

2.0 Summary

Introduction

This ~~Draft Environmental Impact Report~~ EIR has been prepared by the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) as the Lead Agency in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and implementing guidelines. The proposed project is the adoption of the ~~Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan~~ (~~Reuse Plan~~) for the former military base known as Fort Ord. The Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act (Title 7.85, Section 67651 (a)(b)(c)(d) of the Government Code) requires FORA to accomplish the following:

- *To Facilitate the transfer and reuse of Fort Ord with all practical speed;*
- *To minimize the disruption caused by the base's closure on the civilian economy and the people of the Monterey Bay area;*
- *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*
- *To maintain and protect the unique environmental resources of the area.*

The former Fort Ord base was downsized and realigned in 1991 pursuant to the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Act of 1990, since commonly referred to as “BRAC”. Before reuse of former Fort Ord property can be effectively transferred from military to civilian ~~use~~ ownership, a reuse plan and an environmental review document on the reuse plan must be developed. This ~~Draft~~ EIR has been prepared to evaluate potential impacts to the environment under CEQA that may result from implementing the ~~proposed Draft Fort Ord~~ *Reuse Plan*, following disposal of former Fort Ord lands by the Department of the Army (Army).

Since the realignment of the former Fort Ord, the Army has prepared the following documents relating to the disposal and reuse of the military base: the *Fort Ord Disposal and Reuse Final Environmental Impact Statement* (June, 1993) and the *Fort Ord Disposal and Reuse Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* (December, 1995), herein referred to as the Army’s FEIS and DSEIS. Senate Bill 1180 allows FORA to rely in part on the Army’s previous analyses in the FEIS and DSEIS for environmental review of the proposed project. 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 Army’s FEIS and DSEIS, and essentially serves as a supplemental document to these previous NEPA documents.

As with the Army’s FEIS and SDEIS, this ~~Draft~~ 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).

CEQA environmental review conducted for future individual projects that implement the *Final Fort Ord Reuse Plan* will be tiered to this EIR to the extent this program-level analysis remains adequate for such purposes.

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.

2.1 Proposed Project

The proposed project represents an ultimate buildout scenario for the former Fort Ord over the next 40-60 years. This EIR focuses on the development capacity through year 2015. Under the proposed project, more than 27,000 acres of the former Fort Ord would be transferred from the Department of the Army (Army) to a number of government agencies and local organizations which would have land use control within the former Fort Ord. The transfer and redevelopment of such a large area would necessitate substantial restructuring of local jurisdictional boundaries, the incorporation of new local policies and programs to guide development, implementation strategies including capital improvements, and future land management plans. The proposed project addresses all these factors and therefore serves as a long-term, regionally focused, and comprehensive reuse plan, functioning at the general plan level.

The ~~Draft Fort Ord~~ *Reuse Plan* incorporates substantial development of educational, residential, office, light industrial, commercial, and recreational land uses with the majority of the former Fort Ord managed for open space and habitat protection under the Fort Ord Installation Wide Multi-Species Habitat Management Plan recently agreed to by the involved agencies. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of approximately 22,232 dwelling units (including dormitory housing), 45,457 jobs, and a buildout population of approximately 51,773 with an additional 20,000 CSUMB residential students. The adopted project is significantly reduced in size and accomplishes about 50% of these projections by 2015. [For a more detailed description, refer to Chapter 3.0 of this ~~Draft~~ EIR.] Accompanying policies and programs are included as part of the proposed project in order to implement the land use concept. 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 and 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.

Significant Differences Between the Proposed Project and Alternatives Presented in the Army's FEIS and DSEIS

The Army's DSEIS analyzes Alternative 7 (FORA's Interim Reuse Plan) and a minor modification of this alternative labeled Alternative 8. The Army's FEIS analyzes Alternatives 1 through 6R and their sub-alternatives. The proposed project in this ~~Draft~~ EIR is relatively similar to Alternatives 7 and 8, but is significantly different from Alternatives 1 through 6R. The principal differences

CEQA environmental review conducted for future individual projects that implement the *Final Fort Ord Reuse Plan* will be tiered to this EIR to the extent this program-level analysis remains adequate for such purposes.

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.

2.1 Proposed Project

The proposed project represents an ultimate buildout scenario for the former Fort Ord over the next 40-60 years. This EIR focuses on the development capacity through year 2015. Under the proposed project, more than 27,000 acres of the former Fort Ord would be transferred from the Department of the Army (Army) to a number of government agencies and local organizations which would have land use control within the former Fort Ord. The transfer and redevelopment of such a large area would necessitate substantial restructuring of local jurisdictional boundaries, the incorporation of new local policies and programs to guide development, implementation strategies including capital improvements, and future land management plans. The proposed project addresses all these factors and therefore serves as a long-term, regionally focused, and comprehensive reuse plan, functioning at the general plan level.

The ~~Draft Fort Ord~~ Reuse Plan incorporates substantial development of educational, residential, office, light industrial, commercial, and recreational land uses with the majority of the former Fort Ord managed for open space and habitat protection under the Fort Ord Installation Wide Multi-Species Habitat Management Plan recently agreed to by the involved agencies. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of approximately 22,232 dwelling units (including dormitory housing), 45,457 jobs, and a buildout population of approximately 51,773 with an additional 20,000 CSUMB residential students. The adopted project is significantly reduced in size and accomplishes about 50% of these projections by 2015. [For a more detailed description, refer to Chapter 3.0 of this ~~Draft~~ EIR.] Accompanying policies and programs are included as part of the proposed project in order to implement the land use concept. 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 and 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.

Significant Differences Between the Proposed Project and Alternatives Presented in the Army's FEIS and DSEIS

The Army's DSEIS analyzes Alternative 7 (FORA's Interim Reuse Plan) and a minor modification of this alternative labeled Alternative 8. The Army's FEIS analyzes Alternatives 1 through 6R and their sub-alternatives. The proposed project in this ~~Draft~~ EIR is relatively similar to Alternatives 7 and 8, but is significantly different from alternatives 1 through 6R. The principal differences

between the ~~current Draft Fort Ord~~ *Reuse Plan* and previous Alternatives 7 and 8 have resulted in a proposed project that:

- limits impacts on limited water supply;
- is more economically feasible;
- contains a down-scaled and less-costly circulation infrastructure;
- satisfies the demand for adequate housing in the local region;
- includes increased recreational and tourist opportunities; and
- Integrates land uses better.

2.2 Summary of Setting, Impacts and Mitigation

This Summary provides an overview of the analysis contained in Chapter 4.0 – Environmental Setting, Impacts on Mitigation. This summary includes discussion of:

- Beneficial impacts;
- Less than significant impacts;
- Significant but mitigable impacts; and
- Unavoidable significant impacts.

The reuse of former Fort Ord under the ~~Draft Fort Ord~~ *Reuse Plan* would result in a number of beneficial impacts in comparison with 1991 conditions. Beneficial impacts include:

- Socioeconomic impacts associated with the improved employment base and jobs to housing balance;
- Visual quality improvements in existing developed or disturbed areas; and
- Cumulative biological resource protection due to implementation of the Habitat Management plan.

The reuse of former Fort Ord under the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts in the following resource areas:

- Socioeconomics;
- Geology and Soils;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Climate and Air Quality;
- Biological Resources; and
- Cultural Resources.

Under CEQA, a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any physical conditions within the area affected by the proposed project. Significant or potentially significant but mitigable impacts under the proposed project would include:

- Land use impacts relating to incompatible land uses and development in the coastal zone;

- Public services, utilities, and water supply impacts relating to the need for new systems, services, and supplies;
- Public health and safety impacts relating to the exposure to hazardous and toxic materials;
- Visual resources impacts relating to reduced visual quality from increased development within the former Fort Ord and reduced visual quality seen from the Salinas Valley.

Significant impacts, which would be unavoidable under the proposed project, include:

- Proposed project and cumulative-level public health, and safety impacts relating to the increased demand for law enforcement services and the increased demand for fire protection/emergency services;
- Cumulative public services, utilities, and water supply impacts associated with the need for local water supplies;
- Proposed project and cumulative-level traffic and circulation impacts relating to the increased demand on the regional transportation system; and
- Cumulative visual resource impacts associated with landscape change along the SR1 corridor.

A more detailed summary of the impact analyses contained in Chapter 4.0 is presented in Table 2.5-1 at the end of this chapter. The summary table is arranged in seven columns. The first column registers impacts to the resources of concern that would result from the proposed project. The second column lists the policy and program statements developed in the ~~Draft Fort Ord~~ Reuse Plan (Reuse Plan), which are designed to mitigate potential impacts. These policies and programs represent commitments by FORA and its member agencies that are “built in” to the project, and in many cases additional “mitigation measures” are not needed. The level of significance before and after mitigation is also summarized in the table.

Mitigation measures are identified for those impacts, which are considered to be significantly or potentially significant, after implementation of the Reuse Plan policies and programs. Generally, program-level mitigation for the impacts includes modifications to the ~~Draft Fort Ord~~ Reuse Plan or the addition of other requirements. The mitigations recommended to address significant impacts identified in this document form the basis of the mitigation monitoring plan.

2.2.1 Mitigation Monitoring Plan

Mitigation measures are identified for those impacts, which are considered to be significant or potentially significant, after implementation of the Reuse Plan policies and programs. In compliance with CEQA Guidelines (Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code), a mitigation monitoring and reporting program must be developed as part of the CEQA process prior to project approval. The ~~draft~~ Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the proposed project has been combined with the summary of impacts and mitigation measures into Table 2.5-1 (at the end of this chapter). The mitigation schedule and mitigation responsibility are included as columns six and seven of the summary table.

2.3 Summary of Other CEQA Considerations

This summary provides an overview of the analyses contained in Chapter 5.0 – Other CEQA Considerations. The following discussion summarizes:

- Cumulative Impacts;
- Growth inducing impacts;
- Significant irreversible environmental changes; and
- Unavoidable significant impacts.

2.3.1 Cumulative Impacts

In conformance with CEQA, a cumulative impact of the proposed project is “the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the proposed project when added to other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355(b)).” The cumulative impact analyses in this ~~Draft~~ EIR refer to the combined effects of both the proposed project and AMBAG projections for regional growth, including reasonably foreseeable future projects in Monterey County and local cities as identified in Table 5.1-1. These impacts are discussed in Section 5.1 of this ~~Draft~~ EIR and identified in Table 2.5-1.

2.3.2 Growth Inducing Impacts

Under CEQA, a growth inducing impact of the proposed project is one that would foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either indirectly or directly, in the surrounding environment.

The initial phase of development to the year 2015 would not result in a growth inducing impact. Economic, population, and residential increases occurring until the year 2015, as proposed by the Reuse Plan, would constitute only a recovery to the approximate 1991 levels of activity. Beyond 2015, buildout of the proposed project is intended to absorb a substantial portion of Monterey Bay Peninsula (“Peninsula”) growth that is already predicted by AMBAG to occur. Because the proposed project is designed to capture much of the future growth, it is not expected that the Reuse Plan would substantially foster growth in the surrounding environment ~~without~~. A component of additional growth is possible since the establishment of an educational/research center on the former Fort Ord has the potential to attract statewide and nationwide populations to the area which would not otherwise occur. However, the overall Reuse Plan is not expected to remove certain obstacles to growth. The regional water supply shortage in particular would not be solved by the proposed project and would remain a limitation on regional growth.

2.3.3 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to involve a large commitment of renewable resources, except for the building materials required to develop new structures. The reuse of existing buildings on the former Fort Ord would decrease the need for these materials. The proposed project would contribute to the permanent conversion of nondeveloped land to

residential, business, public facility, educational, and mixed uses on the former Fort Ord. This would commit future generations to developed uses.

The proposed project would result in the irretrievable commitment of energy resources for increased electricity and gas demands and in the form of gasoline for construction vehicles and vehicles commuting to the area. The proposed project would also result in the irretrievable commitment of water resources in the form of potable and non-potable water supplies. The proposed project is not expected to pose a high risk of environmental accidents.

2.3.4 Unavoidable Significant Impacts

Under CEQA, a significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project is one that would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment and for which no mitigation is available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level if the Reuse Plan is approved. These impacts are discussed in Section 5.4 of this ~~Draft~~ EIR and identified in Table 2.5-1.

2.4 Summary of Alternative Analysis

The four alternatives to the proposed project considered in this EIR consist of:

- Alternative 6R (Revised Anticipated Reuse; as described in the Army's FEIS)
- Alternative 7 (FORA 12-12-94 Interim Reuse Plan; as described in the Army's DSEIS)
- Alternative 8 (Slight modification of Alternative 7; as described in the Army's DSEIS)
- No Project Alternative (New alternative; caretaker status under the Army except for existing conveyances)

Table 2.4-1 compares the general characteristics of Alternatives 6R, 7, 8, and No Project with the proposed project. The table provides a summary comparison of the population, housing, employment, and land use contained in Chapter 6.0. The five reuse scenarios propose total housing in the range of 4,816-17,132 dwelling units (not including student housing). Total population ranges from 14,388-51,773 (not including student population) and employment ranges from 25,630-58,500. These numbers represent the general levels of development being considered for the former Fort Ord area.

Table 2.4-2 summarizes the key distinguishing impacts of the project alternatives, as evaluated in Chapter 6.0, and compares it to the proposed project impacts (after application of mitigation measures).

2.4.1 The Environmentally Superior Alternative

The reuse scenario under the No Project Alternative would result in the least environmental impacts, 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 the 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. The No Project Alternative would have more adverse impacts than the proposed project in terms of jobs to housing ratios and regional traffic. It would have less impact in many categories, as show in Table 2.4-2.

However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives of developing an economic/employment recovery to compensate for base closure and accommodate regional growth. At the cumulative level, substantial regional growth would still be projected, with potentially greater impacts on other land (e.g., farmland or open space) should development occur outside the former Fort Ord.

The *CEQA Guidelines* require that an additional environmentally superior alternative be identified in cases where the No Project Alternative represents the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 6R has been selected as the second environmentally superior alternative. This selection is based on projected population and the assumption that the 3,700 acres (13% of the former Fort Ord) designated as No Proposed Use would not be developed. Under Alternative 6R, approximately 22.5% (6,100 acres) of total former Fort Ord land would be developed, and 53% (17,195 acres) would be left undeveloped for habitat management and parks and recreation. A comparative discussion with the proposed project is provided in the next section.

2.4.2 Comparisons with the Proposed Project

Table 2.4-2 provides a summary comparison of alternatives. Chapter 6.0 should also be consulted for more details of impacts by alternative.

Compared with Alternative 6R, the proposed project would have less impact in terms of coastal land use compatibility, jobs to housing ratios, loss of coastal habitat, effects on beach/dune habitat, loss of oak woodland, effects on wetlands, and effects on visual resources. The proposed project would have more adverse impact in terms of potential incompatibility of land uses at East Garrison, increased generation of solid waste, demand for water supply, demand for law enforcement and fire protection services, increased traffic, and increased noise. However, unlike alternative 6R, the proposed project – contains a comprehensive set of policies and programs, which reduce the potential impacts to these resources substantially, as described in Chapter 4.0. Alternative 6R would also not fully meet the project objectives.

Compared with Alternative 7, the proposed project would have less impact in terms of general incompatibility of adjoining land uses within the former Fort Ord, jobs to housing ratios, hydrology and water quality, traffic noise, loss of coastal strand habitat, loss of dune scrub, effects of beach/dune habitat, loss of oak woodland, and effects on wetlands and visual resources. The proposed project would have more adverse impact in terms of potential incompatibility of land uses

at East Garrison, increased generation of solid waste, and demand for law enforcement services. However, the project includes a comprehensive set of policies and programs, which reduce the potential impacts considerably, as described in Chapter 4.0. Relative to the proposed project, Alternative 7 would have greater cumulative and regional effect on traffic and associated environmental effects due to the creation of over 10,000 more jobs with a population at the former Fort Ord of approximately 10,000 fewer residents.

The anticipated impacts of Alternative 8 would be very similar in general to those described above for Alternative 7 in relation to the proposed project. The principal difference would be that Alternative 8 would produce similar impacts as under the proposed project in terms of jobs to housing ratio and demand for law enforcement services and traffic, although without the benefits of the policies and programs.

2.5 Summary Table

Table 2.5-1 provides a detailed and comprehensive summary of proposed project impacts and mitigation measures.

Table 2.4-1 General Characteristics of the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives

General Characteristics	Proposed Project	Alternative 6R ^a	Alternative 7 ^a	Alternative 8 ^a	No Project Alternative
General population ^a	51,773	22,770	41,500	45,100	14,388
CSUMB residential students	20,000	N/A	20,000	20,000	20,000
General housing (dwelling units) ^b	17,132	10,210	13,800	15,000	4,816
CSUMB residential student housing	5,100	N/A	5,100	5,100	5,100
Employment (jobs) ^c	45,457	27,000	58,500	48,100	25,630
Jobs:housing ratio	2.05	2.64	3.10	2.39	2.59
Land use categories:					
Habitat Management	62%	53%	62%	61%	56%
Educational/Institutional/ Public Facilities (includes airport)	9%	9%	10%	10%	5%
Retail	1%	N/A	1%	1%	N/A
Business/Planned Development/ Light Industrial (commercial)	5%	3%	7%	6%	3%
Residential	7%	0.5%	6%	6%	2%
Parks and Recreation (golf, beach)	10%	11%	6%	7%	5%
Agri-Business (agriculture)	N/A	3%	3%	3%	N/A
Other (ROW, POM annex) ^d	7%	6%+	4%+	5%+	4%
Visitor Serving (tourism)	<1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Caretaker Status	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	26%
No Proposed Use	N/A	13%	N/A	N/A	N/A

- a Population totals for Alternative 7 and Alternative 8 were estimated in the Army's FEIS based on 3 persons per dwelling unit. This methodology did not reflect student populations, and 20,000 CSUMB residential have been added in this table to reflect this difference. Although CSUMB is planning for 25,000 FTE students, it is estimated that 20,000 students will be living within the former Fort Ord.
Population total for the No Project Alternative includes 4,827 military associated with the POM annex and 406 associated with McKinney Act housing, and 9,155 associated with CSUMB faculty, staff and graduate students.
General population totals includes military population.
- b For Alternative 7 and Alternative 8, 5,100 residential student housing units have been added to the total units listed in the Army's FEIS.
General housing total for the No Project Alternative includes 1,590 units for the military POM Annex, 133 McKinney Act housing units, and 3,093 units associated with CSUMB faculty, staff and graduate student housing.
General housing total for the proposed project assumes 1,590 for military POM Annex housing, 12,449 for community housing, 3,093 for CSUMB faculty, staff and graduate housing, and does not include the 1,790 hotel rooms planned for this alternative.
- c Employment total for the No Project Alternative includes 310 military associated with the POM Annex, 3,200 associated with CSUMB, 210 associated with the beach park, golf, and habitat management, 9,737 associated with the City of Marina airport and Business/Planned Development/Light Industrial development, and 12,173 associated with the County of Monterey Planned Development use.
- d The proposed project includes 1,147 acres for rights-of-way infrastructure; figures from the other alternatives account for only around 320 acres of ROW infrastructure and underestimate these total percentages.
- e Land use category percentages have been reaggreated from the Army's FEIS and DSEIS.
- N/A = Not Applicable

Table 2.4-2 Comparison of Key Distinguishing Impacts of the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives

Impact Issues	Proposed Project	Alternative 6R	Alternative 7	Alternative 8	No Project Alternative
1. Land Use					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistency with state and local policies 	<p>Required policies/ programs would make local plans consistent with all other policies; revised coastal consistency determination required</p>	<p>Greater than proposed project, inconsistency with policies regarding habitat, infrastructure, land use, groundwater, and Coastal Act</p>	<p>Greater than proposed project, inconsistency with policies regarding habitat, infrastructure, land use, groundwater, and Coastal Act</p>	<p>Greater than proposed project, inconsistency with policies regarding habitat, infrastructure, land use, groundwater, and Coastal Act</p>	<p>Greater than proposed project, without reuse plan, use of transferred properties may be inconsistent with state, local policies</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incompatibility between transit center and coastal habitat 	<p>No impact; transit center removed from coastal area</p>	<p>Greater than proposed project; transit center located in coastal natural habitat area</p>	<p>No impact; transit center removed from coastal area</p>	<p>No impact; transit center removed from coastal area</p>	<p>No impact; transit center removed from coastal area</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incompatibility between natural area expansion and development 	<p>Potential incompatibilities with natural area expansion reduced by impact with required policies/ programs</p>	<p>Similar to proposed project, but without mitigating policies and programs; impact from Golf course / Hotel/ Business Park on Natural Area Expansion</p>	<p>Similar to proposed project, but without mitigating policies and programs; impact from Golf course/Hotel/ Business Park on Natural Area Expansion</p>	<p>Similar to proposed project, but without mitigating policies and programs; impact from Golf course/Hotel/ Business Park on Natural Area Expansion</p>	<p>No impact; caretaker status in this location</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incompatibility between East Garrison uses in historic area 	<p>Potential incompatibility of proposed uses incompatible with each other and with adjacent youth camp; reduced impact with required policies/ programs</p>	<p>Fewer impacts than proposed project due to fewer competing uses</p>	<p>Fewer impacts than proposed project due to fewer competing uses</p>	<p>Fewer impacts than proposed project due to fewer competing uses</p>	<p>No impact; caretaker status in this location</p>

Table 2.4-2 Comparison of Key Distinguishing Impacts of the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives (continued)

Impact Issues	Proposed Project	Alternative 6R	Alternative 7	Alternative 8	No Project Alternative
1. Land Use cont. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incompatibility between Highway 68 bypass and adjacent land uses 	Proposed Hwy. 68 incompatible with York School, Laguna Seca; reduced impact with required policies/ programs	Similar to proposed project but without mitigating policies and programs; impact from proposed Hwy. 68 on York School, Laguna Seca	Similar to proposed project but without mitigating policies and programs; impact from proposed Hwy. 68 on York School, Laguna Seca	Similar to proposed project but without mitigating policies and programs; impact from proposed Hwy. 68 on York School, Laguna Seca	No impact; caretaker status in this location
2. Socioeconomics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General housing (dwelling units - excludes CSUMB students) Employment (jobs) 	17,132 45,457 Jobs:housing ratio of 2.05 is improved over previous alternatives	10,210 27,000 Jobs:housing ratio = 2.64	13,800 58,500 Jobs:housing ratio = 3.10	15,000 48,100 Jobs:housing ratio = 2.39	4,816 25,630 Jobs:housing ratio = 2.59
3. Geology and Soils	Potential impacts on unique soil types, soil fertility, coastal facilities, wind erosion, water erosion, landslide susceptibility, and increased sedimentation would be reduced with required programs and policies	Slightly less than under proposed project; potential for less erosion impacts in East Garrison area; potential for greater long-term loss of soil fertility caused by fire suppression	Similar to proposed project; potential for less erosion impacts in East Garrison area	Similar to proposed project; potential for less erosion impacts in East Garrison area	Less than proposed project; potential for greater long-term loss of soil fertility caused by fire suppression
4. Public Services, Utilities, and Water Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for new local water supplies 	18,262 afy Policies/programs and mitigation measures reduce effect on groundwater supplies, but additional water supplies required	12,000 afy Less than proposed project	17,700 afy Similar to proposed project, but without mitigating policies and programs	18,000 afy Similar to proposed project, but without mitigating policies and programs	9,346 afy Substantially less than proposed project

Table 2.4-2 Comparison of Key Distinguishing Impacts of the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives (continued)

Impact Issues	Proposed Project	Alternative 6R	Alternative 7	Alternative 8	No Project Alternative
<p>4. Public Services, Utilities, and Water Supply cont.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="164 426 505 709">• Need for new and upgraded utility systems - Wastewater Generated <li data-bbox="164 709 505 926">- Solid Waste Generated <li data-bbox="164 926 505 1314">- Storm Drainage 	<p>9.8 mgd Capital improvements, policies/ programs, and mitigation measures reduce effect</p> <p>193 tons per day generated at build-out</p> <p>Drainage improvements on 8,701 acres of developed land; capital improvements and policies/ programs reduce effect</p>	<p>Less than proposed project; potential impacts associated with utility system deterioration</p> <p>Substantially less than proposed project, based on lower population</p> <p>Less than proposed project, based on fewer acres developed; potential impacts associated with utility system deterioration</p>	<p>Slightly less than proposed project, based on fewer dwelling units</p> <p>Slightly less than proposed project, based on a lower population</p> <p>Similar to proposed project, based on similar acres developed</p>	<p>Slightly less than proposed project, based on fewer dwelling units</p> <p>Slightly less than proposed project, based on a lower population</p> <p>Similar to proposed project, based on fewer acres developed</p>	<p>Substantially less than proposed project, based on a lower population</p> <p>Substantially less than proposed project, based on a lower population</p> <p>Less than proposed project, based on fewer acres developed; additional impacts associated with utility system deterioration</p>
<p>5. Hydrology and Water Quality</p>	<p>Potential impacts associated with site run-off, water quality degradation, and groundwater recharge would be reduced with required programs and policies</p>	<p>Slightly less than proposed project</p>	<p>Slightly greater than proposed project</p>	<p>Slightly greater than proposed project</p>	<p>Less than proposed project</p>
<p>6. Public Health and Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="164 1692 505 1890">• Increased demand for law enforcement 	<p>Demand for increased law enforcement (103 additional law enforcement officers); policies, programs and mitigation measures reduce effect</p>	<p>Less than the proposed project, based on lower population</p>	<p>Less than the proposed project, based on lower population</p>	<p>Slightly less than the proposed project, based on lower population</p>	<p>Substantially less than the proposed project, based on lower population</p>

Table 2.4-2 Comparison of Key Distinguishing Impacts of the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives (continued)

Impact Issues	Proposed Project	Alternative 6R	Alternative 7	Alternative 8	No Project Alternative
<p>6. Public Health and Safety cont.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased demand for fire protection Exposure to hazardous and toxic materials Long-term exposure to unexploded ordnance 	<p>Increased demand for fire protection; policies/ programs and mitigation measures reduce effect</p> <p>Potential exposure to hazardous materials reduced by policies/ programs</p> <p>Long-term exposure to unexploded ordnance reduced by policies/ programs</p>	<p>Less than proposed project</p> <p>Less than proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p>	<p>Similar to proposed project, based on similar amount of acres served</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p>	<p>Similar to proposed project, based on similar amount of acres served</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p>	<p>Less than proposed project</p> <p>Less than proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p>
<p>7. Traffic and Circulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily Vehicle Trips Generated Increased traffic demand on Fort Ord and regional transportation 	<p>390,000</p> <p>Improved jobs:housing balance would minimize off-site trips; programs and policies assure capacity for on-site trips and reduce but do not eliminate cumulative regional impacts</p>	<p>228,000</p> <p>Substantially lower impact both internally and regionally due to fewer trips</p>	<p>435,139</p> <p>Would generate more trips due to greater jobs:housing imbalance, causing greater impact on regional system without mitigating policies and programs</p>	<p>425,000-430,000</p> <p>Would generate slightly more daily trips, but greater jobs:housing imbalance would result in more trips to from points outside the former Fort Ord thus causing greater impact on regional system; impacts not reduced by mitigating policies and programs</p>	<p>195,000</p> <p>Would generate about one-half the number of trips but absence of community housing within the former Fort Ord is expected to result in higher % of trips to or from points outside the former Fort Ord, causing regional impacts without mitigating policies and programs</p>

Table 2.4-2 Comparison of Key Distinguishing Impacts of the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives (continued)

Impact Issues	Proposed Project	Alternative 6R	Alternative 7	Alternative 8	No Project Alternative
8. Climate and Air Quality	Potential violations of ambient air quality standards would be reduced with required programs and policies	Slightly less than proposed project	Similar to proposed project	Similar to proposed project	Less than proposed project
9. Noise					
• Noise from construction	Potential impacts would be reduced with required programs and policies	Less than proposed project because development would be less intense	Similar to proposed project because amount of development would be similar	Similar to proposed project because amount of development would be similar	Substantially less than proposed project because substantially less development would occur
• Noise impacts from traffic	Potential impacts to new and existing noise-sensitive land uses would be reduced with required programs and policies	Less than proposed project because traffic volumes would be lower	Slightly more than proposed project because amount of traffic would be increased, without mitigating policies and programs	Slightly more than proposed project because amount of traffic would be increased, without mitigating policies and programs	Substantially less than proposed project because substantially less traffic would occur
• Noise impacts from airports	Potential impacts to new noise-sensitive land uses would be reduced with required programs and policies	Less than proposed project because development close to airports would be less intense	Similar to proposed project because location and intensity of development would be similar but without mitigating policies and programs	Similar to proposed project because location and intensity of development would be similar but without mitigating policies and programs	Less than proposed project, because fewer sensitive land uses would be exposed to aircraft noise
• Noise from non-transportation sources	Potential impact to new and existing noise-sensitive land uses would be reduced with required programs and policies	Less than proposed project because development would be less intense	Similar to proposed project because development would be similar without mitigating policies and programs	Similar to proposed project because of similar development without mitigating policies and programs	Fewer land uses with sources of noise would be located adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses

Table 2.4-2 Comparison of Key Distinguishing Impacts of the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives (continued)

Impact Issues	Proposed Project	Alternative 6R	Alternative 7	Alternative 8	No Project Alternative
10. Biological Resources					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of sensitive habitats addressed in the HMP - Loss of maritime chaparral (acres) 	Potential impacts on 2,333 acres would be reduced with required policies and programs	Slightly less than proposed project	Slightly less than proposed project	Slightly less than proposed project	Less than proposed project but more potential for habitat degradation/isolation from lack of active habitat management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of coastal strand 	No loss of habitat; potential impacts to special status species would be reduced with required policies and programs	Slightly more than proposed project	Slightly more than proposed project	Slightly more than proposed project	Similar to proposed project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of dune scrub 	Potential impacts on 2 acres would be reduced with required policies and programs	Slightly less than proposed project	Slightly more than proposed project	Slightly more than proposed project	Similar to proposed project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on beach, blowouts, ice plant mats, disturbed dune 	Potential impacts to 71 acres would be reduced with required policies and programs	More than proposed project	Slightly more than proposed project	Slightly more than proposed project	Less than proposed project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on coastal scrub 	Potential impacts on 348 acres would be negligible	Less than proposed project	Less than proposed project	Less than proposed project	Less than proposed project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on annual grassland 	Potential impacts on 1,525 acres would be negligible	Less than proposed project	Less than proposed project	Less than proposed project	Less than proposed project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on coast live oak woodland and savanna 	Potential impacts 1,584 acres would be reduced with required policies and programs	More than proposed project	More than proposed project	More than proposed project	Less than proposed project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on native perennial grassland 	Potential impacts on 6 acres would be negligible	Slightly less than proposed project	Slightly less than proposed project	Slightly less than proposed project	Slightly less than proposed project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on vernal ponds, riparian corridors, other wetland areas 	Potential impacts on up to 5 acres would be reduced with policies and programs	Slightly more than proposed project	Slightly more than proposed project	Slightly more than proposed project	Similar to proposed project

Table 2.4-2 Comparison of Key Distinguishing Impacts of the Proposed Project and Project Alternatives (continued)

Impact Issues	Proposed Project	Alternative 6R	Alternative 7	Alternative 8	No Project Alternative
<p>10. Biological Resources cont.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of sensitive species not addressed in the HMP Conflict with the goals of the Sanctuary Management Plan for the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary 	<p>Potential impacts would be reduced with required policies and programs</p> <p>Potential impacts of urban run-off or erosion would be reduced with required policies and programs</p>	<p>Slightly less than proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p>	<p>Slightly less than proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p>	<p>Slightly less than proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project</p>	<p>Less than proposed project but potential for habitat degradation/isolation from lack of active habitat mangmt.</p> <p>Less than proposed project</p>
<p>11. Visual Resources</p>	<p>Potential impacts to on-site visual quality, views from State Route 1 and 68, and view from Salinas Valley would be reduced with required policies, programs and mitigation measures</p>	<p>More than proposed project</p>	<p>More than proposed project</p>	<p>More than proposed project</p>	<p>Similar to proposed project but without mitigating policies and programs</p>
<p>12. Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disrupt Native American resources Disrupt historical resources 	<p>Potential impact due to more intense land use would be reduced with required policies and programs</p> <p>Potential impact due to more intense land use, especially in East Garrison area; impact would be reduced with required policies and programs</p>	<p>Less than proposed project because less intense land use</p> <p>Less than proposed project because less intense land use</p>	<p>Similar to proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project regarding Stilwell Hall; slightly less for East Garrison historic district</p>	<p>Similar to proposed project</p> <p>Similar to proposed project regarding Stilwell Hall; slightly less for East Garrison historic district</p>	<p>Less than proposed project because less intense land use; impact from loss of federal protection</p> <p>Similar impact on Stilwell Hall; greater impact on East Garrison because of loss of federal protection</p>

^a Different methodologies were used for Alternative 7 and the proposed project.

^b Different methodologies were used for Alternative 7 and the proposed project; this figure is underestimated.

N/A Not Available

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects	Mitigation				
4.1 Land Use						
1. Incompatibility of Proposed Developments Adjacent to Open Space Areas	<p>ROLU Policy A-1 Program A-1.1</p> <p>ROLU Policy B-2 Program B-2.1</p> <p>Program E-1.6</p> <p>ILU Policy A-1</p> <p>Program A-1.4</p>	Potentially significant	Amend Program B-2.1 within the Fort Ord Reuse Plan to state: 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 the development plan of incompatible land uses as a condition of project approval.	Less than significant	Following conveyance of land and at time of development	Monterey County
2. Development in the Coastal Zone	<p>ROLU Policy E-1 Program E-1.1</p> <p>Program E-1.2</p>	Potentially significant	FORA and CDPR will coordinate future use of the coastal zone through the CDPR master planning process and shall comply with the requirements of the Coastal Zone Management Act and coastal consistency determination.	Less than significant	Correspond with deed transfer and the CDPR master planning process	FORA and California Department of Parks and Recreation
3. Expansion of School Adjacent to Proposed Transportation Corridor	<p>ILU Policy A-1 Program A-1.4</p> <p>ILU Policy B-1 Program B-1.1</p>	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
4. Incompatibility of Expanded Regional Park District with Proposed Highway 68 Transportation Corridor	<p>ROLU Policy A-1 Program A-1.1</p> <p>ROLU Policy B-2 Program B-2.1</p>	Potentially significant	Same as for Impact #1 above.	Less than significant	Following conveyance of land and at time of development	Monterey County
5. Incompatibility Between Land Uses Within the Historic East Garrison District	<p>(RLU) Program C-1.2 Program E-1.2</p> <p>(ROLU) Program E-1.6</p> <p>ILU Policy A-1</p> <p>ILU Policy B-1 Program B-1.1</p>	Potentially significant	Adopt a policy or program for the Fort Ord Reuse Plan that states: The County of Monterey shall review future development projects at East Garrison to ensure compatibility with the historic context and associated land uses.	Less than significant	Following conveyance of land and at time of development	Monterey County
6. Incompatibility of Mixed-Use District Adjacent to Patton Elementary School	<p>ILU Policy A-1</p> <p>ILU Policy B-1 Program B-1.1</p> <p>Program B-1.2</p>	Less than significant	None required	N/A		

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS						
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility ²
4.1 Land Use cont.						
7. Incompatibility of Land Uses Adjacent to University Campus	ILU Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 Program A-1.3 Program A-1.4	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
8. Incompatibility Between Equestrian Center and Public Amphitheater Adjacent to Residential Area and University Park	ILU Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 Program A-1.3 (ROLU) Program E-1.4	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
9. Possible Location of a New High School Near Incompatible Land Uses in the City of Marina	ILU Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Program B-1.2 Program B-1.3	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
10. Incompatibility of Residential Developments Adjacent to the Natural Resource Management Area (NRMA)	ROLU Policy B-2 Program B-2.1 Program B-2.2 Program B-2.3 Program B-2.4	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
Cumulative Land Use Impacts	As above	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
4.2 Socioeconomics						
1. Increase in Monterey County Population, Employment and Demand for Community Services	N/A	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
2. Increase in Monterey County Housing Capacity	N/A	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
Cumulative Socioeconomics Impacts	N/A	Less than significant	None required	N/A		

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility ²
4.3 Geology and Soils						
1. Loss of Unique Soil Type Supporting Rare Plant Communities and Endangered Threatened Species	SGC Policy C-1 Program C-2.1	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
2. Long-term Loss of Soil Fertility Caused by Fire Suppression	(SGC) Program C-2.1	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
3. Potential Loss of Coastal Facilities Due to Construction in a Zone of High Beach or Coastal Erosion	SGC Policy A-1 SGC Policy A-2 Program A-2.3 SGC Policy A-3 SGC Policy A-4 SGC Policy A-5 Program A-5.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
4. Accelerated Wind Erosion	SGC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2 Program A-2.3 SGC Policy A-3 SGC Policy A-4	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
5. Accelerated Water Erosion	SGC Policy A-1 SGC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2 Program A-2.3 SGC Policy A-3 SGC Policy A-4 SGC Policy A-5 Program A-5.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹					
4.3 Geology and Soils cont.						
6. Increased Landslide Susceptibility	SGC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2 Program A-2.3 SGC Policy A-4 SGC Policy A-5 SGC Policy A-6 Program A-6.1 Program A-6.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
7. Increased Sedimentation	SGC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2 Program A-2.3 SGC Policy A-3 SGC Policy A-4 SGC Policy A-5 Program A-5.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
8. Engineering Limitations on Use of Soils	SGC Policy A-1 Program A-2.3 SGC Policy A-5 Program A-5.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
Cumulative Geology and Soils Impacts		As above	None required	N/A		
4.4 Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply						
1. Need for New and Upgraded Utility Systems and Services	HWQC Policy C-5 HWQC Policy C-7 Program C-1.1 Program C-1.2 Program A-1.1 Capital improvements for wastewater, water distribution, and storm drainage	Potentially significant	Write a program to be adopted by the Cities of Marina and Seaside and the County of Monterey that states: the City/County shall comply with Assembly Bill 939, which mandates a reduction in generated solid waste to a target rate of 5.4 lb/cap/day, by developing and enforcing a solid waste reduction and recycling program for the former Fort Ord area.	Less than significant	Prior to implementing the proposed project	Cities of Marina and Seaside and County of Monterey

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹					
4.4 Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply cont.						
1. cont.			Write a program to be adopted by the Cities of Marina and Seaside and the County of Monterey that states: the City/County shall carry out all actions necessary to ensure that the installation of water supply wells comply with State of California Water Well Standards and well standards established by the Monterey County Health Department.		Prior to implementing the proposed project	Cities of Marina and Seaside and County of Monterey
			Write a program to be adopted by the Cities of Marina and Seaside and the County of Monterey that states: the City/County shall carry out all actions necessary to ensure that distribution and storage of potable and non-potable water comply with State Health Department regulations through Title 22.		Prior to implementing the proposed project	Cities of Marina and Seaside and County of Monterey
2. Need for New Local Water Supplies	HWQC Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Program B-1.2 Program B-1.3 HWQC Policy B-2 HWQC Policy C-3 Program C-3.1 Program C-3.2	Potentially significant	Write a program to be adopted by the Cities of Marina and Seaside and the County of Monterey that states: the City/County shall adopt and enforce a stormwater detention plan that identifies potential stormwater detention design and implementation measures to be considered in all new development, in order to increase groundwater recharge and thereby reduce potential for further seawater intrusion and augment future water supplies.	Less than significant	Prior to implementing the proposed project	Cities of Marina and Seaside and County of Monterey
Cumulative Public Services, Utilities, and Water Supply Impacts						
Need for New Local Water Supplies	As above	Significant	Same as for Impact #2 above	Unavoidable significant	Prior to implementing the proposed project	Cities of Marina and Seaside and County of Monterey

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS						
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
4.5 Hydrology and Water Quality						
1. Increased Site Runoff	HWQC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program B-1.1 HWQC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
2. Water Quality Degradation from Urban Runoff	(HWQC) Program C-1.1 Program C-1.3 HWQC Policy C-2 Program C-2.1 HWQC Policy C-6	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
3. Water Quality Degradation from Golf Course Adjacent to Natural Area Expansion	ROLU Policy B-2 Program B-2.1 BRC Policy A-8 Program A-8.1 HWQC Policy C-1 Program C-1.1 HWQC Policy C-2 Program C-2.1	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
4. Water Quality Degradation from Increased Erosion During Construction	HWQC Policy C-4 Program C-4.1 Program C-1.3 HWQC Policy C-6 SGC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2 Program A-2.3	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
5. Degradation of Water Quality from Hazardous Material Spills During Construction	(HWQC) Program C-1.5	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
6. Changes in Amount and Quality of Groundwater Recharge	HWQC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 HWQC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts	As above	Less than significant	None required	N/A		

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹					
4.6 Public Health and Safety						
1. Increased Demand for Law Enforcement Services	N/A	Significant	FORA, jointly with the local city mgrs. and law enforcement agencies involved, shall develop a regional law enforcement program that promotes joint efficiencies in operations, and identifies additional law enforcement needs, and identifies and seeks to secure the appropriate funding mechanism to provide the required services.	Unavoidable significant	Following land conveyances	Cities of Marina and Seaside and County of Monterey
2. Increased Demand for Fire Protection and Emergency Response Services	<p>FFES Policy A-1 Program A-1.1</p> <p>FFES Policy A-2 Policy A-3 Program A-3.1 Program A-3.2</p> <p>FFES Policy A-4</p> <p>FFES Policy C-1 Program C.1-1 Program C.1-2 Program C.1-3</p>	Significant	FORA, jointly with the local city mgrs. and fire protection agencies involved, shall develop a regional program that promotes joint efficiencies in operations, identifies further sources of funding for additional required fire protection services (such as a special fire district or other standard mechanism) and seeks to secure adequate funding to maintain existing levels of service.	Unavoidable significant	Following land conveyances	Cities of Marina and Seaside, County of Monterey, and State Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
3. Risk of Damage from Seismic Activity	<p>SGHS Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2</p> <p>SGHS Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2 Program A-2.3</p> <p>SGHS Policy A-3 Program A-3.1</p> <p>SGHS Policy B-1 Program B-1.1</p> <p>SGHS Policy C-1 Program C-1.1</p>	Less than significant	None required	N/A		

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility ²
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹	Mitigation				
4.6 Public Health and Safety cont.						
4. Exposure to Hazardous and Toxic Materials	HTMS Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 HTMS Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Program B-1.2 Program B-1.4 HTMS Policy B-2 Program B-2.1 Program B-2.2 HTMS Policy B-3 HTMS Policy C-1 Program C-1.1	Potentially significant	FORA, through consultation with the Army and involved land use agencies, shall ensure that clean-up levels are consistent with all revised land uses proposed in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.	Less than significant	Prior to implementing the proposed project	FORA, Army, Cities of Marina and Seaside, and County of Monterey
5. Long-term Exposure to Unexploded Ordnance	(HTMS) Program B-1.3	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
Cumulative Public Health and Safety Impacts	As above	Potentially significant	Same as for Impacts #1, #2, and #4 above	Unavoidable significant	As above	As above
4.7 Traffic and Circulation						
1. Increased Travel Demand on Regional Transportation System	SRC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 SRC Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Program B-1.2 TC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.3 TC Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 TC Policy C-1 Program C-1.1	Potentially significant	Amend Streets and Roads Policy A-1.2 to add the following wording: FORA shall review the options for distributing its fair-share financial contributions to all or selected off-site transportation improvements so as to maximize the effectiveness of these contributions in reducing traffic impacts to the regional roadway system.	Unavoidable significant	Prior to implementing the proposed project	FORA

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS					
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule Mitigation Responsibility ²
4.7 Traffic and Circulation cont.					
1. cont.	TDMC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 Program A-1.3 Program A-1.4 AQC Policy A-3 Program A-3.1				
2. Increased Travel Demand Within Former Fort Ord	SRC Program C-1.1 Program C-1.2 Program C-1.3 Program C-1.4 Program C-1.5 SRC Policy C-2 Program C-2.1 TC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 Program A-1.3 TC Policy C-1 Program C-1.1 AQC Policy A-3 Program A-3.1 PBC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 PBC Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Program B-1.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
Cumulative Traffic and Circulation Impacts					
Off-site	Same as for Impact #1 above	Significant	Same as for Impact #1 above	Unavoidable significant	Prior to implementing proposed project FORA
Within Former Fort Ord	Same as for Impact #2 above	Less than significant	N/A	N/A	

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS						
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility ²
4.8 Climate and Air Quality						
1. Potential Violation of Ambient Air Quality Standards	AQC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 AQC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2 AQC Policy A-3 Program A-3.1 Program A-3.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
Cumulative Climate and Air Quality Impacts						
	As above	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
4.9 Noise						
1. Excessive Noise from Construction Activities	N Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1-2 N Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 N Policy B-2 N Policy B-9	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
2. Exposure of Existing Noise-sensitive Land Uses to Excessive Traffic Noise and Substantial Increases in Ambient Noise Levels	N Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 N Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 N Policy B-2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹					
4.9 Noise cont.						
3. Exposure of New Noise-sensitive Land Uses to Excessive Traffic Noise	N Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program B-1.1 Policy B-2 Policy B-3 Policy B-4 Policy B-5 Policy B-6 Policy B-7 Policy B-8	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
4. Exposure of New Noise-sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Monterey Peninsula Airport and Marina Municipal Airport	N Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Policy B-2 Policy B-3 Policy B-4 Policy B-5 Policy B-6 Policy B-7 Policy B-8	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
5. Exposure of Existing and Planned Noise-sensitive Land Uses to Noise from Non-transportation Sources, Including the Proposed Amphitheater, Peace Officers Training Facility, and the Transit Center	N Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Policy B-2 Policy B-3 Policy B-4 Policy B-5 Policy B-6 Policy B-7 Policy B-8	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
Cumulative Noise Impacts	As above	Less than significant	None required	N/A		

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹					
4.10 Biological Resources						
1. Loss of Sensitive Species and Habitats Addressed in the Habitat Management Plan (City of Marina)	BRC	Policy A-1	None required	N/A		
		Program A-1.1				
		Program A-1.2				
		Program A-1.3				
	BRC	Policy A-2				
		Program A-2.1				
		Program A-2.2				
		Program A-2.3				
		Program A-2.4				
		Program A-2.5				
		Program A-2.6				
	BRC	Policy A-3				
		Program A-3.1				
		Program A-3.2				
		Program A-3.3				
	BRC	Policy A-4				
		Program A-4.1				
		Program A-4.2				
		Program A-4.3				
	BRC	Policy A-5				
	Program A-5.1					
	Program A-5.2					
BRC	Policy A-6					
	Program A-6.1					
	Program A-6.2					
BRC	Policy A-7					
	Program A-7.1					
	Program A-7.2					
	Program A-7.3					
BRC	Policy A-8					
	Program A-8.1					
BRC	Policy A-1					
	Program A-1.1					
	Program A-1.2					
	Program A-1.3					
BRC	Policy A-2					
	Program A-2.1					
(City of Seaside)						

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility
4.10 Biological Resources cont. 1. cont. (County of Monterey)	BRC Policy A-3 Program A-3.1					
	BRC Policy A-4 Program A-4.1 Program A-4.2 Program A-4.3					
	BRC Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 Program A-1.3 Program A-1.4					
	BRC Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2 Program A-2.3 Program A-2.4 Program A-2.5					
	BRC Policy A-3 Program A-3.1 Program A-3.2 Program A-3.3 Program A-3.4 Program A-3.5 Program A-3.6					
	BRC Policy A-4 Program A-4.1 Program A-4.2 Program A-4.3 Program A-4.4 Program A-4.5 Program A-4.6					
	BRC Policy A-5 Program A-5.1 Program A-5.2 Program A-5.3 Program A-5.4 Program A-5.5 Program A-5.6					

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS					
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Responsibility ²
4.10 Biological Resources cont.					
1. cont.	BRC Policy A-6 Program A-6.1 BRC Policy A-7 Program A-7.1 BRC Policy A-8 Program A-8.1 Program A-8.2 BRC Policy A-9 Program A-9.1 Program A-9.2 Program A-9.3				
2. Affecting up to Approximately 71 Acres of Beach and Blowouts, Ice Plant Mats, and Disturbed Dune (City of Marina)	BRC Policy A-8 Program A-8.1	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
(City of Seaside)	BRC Policy A-3 Program A-3.1				
(Monterey County)	BRC Policy A-6 Program A-6.1				
3. Affecting up to Approximately 348 Acres of Coastal Scrub	N/A	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
4. Affecting up to Approximately 1,525 Acres of Annual Grassland	N/A	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
5. Affecting up to Approximately 1,584 Acres of Coast Live Oak Woodlands (City of Marina)	BRC Policy C-2 Program C-2.1 Program C-2.2 Program C-2.3	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
(City of Seaside)	BRC Policy B-2 Program B-2.1 Program B-2.2				

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

Environmental Effects	PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Responsibility ²
	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects ¹	Level of Significance Before Mitigation			
4.10 Biological Resources cont.					
5. cont.	BRC Policy C-2 Program C-2.1 Program C-2.2 Program C-2.3 Program C-2.4 Program C-2.5 Program C-2.6 (BRC) BRC Policy B-2 Program B-2.1 Program B-2.2 BRC Policy C-2 Program C-2.1 Program C-2.2 Program C-2.3 Program C-2.4 Program C-2.5				
6. Affecting up to Approximately Six Acres of Native Perennial Grassland	N/A	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
7. Loss of Vernal Ponds, Riparian Corridors and Other Wetland Areas	BRC Policy B-3 Program B-3.1 Program B-3.2 Program B-3.3 BRC Policy B-3 Program B-3.1 Program B-3.2 BRC Policy B-3 Program B-3.1 Program B-3.2 Program B-3.3 Program B-3.4	Less than significant	None required	N/A	

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS					
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Responsibility
4.10 Biological Resources cont.					
8. Loss of Sensitive Species Not Addressed in the HMP	BRC Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Program B-1.2 BRC Policy B-2 Program B-2.1 Program B-2.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
9. Conflict with the Goals of the Sanctuary Management Plan for the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary	HWQC Policy C-1 Program C-1.1 Program C-1.3 HWQC Policy C-2 Program C-2.1 HWQC Policy C-4 Program C-4.1 HWQC Policy C-6	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts					
	As above	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
4.11 Visual Resources					
1. Reduced Visual Quality On-site	RLU Policy I-1 Program I-1.1 Program I-1.2 RLU Policy I-2 CLU Policy B-3 CLU Policy F-1 CLU Policy F-2 ILU Policy D-1 ILU Policy D-2 ROS Policy B-1 ROS Policy B-2 ROS Policy G-3	Less than Significant	None required.	N/A	

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS						
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Schedule	Mitigation Responsibility?
4.11 Visual Resources cont.						
2. Reduced Visual Quality Seen from State Route 1	ROLU Policy D-1 Program D-1.1 Program D-1.2 Program D-1.3 Program D-1.4 Program D-1.5 ROS Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Program B-1.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
3. Reduced Visual Quality Seen from State Route 68	N/A	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
4. Reduced Visual Quality Seen from the Salinas Valley	CRC Policy B-2 Program B-2.2	Significant	Develop policies and programs to implement design guidelines for development on the bluffs to avoid strong visual contrasts seen from the Salinas Valley.	Less than significant	Prior to project implementation	City of Marina and Monterey County
Cumulative Visual Resources Impacts						
	As above	Significant	Develop and implement corridor visual design guidelines outside Fort boundaries. Consistent with those prepared for the former Fort Ord under the Reuse Plan.	Unavoidable significant	As above	Monterey County, Cities of Marina, Seaside, Del Rey Oaks, Sand City, and Monterey
4.12 Cultural Resources						
1. Disturbance of Lands with Potential to Contain Archaeological Resources	CR Policy A-1 Program A-1.1 Program A-1.2 Program A-1.3	Less than significant	None required	N/A		
2. Disturbance of Lands with Potential to Contain Native American Traditional Cultural Properties	CR Policy A-2 Program A-2.1 Program A-2.2	Less than significant	None required	N/A		

Table 2.5-1 Summary Table of Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Monitoring Plan (continued)

PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS					
Environmental Effects	Policies & Programs That Address Environmental Effects	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Mitigation Responsibility?
4.12 Cultural Resources cont.					
3. Disturbance of Lands with Potential to Contain Historically Significant Resources	CR Policy B-1 Program B-1.1 Program B-1.2 Program B-1.3 Program B-1.4 CR Policy B-2 Program B-2.1 Program B-2.2 Program B-2.3	Less than significant	None required	N/A	
Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts	As above	Less than significant	None required	N/A	

Key: 1 = In most cases where a particular agency is not identified in parentheses, the policies and programs apply to the Cities of Marina and Seaside and the County of Monterey.
 2 = The mitigation responsibilities apply only to those impacts which are considered significant or potentially significant before mitigation.

- RLU Residential Land Use section of the Land Use Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- CLU Commercial Land Use section of the Land Use Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- ROLU Recreation/Open Space Land Use section of the Land Use Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- ILU Institutional Land Use section of the Land Use Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- SRC Streets and Roads section of the Circulation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- TC Transit section of the Circulation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- PBC Pedestrian and Bicycles section of the Circulation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- TMDC Transportation and Demand Management section of the Circulation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- ROS Recreation section of the Recreation and Open Space Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- SGC Soils and Geology section of the Conservation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- HWQC Hydrology and Water Quality section of the Conservation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- BRC Biological Resources section of the Conservation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- AQC Air Quality section of the Conservation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- CR Cultural Resources section of the Conservation Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- N Noise section of the Noise Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- SGHS Seismic and Geologic Hazards section of the Safety Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- FFES Fire, Flood and Emergency Management section of the Safety Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*
- HTMS Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety section of the Safety Element, *Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan*