



THE LAND USE - AIR QUALITY

L I N K A G E

How Land Use and Transportation Affect Air Quality

1994

THE LINKAGE BETWEEN LAND USE AND AIR QUALITY

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	
The Linkages	1
OPTIMUM LAND USE STRATEGIES FOR AIR QUALITY	5
Community Strategies	
Enhanced Central Business Districts	5
Compact Development	6
Clustered Activity Centers	8
Focused Infill and Renewal	9
Jobs-Housing Balance	9
Neighborhood Strategies	
Mixed-Use Developments	9
Integrated Street Patterns	10
Traditional Neighborhood Development	11
Transit-Oriented Development	11
EXAMPLES	
Portland, Oregon	12
Toronto, Canada	13
AIR QUALITY BENEFITS	14
OTHER BENEFITS	14
Fewer Automobile Expenses	14
Lower Infrastructure Costs	15
Diverse and Affordable Housing	15
ARB-FUNDED RESEARCH	16
CONCLUSION	16
SOURCES	17

THE LINKAGE BETWEEN LAND USE AND AIR QUALITY

INTRODUCTION

The form and shape that growing cities take in the next two decades will have an important impact on the future air quality of California's major metropolitan areas. A growing body of literature and research indicates that land use and transportation strategies can reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled, and thus reduce the air pollution produced by automobiles.

Combined with other air quality programs that decrease motor vehicle emissions and reduce reliance on vehicles, land use and transportation strategies can help to reduce air pollution. By creating environments that are more conducive to alternative transportation modes such as walking, biking and transit, we can create more "livable" communities -- communities with reduced congestion, increased personal mobility, and cleaner, healthier air.

This report summarizes data currently available on the relationships between land use, transportation and air quality. It also highlights land use strategies that can help to reduce the use of the private automobile. And, it briefly summarizes several research projects funded by the California Air Resources Board (ARB). As new data becomes available, it will be added to updated versions of this report.

The Linkages

Vehicle Use and Air Quality

The air quality in all of California's major metropolitan areas currently exceeds State health-based standards for ozone and particulates. This is true despite the reduction of air pollution from both mobile sources (cars, trucks and buses), and stationary sources (utilities and other industries). Most of the State's metropolitan areas also fail to comply with State standards for carbon monoxide, another component of "smog."

Mobile sources produce more than 50 percent of all smog precursors and over 90 percent of

the carbon monoxide in the State's major urban areas.¹

Today's new cars pollute about ten times less than models produced 25 years ago due to California's strict emissions standards. However, these reductions in emissions are also being offset by increased vehicle travel. During the past twenty years, the total number of "vehicle miles traveled" (VMT) in the State has increased twice as fast as the rate of population growth. We are driving more often, longer distances, and we also tend to be driving alone more often.

In California, the total annual vehicle miles of travel more than doubled between 1970 and 1990, increasing from 115 billion to over 250 billion miles of travel per year. During the same period of time, the State's population grew by about 51%.²

Total Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled in California, 1970-1990




Figure 1³

A 1989 poll identified the nation's ten most congested urban areas. One-half of these areas are located in California: Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco/Oakland, San Jose, and San Bernadino/Riverside Counties.⁴ If current vehicle use trends continue, increased traffic congestion will result, and average vehicle speeds in the State's major urban areas will continue to decline, especially during peak-

1 Calif. Air Resources Board, 1993.

2 Calif. Energy Commission, 1990.

3 Calif. Dept. of Transportation, 1992.

4 Urban Land Institute, *Land Use In Transition*, 1993.

they choose -- car, vanpool, bus, train or trolley, walking, or bicycling.

Portion Of Personal Trips
5 Miles Or Shorter




Figure 4¹⁰

Modes of Travel

According to a recent statewide study of travel modes in California, about 86% of personal travel is by automobile, motorcycle or light-duty truck. Walking and bicycling together comprise about 9% of total travel, while public transit accounts for only about 2%.

Modes of Travel in California, 1991




Figure 5¹¹

• Walking

Walking comprises an important portion of total travel. A vital part of any transportation system is the linkage between different modes of travel. Providing direct, safe and convenient accessibility for pedestrians at both ends of a trip will encourage walking as well as transit use.

Most pedestrians share these preferences:

- *direct accessibility* - walkers can be easily discouraged by difficult or indirect routes, or by impassable barriers.
- *safety* - walkers are more vulnerable to traffic and other people. Well-lighted, well-observed and spacious walkways increase their sense of security.
- *attractiveness* - walkers prefer an interesting, attractive route, and tend to be discouraged by large areas of asphalt and uninteresting walls or buildings.¹²

How far are people willing to walk? People walk at an average speed of about 3 miles per hour, or 260 feet per minute. According to one study, people in the United States (about 70%) will routinely walk 500 feet (about 1/10 of a mile). About 40% are willing to walk 1,000 feet to 1/4 mile on a regular basis. But only about 10% will willingly walk a half mile or more during their normal daily routines.¹³

• Bicycle Travel

Bicycling has become a popular recreational activity and is also an attractive mode of commuting for many people, especially if safe and direct bicycle facilities are available. Davis, a university-oriented city with 50,000 people near Sacramento, California, has a high-quality, interconnected network of bicycle and pedestrian paths. A recent study of residents' travel patterns found that 22 percent of the employed people surveyed typically ride their bicycles to work. In addition, 43 percent of the Davis students surveyed travel daily to school or to the nearby university by bicycle.¹⁴

In comparison, bicycle trips comprise less than 2% of travel in the Sacramento metropolitan region overall. The large proportion of bicycle use by students and non-students alike in Davis illustrates the importance of convenient and safe bicycle facilities and the proximity of residential areas to commute destinations in encouraging higher rates of bicycle travel.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Calif. Dept. of Transportation, 1992.

¹² American Lung Association, 1981.

¹³ Unterman, 1984.

¹⁴ Kitamura, et al., 1993.

Another study also shows that commuters who live and/or work within 1/4 mile of a BART station are the most likely commuters to take transit to work. Rates of transit use begin to drop off for people who live farther than 1/2 mile from a transit station.

According to a recent nationwide survey, people who live within 1/4 mile of a transit stop or station are nearly three times more likely to use transit than those who live between 1/4 miles and 2 miles from a station. Residents of housing situated within 2 miles of a transit station are almost four times more likely to use transit for commuting than those who live further than 2 miles from a station.²⁰

OPTIMUM LAND USE STRATEGIES FOR AIR QUALITY

Land uses that enable people to walk or to use transit, rather than needing to rely primarily on their cars for mobility, tend to be better for air quality. This section describes several such strategies, and summarizes available data on their potential benefits in reducing vehicle travel and supporting convenient alternatives.

A study of public transit use conducted in Washington., D.C., identified key land use programs for making the best use of a transit system:

- *Promote land uses that generate the most transit trips near stations;*
- *Locate these uses in close proximity to transit station entrances;*
- *Provide high density land development around stations, including suburban locations.*²¹

Land use decisions for the areas around transit corridors are critical due to the fixed nature of rail transit and the limited land supply near stops. Such decisions need to be made with a long-term view, as they will last for many years to come. The wrong land uses or site designs can actually impede the development of subsequent, more transit-supportive projects in the future.

²⁰ U.S. D.O.T., 1986.

²¹ JHK & Associates, 1987.

Land use strategies to support alternative travel modes and reduce automobile use are available on both the community (or metropolitan) and local (neighborhood) levels. These are listed and briefly discussed in the following sections.

Community Strategies

- Less costly land prices in fringe areas of most metropolitan areas have helped to disperse development patterns and reduce overall regional densities. This pattern of growth has generally resulted in longer travel distances and increased reliance on vehicles for personal mobility.²²

According to Pushkarev and Zupan, two researchers who conducted a study of transit and land use in the New York City metropolitan area, "urban residents will more likely use public transportation under these conditions:

- *the higher the density and the larger the size of a downtown or another cluster of nonresidential activity;*
- *the closer their neighborhood is to that nonresidential concentration;*
- *the higher the residential density of their neighborhood; and*
- *the better the transit service."*²³

• **Enhanced Central Business Districts**

Strong central business districts that include substantial amounts of both employment and housing have historically had the best quality transit service and the highest rates of transit use.²⁴ Transit use tends to be higher at downtown sites for many reasons, including: there are a concentrated number of land uses located within walking distance of transit stations (such as jobs, shops, public facilities and retail services), higher parking costs, traffic congestion, limited parking availability, and better access to transit at both trip ends.²⁵

Central business districts of most major cities in the U.S. tend to have a number of high-rise buildings, with some restaurants, shops and other services, but little activity after business

²² Sullivan, 1990.

²³ Pushkarev and Zupan, 1976.

²⁴ JHK and Associates, 1987.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

The relationships between different land uses and people's travel behavior have recently been explored in several studies. A 1990 study comparing travel behaviors in several neighborhoods located in the S.F. Bay Area concluded that for each doubling of density, the average VMT *per person* each year is reduced by 25% to 30%. The neighborhoods studied included varying amounts of services and jobs, were located at different distances from the central business district, and had available a wide range of public transit service.³⁴

A region-wide travel survey conducted in the S.F. Bay Area also concluded that there is a definite relationship between overall population density and increased transit availability and use.³⁵

Relationship Between Population Density and Annual VMT per Capita




Figure 10

A worldwide study of urban density, travel patterns and transportation facilities in 32 major cities, also supports the conclusion that lower levels of vehicle use are related to urban form and density. This study concluded that there is a significant relationship between overall urban density and the provision and use of transit, walking and other alternative modes of travel, and away from automobiles.

The researchers found that for each doubling of population density in cities throughout the world, the average *per capita* consumption of transportation fuel is reduced between 25 to 30%.³⁶ This reduction is attributed to higher

rates of transit usage, with walking and bicycling playing lesser though important roles.

• *Employment Density*

The location, size and concentration of different employment activities are also significant factors in determining the type and level of transit service that can be efficiently provided and its eventual rate of use.

Employment sites scattered over a large area often attract enough vehicles to create significant traffic congestion, but usually do not generate enough transit riders to sustain convenient levels of transit service. In contrast, industrial facilities or offices with more closely-spaced buildings that are connected by direct pedestrian routes and served by convenient transit can result in increased use of alternative modes of travel.

A study in the Seattle area concluded that transit ridership increases significantly when the density of jobs exceeds 50 employees per acre in centers that provide at least 10,000 jobs.³⁷ A typical threshold for providing good local bus service to employment areas is between 50 to 60 employees per acre.³⁸

• *Future Growth*

A 1993 report by the Governor's Growth Management Council points out: "If the State wishes to preserve mobility, open space and a viable agricultural industry, clean air and environmental quality, and an economy that works, it cannot continue to support traditional low-density land use patterns based on large, single family detached dwellings, nor a transportation system based overwhelmingly on single-occupancy vehicle usage. It must promote alternatives."³⁹

Nearly 2 million additional dwelling units will be needed to house the State's expected population over the next five years. If they are developed in traditional suburban locations and densities, these additional dwellings will consume at least 600 square miles of land, not including the associated commercial and

34 Holtzclaw, 1990.

35 D.K.S., 1981.

36 Kenworthy and Newman, 1990.

37 Seattle METRO, 1987.

38 Pushkarev and Zupan, 1977.

39 Growth Management Council, 1993, pg. 11.

number of potential transportation control measures, or "TCMs," that were also tested at the five sites. The consultant evaluated ten TCMs appropriate for major regional shopping centers and found that they would reduce vehicle travel by only about 5 to 7%, even if several different measures were combined.

Another project analyzed five alternative land use and transportation scenarios in the Seattle, Washington metropolitan area. It found that establishing a number of fairly concentrated suburban activity centers or "villages" that are connected by transit could result in much lower levels of VMT and traffic congestion, higher rates of transit use, and less air pollution than the continuation of previous low-density suburban land use patterns. Each new "village" would include a variety of high intensity activities and denser residential areas.⁴⁵ This concept is now being implemented in Seattle.⁴⁶

• Focused Infill and Renewal

The infill, redevelopment and reuse of vacant or underutilized parcels within existing urban areas can help to decrease vehicle traffic, reduce walking distances and support better transit systems. Such strategies also have other benefits: lower infrastructure costs, more efficient delivery of services, increased economic viability of cities, and reduced conversion of agricultural land and open spaces to urban or suburban development.

Infill and redevelopment that is located within walking distance of transit service has greater potential to shift travel away from personal vehicles. The design, quality, mixture and compatibility of residential and other types of infill projects can help increase their acceptability to neighboring residents and businesses, especially in the case of higher-density infill and redevelopment projects.

• Jobs-Housing Balance

The term "Jobs-Housing Balance" refers to programs that attempt to attract employers to locate in housing-rich areas, and to encourage the provision of housing at prices affordable to the people working in the community. If residential areas are located far from major

employment centers, longer commute distances, increased traffic congestion, and significant vehicle emissions usually result.

Between 80 to 100% of the new jobs created in the U.S. during the past two decades were situated in the inner to outer suburbs of metropolitan areas.⁴⁷ Partly as a result of quickly-expanding metropolitan areas, the average commute distance in the U.S. has increased by 25% between 1983 and 1990.⁴⁸

Several analyses of historic urban trends have found that imbalances in the ratio of jobs and housing tend to eventually resolve themselves over time as more jobs move closer to suburban residential districts. In cases of extreme imbalances in the jobs/housing relationship, policies and programs to increase the number of jobs or housing units may help to accelerate this process.

Neighborhood Strategies

Neighborhood strategies are site-specific measures that can be applied to existing as well as new development or redevelopment projects. Combined with overall regional strategies, they can help reduce the vehicle emissions associated with various types of land uses.

• Mixed-Use Developments

Mixed-use development allows compatible land uses, such as shops, offices, and housing, to locate closer together and thus decreases travel distances between them. Mixed-use development, if properly designed and implemented, can reduce VMT and trips and can help increase transit ridership, especially during the off-peak (non-commute) periods.

For example, a mixed-use area containing restaurants, a museum, a theater and retail stores, has a greater potential to generate bus and rail ridership than an area with retail stores alone. Adding housing to the mix of uses improves the situation significantly. Regardless of how people arrive at a mixed-use area, they will be able to make many trips by walking; such trip linkages would not be possible in a single-purpose area.⁴⁹

45 Puget Sound Council of Governments, 1990.

46 Mayor Norman Rice, City of Seattle, 1994.

47 Urban Land Institute, *Land Use in Transition*, 1993.

48 U.S. D.O.T., 1990.

49 Snohomish County, 1989.

very similar to those found in typical hierarchical circulation patterns.⁵⁴

Typically found in many older neighborhoods and small towns, integrated street networks have several advantages over typical suburban-style street patterns. They provide a number of route choices, more direct routes for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as cars, and they help to slow vehicle speeds. Slower vehicle speeds create a much safer and more interesting environment for pedestrians and bicyclists to share, and reduce noise impacts.

• **Traditional Neighborhood Development**

Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) is a development strategy that emphasizes pedestrian accessibility and the orientation of houses towards narrower, tree-lined, gridded or integrated streets. It is an approach that combines mixed uses and integrated street patterns to create a land use pattern that minimizes travel distances and makes it easier for residents to walk between their houses, jobs and commercial services. "TND" incorporates a small downtown, or "town center," within walking distance of homes, and generally has a higher overall density than in typical suburban neighborhoods. "Most housing units are located within a five- to ten-minute walk of the town center, where commercial services and offices are concentrated."⁵⁵

A larger number of townhouse and other multi-family units are clustered within walking distance of the town center. Single-family houses are placed on somewhat smaller lots, with front porches closer to the sidewalk and garages typically behind the houses, often along alleyways. "Granny flats," or second units, are generally permitted and facilitated; sometimes they can be built above the garages.

Another benefit of this type of development can be that "residents feel they are part of a community, not just dwellers in a subdivision." Several "Neo-Traditional"-style developments have been built during the past several years. A survey of 620 homeowners in 4 such neighborhoods revealed a high level of satisfaction with their new residences: an overwhelming majority, 84%, said they prefer their neo-traditional community over a more traditional suburb, even if they could have purchased the same house for the same price elsewhere. Nearly 70% said that they like the shallower front yards with houses closer to the street, more than 60% favored the narrower streets, and 80% enjoyed their front porches. People also said they like to walk and leave their cars at home and use mass transit, when they are given the opportunity to do so.⁵⁷

• **Transit-Oriented Development**

Similar to the traditional neighborhood development, but typically incorporating somewhat higher densities, the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is a development strategy that provides another alternative to typical suburban growth patterns. The TOD concept incorporates an intentional orientation to transit and pedestrian travel, clusters services and other uses in a "town center," and provides a range of housing densities. "TODs" can help minimize the negative effects of new growth such as traffic congestion and air pollution.

A "TOD" can be described as:

A mixed-use community within an average 1/4 mile walking distance of a transit stop and core commercial area. The design, configuration, and mix of uses emphasize a pedestrian-oriented environment and reinforce the use of office, open space, and public uses within comfortable walking

Comparison of Characteristics

Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND)	Standard Suburban Development
¥ Integrated Streets	¥ Hierarchical Streets
¥ Narrower Streets	¥ Wide Streets
¥ On-Street Parking & Parking Structures	¥ Off-Street Parking Lots
¥ Shallower Setbacks	¥ Deeper Setbacks
¥ Shopping on Main St.	¥ Strips/ Malls
¥ Mixture of Uses	¥ Single Uses

Figure 13 ⁵⁶

54 Kulash, Walter, et. al., 1990.

55 Bookout, 1992.

56 *Ibid.*

57 Sacramento Bee, May 7, 1993.

the region by the year 2010. Walking, biking and transit use would comprise 11% of total travel in the Portland metropolitan region.

The third scenario, the "LUTRAQ Alternative," incorporates land use strategies that are more supportive of a multi-modal transportation system including transit, walking and biking. These strategies include: medium density, mixed-use development, a commercial town center, clustered jobs and extensive pedestrian facilities. Higher levels of light rail and bus service would be provided than in the first two scenarios, and some parking fees charged. No new freeway would be built to serve the study area in this scenario.

The LUTRAQ Alternative can accommodate 65% of the new households and 78% of the new jobs projected for the study area, all within walking distance of transit service. The impact of this alternative on regional travel was found to be a 5% increase in the regional share of walking, biking and transit use, compared to either of the first two scenarios. Walking, biking and transit would comprise 16% of total travel in the Portland region.⁶³

Unlike the first three scenarios, the fourth alternative addresses travel patterns in the LUTRAQ study area only, and not the whole region. Within these neighborhoods, the rates of transit use, walking and biking are expected to increase to at least 21%, compared to 6-10% that is typical in conventional single-use suburban residential neighborhoods. The rate of auto use would decrease from 89% to 79% of residents' travel; walking would increase from about 4% to over 12%; and transit use would increase from 7.3% to 8.6% of travel.

The LUTRAQ project has provided data that supports the premise that land use patterns can help to reduce automobile travel and improve air quality, especially when combined with significant improvements in transit service and pedestrian accessibility. On the basis of this study, the Oregon Department of Transportation will consider the LUTRAQ scenario as a viable alternative to building a new freeway in the newly-developing suburban area.

• Toronto, Canada

Over the past 30 years, the city of Toronto, Canada, has reversed its previous trend towards increased vehicle use, less transit and lower densities found in most North American cities. Toronto has become an example of how transit and land use can be effectively integrated to create a less automobile-dependent urban environment. Toronto is ranked between the automobile orientation of most North American cities and the transit, walking and cycling orientation of many European cities. Urban density and public transit use rates in Toronto are high by North American standards, while personal vehicle use is much lower, despite high levels of automobile ownership.

Toronto began developing its transit system during the 1960s when traffic congestion started to become more severe. Now, it enjoys one of the best public transit systems in North America, and also has one of the highest transit usage rates. The effective linking of urban land uses to transit is one of the main reasons for its success. Clustered, higher density, mixed uses within easy walking distance of transit stations allow easier access to those services. A significant increase in the value of the land surrounding major transit corridors has occurred, enabling a vigorous "joint development" program that contributes funds for constructing new transit lines.⁶⁴ The city's mixed-use neighborhoods offer diverse opportunities for residents with minimum travel time and cost. They also provide a quality residential environment with walking or transit accessibility to a variety of urban amenities, including a lively downtown, numerous parks and recreational facilities.

The population of the greater Toronto metropolitan area is currently about 4 million, and is expected to increase to over 5 million residents by 2010. The projected additional population during the next 15-20 years will be almost entirely accommodated by a vigorous program of infill and redevelopment in the urban area. Most new development is expected to consist of higher density, mixed-use projects focused around existing or proposed rapid transit facilities, especially within the downtown area.⁶⁵

⁶³ LUTRAQ, Alternatives Analysis, 1992.

⁶⁴ Kenworthy, 1991.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

household's transportation costs by decreasing the number of vehicles needed for commuting. On average, it costs about \$7,000 per year to own and operate a typical automobile or light-duty truck in Southern California (not counting parking fees, fines, or traffic tickets). This equates to about \$600 per month per vehicle.⁷⁰

• **Lower Infrastructure Costs**

Several studies have analyzed capital costs to local governments, special districts, and private developers, to build and maintain roads, water, utilities and sewer facilities in various locations and developments. One study found that infrastructure costs for lower density developments in suburban fringe areas are up to 50% higher in comparison to more compact development located within existing urban areas.

According to a study of infrastructure costs in Florida, the average cost in 1989 of providing typical urban services to a development with an average density of only three dwelling units per acre, located ten miles from central facilities and employment centers, was about \$48,000 per house. In contrast, the average cost of providing the same services for a home in a development that averages 12 dwelling units per acre and is located closer to an urban center was about one-half as high, or \$24,000.




Figure 15 ⁷¹

These figures illustrate that lower density development in suburban fringe areas typically requires facilities and services that are much more expensive to provide than in more

70 AAA of Southern Calif., 1992.

71 Kasowski, 1992.

compact neighborhoods located closer to existing urban areas. In California, such costs for new development are typically either charged to home purchasers, increasing the price of new housing, or absorbed by developers. Subsequent operating and maintenance costs for services are born by local taxpayers.

• **Diverse and Affordable Housing**

"Area Housing Costs Hinder Efforts to Attract Businesses." ⁷² This newspaper headline illustrates that regions with high housing costs find it more difficult to compete economically with areas that have a lower cost of living. A recent survey of 3,400 U.S. companies concluded that lower real estate costs and the efficiency of local transportation systems are two of the most important considerations in corporate relocation decisions.⁷³

California's high housing costs, combined with dramatic changes in household size and other factors, have resulted in a major shift in consumer demand for housing.⁷⁴ According to the Urban Land Institute, as average household sizes continue to shrink, housing preferences and needs are affected.

The proportion of traditional "nuclear" families (with two adults and one or more children), has significantly declined during the past twenty years. Nuclear families accounted for only 26% of all households in the U.S. in 1990, decreasing from 40% of households in 1970. During the same time period, the percentage of single adult, single parent, and roommate households increased from 30% of the total in 1970, to 44% in 1990.⁷⁵

"Unmarried homeowners are much more likely to choose a condominium or attached townhouse instead of a single-family house than are married homeowners."⁷⁶ A wider variety of housing styles, densities and prices is needed to address these changing needs. Higher density housing may not be for everyone, but it has a significant and growing market "niche."

72 Sacramento Bee, 1992.

73 Urban Land Institute, January 1993.

74 Meyers, 1992.

75 1990 U.S. Census.

76 Urban Land Institute, *Land Use in Transition*.

SOURCES

- AAA of Southern California, *Your Driving Costs in Southern California*, 1992.
- American Lung Association of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails, "Community Transportation Plan," Sacramento Transportation Coalition, 1981.
- Atkins, Diana, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., Sacramento Office, *personal conversation*, December 9, 1992.
- Bartholomew, Keith A., "A Tale of Two Cities," paper prepared for the Air and Waste Management Association conference, 1993.
- Bernick, Michael, and Munkres, Jason: "Incentives for Trip Reduction Through Location of Housing Near California's Rail Transit Stations," Draft. UC, Berkeley, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, National Transit Access Center, February 1992.
- Bookout, Lloyd, "Neotraditional Town Planning: A New Vision for the Suburbs?" Urban Land (Urban Land Institute), January 1992.
- California Air Resources Board, *California's Plan to Reduce Motor Vehicle Pollution*, (brochure) 1993.
- California Air Resources Board, "California Air Pollution Control Laws, 1993 Edition."
- California Air Resources Board, *Technical Support Document: "California Clean Air Act Guidance for the Development of Indirect Source Control"*, July 1990.
- California Air Resources Board, "The Air Pollution-Transportation Linkage - How Vehicle Travel Affects the Air We Breathe," Office of Strategic Planning, 1989.
- California Air Resources Board, "Emissions Inventory" - 1989.
- California Department of Transportation, "California Motor Vehicle Stock, Travel and Fuel Forecast," 1988.
- California Department of Transportation, "1991 Statewide Travel Survey, Summary of Findings," November 1992.
- California Energy Commission, "Energy Statistics - 1970 to 1990," March 1990.
- California Energy Commission, "Energy Aware Planning Guide," 1993.
- Deakin, Harvey and Skabardonis, "Bay Area Travel Statistics from the 1981 Travel Survey," Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), June 1981.
- Ewing, Reid, "TDM, Growth Management and the Other Four out of Five Trips," Transportation Quarterly, July 1993.
- Fehr & Peers, "Effect of Stockton's Proposed Suburban Village Center Development," January 1992.
- Greenhouse Neighbourhood Project - A Technical Report, for the Victorian Government Department of Planning and Development; Environment Protection Authority; and "Energy Victoria," September 1993.
- Growth Management Council, "Strategic Growth: Taking Charge of the Future, A Blueprint for California," January 25, 1993.
- Gruen, Nina J. "Affordable Housing and the California Economy," Urban Land (by the Urban Land Institute) October 1992.
- HCD - Housing and Community Development Department, State of California, "Basic New Construction Need: 1992-1997," 1992.
- Highway Users Federation, "1993 Highway Fact Book," with the Automotive Safety Foundation, 1992.
- Holtzclaw, John, Ph.D. for the Sierra Club, "Explaining Urban Density and Transit Impacts on Auto Use," a report to the Calif. Energy Commission, January 1990.
- Impact Sciences, Inc. "Air Quality Impact Analysis," for a regional shopping center, April 14, 1993.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), "A Toolbox for Alleviating Traffic Congestion," 1989.
- Jacobs, Jane, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, Alfred Knopf and Random House, 1961.
- JHK and Associates, "Final Report for the Development-Related Ridership Survey," for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, March 1987.
- JHK and Associates, "Analysis of Indirect Source Trip Activity Study, Final Draft Report for the ARB" June 2, 1993.
- Kassowski, Kevin, "The Costs of Sprawl, Revisited," Developments, September 1992.
- Kulash, Walter et. al., *Traditional Neighborhood Development - Will the Traffic Work?* for the American Society of Civil Engineers, March 1990.
- Kenworthy, Jeffrey R. & Newman, Peter G., Cities and Automobile Dependence, Gower Technical, 1990.
- Kenworthy, Jeffrey & Newman, Peter, "Cities and Transport Energy: Lessons from a Global Survey," Ekistics, Fall, 1990.

*For additional information,
or to request
additional free copies
of this report, write to:*

**California Air Resources Board
Office of Air Quality and
Transportation Planning,
Transportation Strategies Group
2020 L Street, 4th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814**

Attn: Terry Parker

Or you may call:

(916) 323-6987