



# FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

## ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

8:30 a.m. Wednesday, June 15, 2016

920 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933 FORA Conference Room

### AGENDA

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

*Members of the public wishing to address the Administrative Committee on matters within its jurisdiction, but not on this agenda, may do so for up to 3 minutes.*

**5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

ACTION

- a. June 1, 2016 Minutes

**6. JUNE 10, 2016 BOARD MEETING FOLLOW-UP REVIEW**

INFORMATION/ACTION

- a. Regional Urban Design Guidelines
- b. FORA FY 2016/17 Capital Improvement Program
- c. Categories I and II Post Reassessment Actions Consultant Determination  
Opinion Report Update

**7. BUSINESS ITEMS**

- a. Land Use Covenant Jurisdictions Annual Report Request INFORMATION
- b. Capital Improvement Program Status Report INFORMATION
- c. **Workshop:** "Land Use Control Implementation Plan /  
Operations and Maintenance Plan" INFORMATION

**8. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

**NEXT MEETING: JUNE 29, 2016**



**FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**  
**8:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 1, 2016 | FORA Conference Room**  
920 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Suite A, Marina CA 93933

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Houlemard called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. The following were present:

*\*voting members, AR = arrived after call to order*

Layne Long (City of Marina) AR

Daniel Dawson (City of del Rey Oaks)

Craig Malin, City of Seaside\*

Melanie Beretti, Monterey County\*

Elizabeth Caraker, City of Monterey\*

Anya Spear, CSUMB

Chris Placco, CSUMB

Vicki Nakamura, MPC

Lisa Reinheimer, MST

Mike Zeller, TAMC

Kristie Reimer, RAC

Wendy Elliott, MCP

Doug Yount

Don Hofer, Shea Homes

Bob Shaffer

FORA Staff:

Michael Houlemard Jr.

Steve Endsley

Jonathan Brinkmann

Ted Lopez, Peter Said

Stan Cook, Josh Metz

Mary Israel, Sheri Damon

Helen Rodriguez

Maria Buell

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Pledge of allegiance was led by Mr. Houlemard.

**3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

Stan Cook announced a Workshop on the Environmental Services Conservation Agreement will be presented at the next Administrative Committee meeting on June 15. He added that comments on the draft LUCIP OMP document were answered and new Draft will be presented. Members recommended that beginning time for this workshop be not earlier than 9:00 a.m.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

None.

**5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES (no minutes were approved)**

a. May 18, 2016 Administrative Committee Minutes

MOTION: Chris Placco moved, seconded by Elizabeth Caraker to approve the May 18, 2016 Administrative Committee minutes as presented.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

The committee did not receive comments from members or public.

**6. JUNE 10, 2016 BOARD MEETING AGENDA REVIEW**

Mr. Houlemard reviewed the draft Board Agenda and he announced there is change of command at Presidio and COL Fellingner is leaving. Consequently, a resolution is being prepared acknowledging his contributions to FORA.

a. Special Legislative Session. Mr. Houlemard said both Assembly member Stone and Senator Monning will provide a full report on legislative issues such as a cleanup bill introduced that corrects Fort Ord representation and infrastructure type of bills. Other items appearing on business portion are the

TAMC fee and water; water augmentation with a Memorandum of Understanding; the Regional Urban Design Guidelines will be provided for approval of the final document. The comment period ended on May 31 and comments were received from one jurisdiction related to options to zoning and other codes, but not to the guidelines. Also, there is a second vote on consultant determination opinion. Under Executive Officers report, there is an Administrative consistency determination (entitlement) from City of Marina for the Interim Inc. housing project. Mr. Houlemard asked if there are any items to be added or missing on the Board agenda.

The Committee received comments from members.

## **7. BUSINESS ITEMS**

### **a. Prevailing Wage Orientation Progress**

Sheri Damon spoke of the outreach effort and setting meetings with jurisdictions to implement prevailing wage requests at Ft Ord. Mr. Houlemard thanked jurisdictions for providing support.

The Committee received no comments from members.

The Committee received no public comment.

### **b. TAMC-FORA Fee Reallocation Study and Presentation**

Peter Said and Jonathan Brinkmann gave a brief report on this item. Mike Zeller (TAMC) provided a power point presentation and said the purpose is to re-analyze FORA CIP obligations generated by CIP – Phase III, regional transportation plan consistency, FORA post -2020 obligations and current specific planning. He also provided a land-use update with a preliminary model that uses AMBAG and land use assumptions. Jonathan added that the study is expected to be completed end of July and as a result, a possible change to the CIP might be needed.

The Committee received comments from members and public.

### **c. Water Augmentation: Pipeline Financing MOU Update**

Peter Said gave a brief summary and said the MOU language terms are being further refined and may return to Administrative Committee in July for consideration.

The Committee received no comments from members.

The Committee received no public comment.

### **d. Three-Party Planning: Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Appointments**

Peter Said gave a brief report and added the TAG appointments have not been received from local jurisdictions. Representatives of those jurisdictions said the name of appointed person will be given to Staff shortly. Mr. Houlemard asked for names to be added to TAG from jurisdictions.

There were no comments from Committee members.

The Committee received no public comment.

### **e. Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

#### **i. Review Draft FY 16-17 CIP**

#### **ii. Recommend Board Adoption of FY 16-17 CIP**

Jonathan Brinkmann provided a power point presentation and discussed the current CIP program and remaining pieces to be completed. He discussed the CIP funding: (CFC, land sales proceeds, property tax funds, grants fund and loans fund); he also discussed fee reductions and expected FY 16-17 changes. Committee members gave comments on the habitat management contingencies, assumptions to be made by FORA, the different scenarios to be considered; building removal/cost adjustments need to be accurately reflected in CIP. Mr. Houlemard responded that building removal is a policy directive from the Board and they may change it. But, this is a good time to recommend to Board any changes/comments. Peter Said pointed to information on the CIP Budget (specific line items). Mr. Houlemard said question before Committee is whether this CIP is ready for recommendation for Board. Jonathan Brinkmann asked Committee for its recommendation to Board.

The Committee received comments from members.  
The Committee received public comment.

MOTION: Craig Malin moved, seconded by Melanie Beretti to adopt the FY 16-17 CIP with adjustments and recommendations provided.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Daniel Dawson moved, seconded by Layne Long to postpone recommending Board adoption until the two CIP studies are completed before recommending the CIP to Board and that FY 15-16 CIP budget be continued until the new CIP is adopted.  
MOTION PASSED.

**8. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS**

None.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:54 a.m.

DRAFT



# FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

920 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933

Phone: (831) 883-3672 | Fax: (831) 883-3675 | [www.fora.org](http://www.fora.org)

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Monterey Peninsula College (MPC), University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC), California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB), County of Monterey, Cities of Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Marina, and Seaside

**FROM:** Jonathan Brinkmann, Principal Planner

**RE:** Administrative Committee Meeting Item 7a: Land Use Covenant (LUC) Jurisdictions Annual Report Request

**DATE:** June 10, 2016

### Background

The Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA), DTSC, MPC, UCSC, CSUMB, County of Monterey, Cities of Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Marina, and Seaside signed a memorandum of agreement concerning monitoring and reporting on environmental restrictions on the former Fort Ord (LUC MOA), effective November 15, 2007. The LUC MOA requires the eight reporting entities – MPC, UCSC, CSUMB, County of Monterey, Cities of Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Marina, and Seaside – to report to FORA or the County concerning their compliance with all recorded LUCs in their jurisdiction. Before FORA ceases to exist (June 30, 2020), FORA will transfer its responsibility to the County of Monterey for compiling the eight reporting entities' monitoring reports and transmittal of the compiled report to DTSC. FORA and the County will send correspondence notifying the Parties of the LUC MOA when FORA transfers its responsibility to the County of Monterey.

### LUC Reporting Request for Period July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

The eight reporting entities are currently on schedule with the current reporting cycle. A year ago, FORA staff met with the County of Monterey and DTSC to discuss ways to streamline the LUC reporting process. FORA, County of Monterey, and DTSC representatives identified measures to improve LUC reporting process effectiveness:

- 1) **The Jurisdictions are reminded that DTSC enforces compliance with the LUC MOA, including reporting submission deadlines. Failure to meet the LUC reporting deadlines may result in a reporting entity incurring additional costs for DTSC to complete the Jurisdiction's LUC reporting requirements.**
- 2) The LUC reporting surveys that FORA (or the County, in the future) transmit to the reporting entities for their annual reports will use a modified format, as shown in **Attachment A**, to streamline the reporting process.
- 3) FORA or County should allow up to a 3-month period between the LUC reporting survey request date and due date.

The requested LUC reporting survey **due date is September 30, 2016**. If you have any questions about the LUC MOA or the annual LUC reporting process, please contact Ted Lopez, Associate Planner ([ted@fora.org](mailto:ted@fora.org)) or me ([jonathan@fora.org](mailto:jonathan@fora.org)) at (831) 883-3672.

**Former Fort Ord  
Land Use Covenant Report Outline**

Combined Annual Status Report for \_\_\_\_\_ (Jurisdiction) on Land Use Covenants

Covering the period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

(See Parcel and LUC lists in Table 3-1)

This form is to be submitted by each Jurisdiction to:

**Fort Ord Reuse Authority**

By

September 30, 2016\*

**DATE OF REPORT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SUBMIT TO:** Fort Ord Reuse Authority  
Attn: Jonathan Brinkmann  
920 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Suite A  
Marina, CA 93933

**GENERAL:**

Has jurisdiction staff previously provided a compliance summary in regards to the local digging and excavation ordinances, including the number of permits issued?

yes or  no

Has jurisdiction staff provided an annual update of any changes to applicable digging and excavation ordinances?

yes or  no

Has jurisdiction staff provided an annual update of any changes to the Monterey County Groundwater Ordinance No. 4011?

yes or  no

**PARCELS**

Have any of the parcels with covenants in the jurisdiction split since the last annual report?

yes or  no

If so, please reflect the split(s) in reporting on compliance with section 2.1.2 of the MOA in Table 3-1.

**\* The Jurisdictions are reminded that DTSC enforces compliance with the LUC MOA, including reporting submission deadlines. Failure to meet the LUC reporting deadlines may result in a reporting entity incurring additional costs for DTSC to complete the Jurisdiction's LUC reporting requirements.**

**GROUND WATER COVENANTS:**

Is a ground water covenant applicable in your jurisdiction?  yes or  no  
(if no, skip questions 1 through 4)

1. Did jurisdiction staff visually inspect the parcels in your jurisdiction (see Table 3-1) with ground water covenants? Such visual inspection shall include observed groundwater wells, and any other activity that would interfere with or adversely affect the groundwater monitoring and remediation systems on the Property or result in the creation of a groundwater recharge area (e.g., unlined surface impoundments or disposal trenches).

yes or  no

2. Did jurisdiction staff check with the applicable local building department (please list department name: \_\_\_\_\_) to ensure that no wells or recharge basins such as surface water infiltration ponds were built within your jurisdiction?

yes or  no

3. Did jurisdiction staff check with the applicable local planning department (please list department name: \_\_\_\_\_) to ensure that no well permits were granted or recharge basins requested within your jurisdiction?

yes or  no

4. Did jurisdiction staff review the County well permit applications pertaining to your jurisdiction to ensure that no wells have been dug or installed in violation of the ordinance or the ground water covenants?

yes or  no

If you answered yes to any questions 1 through 4 above, please note and describe violations with USACE parcel numbers and street addresses (Use additional sheets if needed.)

---

---

---

---

---

**LANDFILL BUFFER COVENANTS:**

Is a landfill buffer covenant applicable in your jurisdiction?  yes or  no  
(if no, skip questions 1 through 3)

1. Did jurisdiction staff visually inspect the parcels in your jurisdiction (see Table 3-1) with landfill buffer covenants? Such visual inspection shall include observation of any structures and any other activity that would interfere with the landfill monitoring and remediation systems on the Property.

yes or  no

2.. Did jurisdiction staff check with the applicable local building department (please list department name: \_\_\_\_\_ ) to ensure that no sensitive uses such as residences, hospitals, day care or schools (not including post-secondary schools, as defined in Section 1.19 of the MOA) were built on the restricted parcels within your jurisdiction?

yes or  no

3. Did jurisdiction staff check with the applicable local planning department (please list department name: \_\_\_\_\_) to ensure that no other structures were built without protection for vapors in accordance with the landfill buffer covenants.

yes or  no

If you answered yes to any questions 1 through 3 above, please note and describe violations with street addresses. (Use additional sheets if needed.)

---

---

---

---

---

**SOIL COVENANTS:**

Is a soil covenant applicable in your jurisdiction?  
(if no, skip questions 1 through 4)

yes or  no

1. Did jurisdiction staff visually inspect the parcels (see Table 3-1) in your jurisdiction with soil covenants to assure no sensitive uses such as residences, hospitals, day care or schools (not including post-secondary schools, as defined in Section 1.19 of the MOA) were constructed or are occurring on the restricted parcels in your jurisdiction?

yes or  no

2. Did jurisdiction staff check with the applicable local building department to ensure that no soil was disturbed without an approved soil management plan in accordance with the excavation and digging Ordinance in your jurisdiction?

yes or  no

3. Did jurisdiction staff check with the applicable local planning department for notification of MEC within your jurisdiction?

yes or  no

4. Did jurisdiction staff review the 911 records of MEC observations and responses and provide a summary in annual report as required by the LUC MOA dated November 15, 2007?

yes



If you answered yes to any questions 1 through 4 above, please provide the following information:  
(Use additional sheets if needed.)

- a) details on how the 911 records were reviewed (such as County point of contact requested 911 records from responsible County department and distributed 911 records to reporting entities)
- b) date and time of the call,
- b) contact name,
- c) location of MEC finding,
- d) type of munitions, if available and
- e) response of jurisdiction law enforcement agency.

**Jurisdiction's Representative Compiling this Report:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Contact Information:**      **Phone** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email** \_\_\_\_\_

**Signature of Preparer:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Suggested Attachments to Annual LUC Report**

1. Table summarizing inspections, parcels, restrictions and any deficiencies in the LUCs. Inspection Notes for each parcel.
2. Inspection Photos for each parcel.
3. County and jurisdiction well records, permit reports.
4. Building department permit records.
5. Planning department permit records.
6. MEC findings (911 call records).
7. GPS coordinates for parcels