

## **Response to LandWatch's 3/14/12 email concerning AB 1614**

*In their email, LandWatch Monterey County claims that, "instead of re-using and upgrading the blighted parts of the closed base, FORA gave developers public subsidies to help them do what was easy - build on open ground." They go on to state that "LandWatch only supports extending FORA under the 5 conditions included below."*

*FORA has met with representatives from the Sierra Club, League of Women Voters, and LandWatch over the past five months and addressed each of their concerns. For instance, FORA has not provided developers with subsidies to build on open ground. FORA has spent over \$29 million in building removal to incentivize development in the blighted parts of Fort Ord. Please see other specific responses to LandWatch's list of 5 conditions below.*

- 1. The FORA Plan, adopted in 1997, should be updated at least every ten years beginning in 2014 to account for new laws, changing land use patterns and economic conditions.**

*Changing land use patterns and economic conditions are precisely what will be studied in the required BRP Reassessment. The Board may also determine that the BRP should be adjusted after reviewing the BRP Reassessment report from the consultants. That could either be accomplished by FORA before it sunsets in 2014, or as part of its duties if it is extended.*

- 2. A focus on the infrastructure and land uses that address urban blight should be a requirement of the plan revisions.**

*Issues related to infrastructure, land uses, and urban blight will be studied in the reassessment. The Board and community can discuss conclusions, strategies, and options in the Reassessment Process.*

- 3. The appeal process and associated fees of \$5000 are excessive and deny the public a right to petition their government; therefore the fees should be eliminated.**

*It is FORA's intent to allow the public to be a part of the public process and have the ability to weigh in on consistency determinations. FORA adopted its appeal process and associated fees as part of the 1998 FORA-Sierra Club Settlement Agreement. FORA and the Sierra Club must both agree on modifications to FORA's adopted appeal process before FORA may adopt changes. After recent Sierra Club discussions, FORA staff is prepared to make recommendations to the FORA Board addressing this issue.*

**4. The Plan is 15 years old, Base Reuse Policies haven't consistently been followed, and improved enforcement of an Updated FORA Plan is needed.**

*There may be specific instances where people feel Base Reuse Plan policies have not been followed, but such instances would have to be referenced in order to respond to the concern in detail. The Base Reuse Plan emphasizes jobs, education, sustainable development, and open space. Sometimes there are conflicts between these objectives and compromises must be reached. FORA is the appropriate entity to address such issues.*

**5. FORA should develop and adopt a Phase-Out Plan.**

*FORA staff has already agreed that it is a good idea to include specific reference to a Phase-out Plan (for whenever FORA sunsets). Assemblymember Monning has submitted bill language to accomplish the Phase-Out Plan.*

As one can see, most of the suggestions made by LandWatch regarding the FORA extension legislation (which are similar to Sierra Club and League of Women Voters suggestions) are acceptable to FORA staff and can be addressed in the Reassessment process or amending the FORA Master Resolution.