

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT

BUSINESS ITEMS

Subject: Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Update

Meeting Date: February 9, 2018

Agenda Number: 8c

INFORMATION/ACTION

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- i. Receive an Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Update from January 12, 2018.
- ii. Receive a Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) Presentation.
- iii. Discuss and consider approval of Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (**Exhibit A**) for use in future preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The FORA Board continued Item 8d, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (**Exhibit B**), from the January 12, 2018 Board Meeting to a Special Meeting, which had been scheduled Friday, February 2, 2018 at 3:00 pm. That meeting was canceled. The Board directed staff to include Board input as updates to the January 12, 2018 agenda item Attachment A – Eastside Parkway goals and objectives. **Exhibit A** to this report displays those contributions as revised Eastside Parkway goals and objectives. Staff has also compiled additional public comments received since the distribution of the January 12 Meeting Packet. These comments are presented as **Exhibit C**. At the January Board meeting, the TAMC Executive Director offered to provide a presentation of additional transportation-related information from her staff. At the Board's request for additional information, this agenda item will include a presentation by TAMC on traffic-related issues associated with goals and objectives.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller

For Helen Rodriguez
HR

Staff time for this item is included in the approved annual budget.

COORDINATION:

Authority Counsel, Administrative and Executive Committees, TAMC.

Prepared by

Jonathan Brinkmann
Jonathan Brinkmann

Approved by

Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.
Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives

Proposed Project Background/Need:

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

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

Proposed Project Goals and Objectives:

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

- **Provide a primary southwest-northeast corridor through former Fort Ord, while maintaining an acceptable level of service throughout the FORA CIP roadway network with the implementation of the approved reuse of Fort Ord (BRP Vol.1 pg. 119, BRP Vol.2 pg. 297-298, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).**
- **Improve and provide efficient regional travel and access to the former Fort Ord, reducing travel time and distances and associated traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution emissions (BRP Vol. 2 pg. 298, Commercial Land Use Objective E and program E-1.1, pg. 261, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 21, 44, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).**
- **Serve the area immediately south of CSUMB campus (BRP Vol.2 pg. 295).**
- ~~**Avoid bisecting CSUMB Campus (BRP Vol.2 Institutional Land Use Program A-1.4 on pg. 278, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 76).**~~
- **Minimize disrupting any community, including its expansion and circulation (FORA Board Meeting, January 12, 2018, BRP Vol.2 Institutional Land Use Program A-1.4 on pg. 278, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 76).**

- **De-emphasize Inter-Garrison Road as a major vehicular route with greater emphasis placed on pedestrian and bicycle traffic** (BRP Vol.2 pg. 295).
- **Provide direct and efficient linkages from former Fort Ord lands to the regional transportation system** (BRP Vol.2 Objective B, pg. 299, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 44, [Exhibit C, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Emails to the Board of Directors, pg. 8](#), Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- **Consider best practices in transportation planning, including regional and systemic improvements such as roundabouts and autonomous vehicles** ([FORA Board Meeting January 12, 2018, Exhibit C, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Emails to the Board of Directors, pg. 31, 32](#)).
- **Provide a safe and efficient street system at the former Fort Ord** (BRP Vol.2 Objective C, pg. 299, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 74, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- **Connect the Fort Ord National Monument and California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery to regional roadways** (BRP Vol.2 Objective A, pg. 298 and Recreation Policy A-1, pg. 327, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 7, 44, 53, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- **Design the project to respect and integrate natural resources by minimizing impacts to coast live oak woodland, special-status species, and wildlife corridors** (BRP Vol.2 Recreational/Open Space Objective A, pg. 263, Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, Biological Resources Policy C-2, pg. 383, and Recreation Policy C-1, pg. 328, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 4, 12, 34, 44, 49, 59, 84, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- **Maintain the aesthetic character of the area by avoiding or minimizing impacts from grading to major topographical features such as drainages, steep slopes, and scenic viewsheds** (BRP Vol.2 Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, and Biological Resources Policy C-1, pg. 383, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 59, 70, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- **Minimize noise impacts adjacent to sensitive receptors** (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 77).
- **Consider the safety of residents, pedestrians, bicyclists, and wildlife through various project design features by:**
 - **Providing dedicated pedestrian and bicycle facilities** (BRP Vol.2 Commercial Land Use Policy E-2 and program E-2.2, pg. 261 and Pedestrian and Bicycles Objectives A and B, pg. 308, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 8, 21, 77, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments);
 - **Considering Regional Urban Design Guidelines for complete street design features** (BRP Vol.1 pg. 61, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 34); and
 - **Implementing design features to minimize impacts to wildlife movement** (BRP Vol.1 pg. 128, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public

Comments pg. 53, 58, 71, 77, 78, 84, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments, [Exhibit C Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Emails to the Board of Directors pg. 17](#)).

- **Protect designated habitat management areas from potential roadway edge effects by applying suitable buffers and project design features** (BRP Vol.2 Biological Resources Objective C, pg. 363, and Biological Resources Policy C-3, pg. 384, Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 71, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- **Minimize environmental impacts on existing communities, including, but not limited to CSUMB campus, MPC, East Garrison, and the Cities of Seaside, Marina, Del Rey Oaks, and Monterey** (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments pg. 4, 24 49, 58, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments, [Exhibit C Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Emails to the Board of Directors pg. 17](#)).
- **Accommodate and maintain existing and proposed trail networks, including, but not limited to, the Fort Ord Recreational Trail and Greenway and other regional trails** (Attachment B, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments, pgs. 3, 8, 44, 47, 50, 53, 59, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments).
- **Improve mobility of emergency system responders, including, but not limited to, firefighter access** (FORA Board Meeting, January 12, 2018, BRP Vol. 2 Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Objectives A and C, pg. 435, and Program C-1.1).
- **Improve MPC, CSUMB and other educational institutions' access for student, staff, and faculty** (FORA Board Meeting, January 12, 2018, BRP Vol. 2 Institutional Land Use Objective B, pg. 273).
- **Utilize existing roadways as the foundation for the future network** (FORA Board Meeting, January 12, 2018, BRP Vol. IV Environmental Setting, Internal Roadway Network description pg. 4-93, Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Written Public Comments, pgs. 2, 3, 4, 11, 24, 62, Attachment C, Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments, [Exhibit C Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Emails to the Board of Directors, pg. 14](#)).
- **Comply with policies and programs of the Reuse Plan** (FORA Board Meeting, January 12, 2018).

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT

BUSINESS ITEMS

Subject:	Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives	
Meeting Date:	January 12, 2018	INFORMATION/ACTION
Agenda Number:	8d	

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- i. Receive an Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives Report.
- ii. Discuss and consider approval of Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives (**Attachment A**) for use in future preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

Completion of FORA's "Fair Share" of transportation improvements, as listed in FORA's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) (<http://fora.org/Reports/CIP/CIPReports/CIP2017-18.pdf>) pg. 18, is a reuse mitigation described in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan (BRP) Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) (http://www.fora.org/Reports/BRP/BRP_v4_FinalEIR_1997.pdf Section 4.7 Traffic and Circulation pg. 4-88 to 4-119).

The FEIR identified the following, "[i]mpact: Increase Travel Demand on Regional Transportation System" (pg. 4-108). It also identified the following mitigation for this impact: "A Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) to establish programs and monitor development at Fort Ord to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities and water supply shall be established by FORA." This reuse mitigation is identified in the BRP FEIR (http://www.fora.org/Reports/BRP/BRP_v4_FinalEIR_1997.pdf pg. 4-112).

The DRMP states: "FORA shall fund its "Fair Share" of "on-site," "off-site," and "regional" roadway and transit capital improvements based on the nexus analysis of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) regional transportation model" (BRP Vol.1, pg. 195).

The FEIR identified Eastside Road within the "on-site" network to connect Imjin Parkway to Gigling Road (FEIR pg. 4-104 - 4-106). TAMC's 1997 Fort Ord Transportation Study presented cost allocations based on Eastside Road preliminary nexus analysis and other transportation improvements (http://fora.org/Reports/1997_Fort_Ord_Transportation_Study.pdf pg. 7-6). According to the study, Fort Ord development was allocated 72% of Eastside Road's cost burden, while other areas outside of Fort Ord were allocated 28% of the cost.

TAMC's 2005 FORA Fee Reallocation Study resulted in an Eastside Road conceptual alignment to address California State University (CSU) Monterey Bay's concerns that the BRP conceptual Eastside Road alignment would impact campus traffic flow (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2005.pdf pg. 12, 13, and 45). The 2005 conceptual Eastside Road alignment is described as a 2-lane arterial roadway from Eucalyptus Road to Schoonover Drive. The 2005 study included two options for allocating FORA's share of transportation improvement costs: Option 1 was a Prorata Based on Fee Approach (nexus based) and Option 2 was a Fund Local First (FORA would fund 100% of on-site transportation

improvements, pg. 31-32). The Prorata Based on Fee Approach attributed 65.5% of the Eastside Road's cost burden to Fort Ord Development, while other areas outside of Fort Ord were allocated 34.5% of the cost. The 2005 study recommended the Fund Local First Approach, which resulted in FORA taking on the regional and local cost share for on-site transportation improvements such as Eastside Road and assuming a smaller cost share for regional transportation improvements. Both boards adopted the 2005 recommendations.

In December 2009, the FORA Board prioritized Eastside Road when it adopted its 2009-10 mid-year CIP. In 2010, County of Monterey staff suggested changing the roadway name from "Eastside Road" to "Eastside Parkway." Under Whitson Engineers' (Whitson) contract amendment #2, in January 2012, FORA's consultant team completed a Draft Preliminary Initial Study Checklist, which included a recommendation to prepare an EIR for Eastside Parkway. In November 2016, the FORA Board approved contract amendment #3 with Whitson to proceed with Eastside Parkway environmental review. Subsequently, Whitson conducted an environmental consulting services selection process. In August 2017, Whitson selected Denise Duffy and Associates (DD&A) to provide these services.

FORA staff and consultants are impartial on the proposed project. In order to minimize issues related to public momentum or bias as to any one project, FORA staff and consultants held a community workshop (meeting) in two sessions on December 6, 2017 from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm and from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm to obtain public input on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. Goals/Objectives are key in the CEQA process, as they are a basis/framework to:

- 1) write the project description and statement of a project's objectives;
- 2) develop a reasonable range of alternatives for the EIR;
- 3) support the evaluation of project alternatives; and
- 4) aid decision-makers in preparing findings.

FORA received written public comments on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives through submitted public comment forms, emails, and letters. Written public comments are included under **Attachment B**. At the December 6, 2017 public meetings, members of the public also offered spoken comments on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. Videos of the December 6, 2017 public meetings are included at the following websites:

1-3 pm video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ncJCAha6ZKk&feature=youtu.be>

6-8 pm video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MZqWUasUD_M&feature=youtu.be

FORA staff summarized these spoken public comments under **Attachment C**. FORA staff provided a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document on Eastside Parkway as materials at the public meetings and has periodically updated this document as additional questions are received. The current FAQ document is under **Attachment D**. As the Board reviews

Attachment A, any added Goals or Objectives will be incorporated.

The next steps include publishing and distributing the NOP with the finalized Goals and Objectives and proposed Project Description for a 30-day public review period. During that public review period, FORA will hold a public scoping meeting for the proposed project, which will include a charrette-style format. This meeting is anticipated for April 2018.

Additional Eastside Parkway information is available at the following FORA webpage: <http://fora.org/EastsideParkway.html>

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller 

Staff time for this item is included in the approved annual budget.

COORDINATION:

Authority Counsel, Whitson, DD&A, Administrative Committee and Executive Committee.

Prepared by  for
Jonathan Brinkmann

Approved by 
Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives

Proposed Project Background/Need:

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

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

Proposed Project Goals and Objectives:

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

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

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

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

Item 8d, Attachment B

**is available for download at the following web
location:**

http://fora.org/Board/2018/Packet/Additional/011218_Item8d-AttachB_ESP_GO_written_comments.pdf

Summary of December 6, 2017 Spoken Public Comments

Background/Purpose

On December 6, 2017, FORA staff and consultants held community workshop in the form of two meetings from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm and from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm to seek public input on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. FORA provided an Eastside Parkway Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document as a handout for the public at the staff table along with Comment Sheets for written comments and speaker cards for spoken comments. After presenting information on Eastside Parkway Background, Roadway Network Overview, and CEQA Goals and Objectives, including examples of Goals and Objectives, FORA staff invited public comment on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives.

The primary purpose of the community workshop was to seek public input on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. The local community who attended expressed criticism of the process, concerns about the conceptual Eastside Parkway improvement, reasons why the improvement is needed, and input for specific Goals and Objectives.

Criticism of the Process

FORA received spoken public comments from 35 people. Many members of the public found fault with the process. Examples of comments included:

- There is no opportunity for questions to be answered at this meeting;
- Not adequate notice/announcements;
- This is not a workshop;
- Prefer a charrette and/or small groups for discussion;
- Workshop does not provide opportunity for public participation or dialogue;
- Email address to send comments not available on website as of 6 pm session;
- I thought I would see a map and have a map to draw on;
- I thought I would see alternatives to Eastside Parkway;
- How can we give Goals and Objectives on a road alignment we haven't seen.

Eastside Parkway - Concerns

Out of the 35 speakers, most of those commenting stated their concerns about Eastside Parkway. Examples of comments included:

- Traffic impacts to roadways adjacent to Eastside Parkway (such as Inter-Garrison Rd and Coe Ave);
- Keep open space accessible for recreation;
- Develop in the already developed areas of the base and upgrade existing roads;
- Maximize infill development first;
- Do not bisect open space areas of Fort Ord;
- Respect Fort Ord Rec. Trail and Greenway (FORTAG);
- Impacts to Fort Ord National Monument (FONM);
- Support future needs of workers and residents;
- Facilitates Monterey Downs/future development;

- Funding and prioritization concerns;
- Consistency with and integration of Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG);
- Monterey Peninsula has reached visitor capacity and ESP might facilitate more growth;
- Impacts to “Happy Trails” area;
- Visual and noise impacts;
- Encourages more traffic;
- No additional encroachment on natural lands;
- Improve existing facilities instead of Eastside Parkway;
- Wildlife and plant impact concerns (e.g., corridor/movement, gray fox, plants, oak tree);
- Integration with Oak Woodland Conservation Plan process and future Seaside East development;
- Increase in dumping of trash;
- Don’t follow outdated Base Reuse Plan – projections are very different now;
- Eastside Parkway is not needed now or in the future;
- Build affordable housing near jobs instead of Eastside Parkway;
- Improve transit and ride sharing instead of Eastside Parkway.

Eastside Parkway - Need

A few speakers stated that Eastside Parkway is a needed improvement. Examples of comments included:

- Need additional route and not attached to any specific alignment;
- Link Salinas to the Peninsula to move commuters back and forth;
- Increase routes North and South;
- Important for future;
- Important for local workers and residents;
- Additional route would shorten commute times and alleviate stress;
- Integrate and provide access with FORTAG;
- Existing congestion is local traffic, not visitors;
- Connect to Veterans Cemetery;
- Locate an alignment with access to BLM trailheads and 8th/Gigling parking area/trailhead.

Goals and Objectives Input

FORA staff reviewed in detail the spoken public comments with the aim of identifying input on Eastside Parkway Goals and Objectives. The following is a list of public input on Goals (open bullet “○”) and Objectives (square “■”):

- Reduce the need for a new roadway by increasing affordable housing in the Peninsula cities;
- Plan for increased traffic on end-point roads;

- Plan ahead for post-FORA Eastside Parkway construction, be transparent as to the next steps;
- Preserve “open areas;”
- Utilize existing facilities;
- Tear down barracks;
- Preserve the clean air;
- Include wildlife migration protection;
- Recognize value of “Happy Trails” recreation and habitat area benefits, which have grown since the BRP (“Happy Trails” extent is North and Northwest of the Fort Ord National Monument, south of Inter-Garrison, east of the Veterans Cemetery and west of Reservation Road);
- Reiterate allowed flexibility of the Reuse Plan for amendment (Volume 1, last paragraph);
- Choose an option with minimal risk of costing too much money and eventually not being constructed;
- Maximize the incentive to build housing near employment;
- Maximize overlap with infill development;
- Defer this project until FORA measures 50-75% residential buildout;
- Consider bussing of workers, work with TAMC;
- Consider light rail instead of parkway;
- Maximize reuse of existing roads by widening;
- Minimize visibility of traffic as seen from recreational and habitat areas;
- Minimize sound of traffic as heard from recreational and habitat areas;
- Make more incentives for people to choose active transportation and mass transit;
- Develop more mass transit;
- Keep open spaces safely accessible as they are currently utilized by children at play on bicycles and on foot;
- Consider carpool lanes and carpool programs, or spread out traffic by encouraging variable work hours;
- Improve General Jim Moore Blvd by added roundabouts in place of stop signs and then study traffic flow;
- Improve traffic patterns on the current roadway network before looking at adding roads;
- Make project consistent with FORTAG and access to trailheads;
- Maintain public access to open space;
- Allow for free and safe West to East crossing, including people in wheelchairs, with strollers, or on horseback, such as underpasses or overpasses;
- Locate a road alignment with access to BLM trailheads and equip the trailheads with facilities;
- Utilize illuminated walkways over or under the roadway;
- Reduce the anticipated and current impact of commuters from the Salinas Valley to the Monterey Peninsula while at the same time reducing impacts on wildlife, open space and open space users (recreational users);
 - Increase the width of Imjin Road to match Imjin Parkway and add roundabouts as a way to carry more people;

- Increase multimodal transportation including safe bike access and frequency of busses;
- Infill center of Hwy 1 with a new vehicle lane that changes direction by time of day;
- Build a north-south route with alignment to the Veterans Cemetery;
- Build tunnels under, or natural bridges over, the roadway to allow wildlife and recreational crossing;
- Include parking for BLM entry;
- Link Salinas to the Peninsula to move commuters back and forth;
- Integrate with FORTAG trails;
- Minimize harm to wildlife and the environment;
- Increase the number of routes north and south but prioritize fixing routes that are now in place first;
- Amend the reuse plan to recognize the value the public has placed on the geography around 8th and Gigling with respect to habitat and recreation;
- No additional bifurcation of the recreational areas of former Fort Ord;
- No additional encroachment of the development footprint (busy roads and buildings) toward the core habitat areas of the former Fort Ord;
- No bifurcation of the remaining oak woodlands on former Fort Ord;
- Consider the impact distance that wildlife species experience, as described in Fred Watson's journal article highlighting gray foxes;
- Use an efficient design to save as much money as possible if the Eastside Parkway is built, since the money will come from Marina;
 - Utilize existing roads to save money on the alignment such as 8th Avenue or General Jim Moore Blvd.;
- Adversely affect open space as little as possible;
 - Utilize existing roads to minimize open space impacts;
- Maximize safety of residents of CSUMB's East Campus housing in commuting to campus;
 - Establish bike and pedestrian routes north or south of, but parallel to Inter-Garrison Road;
- Respect FORTAG and how it respects the natural contours of the land and the public need and desire;
- Leave FORTAG implementable the way it was designed;
- Complete streets, not expressway;
- Look at the topography and allow for future use as bicycle-prominent route;
- Create a buffer/borderland between road and wildlands;
- Incorporate/be consistent with RUDG;
- Avoid encroaching on "edge zone" of the "wilderness";
- Minimize use of traffic signals and stop signs (General Jim Moore Blvd has too many).

Eastside Parkway Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) 01-02-18

1. What is Eastside Parkway and what is it intended to do?

Eastside Parkway is a conceptual Southwest-Northeast arterial roadway within the Fort Ord on-site transportation network. The Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) FY 05-06 thru 17-18 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) documents describe the conceptual roadway as a 2-lane arterial roadway from Eucalyptus Road to Schoonover Drive. Eastside Parkway is expected to accommodate 18,586 average daily trips (ADT) at 2035 (see “2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study” [http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf] for additional information).

2. What will the alignment of Eastside Parkway look like when it’s complete?

The alignment of Eastside Parkway has not yet been determined. As next steps in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process for the roadway, FORA will prepare a statement of the project’s goals and objectives and a project description of the proposed project. The precise alignment of Eastside Parkway will not be determined until the CEQA process is complete.

3. When and how was the public informed of FORA’s plan to build Eastside Parkway?

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

Eastside Road, renamed Eastside Parkway by County staff in 2010, is an “on-site” road within the Fort Ord Transportation Network identified in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan and its accompanying FEIR, 3 traffic studies in 1997, 2005, and 2017, and in FORA’s annual CIP documents from 2001-02 to present. The FORA Board prioritized Eastside Parkway funding in the 2009/10 mid-year CIP and maintained this funding priority in subsequent, annual CIP document approvals. These documents are available on the FORA website: <http://fora.org/EastsideParkway.html>

4. What Fort Ord developments does Eastside Parkway serve?

Eastside Road was designed as a part of a network that accommodated Fort Ord and regional traffic. Per the 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation study, the conceptual alignment from General Jim Moore Blvd to Inter-Garrison Rd would serve regional traffic and local former Fort Ord traffic areas such as East Garrison, East Campus Housing, California State University Monterey Bay, Defense Manpower and Data Center, California Central Coast Veteran’s Cemetery and Presidio of

Monterey military housing, and future planned developments, such as Campus Town and Seaside East. Future traffic conditions in 2035 modeled in the “2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study” show that Eastside Parkway would provide important roadway capacity, meaning 18,586 ADT would use Eastside Parkway. TAMC modeled the 2035 scenario finding that, with TAMC’s Regional Transportation Plan and the FORA CIP, roadways in the Fort Ord Transportation Network would perform within acceptable levels of service (LOS) D or better.

5. If Fort Ord developments are not built, will Eastside Parkway still be necessary?

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

6. Will there be bike paths on Eastside Parkway?

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

7. How will Eastside Parkway be funded?

Eastside Parkway is funded through the FORA CIP. The primary source of funds for the FORA CIP is the FORA Community Facilities District (CFD) Special Tax, which is a one-time special tax on former Fort Ord development. For additional details, you can access the current FORA CIP document on the FORA website: <http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf>

8. Why was Eastside Parkway designed to go through open space and disrupt habitat?

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

9. Why is FORA still using the current conceptual alignment for Eastside Parkway?

FORA is not using the current conceptual alignment for Eastside Parkway.

10. What was the lawsuit about, and what was the error by the County and FORA? How was it corrected?

FORA, County of Monterey, and the County of Monterey Redevelopment Agency approved a 5-party memorandum of agreement (MOA) in 2011, agreeing to grant road rights of way (ROW) along the conceptual Eastside Parkway alignment to the County of Monterey. Keep Fort Ord Wild (KFOW) filed a lawsuit arguing that FORA and the County of Monterey should have completed CEQA prior to approval of the 2011 MOA. The Court sided with KFOW, and FORA and County of Monterey subsequently settled with KFOW and rescinded their 2011 MOA approvals.

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

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

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

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

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

12. Where do you get on the Parkway at either end?

Although the proposed alignment and associated project description have not been determined, it is generally described as Davis Road westerly to Reservation Road to Inter-Garrison Road to Eastside Parkway to General Jim Moore Blvd to the Monterey Peninsula. FORA's CIP transportation improvements are generally described in the CIP. <http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf>

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

FORA has not yet completed a project description for Eastside Parkway. FORA is considering options. When FORA prepares the EIR, traffic impacts, including potential safety hazards, will be identified and analyzed under the EIR and provided to the public and decision-makers.

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

See the response to FAQ #12. FORA will present maps at the EIR Scoping Meeting anticipated to be in April 2018.

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

CEQA requires FORA to complete a Notice of Preparation (NOP) stating that an EIR will be prepared. The NOP will include a project description and a statement of project goals and objectives. FORA is seeking community input on the project goals and objectives for this reason. In accordance with CEQA, FORA will proceed with an environmental review process that involves public participation, evaluation of a project's environmental impacts, and analysis and consideration of reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project to reduce environmental impacts, including a "no-project" alternative.

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

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

17. Why this prioritization?

The FORA Board establishes CIP priorities as set forth in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan (Volume I, DRMP Section 3.11.5.6 on page 202.) They are tasked to complete the FORA CIP. The representatives of this region's leadership serve on the Board to fulfill the vision of reuse and recovery of former Fort Ord. See the response to FAQs #3 and #16 for additional information.

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

Although FORA has not set specific project Goals and Objectives, the Fort Ord Reuse Plan has a Goal in the circulation element which states: *"Create and maintain a balanced transportation system, including pedestrian ways, bikeways, transit, and streets, to provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods to and throughout the former Fort Ord."* (pg. 281) Additionally, the circulation element includes multiple objectives:

Objective A, "an efficient regional network of roadways that provides access to the former Fort Ord."

Objective B, "Provide direct and efficient linkages from former Fort Ord lands to the regional transportation system."

Objective C, "Provide a safe and efficient street system at the former Fort Ord."

For additional information, see the responses to FAQs #16 and #17 above.

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

The FORA Board establishes priority for its CIP transportation improvements, including Eastside Parkway. See responses to FAQs #16 and #17.

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

See response to FAQ #16 regarding transportation improvement prioritization process. Other onsite roads yet to be completed include: Abrams Drive, 8th Street, Gigling Road, Salinas Avenue, and South Boundary Road. Offsite roads yet to be completed include: Del Monte extension (aka 2nd Avenue), Davis Road north of Blanco, Davis Road south of Blanco, Widen Reservation Road to 4 lanes to Watkins Gate, and Crescent Avenue extension to Abrams. Regional improvements include Highway 1 in Seaside and Sand City, Highway 1 Monterey Road Interchange, and Highway 156 freeway upgrade.

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

Completion of FORA's "Fair Share" of transit improvements, listed in FORA's CIP, is a mitigation described in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan FEIR. CIP Transit improvements include: 1) Transit Vehicle Purchase and Replacement, and 2) Intermodal Centers. See the FY17-18 CIP for more detailed descriptions (<http://www.fora.org/Reports/CIP-Current.pdf>). Additionally, FORA contributed matching funds to TAMC for a CalTrans planning grant, which resulted in a recommended Marina to Salinas multimodal corridor alignment. For Eastside Parkway, FORA will proceed with an environmental review process with public participation, environmental impact analysis and consideration of reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project to reduce environmental impacts, including a "no-project" alternative, and project evaluation.

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

FORA supports alternative transportation modes, such as employer-sponsored shuttle routes. FORA urges you to take these ideas to the various entities that can initiate them. See the response to FAQ #21 for information about FORA's contributions to transit improvements in the region.

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

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

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

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

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

As part of the Eastside Parkway EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including traffic impacts. Measures will be created to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative. The public is referred to the 2017 TAMC Fee Reallocation Study for traffic data as referenced in question #13 through #16.

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

As part of the Eastside Parkway EIR, FOR A will assess a number of impacts including traffic impacts. Measures will be created to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about specific impacts and mitigations would be speculative. The public is referred to the 2017 TAMC Fee Reallocation Study for traffic data as referenced in question #13 through #16.

27. How does FORA plan to mitigate the intrusion of Eastside Parkway to the natural animal migration? Wildlife corridor?

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

28. Could 68 be made four lanes to alleviate traffic?

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

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

As part of the Eastside Parkway EIR, FORA will assess a number of impacts including recreation impacts. Measures will be identified to address potentially significant impacts. Before completing an EIR, any assumptions about impacts and mitigations would be speculative.

30. How would Eastside Parkway fit in with the Oak Woodlands Conservation Plan, and what have FORA and City of Seaside done around that work?

FORA is considering all reasonable and feasible alignments for Eastside Parkway. Currently, the County of Monterey and City of Seaside are considering various potential oak woodland conservation areas within their former Fort Ord lands to meet Fort Ord Reuse Plan policies and programs. For additional information, please visit the following website: www.oakwoodlands.org. Since FORA will consider a number of potential alignments and alternatives for Eastside Parkway,

there is the potential that one or more alignment options could traverse one of the draft oak woodland conservation areas. At this current draft planning stage, the City of Seaside and County of Monterey's oak woodland conservation planning efforts take into account that potential future road and trail rights of way may reduce the acreage of conserved oak woodland if they overlap. FORA, the City of Seaside, and County of Monterey will continue to coordinate these planning efforts. One effort does not preclude the other.

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

The City of Seaside is responsible for Seaside East development, and provides FORA with annual development forecasts for that area. Those forecasts also inform TAMC studies such as the 2017 FORA Fee Reallocation Study (http://fora.org/Reports/FORA_Fee-Reallocation_Study2017.pdf). TAMC's traffic studies utilize the AMBAG regional traffic model to assess 2035 project development (i.e. population and jobs) and the number of trips using the transportation system in 2035. The traffic loads today, measured by ADT, are relevant since they serve as a baseline for future studies. See the response to question #13 for more information about Eastside Parkway traffic impacts and mitigations.

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

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

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

These questions are similar to question # 16 and question #32. Please see the responses to these questions.

34. How come the Fort Ord BRP adopted in 1997 is still living in '97 concepts? Things have moved on, AMBAG has moved on, has FORA? Growth and economic development changes. How does the BRP reflect new thinking compared to something that was put in writing and tied to property rights and deed restrictions in 1997?

The 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan provides for flexibility in meeting mitigations. For example, DRMP section 3.11.5.3(b) states: "FORA will retain the flexibility to build roadway improvements to the "on-site" and "off-site" network... [and] will participate in reimbursement programs to recover expenses beyond Fort Ord's fair share when alternative programs for financing roadway and transit improvements are established." (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume I, pg. 195) DRMP Section

3.11.5.3(d) outlines how FORA will work with TAMC to monitor current and projected traffic LOS to “prevent development from exceeding FORA’s LOS standards.” (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume I, pg. 195). See the responses to FAQs #3, #5, and #17 for more information on the DRMP as it relates to roadway improvements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Completion of FORA’s “Fair Share” of transportation improvements, listed in FORA’s CIP (<http://fora.org/Reports/CIP/CIPReports/CIP2017-18.pdf>) pg. 18, is a mitigation described in the 1997 Fort Ord Reuse Plan FEIR (4.7 Traffic and Circulation).

The FEIR identified the following impact: Increase Travel Demand on Regional Transportation System (pg. 4-108). It also identified the following mitigation for this impact: “A Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) to establish programs and monitor development at Fort Ord

to assure that it does not exceed resource constraints posed by transportation facilities and water supply shall be established by FORA.” This is identified in the FEIR as a mitigation on page 4-112.

The DRMP states: FORA shall fund its “Fair Share” of “on-site,” “off-site,” and “regional” roadway and transit capital improvements based on the nexus analysis of the TAMC regional transportation model (Fort Ord Reuse Plan Volume 1, pg. 195).

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

38. What are the relevant documents that show that by building the Eastside Parkway, CEQA mitigations are addressed?

Please see these studies:

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

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

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

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

Please see the responses to questions #37 and #38 above.

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

Please see the responses to questions #37 and #38 above.

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

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

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

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

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

As noted in FAQ responses above, including #30, 31, & 32, FORA will first engage a robust public outreach program, establish goals and objectives, analyze reasonable alternatives, and assess impacts. Once the preferred project is selected, a description will be included with the Notice of Preparation, which is scheduled for Spring 2018. FORA has been seeking input on Goals and Objectives to help define the Project Description. There will be opportunities for public comment at each step.

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

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

45. How many cars ride 68, Imjin, single person? How about carpooling and carpool lanes?

TAMC gathers annual jurisdictions' trip counts on a number of roadway facilities. Those trip counts do not track amount of people transported in a single trip (See FAQ #42). The AMBAG regional transportation model includes statistical assumptions about trips accommodated by ridesharing. TAMC's trip count information is available at the following website: <http://www.tamcmonterey.org/programs/traffic-counts>

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

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

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