

## 6.0 Alternatives

### Introduction

The *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that the ~~Draft~~ EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or its location, that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The comparative merits of the alternatives must be evaluated (Section 15126(d)).

The ~~Draft~~ EIR must include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project (Section 15126(d)(3)). This becomes the factual basis for reaching conclusions about the feasibility of various alternatives. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, this must be discussed, but at a lesser level of detail.

The range of alternatives to be examined in the ~~Draft~~ EIR is governed by the rule of reason, which requires that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice need be addressed. The CEQA Guidelines require that the number of alternatives analyzed be limited to those that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project (Section 15126(d)(5)). Of those alternatives, the ~~Draft~~ EIR need only examine in detail those that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. Among the factors that a lead agency can consider in determining feasibility, the CEQA Guidelines specifically identifies site suitability, economic limitations, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plan or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether there is a reasonable ability to acquire, control, or otherwise have access to an alternative site (Section 15126(d)(5)(A)). CEQA Guidelines indicate that an EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative (Section 15126(d)(5)(C)).

This ~~Draft~~ EIR addresses the following alternatives:

- Alternative 6R (Revised Anticipated Reuse; from the Army's FEIS)
- Alternative 7 (FORA 12-12-94 Reuse Plan; from the Army's DSEIS)
- Alternative 8 (Modification of Alternative 7 to include newly excessed lands; from the Army's DSEIS)
- No Project Alternative (New alternative; caretaker status under the Army except for existing conveyances)

A full range of alternative reuse scenarios for the former Fort Ord were developed and analyzed in the Army's FEIS and DSEIS. These include Alternatives 1 through 8 and their subalternatives. Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4 are not being pursued as viable alternatives, and they have been eliminated from further consideration by the Army because of significant environmental impacts; therefore, they are not considered in this ~~Draft~~ EIR. Alternative 5, which was described as environmentally preferred in the Army's Record of Decision, was eliminated from further consideration by the Army due to significant economic impacts. Furthermore, Alternative 5 is rendered obsolete by presently existing land conveyances and is therefore not considered in this ~~Draft~~ EIR.

Alternatives 6R, 7, and 8 are summarized below, and a new No Project Alternative is presented. The following discussion describes the land use scenarios and evaluates the impacts associated with each alternative. A comparison table and summary of comparative impacts relative to the proposed project is provided in Section 2.4.

## **The Environmentally Superior Alternative**

The reuse scenario under the No Project Alternative would result in the least development, and is, therefore, the environmentally superior alternative at a local level. This is based on the acreage of open space and habitat conservation in relation to development, projected population, and the level of construction for development and infrastructure.

Under the No Project Alternative, only 13% of total former Fort Ord property (or 3,800 acres) would be developed; this would include already-existing development and land remaining under the Army. Approximately 56% of the former Fort Ord would be left undeveloped for habitat management (15,648 acres), 5% of the land would have little or no development for parks and recreation (1,320 acres), and an additional 26% (7,200 acres) would be left undeveloped under Army caretaker status.

~~However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives of developing an economic/employment recovery to compensate for base closure.~~ 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% (17,915 acres) would be left undeveloped for habitat management and parks and recreation.

## **6.1 Alternative 6R**

### **6.1.1 Description**

Alternative 6R (revised) refers to the Army's preferred alternative for the POM annex and reserve center, and the disposal of lands excess to Army needs. Approximately 23,500 acres (84%) of the former Fort Ord, which have been requested by other federal, state, and local agencies through the real estate screening process, would be conveyed to public agencies for the uses identified in the screening process. Future development of conveyed lands would need to be in accordance with current local land use requirements and regulatory agency requirements.

The remaining excess land (approximately 3,500 acres or 3%) would be temporarily designated as No Proposed Use and could be sold by the Army to private entities. Future use of these lands would be established by the new owners in accordance with local land use requirements and

regulatory agency requirements. For the purpose of analyzing an alternative with a medium level of development and based on minimal speculative assumptions, no further development of these lands is assumed through the buildout period. [For a more extensive description of Alternative 6R and its impacts, refer to the Army's FEIS (p. 3-8 and 5-120)].

The proposed land use scenario under Alternative 6R is shown in Figure 6.1-1. Under this alternative, approximately 14% of the undeveloped land would be developed, with a total of 27,000 jobs and 10,210 dwelling units. The buildout population would be approximately 22,800. The land use division for all of former Fort Ord would be as follows:

- 5 63% Habitat Management
- 9 5% Educational/Institutional/Public Facilities (includes airport)
- 0% Retail
- 4 3% Business/Planned Development/Light Industrial
- 0.5 6% Residential
- 4 4% Parks and Recreation (includes beach area)
- 3% Agribusiness
- 6% Other (rights-of-way; POM annex)
- 4 0% Visitor Serving
- 43 0% No Proposed Use

Infrastructure at the former Fort Ord, including water supply and distribution, electricity and gas distribution, sewage collection and disposal, roads and street lights, solid waste collection and disposal, stormwater collection and disposal, telephone service, and cable television would be retained by the Army in the short-term to serve the POM annex, reserve center, and any interim uses approved prior to land disposal. The Army would complete engineering analyses of these systems to determine their condition and remaining life, and would upgrade ownership of the systems serving remaining Army properties.

Alternative 6R would result in the transfer of most sensitive environmental areas to other federal and state agencies, which would manage the lands without causing significant environmental impacts. Transfer of portions of the former Fort Ord to local agencies would allow for development of educational, recreational, airport, business, and institutional uses that would offset the economic effects of closure of the former Fort Ord.

A hospital is not included in Alternative 6R, because it was not requested through the real estate screening process.

## Mitigation Summary

The following mitigation measures would be provided by the Army prior to implementing reuse plans under Alternative 6R (refer to the Army's FEIS, p. 6-1):

- Limit properties that may be out-granted and restrict access to redevelopment areas.
- Encourage additional CHAMPUS/PRIME providers.
- Provide for public utilities easements.
- Maintain facilities that collect wastewater from areas outside of the POM annex and reserve center.

- Disclose information on buried utilities infrastructure to the Underground Service Alert.
- Conduct periodic maintenance.
- Maintain cable service.
- Create a joint powers agreement to ensure proper oversight and maintenance.
- Implement measures during renovation to minimize NO<sub>x</sub> emissions (for establishment of the POM annex only).
- Develop and coordinate an installation-wide multispecies habitat management plan. (Agencies and entities receiving former Fort Ord lands would implement the HMP.)
- Maintain historic buildings and condition their sale or transfer with protective covenants.
- Conduct archeological surveys of former Fort Ord lands.
- Contact California Native American groups that may have traditional cultural properties located on former Fort Ord lands.

## 6.1.2 Impacts

### Land Use

Alternative 6R proposes reuse of the developed portion of the former Fort Ord, as well as an additional 10% of the undeveloped portion. Uses associated with open space, institutional/public, and parks and recreation would remain slightly less than or the same as the proposed project. Major differences would occur in the areas of residential land use (6.5% less than proposed project), tourism (none compared to 4% in proposed project), and No Proposed Use (3% compared to none in proposed project).

This alternative proposes siting of a transit center in the coastal zone, which would constitute a greater impact on the natural habitat resources in this area than the proposed alternative where the center has been relocated east of the highway. Other impacts associated with incompatible land uses in this alternative relate to the natural area expansion at the southern border of the base, the agri-center in the East Garrison area, the Highway 68 transportation corridor and the disturbed habitat zone.

### **Figure 6.1-1, Alternative 6R Land Use**

*This figure can be found within the "Maps" section off the homepage of the FORA CD-ROM Application.*

*This page intentionally left blank.*

The alternative would not have the conflict among planned uses for the East Garrison area land use which must still be resolved for the proposed project. This would lead to fewer compatibility impacts between proposed uses under Alternative 6R.

Under this alternative, several areas of land would be left in the No Proposed Use (NPU) status within all three jurisdictions. These areas would be disposed of to private interests and would be subject to the land use controls of the local governments. Although no uses have been proposed in these areas, there would be impacts of reuse in these areas, including potential incompatibilities with the proposed McKinney Act housing facilities, the NRMA, and a campground facility near the East Garrison fire ranges.

Alternative 6R proposes development that would be inconsistent with relevant state and local plans and policies related to the AQMP, adequate infrastructure, land use incompatibilities, protection of sensitive environmental habitats and resources, groundwater resources, and visual quality of the coastal area.

Alternative 6R does not require local jurisdictions to adopt policies and implement programs to reduce or eliminate any project impacts. This would lead to greater impacts associated with this alternative related to incompatibilities between proposed uses or inconsistencies with relevant state and local plans and policies.

### **Socioeconomics**

Alternative 6R would result in a buildout population of approximately 22,770 persons, 10,210 total housing units, and 27,000 new jobs. These figures are substantially lower than those for the proposed project, due to the down-scaled level of development occurring under this alternative. Buildout under Alternative 6R would require school capacity through the 12th grade for approximately 4,300 additional students. Regional economic activity, as measured by countywide employment, personal income, and industrial output, would be less than under the proposed project but would increase over 1991 conditions. Military retirees would be affected by the loss of medical services currently available at the former Fort Ord. Alternative 6R would have 3,750 acres of land available for undeveloped recreational opportunities and developed recreational opportunities, which is similar to the proposed project.

### **Soils and Geology**

Impacts to soil resources under Alternative 6R would be slightly less than the impacts under the proposed project because less undeveloped area would be disturbed. However, Alternative 6R also contains No Proposed Use areas are assumed to remain as open space. Without active habitat management, soils in these areas could be subject to increased long-term loss of soil fertility caused by fire suppression activities. If these areas are eventually developed, they would experience the same development-related impacts as the other areas planned for development.

Alternative 6R proposes agri-center uses in polygon 11b. This designation restricts development on steep slopes and in the southern portion of the parcel where erosion hazards are particularly acute. The proposed designation for this polygon under the proposed project - a mixed use district with equestrian opportunities and possible business park and light industrial uses - does not explicitly include these development restrictions. Therefore, erosion impacts on polygon 11b are likely to be less under this alternative than under the proposed project.

## **Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply**

Less development and fewer dwelling units would occur under Alternative 6R than the proposed project, thus there would be less demand for utilities and water supply. Upgrades of some existing utility systems would be required to provide adequate service under Alternative 6R. Increased wastewater treatment capacity, an increased demand for gas and electricity service, and expanded stormdrain and water supply infrastructure would be needed. Public or private utility companies would be required to upgrade, replace, and/or expand existing infrastructure to provide service to the proposed uses in this alternative. However, this alternative would reduce the demand for telephone and cable television services and generate approximately the same amount of solid waste as baseline conditions. Additional impacts resulting from utility system deterioration may occur on lands designated as No Proposed Use. Annual water demand would be approximately 12,000 acre feet per year under Alternative 6R, less than the demand under the proposed project. The existing supply consists entirely of groundwater and existing demand already exceeds the safe yield of the groundwater basin in the vicinity of the former Fort Ord, as indicated by the occurrence of seawater intrusion. Local groundwater could not supply the water needed for this alternative.

## **Hydrology and Water Quality**

To assess hydrology and water quality impacts, in addition to considering the overall number of acres planned for development, the relative number of acres of the various types of uses to be developed was considered. The following land uses are listed in order from those considered to generate the greatest hydrology and water quality impacts to those generating the least:

- business/planned development/light industrial; agribusiness; and retail (referred to below as business-related uses);
- educational/institutional/public facilities; residential; parks and recreation; other; visitor-serving (referred to below as residential-related uses);
- caretaker status;
- habitat management; and
- no proposed use.

As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 6R would result in the development of the same percentage of acreage in business-related uses, 5.5% less acreage in residential-related uses, and 9% less acreage in habitat management uses. This alternative assumes 13% of the base would be designated with no proposed use. Therefore, this alternative is expected to result in hydrology and water quality impacts of slightly less magnitude as compared to the proposed project.

## **Public Health and Safety**

The demand for law enforcement officers would be less under Alternative 6 than with the proposed project. Other lesser potential impacts include susceptibility of new and existing structures to damage from seismically-induced ground shaking and associated safety risks. Reuse of former



hazardous and toxic waste sites would pose slight risks to public health and safety. Development could occur on areas of unidentified hazardous waste or unexploded ordnance. Additional hazardous waste would be generated on the installation by demolishing buildings that may contain asbestos and other potentially hazardous materials. Reuse of the landfill for university research purposes could increase soil and groundwater contamination and risks to human health and the environment. The amount of hazardous waste generated at Fritzsche Army Airfield also could increase after the airport is converted to civilian use.

Exposure to asbestos is possible if asbestos is not removed from buildings before demolition. Hazardous air pollutants and PM<sub>10</sub> could be emitted during hazardous waste cleanup and recovery of unexploded ordnance. Construction activities during reuse would generate a substantial increase in NOx emissions. Alternative 6R would not create excessive levels of CO at locations where people live or work. Operational increases in air emissions would be lower than under existing conditions, resulting in a net decrease in NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions. Alternative 6R would be consistent with the MBUAPCD 1991 AQMP and the 1982 SIP.

### **Traffic and Circulation**

Alternative 6R includes approximately half the number of dwelling units and approximately 40% fewer jobs than the proposed project. Based on this, the alternative may be expected to generate significantly fewer trips than the proposed project (228,000 daily vehicle trips versus 390,000). In turn, this would lessen both the impact on the regional transportation system and the on-base system requirements. The reduction in on-base requirements may be tempered by the need to provide a basic amount of transportation infrastructure to provide access to the development areas.

### **Climate and Air Quality**

The proposed project, which has a substantially greater number of daily trips on area roadways than does Alternative 6R, was determined to have no significant adverse impacts relative to localized carbon monoxide, per the Caline 4 model run for a number of on-base and off-base intersections (modeling worksheets enclosed in Appendix C). There would be even less emissions and impacts associated with Alternative 6R. Furthermore, because less commercial/industrial land use is associated with this alternative than with the proposed project, the potential for future toxic emissions associated with this alternative will be less. The cumulative impacts in this scenario would be less because of the fewer daily vehicle trips associated with this alternative. Consistency with the AQMP is subject to the same conditions associated with the proposed project, which are discussed above in the cumulative discussion (Section 5.1).

### **Noise**

As with the proposed project, Alternative 6R would require construction of new major arterials within the former Fort Ord. Because less development would occur under Alternative 6R than under the proposed project, less traffic and traffic noise would be generated under this alternative. Alternative 6R would generate 228,000 daily trips at buildout versus 390,000 trips generated by the proposed project at buildout. However, as with the proposed project, substantial increases in traffic noise would occur along several existing roadway segments and noise-generating land uses would be located adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses.

## **Biological Resources**

Alternative 6R would result in the removal of approximately 1,550 acres of common biological communities and associated common wildlife species. These communities include approximately 55 acres of beach blowouts, ice plant mats, and disturbed dune; about 90 acres of coastal scrub; 580 acres of oak woodland and savanna; about 820 acres of annual grassland. Additionally, Alternative 6R would result in the removal of the following acreages of sensitive habitats: 925 acres of maritime chaparral, 1 are of dune scrub, 32 acres of native perennial grasslands and 2 acres of vernal ponds, riparian corridors and other wetland areas.

In the analysis of impacts on biological resources for Alternative 6R in the FEIS and supplemental Biological Assessment (US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District 1993), it was assumed that no habitat would be removed in all areas designated as no proposed use (NPU). However, in response to concerns raised by the community regarding the NPU designation, the Army modified Alternative 6R to include land uses for the NPU areas that were consistent with the community's reuse plan. As a result, the analysis of impacts on biological resources was modified for the Record of Decision (ROD) and the HMP. The Army determined that the modifications to Alternative 6R were consistent with the range of alternatives analyzed in the FEIS, and therefore would not result in impacts not analyzed in the FEIS.

Both the ROD and the HMP are based on Modified Alternative 6R. The impacts on biological resources analyzed for this alternative are different than the analysis of Alternative 6R, primarily because land uses were designated for the NPU areas. Modified Alternative 6R would result in the removal of approximately 3,785 acres of common biological communities and associated common wildlife species. These communities include approximately 134 acres of beach blowouts, ice plants mats, and disturbed dune; about 280 acres of coastal scrub; 1,956 acres of oak woodland and savanna; about 1,415 acres of annual grassland. Additionally, Modified Alternative 6R would result in the removal of approximately 2,145 acres of freshwater marsh, riparian corridors and other wetland areas. The habitat losses under Modified Alternative 6R are slightly increased over the proposed project.

## **Visual Resources**

The development proposed under Alternative 6R would reduce the visual quality of some areas of the former Fort Ord seen from the Salinas Valley. Proposed development would reduce the amount and diversity of natural vegetation cover and introduce built elements with contrasting attributes of form, line, color and texture. Views from state-designated and proposed scenic routes heavily traveled by tourists and recreationists, particularly SR 1, would be reduced in visual quality by proposed development along these roadways. Impacts would be more adverse than with the proposed project due to location and design controls on development, such as the transit center west of SR 1.

## **Cultural Resources**

The potential effects of each of the alternatives are related, in part, to the intensity of the proposed land use. The more intense the land use, the more likely these types of cultural resources would be adversely affected by the alternative. Since this alternative would represent a somewhat reduced

intensity compared to the proposed project, the alternative has less chance to affect archaeological or Native American sites or buildings potentially identified for the National Register. This alternative includes mitigation measures such as protective covenants and coordination with appropriate agencies and interested parties. However, Alternative 6R does not require local jurisdictions to adopt policies and implement programs to reduce or eliminate any project impacts. This would lead to greater impacts associated with this alternative related to cultural resources.

## 6.2 Alternative 7

### 6.2.1 Description

Alternative 7 refers to the initial FORA Base Reuse Plan that was accepted on December 12, 1994. Approximately 19,000 acres of the former Fort Ord, which have been requested by other federal, state, and local agencies through the real estate screening process, would be transferred to public agencies for the uses identified in the screening process. Alternative 7 is a three-phased, 40-60 year buildout reuse plan that would result in approximately 13,800 dwelling units and 58,500 jobs. The population would be approximately 41,500 plus 20,000 CSUMB students by ultimate buildout. This population represents 8% of AMBAG's county-wide population estimate of 519,969 for the year 2015, which is the farthest into the future that AMBAG projects. [For a more extensive description of Alternative 7 and its impacts, refer to the Army's DSEIS (p3-2, and 5-10)].

The proposed land use scenario under Alternative 7 is shown in Figure 6.2-1. The land use division for all of the former Fort Ord would be as follows:

- 62% Habitat Management
- 6 5% Parks and Recreation (includes beach, golf)
- 40 7% Educational/Institutional/Public Facilities (includes airport)
- 3% Agribusiness
- 4 0% Retail
- 4% Other (rights-of-way; POM annex)
- 7 12% Business/Planned Development/ Light Industrial
- 1% Visitor Serving
- 6% Residential
- 0% No Proposed Use

### **Figure 6.2-1, Alternative 7 Land Use**

*This figure can be found within the "Maps" section off the homepage of the FORA CD-ROM Application.*

*This page intentionally left blank.*

Infrastructure at the former Fort Ord, including water supply and distribution, electricity and gas distribution, sewage collection and disposal, roads and street lights, solid waste collection and disposal, stormwater collection and disposal, telephone service, and cable television would be retained by the Army in the short-term to serve the POM annex, reserve center, and any interim uses approved prior to land disposal. The Army would complete engineering analyses of these systems to determine their condition and remaining life, and would upgrade ownership of the systems serving remaining Army properties.

Alternative 7 would result in the transfer of most sensitive environmental areas to other federal and state agencies which would manage the lands without causing significant environmental impacts. Transfer of portions of the former Fort Ord to local agencies would allow for development of educational, recreational, airport, business, and institutional uses that would significantly add to the economic output of the region.

### **Mitigation Summary**

Alternative 7 encompasses conceptual mitigation strategies as part of the proposed project, in order to reduce impacts to the resources of concern. These include additional mitigations for specific road segments and parcels developed to minimize impacts to biological resources (refer to the Army's DSEIS, p3-11 and Appendix D of the DSEIS). Since the DSEIS was completed, mitigation measures preferable to the conceptual mitigation strategies have been developed, and were agreed on during a meeting between the Army, USFWS, and FORA on March 15, 1996. For the purpose of this analysis, however, Alternative 7 as described in the DSEIS has been used. Capital improvement strategies contain concept plans for improvement to the communication systems, wastewater system, energy supply systems, water distribution system, stormwater system, road network, and transportation corridor rights-of-way).

## **6.2.2 Impacts**

### **Land Use**

The land use pattern for Alternative 7 closely resembles the uses included in the proposed project. Compared with the proposed project, this alternative represents higher land use densities associated with commercial and industrial uses, lower densities associated with housing, more jobs created, and a larger-sized circulation plan.

Major differences in land use between Alternative 7 and the proposed project as shown in Table 3.2-1, occur in Polygon 1c (remains a light industrial use area under Alternative 7, but without opportunities for golf and hotel), Polygon 4 (low density housing only under Alternative 7, without any other uses); and Polygon 11b (agribusiness center/public safety training only under Alternative 7, no business park or equestrian use opportunities). These differences represent less intense land uses for these areas and therefore, potentially reduced impacts related to land use incompatibility and policy inconsistency. However, as discussed under Alternative 6R above, Alternative 7 does not request local jurisdictions to adopt specific policies and implement programs to reduce or eliminate any project impacts which would otherwise lead to more land use incompatibilities and policy

inconsistencies. Alternative 7, as with the proposed project, would be inconsistent with the previous Coastal Commission Consistency Determination.

### **Socioeconomics**

Alternative 7 would increase the resident population from 31,270 persons in 1991 to a buildout population of approximately 61,500 (including CSUMB students), which would be approximately 86% of the population for the proposed project. Approximately 58,500 new jobs (28% more than the proposed project) would occur and 13,800 housing units (approximately 80% of the proposed project units) would be provided (including to CSUMB student housing). Alternative 7 would intensify the jobs/housing imbalance that exists in Monterey County by supporting more jobs than can be accommodated by the proposed number of housing units. Additional grade schools for the region would be provided to accommodate the growth of students generated. Regional economic activity, as measured by countywide employment, personal income, and industrial output, would increase substantially over 1991 conditions. Alternative 7 would make less land available for undeveloped recreational opportunities and developed recreational opportunities than under the proposed project.

### **Soils and Geology**

Alternative 7 is very similar to the proposed project. Impacts to soil resources would not be significantly different under Alternative 7 except for the potential difference in impacts associated with polygon 11b, as described above in the discussion of Alternative 6R. Impacts on this area would be less under Alternative 7 than under the proposed project.

### **Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply**

The total population and dwelling units under Alternative 7 would be less than the proposed project and thus would require less solid waste and waste water requirements. Upgrades and expansion of existing services and infrastructure would still be needed for this alternative. An increase in Stormwater/runoff and services would result under this alternative and would be similar to the proposed project. Annual water demand on the former Fort Ord would be approximately 17,500 acre feet per year. The existing supply consists entirely of groundwater; local groundwater could not supply the water needed for this alternative and new supplies would need to be found, as with the proposed project.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 7 would result in the development of 5% more acreage in business-related uses, 6% less acreage in residential-related uses, and the same percentage of acreage in habitat management uses. Therefore, this alternative is expected to result in hydrology and water quality impacts of slightly greater magnitude as compared to the proposed project.

### **Public Health and Safety**

Alternative 7 would require a similar number of law enforcement officers, firefighters, and emergency medical services as for the proposed project. The alternative would also increase the demand for community medical services. Other potential impacts include susceptibility of new and

existing structures to damage from seismically-induced ground shaking. The installation is in a seismic and tsunami risk area, and people would be exposed to risks from buildings subject to ground shaking. After hazardous and toxic waste remediation activities are complete at the former Fort Ord, reuse of former hazardous and toxic waste sites would pose slight risks to public health and safety. Development could occur on unidentified hazardous waste or unexploded ordnance areas. Additional hazardous waste would be generated on the installation by demolishing buildings that may contain asbestos and other potentially hazardous materials. Reuse of the landfill for university research purposes could increase soil and groundwater contamination and risks to human health and the environment. The amount of hazardous waste generated at the former Fritzsche Army Airfield could also increase now that the airport is converted to civilian use.

### **Traffic and Circulation**

Alternative 7 would include approximately 20% fewer dwelling units than the proposed project, but approximately 28% more jobs. These differences would be expected to result in an increase for Alternative 7 in the number of trips generated by the former Fort Ord development (435,000 daily vehicle trips versus 390,000) resulting in an increased demand placed on both the internal and regional transportation systems. More significantly, this alternative would result in a jobs-housing ratio of approximately 3.10:1 compared to 2.05:1 for the proposed project. This higher imbalance means that a significantly higher percentage of trips would have one trip end outside of the former Fort Ord area, thus creating a greater impact on the regional transportation system.

### **Climate and Air Quality**

The number of daily vehicle trips generated by Alternative 7 is close enough to that of the proposed project to conclude that the impacts of this alternative would be similar, including impacts associated with toxic pollutants and cumulative conditions. Consistency with the AQMP is subject to the same conditions associated with the proposed project, which are discussed above in the cumulative discussion (Section 5.1).

### **Noise**

As with the proposed project, Alternative 7 would require the construction of new major arterials within the former Fort Ord. Traffic and traffic noise under Alternative 7 would be slightly greater than under the proposed project. Alternative 7 would generate 435,000 daily trips at buildout versus the 390,000 trips generated under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, substantial increases in traffic noise would occur along several existing roadway segments and noise-generating land uses would be located adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses.

### **Biological Resources**

Alternative 7 would result in the removal of or effects on approximately 3,380 acres of common biological communities and associated common wildlife species. These communities include approximately 92 acres of beach blowouts, ice plant mats, and disturbed dune; about 260 acres of coastal scrub; 1,828 acres of oak woodland and savanna; about 1,200 acres of annual grassland. Additionally, Alternative 7 would result in the removal of or effects on approximately 2,160 acres of



maritime chaparral, 5 acres of native coastal strand and dune scrub, 2 acres of native perennial grasslands and 2 acres of freshwater marsh, riparian corridors and other wetland areas. These habitat losses would be slightly less (ca. 300 acres) than the proposed project. However, there would be less oak woodland habitat lost under the proposed project than under this Alternative.

## **Visual Resources**

Similar development would occur under Alternative 7 as the proposed project. Alternative 7 would result in reduced visual unity and intactness for some visually sensitive areas due to short- and long-term construction impacts, and reduced visual quality of areas seen from SR 1. Implementation of land uses would require construction of a substantial number of buildings, renovation of existing buildings, and modification of infrastructure. These activities would produce short-term visual impacts and could produce long-term visual impacts. Implementing the land uses for the excessed lands and the revised use areas would also substantially alter the visual character and reduce the visual quality of some areas seen from SR 1. Viewed from SR 1, which is a proposed scenic route that is heavily traveled by tourists and recreationists, high-intensity land uses would encroach on the foreground and middleground distance zones of some views. Visual impacts would be more adverse than with the proposed project due to less vegetative screening in Polygons 2a and 15 and less restoration of disturbed areas west of SR 1. The visual policies and programs described in Chapter 4.0 for the proposed project would also reduce visual impacts substantially relative to Alternative 7.

## **Cultural Resources**

The impacts of Alternative 7 on cultural resources would closely resemble the uses of the proposed project. There would be less intense uses under this alternative in the areas most changed from the proposed project (Polygons 1c, 4 and 11b) as well as in residential land use. This would impact the East Garrison area (Polygon 11b) most, both in the area of historically significant buildings and archaeological resources which occur in the area's terraces and bluffs along the Salinas River. However, this alternative represents higher land use densities associated with commercial and industrial uses and a larger-sized circulation plan. This would potentially impact more archaeological resources as well as the East Garrison historical district which is located near a major transportation corridor proposed for alternative 7. Again, this alternative does not require local jurisdictions to adopt policies and implement programs to reduce or eliminate any project effects which would lead to less mitigation and hence, greater impacts.

## **6.3 Alternative 8**

### **6.3.1 Description**

Alternative 8 is a slight modification of Alternative 7, which includes the addition of two golf courses (polygons 8a and 19a) and 1,200 additional residential units proposed in conjunction with one of the golf courses. The golf courses would replace a large university research area overlying the former Fort Ord landfill in the City of Marina's sphere of influence and a large area of planned light industrial uses in Monterey County's sphere of influence. The other differences represent a minor adjustment to the range of uses expected in office park and transit center areas, adjustments in the boundaries of a community park (polygon 17a), the addition of some rights-of-way to be dedicated to CalTrans, and minor changes in the boundary of the large natural resources management area

(NRMA) in the undeveloped portion of the former Fort Ord. [For a more extensive description of Alternative 8 and its impacts, refer to the Army's DSEIS (p3-12, and 5-86)].

The proposed land use scenario under Alternative 8 is shown in Figure 6.3-1. Implementation of Alternative 8 would result in 15,000 dwelling units (plus CSUMB accommodation) and 48,100 jobs. The buildout population would be approximately 45,100 plus 20,000 CSUMB students. This population represents 9% of AMBAG's countywide population estimate of 519,969 for the year 2015, which is the farthest into the future that AMBAG projects.

The land use division for all of former Fort Ord would be as follows:

- 61% Habitat Management
- 40% Educational/Institutional/Public Facilities (includes airport)
- 4% Retail
- 6% Business/Planned Development/ Light Industrial
- 6% Residential
- 7% Parks and Recreation (includes beach, golf)
- 3% Agribusiness
- 5% Other (rights-of-way; POM annex)
- 1% Visitor Serving
- 0% No Proposed Use

The support structure required to implement the Alternative 7 land use scenario would also be needed to support Alternative 8 (i.e. communication systems, wastewater system, energy supply systems, water distribution system, stormwater system, road network improvements, and transportation corridor rights-of-way). [For a more detailed discussion of Alternative 8, refer to the Army's DSEIS (p3-11) and Appendix D].

### **Mitigation Summary**

Alternative 8 involves the same mitigation strategy as proposed under Alternative 7, to reduce impacts to the resources of concern. Concept plans have been developed for the infrastructure needed to support land use development under this alternative (i.e. communication systems, wastewater system, energy supply systems, water distribution system, stormwater system, road network improvements, and transportation corridor rights-of-way). Additional mitigation for specific road segments are developed to minimize impacts to biological resources (refer to the Army's DSEIS, p3-11 and Appendix D).

**Figure 6.3-1, No Project Alternatives Land Conveyances**

*This figure can be found within the "Maps" section off the homepage of the FORA CD-ROM Application.*

## **6.3.2 Impacts**

### **Land Use**

Alternative 8 most closely resembles the proposed project, with only a few minor differences in proposed land uses. Under this alternative, 18% of undeveloped land would be developed, with a slight decrease in open space, an increase in commercial/business/industrial acreage and a decrease in residential units. Land use incompatibilities and policy inconsistencies would be similar to Alternative 7. Addition of the golf courses in Polygons 8a and 19a would bring the land use scenario of this alternative in closer alignment with the proposed project.

As with the previous alternatives, Alternative 8 does not request local jurisdictions to adopt policies and implement programs to reduce or eliminate any project impacts which would lead to more land use incompatibilities and policy inconsistencies. As with Alternative 7 and the proposed project, a revised Coastal Zone Consistency Determination would be required.

### **Socioeconomics**

Implementing Alternative 8 would increase the jobs to housing ratio imbalance, as compared with the proposed project. Alternative 8 would have a lower resident population at buildout of approximately 45,100. A total of 15,000 housing units and 48,100 jobs would be provided by Alternative 8. Alternative 8 would have less land available for undeveloped recreational opportunities and developed recreational opportunities than the proposed project.

### **Soils and Geology**

Alternative 8 is very similar to the proposed project. Impacts to soil resources would not be significantly different except for the potential difference in impacts associated with polygon 11b, as described above in the discussion of Alternative 6R. Impacts on this area would be less under Alternative 8 than under the proposed project.

### **Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply**

Increased demand for wastewater and solid waste under this alternative would be similar though slightly less than the proposed project. Increased services and stormwater runoff would be the same as the proposed project. Alternative 8 would increase annual water demand on the former Fort Ord from the proposed project demand to approximately 18,000 afy.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

As compared to the proposed project, Alternative 8 would result in the development of 4% more acreage in business-related uses, 5% less acreage in residential-related uses, and 1% less acreage in habitat management uses. Therefore, this alternative is expected to result in hydrology and water quality impacts of slightly greater magnitude as compared to the proposed project.

## **Public Health and Safety**

Alternative 8 would require similar numbers of law enforcement officers and firefighters as under the proposed project, and similar medical or emergency medical services. Public health and safety risks would result from buildings subject to seismically-induced ground shaking and the reuse of former hazardous and toxic waste sites.

## **Traffic and Circulation**

Alternative 8 is most similar to the proposed project in terms of trip generation characteristics. This alternative has 12% fewer housing units, but 6% more jobs. The net result is that the total number of trips generated under this alternative would be slightly more than in the proposed project. The internal transportation needs would be similar. However, the higher jobs-housing ratio (2.39:1 versus 2.05:1 for the project) would be expected to result in a higher number of trips between the former Fort Ord and areas outside the base. This would increase the impact of the former Fort Ord development on the regional transportation system. However, the jobs-housing imbalance and regional traffic impacts in this alternative are not as great as in Alternative 7.

## **Climate and Air Quality**

This alternative would result in a similar number of daily trips as compared with the proposed project, but allows a slightly higher amount of area set aside for industrial/commercial land uses. Therefore, it is projected that air contaminants associated with future development would be slightly higher. Consistency with the AQMP is subject to the same conditions associated with the proposed project, which are discussed above in the cumulative discussion (Section 5.1).

## **Noise**

As with the proposed project, Alternative 8 would require the construction of new major arterials within the former Fort Ord. Traffic and traffic noise under Alternative 8 would be slightly greater than under the proposed project. Alternative 8 would generate 425,000 to 430,000 daily trips at buildout versus the 390,000 trips generated under the proposed project. As with the proposed project, substantial increases in traffic noise would occur along several existing roadway segments and noise-generating land uses would be located adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses.

## **Biological Resources**

Alternative 8 is almost identical to Alternative 7 in terms of the extent of habitat removal. Alternative 8 would result in the removal of or effects on approximately 3,389 acres of common biological communities and associated common wildlife species. These communities include approximately 92 acres of beach blowouts, ice plant mats, and disturbed dune; about 260 acres of coastal scrub; 1,828 acres of oak woodland and savanna; about 1,209 acres of annual grassland. Additionally, Alternative 8 would result in the removal of or effects on approximately 2,221 acres of maritime chaparral, 5 acres of native coastal strand and dune scrub, 2 acres of native perennial grasslands and 2 acres of freshwater marsh, riparian corridors and other wetland areas. The habitat losses under Alternative 8 would be slightly less (ca. 300 acres) than the proposed project but, as with Alternative 7, more oak woodland would be removed under Alternative 8 than with the proposed project.

## **Visual Resources**

Generally, similar development would occur under Alternative 8 as in Alternative 7 and the proposed project. Alternative 8 would result in reduced visual unity and inactness for some visually sensitive areas resulting from short- and long-term construction impacts, and reduced visual quality of areas seen from SR 1. Implementation of land uses would require construction of a substantial number of buildings, renovation of existing buildings, and modification of infrastructure. These activities would produce short-term visual impacts and could produce long-term visual impacts. Implementing the land uses for the excess lands and the revised use areas would also substantially alter the visual character and reduce the visual quality of some areas seen from SR 1. Viewed from SR 1, which is a proposed scenic route that is heavily traveled by tourists and recreationists, high-intensity land uses would encroach on the foreground and middleground distance zones of some views. Visual impacts overall would be more adverse than with the proposed project, as described for Alternative 7 above (Section 6.2).

## **Cultural Resources**

Alternative 8 shows only a few differences from the proposed project, which would not substantially impact the protection of cultural resources at the former Fort Ord. This alternative would be slightly less intense and therefore show a somewhat reduced potential for impact on cultural resources. However, the beneficial impact would be negated by the lack of required policies and programs to help mitigate any impacts, which would add to the effects under this alternative.

## **6.4 No Project Alternative**

### **6.4.1 Description**

The No Project Alternative would occur if the former Fort Ord was unable to adopt a reuse plan. The resulting land use scenario would be a combination of land under Army caretaker status and land conveyances that are either completed or are able to proceed without the ~~Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan~~. The completed and proposed land conveyances that would endure under this alternative are shown in Figure 6.4-1. Approximately 19,960 acres of the former Fort Ord land would be transferred to federal, state, and local agencies for the uses identified in the real estate screening process. The Army would retain approximately 805 acres for its POM annex and reserve center, and it would place the excess 7,200 acres into caretaker status indefinitely.

As shown in Figure 6.4-1, those properties assumed as of January, 1996 to be conveyed by the Army include:

- properties for which the land transfer is complete;
- properties for which the Army currently has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to dispose of in phases and for which transfer of ownership could be completed without the ~~Draft Fort Ord Reuse Plan~~; and

### **Figure 6.4-1, No Project Alternative Land Conveyances**

*This figure can be found within the "Maps" section off the homepage of the FORA CD-ROM Application.*

*This page intentionally left blank.*



- properties pending public benefit conveyance for which transfer of ownership could be completed without the ~~Draft Fort Ord~~ *Reuse Plan*.

Completed land conveyances have been transferred to the California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB), University of California MBEST (UCMBEST), Monterey Peninsula Unified School District (MPUSD), and the City of Marina for the airport and adjacent lands. Under this alternative, CSUMB would have the jurisdiction and land area needed to continue buildout of the campus to 25,000 FTE. Similarly, University of California would have the jurisdiction to continue with buildout of the UC MBEST center.

The buildout population would be approximately 14,388, with an additional 20,000 CSUMB students on-campus. The land use division for all of the former Fort Ord property would be as follows:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| • 56% Habitat Management                           | • 5% Parks and Recreation (includes golf) |
| • 5% Educational/Institutional/Public Facilities   | • 0% Agribusiness                         |
| • 3% Business/Planned Development/Light Industrial | • 4% Other (rights-of-way; POM annex)     |
| • 2% Residential                                   | • <1% Visitor Serving                     |
| • 26% Caretaker                                    | • 0% No Proposed Use                      |

Under the No Project Alternative, approximately 61% of the former Fort Ord would be left undeveloped for habitat management (15,648 acres) and parks and recreation (1,320 acres), and an additional 26% (7,200 acres) would be left undeveloped under Army caretaker status. Approximately 13% (3,800 acres) of the former Fort Ord would be developed according to the uses described above (including military) but would include already-existing development. Lands transferred to government and educational groups would allow for the development of educational, recreational, airport, and institutional uses that would offset some of the economic effects of the closure of the former Fort Ord. A minimal amount of Business/Light Industrial and Planned Development uses, as well as residential, would be included for development under this alternative.

Only those agencies having jurisdiction on the former Fort Ord property or lands conveyed under special legislation (Seaside golf course) would be allowed full development under this alternative. For example, the City of Seaside could operate its newly acquired golf courses (through special legislation), but would not have the required jurisdiction to be able to develop its intended hotel uses.

Proposed conveyances under a MOU will be transferred to: the US Bureau of Land Management; University of California at Santa Cruz; Golden Gate University; the City of Seaside (for the golf courses); and CSUMB, UCMBEST, and the City of Marina for small parcels pending environmental cleanup. Pending public benefit conveyances that are anticipated to be completed include the California Department of Parks and Recreation's beach park property, CalTrans' Highway SR 1 rights-of-way, and McKinney Act housing. Lands that are shown to be Not Available on Figure 6.4-1 are lands that would remain in operation under the Army (i.e., the POM annex and reserve center).

Reuse of those conveyed lands identified in Figure 6.4-1 would be dependent on Army services, at least in the short-term. Utilities, water supply, and safety services would be retained by the Army until any required upgrading and transfer of services was completed. Excess utilities, structures, and

operation and maintenance systems (which would not be required for POM annex and reserve center operations) would be placed by the Army into a caretaker status until potential reuse decisions were defined and allowed for.

Approximately 7,200 acres of Army excess lands would remain in caretaker status indefinitely, until such time as they could be disposed to private entities. For the purpose of analyzing a No Project Alternative with a minimum level of development and based on minimal speculative assumptions, no further development of these Army caretaker lands is assumed through the buildout period. Caretaker status is defined by Army regulation as the minimum required staffing to maintain an installation in a state of repair that maintains safety, security, and health standards. In order to meet required safety, security, and health standards, caretaker operation will include: the periodic maintenance of utilities, landscaping, and security systems; the stabilization of unoccupied structures; fire department protection; land management programs; occasional public access for recreational events; and utilities servicing.

### **Mitigation Summary**

- It is assumed that the same mitigations as under Alternative 6R would be implemented by the Army prior to reuse, as follows:
- Limit properties that may be outgranted and restrict access to redevelopment areas.
- Encourage additional CHAMPUS/PRIME medical providers.
- Provide for public utilities easements.
- Maintain facilities that collect wastewater from areas outside of the POM annex and reserve center.
- Disclose information on buried utilities infrastructure to the Underground Service Alert.
- Conduct periodic maintenance.
- Maintain cable service.
- Create a joint powers agreement to ensure proper oversight and maintenance.
- Implement measures during renovation to minimize NOx emissions (for establishment of the POM annex only).
- Develop and coordinate an installation-wide multispecies habitat management plan. (Agencies and entities receiving the former Fort Ord lands would implement the HMP.)
- Maintain historic buildings and condition their sale or transfer with protective covenants.
- Conduct archeological surveys of the former Fort Ord lands.
- Contact California Native American groups that may have traditional cultural properties located on the former Fort Ord lands.

## **6.4.2 Impacts**

### **Land Use**

Under the No Project Alternative, only 19,960 acres of the former Fort Ord would be transferred to federal, state, and local agencies for uses identified in the real estate screening process. The remaining acreage would be split between the Army for its POM Annex and Reserve Center (approximately 805 acres) and caretaker status (7,200 acres). This compares to a total of 27,964 acres to be transferred under the proposed project.

Under the No Project Alternative, there would only be minimal development of educational, recreational, airport, and institutional uses. The completed land transfers that would be included are the BLM land, the City of Seaside golf courses, and most of the educational conveyances. In addition, the pending public benefit conveyances that would be completed include the former Fort Ord Dunes State Park, State Highway 101 right-of-way, and McKinney Act housing.

The intensity of land use under this alternative would be greatly reduced from the proposed project and would therefore imply a reduced impact. Land use related to the BLM lands and the golf courses would not differ significantly from the proposed project. It is also assumed that the educational institutions would proceed with their plans as intended under the proposed project. This would lead to similar impacts for these uses as under the proposed project, as would development of the coastal zone as a state park, use of the highway right-of-way, and implementation of McKinney Act housing. These impacts would not be reduced to insignificant levels as under the proposed alternative because there would be no FORA Reuse Plan and therefore no policies and programs for the local jurisdictions. This would lead to more land use incompatibilities and policy inconsistencies than under the proposed project.

### **Socioeconomics**

Less development would occur under this alternative than compared with the proposed project, resulting in a substantially smaller population (14,388 plus CSUMB students), less jobs (25,630), and less housing units (9,916 including CSUMB housing). The reduced housing would increase the jobs to housing imbalance in comparison with the proposed project. Placing the former Fort Ord lands in caretaker status could result in economic impacts to the Army and local public agencies. There would be significantly less local and regional economic output, as measured by employment, value added, business taxes, and residential property taxes.

### **Geology and Soils**

Impacts to soil resources associated with development would be greatly reduced under the No-Project Alternative, relative to the proposed project, due to the relatively low level of development associated with this alternative. However, for those properties currently in open space uses that are proposed to be in caretaker status, little to no active management of these properties' vegetation and biological resources would occur. Therefore, the loss of soil fertility caused by fire suppression impact could be greater under this alternative than under the proposed project; depending on the length of time these properties are in caretaker status. The longer these properties are in caretaker status and conveyance is delayed, the greater the probability of increased fuel loads leading to wildfires that could be hot enough to adversely affect soil fertility.

## **Public Services, Utilities and Water Supply**

Requirements for all utilities and services would be substantially less than under the proposed project. Placing lands in caretaker status may result in impacts associated with utility system deterioration. The requirements for utilities and services would be less than under the proposed project, but would still necessitate upgrades of existing systems. The demand for water would be approximately ~~6,067~~ 9,346 afy, and the amount of wastewater generated would be approximately ~~4.85~~ 5.80 mgd.

## **Hydrology and Water Quality**

As compared to the proposed project, the No-Project Alternative would result in the development of 3% less acreage in business-related uses, 16% less acreage in residential-related uses, and 6% less acreage in habitat management uses. This alternative assumes 26% of the base would be designated in caretaker status. Therefore, this alternative is expected to result in hydrology and water quality impacts of less magnitude as compared to the proposed project.

## **Public Health and Safety**

Placing Army lands in caretaker status may produce health risks from building demolition and exposure to asbestos. Potential safety impacts may result from increased illegal entry, illegal dumping, and vandalism of structures to lands in caretaker status. Reduced ability to respond to fires and medical emergencies as well as calls for mutual aid to the region may result under this alternative.

## **Traffic and Circulation**

The No Project scenario would include approximately one-half the number of dwelling units and jobs as in the proposed project. As a result, the number of trips generated by uses within the former Fort Ord under this alternative would be approximately 50% of that under the proposed project alternative. The No Project alternative is estimated to generate 120,000 daily person trip ends in 2015 and 270,000 daily person trip ends (195,000 vehicle trips) at buildout. Although termed No Project, this alternative would include a significant amount of development within the former Fort Ord. This development would require improvements to the internal transportation system, and would contribute to needs outside of the base boundaries. As with the Project alternative, development under this scenario combined with growth throughout the region would place significant additional demand on the regional transportation system.

The internal transportation system would need to provide access to all developed areas at reasonable levels of service. Under this alternative, development activity is concentrated at two locations: near Light Fighter Drive/North South Road (CSU and POM Annex) and along Reservation at Blanco (airport, Marina Light Industrial Park and MBEST). The combination of the lower number of trips and smaller area of development would greatly reduce the transportation system requirements within the base. For the most part, roadways serving these areas currently exist, but would need to be upgraded primarily for safety reasons as opposed to capacity concerns. Additional local access and circulation roads, consistent with the proposed uses, would also be required. The reduced travel demand would allow for the closure of many roads and gates except those most proximate to the

development areas, and preclude the need for construction of additional connections such as the 2nd/Del Monte extension.

Outside the former Fort Ord, the impact on the regional system would also be reduced. This alternative is forecast to generate 90,000 person trips or 64,000 vehicle trips between Ford Ord and off-site areas by the year 2015. However, this demand combined with increases related to growth outside of the former Fort Ord would result in deficient operating conditions on many regional roadways if improvements are not implemented. Deficient locations would occur at a level between those identified under the “Financially Constrained” scenario (see Section 4.7.4 above) and those projected under the “POM Use Only” scenario, as follows:

As shown in Table 4.7.3, in general, volumes on all roadway segments would increase under the POM Use Only scenario, although the majority of segments analyzed would operate at LOS D or better. However, those segments that would experience significant drops in service levels (from LOS D or better to LOS E/F) include: State Highway 1 in Seaside, State Highway 183 in Castroville, Fremont Boulevard in both Monterey and Seaside, and Blanco Road/Sanborn Road in Salinas. Roads that experienced a decrease in LOS from E to F include: State Highway 1 north of Castroville, State Highway 156, State Highway 183 north to Salinas, Reservation Road in Marina, and Blanco Road. Roadways experiencing increased volumes, but no change in service levels include: State Highway 68 from State Highway 1 to San Benancio Road, Del Monte Boulevard in Monterey, and Davis Road from Blanco Road to US 101.

A complicating issue under this scenario would be the impact on the regional system created by the absence of an extensive arterial system on the former Fort Ord. Under the proposed project, the internal arterial system provides not only for access to and travel between locations at the former Fort Ord, but also provides an alternative to other regional routes and relief for congested facilities.

### **Climate and Air Quality**

Air quality within the Monterey Peninsula area under this alternative is expected to remain similar to 1991 levels with fluctuations in emissions reflecting atmospheric conditions and peak emissions events in the region associated with the peak visitation periods. Impacts related to increased PM<sub>10</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from future development associated with this alternative would be slight due to the relatively small population. Exceedance of the state and federal standards would occur infrequently and not primarily as a result of the proposed project. With implementation of the AQMP, existing air quality impacts would continue to decrease until the standards are achieved.

### **Noise**

Because substantially less development would occur under the No-Project Alternative relative to the proposed project, less traffic and traffic noise would be generated under those alternative. The No-Project Alternative would generate approximately 195,000 trips at buildout versus the 390,000 trips that would be generated by the proposed project. Some new roadways would be constructed under this alternative, and some increases in noise along existing roads are expected, as with the proposed project. Under the No-Project Alternative, fewer noise-generating land uses would be located adjacent to noise-sensitive land uses. The primary exception is the Marina Municipal Airport, which would be a source of noise under the proposed project and all of the project alternatives. Under this

alternative, fewer noise sensitive land uses would be affected by aircraft noise as compared to the proposed project.

### **Biological Resources**

Under the no project alternative, approximately 26% of the land on the former Fort Ord would be placed in caretaker status. Caretaker status is defined by Army regulation as “the minimum required staffing to maintain an installation in a state of repair that maintains safety, security, and health standards.” This would not include active habitat management of lands placed in caretaker status. Some of these lands include key habitat corridors designated in the HMP that link the conservation areas on the coastal portion of Ford Ord with the interior NRMA lands. This corridor linkage is essential to lessen the effect of natural fluctuations on small populations, allow for recolonization of habitats when local extinction occurs, and maintain genetic diversity. Active management practices often are required to maintain the ecological integrity of habitats within the conservation areas and corridors. Under caretaker status, this active management would not occur on some of the lands designated as conservation areas and corridors--in particular the lands connecting the NRMA to the coastal portions of Ford Ord.

Although the removal of habitat would be less under the No Project Alternative than under the Proposed Project, the lack of active habitat management could result in degradation of habitats, and even habitat loss where non-native species outcompete and replace native habitats. Therefore, the overall impact on biological resources for the No Project Alternative could be greater than under the Proposed Project.

### **Visual Resources**

The No Project Alternative would introduce visual impacts to the SR 1 corridor from modifications to the State Parks area (including landscape restoration) and development of housing in Polygon 20b. However, as described for the proposed project, these would be implemented without the same policies and programs as defined for the proposed project, potentially resulting in higher adverse effects on the scenic corridor. Visual impacts would be similar to the proposed project at the northern boundary and the adjoining Salinas Valley bluffs. The larger area of open space left in caretaker condition would reduce the overall visual impacts for the majority of the Base area as compared with the proposed project, resulting in similar levels of visual impact overall.

### **Cultural Resources**

The No Project Alternative assumes that FORA would not adopt a reuse plan. As a result, only 19,960 acres of the former Fort Ord would be transferred to various agencies. This would constitute a substantially less intense use of the land, with a corresponding reduced potential for impact on cultural resources. Included in the completed land transfers would be the former Fort Ord Dunes State Park with Stilwell Hall, a structure, which is eligible for the National Register status. It is assumed that the California Department of Recreation and Parks would assume responsibility for this coastal zone, which would render the impacts to cultural resources similar to those in the proposed project.

The East Garrison historical district would be part of the 7,200 acres to remain in caretaker status indefinitely and could potentially be disposed to private entities without the Army determining future uses. Caretaker status does not include historical preservation and would constitute a negative impact over the long-term, either through deterioration of resources or lessened protection of resources after disposal. This same impact would be evident in identification and protection of archaeological and Native American cultural resources.

For the land that would be transferred by the Army--mostly for educational uses, BLM stewardship, the Dunes State Park and State Highway 101 rights-of-way--there would not be any comprehensive required policies and programs to mitigate impacts. This would constitute a larger impact than the proposed project.

*This page intentionally left blank.*