

Fort Ord Reuse Authority



Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

FY 2001/2002 through 2020/2021

(Final Version – FORA Board Approval, 06/08/01)

Table of Contents

	Page No.
I. Executive Summary	3, 4, 5
II. Obligatory Program of Projects – Description of CIP Elements	
a. Transportation/Transit Projects	6, 7, 8, 9
b. Potable Water Augmentation	10
c. Storm Drainage System Projects	11
d. Habitat Management Requirements	12
e. Public Facility (Fire Station) Requirements	13
f. Building Removal Program	14, 15, 16
g. Water and Wastewater Collection Systems	17
III. FY 2001/2002 through 2020/2021 CIP	
a. Transportation/Transit Element	18-22
b. Summary of Obligatory CIP Elements	23, 24
c. Summary Spreadsheet (Overall CIP)	25
Appendices	
A. Protocol for Review/Reprogramming of CIP	26
B. Summary of funded projects through 2000/2001	27-38
C. Protocol for “Candidate Projects” as replacements to listed mitigative transportation projects Attachment A	39-42
D. CIP Revenue Discussion	43-44

Executive Summary

1) Overview

This Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is responsive to the capital improvement obligations defined under the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan (BRP) as adopted by the FORA Board in June 1997.

The BRP carries a series of mitigative project obligations defined in Appendix B of that plan as the Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP). The PFIP, which serves as the baseline CIP for the reuse plan, is to be re-visited annually by the FORA Board to assure that required projects are implemented in a timely way to meet development needs.

The PFIP was developed as a four-phase program spanning a twenty-year development horizon (1996-2015) and was based upon the best at-the-time forecasts of development patterns anticipated in concert with market absorption schedules for the area. The PFIP also anticipated that property transfers (Army to FORA to land use jurisdictions) would be completed in a timely fashion at the onset of the twenty-year horizon.

Although the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the U.S. Army and FORA for the no-cost Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) for transfers of property was executed in summer 2000, actual transfers will be phased (over the next six to eight years) as properties are “cleaned” of hazards/contaminants by the Federal Government. Following transfer to FORA properties will transfer to the municipalities for sale or to the private sector as defined in the FORA Land Use Jurisdictions’ Implementation Agreements.

FORA has worked closely with its Member Agencies/Land Use Jurisdictions to re-forecast development, based upon Army-projected remediation and removal activities and current forecasts of development patterns and timing on the former Fort Ord.

This work has led to this re-programmed CIP which incorporates the obligatory elements distributed over a four phase twenty-year horizon from fiscal year 2001/2002 through fiscal year 2020/2021.

The Fort Ord Reuse Authority is scheduled to sunset in 2014 (or when 80% of the BRP has been implemented, whichever occurs first) according to State Law, which will occur prior to the end of this CIP time horizon. Therefore, the revenues and obligations herein will be allocated accordingly to jurisdictions under the Local Agency Formation Commission process for the dissolution of the Authority.

2) Periodic CIP Review and Reprogramming

Due to the nature of development forecasting, it is certain that today’s best forecasts of development timing and patterns will differ from reality. Recognizing this, the BRP requires the FORA Board to periodically review and revise its CIP to reflect development

realities to assure that the adopted mitigative projects are implemented in sequence with development needs.

A protocol for the review and reprogramming of the CIP is included herein (Appendix A), which defines a process whereby FORA and its Member's Agencies will comprehensively review development timing and patterns to assure proper implementation of the BRP mitigation projects.

Each year at budget approval, the Board will be asked to approve a CIP that has been revised, as necessary, via the defined review protocol. That approval will be required to affirm funded project elements of the CIP as well as the placement in time of those yet-to-be funded projects.

It is important to note here that much greater clarity will be apparent in the first 5-year increment (Phase I) of the CIP. Every effort will be made to provide a minimal number of changes in the first phase of the CIP until such approved projects have been processed from conception through completion. This is due to the multi-year timeframe associated with bringing projects on line through design, environmental review/approval and construction. As demonstrated by the placement of projects herein, it is anticipated that at least a three-year window is necessary to move from project concept to completion of construction. This timeframe will be taken into account during the CIP review process prior to any requests for Board action.

3) CIP Costs

The costs assigned to the various elements of the CIP were originally estimated in May 1995 and published in the draft 1996 BRP. This current CIP has inflated costs to January 2001 estimates applying the Engineering News Record (ENR) construction cost indexes to account for inflation. This will be a routine procedure each year hereafter.

4) CIP Revenues

The primary sources of revenue anticipated to cover the costs of obligatory CIP projects are Development Fees and Land Sale (and lease) proceeds. These primary sources will be augmented by Tax Increment Revenue where eligible.

The current FORA Development Fee policy has been structured to accommodate CIP costs of Transportation/Transit Projects, Habitat Management, Potable Water Augmentation, Storm Drainage System improvements and public facility (fire station) improvements.

The Development Fee policy adopted by the Board in 1999 is expected to be replaced or implemented by one or more assessment districts. This policy and the assessment districts will be structured to allow annual inflation adjustments to account for inflation.

Land Sale (and lease) proceeds are expected to cover costs associated with the Building Removal Program. Such proceeds will follow transfers and the jurisdictions processing of individual projects.

FORA, in concert with its Member Agencies, utilized the most current forecasts of development (timing and patterns), in conjunction with anticipated revenue streams expected from those developments, to “place” projects (and their costs) to arrive at cost/revenue balance. This exercise will be routine in the review and reprogramming efforts described above.

[Section III and Appendix D herein provide additional information regarding cost/revenue balance over the CIP planning horizon.]

5) Projects Accomplished to Date

Although the BRP was not adopted until 1997, and it wasn't until year 2000 that land conveyance agreements were finalized between the U.S. Army and FORA, FORA has been actively implementing projects since 1995.

As of this writing, FORA has successfully secured approximately \$ 24M in grant funds from The Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration (EDA). This amount represents approximately \$ 27M in total project costs (soft and hard costs) inclusive of requisite local matching funds.

In addition, FORA has secured \$ 889,684 in State Defense Adjustment matching (DAM) Grants which has been applied against the EDA Grants local match requirements. FORA Members have also contributed funds for the EDA Grants local match requirements in the amount of \$ 1,878,528.

Appendix B herein includes a fiscal summary of the information provided above, as well as a status report of previously approved projects that have been completed or are currently being implemented.

Section III herein provides additional detail regarding how a number of EDA-funded projects are credited against the FORA base wide obligations.

The following Section II provides summary descriptions of the BRP obligatory elements of this CIP.

II. Obligatory Program of Projects – Description of CIP Elements

As noted in the Executive Summary, the distinct obligatory elements of the BRP CIP include Transportation/Transit, Potable Water Augmentation, Storm Drainage, Habitat Management, Public Facility (Fire Station) improvements and Building Removal.

The first five elements noted are to be funded by Development Fees. Land sale (and lease) proceeds are to fund the Building Removal Program.

Summary descriptions of each element of the BRP CIP follows.

a) Transportation/Transit Element

During the preparation of the BRP and the accompanying Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) undertook a regional study (The Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study, July 1997) to assess Fort Ord Development impacts on the study area (north Monterey County) transportation network.

The TAMC Study utilized the Draft BRP transportation network as the basis for its transportation “modeling”. TAMC assigned and distributed trips projected from the zoning and proposed plan densities of development to determine the “preliminary nexus” impact of Fort Ord development on the three categories of roadways, namely, “On-Site” former Fort Ord, “Off-Site” former Fort Ord and “Regional” (eg, State Highways) to the former Fort Ord.

The TAMC Study results projected a percentage of traffic attributable to Fort Ord Development in the noted categories and assigned a corresponding dollar amount to the several projects in each category as FORA Development share of costs. Table 1, Section III a) provides detailed information on the “assigned” costs. Additionally, Table 1 provides brief project descriptions and project limits for the several project elements.

When the BRP and the accompanying Final EIR were adopted by the Board, the transportation (and transit) obligations as defined by the TAMC Study were also adopted as mitigations to the development under the BRP.

The FORA Board subsequently included the Transportation/Transit element (obligation) as a requisite cost component of the adopted Development Fees.

The following graphic (Figure 1) provides a pictorial representation of the obligatory Transportation elements assigned to the BRP. Figure 2 depicts Fort Ord within the TAMC Study limits.

Transportation Map

Figure 1

Page 7

Figure 2

TAMC Study Map

As can be seen in Figure 1, “Off-Site” and “Regional” Projects are beyond the boundaries of the former Fort Ord. Implementation of these projects also falls outside FORA’s purview, with lead agency status resting with other responsible parties (eg. Caltrans, TAMC, Monterey County).

Additionally, the majority, if not all of the “Off-Site” and “Regional” Projects, are projects which have only the Fort Ord Development financial obligation secured by means of the FORA Development Fees. The majority of funds required to effect design, environmental review, and construction remain unsecured.

It is likely that development will proceed on the former Fort Ord before full funding is secured for these “Off-Site” and “Regional” improvements. Recognizing this potential eventuality, the BRP provides for the flexibility to allocate funds, earmarked as obligatory funding contributions to these off-site and regional mitigation projects, to alternative projects that can be designed, environmentally reviewed and constructed within FORA’s purview to alleviate the traffic congestion and impacts associated with the development on the former Fort Ord.

Toward the goal of exercising the provision of the BRP to mitigate traffic impacts with alternative (“candidate”) projects, a process protocol has been established to identify alternative projects that can be implemented by FORA, and/or to reassign FORA’s financial obligations to projects that provide equivalent (or better) mitigation to traffic impacts from Fort Ord Development.

Appendix C herein contains the protocol process by which the CIP Joint Committee defined in Appendix A can identify and recommend “candidate” projects. Attachment A to Appendix C includes four “candidate” projects already identified by the CIP Joint Committee.

The FORA Board’s endorsement of the protocol described herein will provide for the implementation of mitigative transportation improvements that may not otherwise be accomplished during the course of development of the BRP.

b) Potable Water Augmentation

The BRP as adopted by the Board in June 1997 identifies availability of water as its primary resource constraint.

The density of development anticipated by the BRP utilizes the total available potable water supply of 6600 acre-feet per year (AF/yr), as described in the BRP, Appendix B, (PFIP section p 3-63).

In addition to the potable water supply, the adopted BRP requires an augmentation of 2300 AF/yr for irrigation purposes to achieve the development level permitted by the BRP.

Given the above, the FORA Board approved the Development Fee inclusive of a \$15M earmark for potable water augmentation. The \$15M in January 2001 dollars has escalated to \$ 17,175,000, given the inflationary factors described herein.

This funding earmark was set aside to address the mandate in FORA's Development and Resource Management Plan (DRMP) which states the following under the "Management of Water Supply" Section, Article 3.11.5.4(d) 3) Reclaimed Water Source and Funding:

"FORA shall continue to actively participate in and support the development of reclaimed water supply sources by the water purveyor and the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) to ensure adequate water supplies for the former Fort Ord. The CIP shall fund a reclaimed water program adequate for the full development of industrial and commercial land uses and golf course development."

In addition to reclaimed water, the BRP anticipates the exploration of other potential water sources as well, inclusive of desalination. FORA continues to work with Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) and MRWPCA on moving the reclamation project forward and FORA is exploring options with MCWD with respect to desalination facilities.

The \$ 17,175,000 obligation has been placed in the CIP document as an even distribution of \$ \$ 903,947 over a nineteen year period, beginning in FY 2002/2003.

This "placement" of funds will be refined as more detailed planning, environmental feasibility and design work ensues with both MCWD and MRWPCA.

c) Storm Drainage System Projects

The adopted BRP recognizes the need to eliminate the discharge of storm water runoff from the former Fort Ord to the National Marine Sanctuary. In addition, the FEIR accompanying the BRP specifically addresses the need to remove the five storm water outfalls that currently discharge storm water runoff to the Sanctuary. Section 4.5 of the FEIR, Hydrology and Water Quality, contains the following obligatory Conservative Element Program:

“Hydrology and Water Quality Policy, C-6: In support of Monterey Bay’s National Marine Sanctuary designation, the City/County shall support all actions required to ensure that the bay and inter-tidal environment will not be adversely affected, even if such actions should exceed state and federal water quality requirements.”

“Program C-6.1: The City/County shall work closely with other Fort Ord jurisdictions and the (California Department of Parks and Recreation) to develop and implement a plan for storm water disposal that will allow for the removal of the ocean outfall structures and end the direct discharge of storm water into the marine environment. The program must be consistent with State Park goals to maintain the open space character of the dunes, restore natural land forms and restore habitat values.”

With these programs/policies in mind, the FORA Board included a \$5.2M earmark in the Development Fee it adopted in 1999, which has escalated to \$5,808,585 (January 2001 dollars).

Also in 1999, the City of Seaside, working in concert with FORA, was awarded a Technical Assistance Grant by the EDA in the amount of \$ 110,000. The proceeds of these funds, as managed by FORA, are currently being utilized to initiate planning, environmental feasibility and preliminary designs for projects which would provide an alternative disposal method for storm water runoff and allow for the removal of the storm water outfalls.

At this time, a formal application for Grant funds has been invited and submitted (April 16, 2001) to EDA. FORA awaits EDA’s review and response which is anticipated to occur this summer.

The \$3M requested Grant funds would allow FORA and Seaside (co-applicant) to complete designs, environmental review and construction for up to three of the five storm drainage tributary areas, which would include the required removal of the outfalls.

Should all or a portion of the noted EDA funds be awarded, the current Storm Drainage Systems obligation of \$ 5,808,585 would be accordingly reduced and will be reflected in next year’s annual update of the CIP.

d) Habitat Management Requirements

Appendix A, Volume 2 of the BRP contains the Habitat Management Program (HMP) Implementation Management Agreement. This Management Agreement defines the respective rights and obligations of FORA, its Member Agencies, California State University and the University of California with respect to the implementation of the HMP.

Subject to final approval by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), FORA's Habitat Management funding obligations will take on the following form:

1. A \$ 1.5M upfront funding (comprised of \$1.3M in borrowed funds and \$200K in secured funds) for initial management planning and capital costs, serves as a down payment on an endowment fund, the earnings on which will allow for required habitat management activities on the habitat parcels that have already transferred.
2. Additionally, as development takes place and Development Fees are paid, \$1 out of every \$ 4 collected will be earmarked to build a total endowment of \$ 6,339,046, the principal funds necessary to produce an annual income sufficient to carry out required habitat management responsibilities in perpetuity. This fund estimate has been developed by an independent consultant retained by FORA (and includes the \$1.5M upfront capital).

The financing plan is predicated on an earnings rate assumption acceptable to USFWS and CDFG for endowments of this kind, and economies of scale provided by unified management of FORA's habitat lands by qualified non-profit habitat managers. FORA will be securing the services of the appropriately experienced habitat manager(s) via a formal selection process this year.

It is noted that FORA will not control expenditure of the annual line items, but merely fund the endowment, and the initial and capital costs, to the agreed upon levels. This will be accomplished as follows:

1. \$1.3M revenue bond issue, secured by Preston Park revenue stream.
2. \$ 200,000 previously appropriated by the FORA Board from the pre-01/02 fiscal year Preston Park revenues.
3. Additional Development Fees collected as development occurs, on a \$ 1 for habitat management for every \$ 4 of Developer Fees collected. This will cease when the target of \$ 6,339,046 is achieved.

e) Public Facility (Fire Station) Requirements

The Fire Station Mitigation identified as an obligation under the BRP is solely designed to augment wild fire fighting capability. Urban firefighting services are to be absorbed by current jurisdictional public service operational efforts. The \$ 1.1M included in the FORA capital budget is for capital expenditures only, designed to augment capital expenditures of agencies that will jointly undertake wildfire fighting operational responsibilities. It is expected that those expenditures will assist in the building or rehabilitation of an appropriately located facility on the former Fort Ord. FORA will be convening a multi-agency task force of fire service officials this year to further refine this effort.

f) Building Removal Program

The BRP includes, as a base wide obligation, the removal of non-useable building stock to make way for redevelopment of certain portions of the cantonment, housing, and East Garrison areas of the former Fort Ord. The FORA Board re-confirmed last winter that within the Economic Development Conveyance areas, select building removal (required for redevelopment) is a base wide cost and is the responsibility of FORA. It has been assumed to date that most (if not all) of this select building removal will be funded from land sale (or lease) revenues. Therefore, funding to accomplish the building removal remains project development dependent and may be uneven in its accrual.

FORA will continue to work with its Member Agencies to develop priority areas for building removal in the following areas:

1. Within the City of Marina along Highway 1 east to 2nd Avenue, including all of Combat Development Experimentation Command (CDEC) Hill. (Similar to West University Village area in the proposed Marina General Plan)
2. Within the City of Marina from 2nd Avenue East to CSUMB. (Including but larger than North University Village area in the proposed Marina General Plan)
3. Surplus II – Within the City of Seaside, selected buildings not programmed for reuse along Gigling.
4. East Garrison – Selected buildings within this area of the County that are not programmed for reuse.

The Building Removal Program will proceed as development occurs and land sale proceeds are collected, with a few exceptions where grants, federal programs, or other seed funds are secured to accelerate removal. The Building Removal Program is recommended to proceed as follows:

- a) Systematic phasing of building removal, to be sequenced as developments come on line, as follows:
 - i) FY 2001/2; +/- \$1.4M bond issuance (collateralized by Preston Park lease proceeds if endorsed by the FORA Board), to provide for the removal of the buildings within the 12th Street corridor.
 - ii) Earmark a funding level as shown in Table 3 (Page 25) herein to accommodate an estimated cost of \$ 73.4M to bring the building removal program to completion. The accompanying map (Figure 3) depicts (shaded areas) where anticipated land sale proceeds will be applied. Figure 3 also depicts building removal activity along the 12th Street corridor, should bond issuance as described above proceed in FY 2001/2002.
- b) Account for building removal/disposal provided by the Army under its legislated mandate to develop “thermo-chemical” conversion of the building materials/building stock slated for removal on the former Fort Ord.

- c) Seek supplemental funds (grants or low/no interest loans) to enhance and accelerate building removal along the Highway 1 corridor.
- d) Continue to explore and deploy deconstruction principles wherever practical.

It should be noted that in select cases, a project developer may choose to accelerate the building removal process by taking on portions of the requirements by using buildings in place or demolishing structures in advance of land sale cash flow availability. In these cases, through negotiating the final sale price of such a parcel, FORA will forego a portion or all of the FORA share of land sales revenue for that parcel commensurate with the actual building removal expenditure by the developer accelerating the process to initiate a project.

The building removal activity forecast in the Revenue/Cost Summary (Table 3) reflects a balancing of costs and revenues as currently predicted. In anticipation of revenue accrual and in order to accomplish proper prioritization and sequencing of building removal activities, the local agencies and FORA should consider buildings for removal based upon the following factors:

- The removal should be based upon a community process involving participation from the most affected communities. This review may very well be tied to the specific planning process that should soon be underway for the West & North University Village development.
- The removal or interim transformation of the buildings should be based upon multiple factors emphasizing interim economic return, safety and aesthetics. In this regard, buildings (such as the warehouses near Highway1) may be transformed to preserve the economic opportunity, while buildings more remote which have little economic potential and are unsafe in their deteriorated condition may be high candidates for removal when considered through a public process outlined above.

- **Insert Building Removal Map**

Fig. 3

g) Water and Wastewater Collection Systems

Following a competitive selection process in 1997, the FORA Board approved MCWD as the purveyor to own and operate the water and wastewater collection systems on the former Fort Ord.

By agreement with FORA, MCWD is tasked to assure that a Capital Improvement Program is in place and implemented to accommodate repair, replacement and expansion of the systems. To provide uninterrupted service to existing customers and to track with system expansion to keep pace with proposed development, MCWD and FORA Staff continue to coordinate system(s) needs with respect to anticipated development.

MCWD is fully engaged in the FORA CIP Process, and adjusts its program for the noted systems to be coincident with the FORA CIP.

The FORA Board, by its action in 1997, has also established a Water and Wastewater Oversight Committee (WWOC) which serves in an advisory capacity to the Board.

A primary function of the WWOC is to meet and confer with MCWD Staff in the development of operating and capital budgets and the corresponding customer rate structures. Annually at budget time, the WWOC and Staff prepare recommended actions for the Board's consideration with respect to budget and rate approvals.

This process provides the proper tracking mechanism to assure that capital development of the systems is in sequence with development needs on the former Fort Ord.

Capital Improvements for system(s) operations and improvements are to be funded by customer rates, uniformly distributed to the water and wastewater collection system customers.

The capital improvements for the system(s) are approved on an annual basis by the MCWD Board and the FORA Board as outlined above. Therefore, the systems' capital improvements are not duplicated in this document.

III. FY 2001/2002 through 2020/2021 Capital Projects

Sections I & II of this CIP document, more particularly the projected costs and revenues of the obligatory elements of the CIP, are summarized in this Section III on Table 3, page 25. The reader's attention is directed to the following Article a), which provides more detail on the Transportation/Transit Element, the most costly and complex portion of the program.

a) Transportation/Transit Element

Article 5 of the Executive Summary, "Projects Accomplished to Date", provides a brief overview of the Capital Project activities FORA has been pursuing since 1995, prior to the adoption of the BRP (1997) and prior to initial land transfers to FORA (2000).

The additional background information provided below will assist the reader in understanding the premise of the transportation/transit element of the 20-year CIP document.

Background Information

Since 1995, FORA has pursued EDA Grant funds to design, environmentally assess and construct much-needed improvements on the infrastructure systems that are victims of deferred maintenance. Additionally, FORA needed to address bringing Army constructed improvements into compliance with transportation and municipal standards.

Such improvements, as summarized in Appendix B herein, were implemented predominately on the existing water system, wastewater collection system and roadway system, funded by Grants secured in 1995, 1996, and 1997.

Following adoption of the BRP, the FORA Board shifted its attention to the obligatory transportation network projects, which represent approximately seventy-eight percent of the base wide obligatory capital costs.

FORA Staff was directed to pursue funding based upon the Board's July 1998 action to re-prioritize several transportation project elements considered to be top priorities.

Funds were secured in 1998, 1999 and 2000 (EDA Grant Program) and are currently being utilized for design and environmental review, with construction to commence this year, on the following top priority obligatory projects:

California Avenue
Blanco Road
Imjin Road
Reservation Road
12th Street Gateway/Corridor

The following spreadsheet (Table 1), entitled “Transportation Network Information” graphically demonstrates the EDA Program offsets against the obligatory costs of the above-listed projects, as well as previously completed projects that have also reduced the BRP Transportation obligations. The reader’s attention is directed to off-site projects 3 and 7, as well as on-site projects F01, F03, and F010, which are the obligatory projects against which EDA funding has applied.

Transportation Network Information						1995/1996 - 2000/2001 EDA Capital Improvement Program (Obligatory Transpo \$ Offsets)							
Project #	Project Title	Project Limits	Transportation Improvement Costs July 1997 TAMC Study (May 1995 dollars)	TAMC Preliminary Nexus Improvement Costs (July 1997 Study) Fort Ord Development Share (1995 dollars)	15.96% Improvement Cost Inflation (from May 1995 to January 2001)	Project #	1995/1996	1996/1997	1997/1998	1998/1999	1999/2000	2000/2001	Net FORA Development Obligations
REGIONAL IMPROVEMENTS													
R1	Highway 1 - Hatton Canyon		\$36,000,000	\$0	\$0	R1							
R2	Highway 1 - North of Castroville		\$60,000,000	\$0	\$0	R2							
R3	Highway 1-Seaside/Sand City	Widen Highway 1 from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from Fremont Avenue Interchange south to the Del Monte Interchange.	\$20,000,000	\$6,400,000	\$7,421,440	R3							\$7,421,440
R4	U.S. 101 - Prunedale Bypass		\$236,000,000	\$0	\$0	R4							
R5	U.S. 101 - Interchanges		\$63,000,000	\$0	\$0	R5							
R6	Highway 68 - Bypass Freeway	Construct Highway 68 bypass from Highway 218/Hwy 68 to east of San Benancio Road Intersection.	\$177,000,000	\$18,054,000	\$20,935,418	R6							\$20,935,418
R7	Highway 156 Widening		\$50,000,000	\$0	\$0	R7							
R8	Highway 183 Widening		\$59,000,000	\$0	\$0	R8							
R9	Highway 218 Widening	Widen Highway 218 from 2 lanes to 4 lanes between Gen. Jim Moore Blvd and Highway 68 intersection.	\$3,590,000	\$1,629,860	\$1,889,986	R9							\$1,889,986
Subtotal Regional Improvements			\$704,590,000	\$26,083,860	\$30,246,844								\$30,246,844
OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENTS													
1	Davis Road-Widening n/o Blanco	Widen Davis Road from 2 lanes to 4 lanes from Blanco Road northerly to West Rossi Street (Northerly of SP Railway). Widen from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from West Rossi St northerly to Hwy 101.	\$10,000,000	\$5,570,000	\$6,458,972								\$6,458,972
2	Davis Road- New bridge	(PFIP T-4) Replace existing bridge, 4 lanes wide at higher elevation (at Salinas River) to avoid wash outs.	\$5,000,000	\$2,030,000	\$2,353,988	1							\$2,353,988
3	Blanco Road-Widening and bridge <i>Footnote [1]</i>	(PFIP T-5.1, T-5.2) Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes from Reservation Road to Alisal Road including the Salinas River Bridge.	\$12,378,000	\$6,337,536	\$7,349,007	2						\$1,550,000	\$5,799,007
4	Reservation Road-Widening	(PFIP T-6, T-7, T-8) Widen Reservation Road from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from Del Monte Boulevard to Crescent Avenue intersection and from Salinas Avenue intersection to Blanco Road intersection. (T-6; identifies only from Salinas Avenue intersection to Blanco Road. Construct new 4-lane connector between Reservation Road from easterly boundary of UC MBEST East Campus to Watkins Gate intersection on Reservation Road. (T-7 & T-8)	\$12,664,400	\$9,068,973	\$10,516,381	3							\$10,516,381
5	Del Monte-Seaside/Monterey	(PFIP T-9) Widen Del Monte Boulevard from 4 lanes to 5 lanes from Monterey City Limits, south of Highway 218 (Canyon Del Rey Boulevard), northerly to Fremont Boulevard. (See PFIP Project T-9)	\$10,000,000	\$3,420,000	\$3,965,832	4							\$3,965,832
6	Del Monte-Marina	PFIP T-10) Widen Del Monte Boulevard from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from proposed junction of Second Avenue extension with Del Monte Boulevard northerly to the intersection of Reservation Road.	\$5,576,300	\$4,488,922	\$5,205,354	5							\$5,205,354
7	California <i>Footnote [2]</i>	(PFIP T-12, T-13) Construct new 2-lane arterial from Tamara Court south to Third Avenue. Upgrade existing California Avenue to 2-lane arterial from Tamara Court to Reservation Road.	\$2,460,000	\$697,500	\$808,821	6						\$642,569	\$166,252
8	Crescent	(PFIP T-14) Extend existing Crescent Court southerly to join proposed Abrams Drive on the former Fort Ord (See Project # F02).	\$720,000	\$720,000	\$834,912	7							\$834,912
Subtotal (Off-Site Improvements)			\$58,798,700	\$32,332,931	\$37,493,267							\$2,192,569	\$35,300,698

Transportation Network Information

1995/1996 - 2000/2001 EDA Capital Improvement Program (Obligatory Transpo \$ Offsets)													
Project #	Project Title	Project Limits	Transportation Improvement Costs July 1997 TAMC Study (May 1995 dollars)	TAMC Preliminary Nexus Improvement Costs (July 1997 Study) Fort Ord Development Share (1995 dollars)	15.96% Improvement Cost Inflation (from May 1995 to January 2001)	Project #	1995/1996	1996/1997	1997/1998	1998/1999	1999/2000	2000/2001	Net FORA Development Obligations
ON-SITE IMPROVEMENTS													
FO1	Gateway & Misc Safety Improvements/Rehab <i>Footnote [3]</i>	(PFIP T-15, T-16.1 thru T-16.13, T-17.1 thru T-17.5, T-18.1 thru T-18.5) Construct new gateway entrances to the former Fort Ord at 5 locations: Light Fighter Drive east of Highway 1; Twelfth Street (11th Street) east of Highway 1; Imjin Road north of Reservation Road; East Garrison south of Reservation Road; General Jim Moore Boulevard at Highway 218. Safety improvements and rehabilitation of roadways suffering from deferred maintenance in various locations as defined in PFIP.	\$20,300,364	\$10,520,364	\$12,199,414	FO1			\$ 2,221,943 (Rehab & Safety)			\$ 1,200,000 (Imjin Gateway) \$993,304 (General Jim Moore/Hwy 218 Gateway)	7,784,167
FO2	Abrams	(PFIP T-39) Construct a new 2-lane arterial from intersection with the Second Avenue (link to Del Monte Boulevard, in Marina, (See project FO#8)) easterly to intersection with Crescent Court extension (See Project #8).	\$603,000	\$603,000	\$699,239	FO2							\$699,239
FO3	12th/Imjin <i>Footnote [5]</i>	(PFIP T-19, T-26) Realign Twelfth Street from Highway 1 to California Avenue as 4-lane arterial and widen Twelfth Street and Imjin Road from 2 lanes to 4-lane arterial from California Avenue to Reservation Road.	\$9,065,000	\$4,532,500	\$5,255,887	FO3						\$6,718,677	(\$1,462,790)
FO4	Blanco/Imjin Connector	(PFIP T-40) Construct new 4 lane arterial from Imjin Road (@ Abrams), northeasterly to Reservation Road (@ Blanco).	\$4,080,000	\$4,080,000	\$4,731,168	FO4							\$4,731,168
FO5	8th. Street	(PFIP T-21, T-31, & T-32) Upgrade/construct 2-lane arterial from Hwy 1 Overpass to Inter-Garrison (Eighth Street Cutoff).	\$3,821,000	\$3,248,615	\$3,767,094	FO5							\$3,767,094
FO6	Inter-Garrison	(PFIP T-38) Upgrade to 2-lane arterial from Eighth Street Cutoff easterly to Reservation Road.	\$4,480,000	\$3,808,000	\$4,415,757	FO6							\$4,415,757
FO7	Gigling	(PFIP T-23 & T-35) Upgrade/construct new 4-lane arterial from General Jim Moore Blvd. easterly to Eastside Road.	\$4,537,800	\$3,221,838	\$3,736,043	FO7							\$3,736,043
FO8	2nd. Avenue	(PFIP T-27, T-29) Upgrade/construct 4-lane arterial from Lightfighter Drive to Del Monte Blvd.	\$7,232,500	\$5,398,068	\$6,259,600	FO8							\$6,259,600
FO9	General Jim Moore Blvd.	(PFIP T-33, T-34) Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes from Normandy Road to Coe Avenue. Upgrade and reconstruct as 2-lane arterial from Coe Avenue to Highway 218.	\$6,160,600	\$3,326,724	\$3,857,669	FO9							\$3,857,669
FO10	California <i>Footnote [4]</i>	(PFIP T-20, T-30) Construct new 2-lane arterial from Third Avenue southerly to intersection with Eighth Street.	\$2,769,200	\$1,038,450	\$1,204,187	FO10						\$642,570	\$561,617
FO11	Salinas Avenue	(PFIP T-24) Construct new 2 lane arterial from Reservation Road southerly to Abrams Drive.	\$2,412,000	\$2,412,000	\$2,796,955	FO11							\$2,796,955
FO12	Eucalyptus Road	(PFIP T-37) Upgrade to 2-lane collector from General Jim Moore Boulevard to Parker Flats cut-off.	\$2,880,000	\$2,880,000	\$3,339,648	FO12							\$3,339,648
FO13	Eastside Road	(PFIP T-36) Construct new 2-lane arterial from intersection with Gigling Road (See Project #FO7) northeasterly to intersection with Imjin Road (See Project #FO3).	\$6,020,000	\$4,358,480	\$5,054,093	FO13							\$5,054,093
Subtotal (On-Site Improvements)			\$74,361,464	\$49,428,039	\$57,316,754				\$2,221,943			\$9,554,551	\$45,540,260
T3	Transit Vehicle Purchase & Replacement	15 busses	\$15,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$5,798,000	T3							\$5,798,000
T22	Intermodal Centers	(PFIP T-31) includes 3 elements: 1. Intermodal Transportation Center @ 1st. Avenue South of 8th. Street (\$2,061,000) 2. Park and Ride Facility @ 12th Street and Imjin (\$1,030,500) and 3. Park and Ride Facility @ 8th. Street and Gigling (\$ 1,259,500).	\$3,800,000	\$3,800,000	\$4,406,480	T22							\$4,406,480
Subtotal (Transit Improvements)			\$18,800,000	\$8,800,000	\$10,204,480								\$10,204,480
Total Capital Costs/Shares			\$856,550,164	\$116,644,830	\$135,261,345	Grand Totals by year			\$2,221,943			\$11,747,120	\$121,292,282

As the table demonstrates, the \$ 135,261,345 transportation/transit total obligation (January 2001 dollars) has been reduced to \$ 121,292,282 due to application of the EDA Grant Program.

The FORA Board priority project (from July 1998 Board action) not addressed above is the main gate (Lightfighter Drive) improvement project. This project, fifth of five on the priority list, is currently undergoing design funded by the 1999 EDA (Technical Assistance) Grant).

It is expected that this project will be constructed with approximately \$1.9M realized under the EDA Credit-Enhanced Bond issues if approved by the FORA Board.

This project appears as the single FY2001/2002 transportation project on the following spreadsheet (Table 2) entitled “FORA Capital Improvement Program (CIP) 2001/2002 – 2020/2021 (Phases I-IV) Transportation Network and Transit Elements”.

(It should be noted that the previously described top priority obligatory transportation projects (listed on page 18) will be advanced to construction completion during the course of FY 2001/2002).

FORA Capital Improvement Program (CIP) 2001/2002 - 2020/2021 (Phases I-IV) Transportation Network and Transit Elements

Project #	Phase I					Phase II					Phase III					Phase IV					TOTAL
	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	
Regional Improvements																					
R1																					
R2																					
R3						\$742,144	\$742,144	\$742,144	\$742,144	\$742,144	\$742,144	\$742,144	\$742,144	\$742,144	\$742,144						\$7,421,440
R4																					
R5																					
R6						\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542	\$2,093,542						\$20,935,420
R7																					
R8																					
R9						\$188,999	\$188,999	\$188,999	\$188,999	\$188,998	\$188,998	\$188,998	\$188,998	\$188,998	\$188,998						\$1,889,984
Subtotal Regional Improvements						\$3,024,685	\$3,024,685	\$3,024,685	\$3,024,685	\$3,024,684	\$3,024,684	\$3,024,684	\$3,024,684	\$3,024,684	\$3,024,684						\$30,246,844
Off-Site Improvements																					
1						\$645,898	\$645,898	\$645,897	\$645,897	\$645,897	\$645,897	\$645,897	\$645,897	\$645,897	\$645,897						\$6,458,972
2						\$235,399	\$235,399	\$235,399	\$235,399	\$235,399	\$235,399	\$235,399	\$235,399	\$235,398	\$235,398						\$2,353,988
3						\$579,901	\$579,901	\$579,901	\$579,901	\$579,901	\$579,901	\$579,901	\$579,900	\$579,900	\$579,900						\$5,799,007
4						\$1,051,639	\$1,051,638	\$1,051,638	\$1,051,638	\$1,051,638	\$1,051,638	\$1,051,638	\$1,051,638	\$1,051,638	\$1,051,638						\$10,516,381
5						\$396,583	\$396,583	\$396,583	\$396,583	\$396,583	\$396,583	\$396,583	\$396,584	\$396,584	\$396,584						\$3,965,832
6						\$520,536	\$520,536	\$520,536	\$520,536	\$520,535	\$520,535	\$520,535	\$520,535	\$520,535	\$520,535						\$5,205,354
7					\$166,252																\$166,252
8			\$83,491	\$83,491	\$667,930																\$834,912
Subtotal Off-Site Improvements			\$83,491	\$83,491	\$834,182	\$3,429,956	\$3,429,955	\$3,429,954	\$3,429,954	\$3,429,953	\$3,429,953	\$3,429,952	\$3,429,952	\$3,429,952							\$35,300,698
On-Site Improvements																					
F01 <i>Footnote [6]</i>	\$1,900,000					\$1,014,600	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063							\$7,784,167
F02			\$69,924	\$69,924	\$559,391																\$699,239
F03			(\$146,279)	(\$146,279)	(\$1,170,232)																(\$1,462,790)
F04																					
F05															\$376,712	\$376,712	\$3,013,670				\$4,731,168
F06								\$441,576	\$441,576	\$3,532,605											\$3,767,094
F07								\$373,604	\$373,604	\$2,988,835											\$4,415,757
F08			\$625,960	\$625,960	\$5,007,680																\$3,736,043
F09		\$385,767	\$385,767	\$3,086,135																	\$6,259,600
F10								\$56,162	\$56,162	\$449,293											\$3,857,669
F11						\$279,696	\$279,696	\$2,237,563													\$561,617
F12						\$333,965	\$333,965	\$2,671,718													\$2,796,955
F13								\$505,409	\$505,409	\$4,043,275											\$3,339,648
Subtotal On-Site Improvements	\$1,900,000	\$385,767	\$935,372	\$3,635,740	\$4,396,839	\$1,628,261	\$1,154,724	\$6,827,095	\$1,917,814	\$11,555,071	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$541,063	\$376,712	\$376,712	\$3,486,787	\$473,117	\$3,784,934	\$45,540,260
Transit Capital Improvements																					
T3		\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143						\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,143	\$414,141	\$5,798,000
T22 <i>Footnote [7]</i>			\$127,556	\$127,556	\$1,020,448	\$104,364	\$104,364	\$834,912										\$208,728	\$208,728	\$1,669,824	\$4,406,480
Subtotal Transit Capital Improvements		\$414,143	\$541,699	\$541,699	\$1,434,591	\$518,507	\$518,507	\$1,249,055	\$414,143	\$414,143						\$414,143	\$414,143	\$622,871	\$622,871	\$2,083,965	\$10,204,480
Grand Totals by year	\$1,900,000	\$799,910	\$1,560,562	\$4,260,930	\$6,665,612	\$8,601,409	\$8,127,871	\$14,530,789	\$8,786,596	\$18,423,851	\$6,995,700	\$6,995,700	\$6,995,699	\$6,995,699	\$6,995,699	\$790,855	\$790,855	\$4,109,658	\$1,095,988	\$5,868,899	\$121,292,282

Footnote Summary Sheet

Footnote #	Project #	Remarks
[1]	Off-Site 3	\$1,550,000 of EDA Grant Numbers 07-49-03853.01 (\$1,200,000) and 07-49-04072.02 (\$350,000) apply to this improvement.
[2]	Off-Site 7	\$ 642,569 of EDA Grant 07-49-04072.03 applies to this improvement.
[3]	On-Site F01	\$ 4,415,247 of EDA Grant Numbers 07-04072 and 07-49-03853.01 apply to these improvements.
[4]	On-Site F010	\$ 642,570 of EDA Grant 07-49-04072.03 applies to this improvement.
[5]	On-Site F03	\$ 6,718,677 EDA Grant 07-49-03853.02 applies to these improvements.
[6]	On-Site F01	\$1,900,000 in year 2001/2002 is to be applied against Lightfighter Drive Gateway Improvements as a FORA Board priority project. \$ 1,014,600 in 2006 is to be applied to the East Garrison Gateway Improvement Project. The \$ 541,063/year-10 year distribution (2006-2015) is to be applied to continue any necessary safety and rehab improvements.
[7]	T-22	The \$1,275,560 facility @ 8th Street and Gigling is scheduled for completion in 2005. The \$ 1,043,640 Park and Ride Facility @ 12th Street and Imjin is scheduled for completion in 2008. The \$ 2,087,280 Intermodal Transp Center @ 1st Ave south of 8th Street is scheduled for completion in 2020, to be coincident with the Blanco Extension Multi-modal Corridor Project.

The reader's attention is directed to Table 2, on-site project F01, against which the previously described bond issue will apply.

At this time, EDA is not forecasting any additional invitations for grants to FORA. Dwindling EDA resources as well as FORA's several years of success in receiving grant funds ahead of other competing Local Reuse Authorities (LRAs) are primary reasons given.

With that in mind, the CIP Transportation/Transit obligations will become fully dependent upon the Development Fees expected to be collected over time. This is the premise upon which Table 2 was constructed.

As previously noted, project(s) "placement" in time has been accomplished using FORA Member Agency best current knowledge of proposed and forecasted developments, balanced against anticipated Development Fee revenue to be generated from the development projects. Projects have been sequenced to assure that improvements are completed to be coincident with the added demands imposed on the transportation network by the developments.

b) Summary of obligatory CIP project elements (FY 2001/2002 through 2020/2021)

A summary of the CIP project elements and their forecasted costs and revenues are presented in the following spreadsheet (Table 3). Annual updates of the CIP will contain like summaries and will account for funding received and applied against required projects, as does this document.

Development Fee and Land Sale proceeds are sufficient to accommodate forecasted CIP costs for the full program. However, uneven accrual of these revenues require the use of tax increment and bond financing to balance cost and revenue projections.

Appendix D, Page 43 herein "CIP Revenue Discussion", provides more descriptive information on this and additional revenue generating approaches that will be employed over time as implementation of the BRP progresses.

Summary of Capital Improvement Program (CIP) 2001/2002 - 2020/2021 (Phases I - IV)

	Phase I					Phase II					Phase III					Phase IV					Build Out Total	
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21		
CIP Projects Funded By Development Fees																						
Dedicated Revenues																						
Development Fees	0	23,750,000	19,781,000	10,845,000	5,914,000	1,222,000	36,000	6,901,000	6,913,000	6,901,000	9,197,000	6,901,000	19,372,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,274,000	225,887,000	
Preston Park Lease Revenue (1)	516,000	336,000	337,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,589,000	
Preston Park Bond Allocation	3,200,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,200,000	
Tax Increment Bond (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,000,000	
Total Revenues	3,716,000	24,086,000	20,118,000	11,185,000	6,254,000	1,562,000	376,000	7,241,000	7,253,000	19,241,000	9,537,000	7,241,000	19,712,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,480,000	15,274,000	245,676,000	
Expenditures																						
Projects																						
Transportation/Transit	1,900,000	799,910	1,560,562	4,260,930	6,665,612	8,601,409	8,127,871	14,530,789	8,786,596	18,423,851	6,995,700	6,995,700	6,995,699	6,995,699	6,995,699	790,855	790,855	4,109,658	1,095,988	5,868,899	121,292,282	
Potable Water Augmentation (3)		903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	903,947	17,175,000	
Storm Drainage System			580,858	580,858	4,646,869																5,808,585	
Habitat Management	1,500,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000																6,300,000	
Public Fac. (Fire Station)	0	0	110,000	110,000	880,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,100,000	
Subtotal Projects	3,400,000	2,903,857	4,355,367	7,055,735	14,296,428	9,505,356	9,031,818	15,434,736	9,690,543	19,327,798	7,899,647	7,899,647	7,899,646	7,899,646	7,899,646	1,694,802	1,694,802	5,013,605	1,999,935	6,772,846	151,675,867	
Debt Service																						
Preston Park Debt Service	316,000	336,000	337,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,389,000	
Tax Increment Debt Service (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	9,927,000	17,897,000	
Subtotal Debt Service	316,000	336,000	337,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	340,000	1,137,000	1,137,000	1,137,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	797,000	9,927,000	22,286,000	
Total Expenditures	3,716,000	3,239,857	4,692,367	7,395,735	14,636,428	9,845,356	9,371,818	15,774,736	10,030,543	20,464,798	9,036,647	9,036,647	9,036,646	8,696,646	8,696,646	2,491,802	2,491,802	5,810,605	2,796,935	16,699,846	173,961,867	
Net Annual Revenue	0	20,846,143	15,425,633	3,789,265	(8,382,428)	(8,283,356)	(8,995,818)	(8,533,736)	(2,777,543)	(1,223,798)	500,353	(1,795,647)	10,675,354	6,783,354	6,783,354	12,988,198	12,988,198	9,669,395	12,683,065	(1,425,846)	71,714,133	
Cumulative Revenue	0	20,846,143	36,271,775	40,061,040	31,678,612	23,395,255	14,399,437	5,865,700	3,088,157	1,864,359	2,364,711	569,064	11,244,418	18,027,771	24,811,125	37,799,322	50,787,520	60,456,915	73,139,979	71,714,133		
CIP Projects Funded By Land Sales Revenue																						
Dedicated Revenues																						
Land Sales (4)	0	10,858,000	6,296,000	3,468,000	4,140,000	1,281,000	183,000	1,846,000	1,964,000	1,846,000	3,154,000	1,846,000	13,379,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,700,000	76,461,000	
Preston Park Lease Revenue (1)	109,000	242,000	246,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,117,000	
Preston Park Bond Allocation	1,400,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400,000	
Total Revenues	1,509,000	11,100,000	6,542,000	3,720,000	4,392,000	1,533,000	435,000	2,098,000	2,216,000	2,098,000	3,406,000	2,098,000	13,631,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,700,000	80,978,000	
Expenditures																						
Projects																						
Building Removal	1,400,000	0	9,000,000	9,000,000	6,762,000	1,281,000	183,000	1,846,000	1,964,000	1,846,000	3,154,000	1,846,000	13,379,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	2,989,000	0	73,400,000	
Debt Service																						
Preston Park Debt Service	109,000	242,000	246,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,117,000	
Total Expenditures	1,509,000	242,000	9,246,000	9,252,000	7,014,000	1,533,000	435,000	2,098,000	2,216,000	2,098,000	3,406,000	2,098,000	13,631,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	2,989,000	0	76,517,000	
Net Annual Revenue	0	10,858,000	(2,704,000)	(5,532,000)	(2,622,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	761,000	3,700,000	4,461,000
Cumulative Revenue	0	10,858,000	8,154,000	2,622,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	761,000	4,461,000		
Total Capital Improvement Program																						
Net Revenue - Annual Total	0	31,704,143	12,721,633	(1,742,735)	(11,004,428)	(8,283,356)	(8,995,818)	(8,533,736)	(2,777,543)	(1,223,798)	500,353	(1,795,647)	10,675,354	6,783,354	6,783,354	12,988,198	12,988,198	9,669,395	13,444,065	2,274,154	76,175,133	
Cumulative Net Revenue Before Other Costs & Contingencies	0	31,704,143	44,425,775	42,683,040	31,678,612	23,395,255	14,399,437	5,865,700	3,088,157	1,864,359	2,364,711	569,064	11,244,418	18,027,771	24,811,125	37,799,322	50,787,520	60,456,915	73,900,979	76,175,133		
Other Costs & Contingencies																						
Additional Project Costs (5)																					30,000,000	
Caretaker Costs (6)																					14,000,000	
Contingency Reserve																					30,000,000	
Total Other Costs & Contingencies																					74,000,000	
Cumulative Net Revenue																					2,175,133	

Note: This is a twenty year projected program that exceeds the lifespan of the Fort Ord Reuse Authority. Therefore, the revenues and obligations herein will be allocated accordingly to jurisdictions under the Local Agency Formation Commission process for the dissolution of the Authority.

(1) Only includes portion of lease revenue dedicated to debt service. FY 2001-02 amount for "CIP Projects Funded by Development Fees" also includes \$200,000 carryover from FY 2000-01.

(2) Tax increment bonds used only to the extent needed to fund interim negative cash flows. Debt is backed by tax increment revenue but debt service is able to be funded by development impact fees. Bonds assumed to be callable with all debt retired by end of period (FY 2020-21) with balloon payment.

(3) Total cost represents FORA's estimated share of total project costs. Phasing of costs assumes project is financed and FORA contributes to debt service payments.

(4) The Land Sales Revenues will be analyzed on a regular basis to evaluate development fee impacts and to reflect any adjustments to land prices in the region. It should be noted that staff and consultants have concluded that the net effect of indexing the Development Fee at this time does not require a corresponding decrease in the Land Sales revenue current projection of \$76 Million.

This conclusion is reached because the regional land sales value increases over the last four years since the last land sales forecast was completed are more than adequate to keep pace with the proposed indexing of the Development Fees.

(5) Potential additional base-wide expenditures not included in current project cost estimates (e.g., sound walls for major streets and street landscaping).

(6) Costs associated with potential delays in redevelopment and represent interim capital costs associated with property maintenance prior to transfer for development (as per Keyser-Marston truthing of caretaker and other costs).

Appendix A

Protocol for Review/Reprogramming of FORA Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

(Revision # 2 September 20, 2000)

- 1.) Conduct quarterly meetings with joint Committee Members from Administrative Committee, Infrastructure Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), Planning Group and Water/Wastewater Oversight Committee (WWOC). Staff representatives from the California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), and Monterey Salinas Transit (MST) will be requested to participate and provide input to the joint committee.

These meetings will be the forum to review developments as they are being planned to assure accurate prioritization and timing of CIP projects that will need to be in place to best serve the developments as they are planned to come on line.

The joint committee will balance projected project costs against projected revenues as a primary goal of any recommended reprogramming/reprioritization effort.

- 2.) Provide a mid-year and yearly report to the Board (at mid-year budget and annual budget meetings), that will include any recommendations for CIP modifications from the joint committee and staff.
- 3.) Anticipate FORA Board annual approval of a CIP program that comprehensively accounts for all obligatory base wide projects under the Base Reuse Plan (BRP).

These base wide project obligations include transportation, transit, potable water augmentation, storm drainage, habitat management, building removal and public facilities (fire station).

Appendix B

Summary of funded projects through FY 2000/2001

Table of Contents

	Page No.
A. Funding Summary to Date for EDA Grant Program – (1995-2001)	28
B. FORA Economic Development Administration (EDA) Grant Program (Capital Improvement Project)	
a. EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects – Round 1 (FY 1995)	29, 30
b. EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects Round 1 Amended (FY 1996)	30
c. EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects – Round 2 (FY 1997)	30, 31
d. EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects FORA/UCMBEST Co-Application – (FY 1998)	32
e. EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects – Round 3 (FY 1998)	32, 33, 34
f. EDA Technical Assistance Grant (Roadway Corridors) – (Design FY 1999)	34, 35
g. EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects [Round 4 Construction of Roadway Corridors] (Construction 1999/2000 and 2000/2001)	36 35, 36
h. EDA Technical Assistance Grant (Storm Drainage System) (Design FY 1999)	36, 37
i. EDA Technical Assistance Grant (Financial Analysis and Model Program for Credit Enhancement) (FY 1999)	37, 38

Funding Summary for EDA Grant Program (1995/1996 – 2000/2001)

	EDA Grant Award No.	Total Projects Cost (\$)	EDA Contribution (%)	EDA Contribution (\$)	Local Match Contribution (%)	Local Match Contribution (\$)	Local Match Contribution by Agency (\$)	
a)	07-49-04072 (Round 1 (1995))	5,230,000	100	5,230,000	0	0	No Local Match Required	
b)	07-49-04072.01 (Round 1A (1996))	1,111,112	90	1,000,000	10	111,112	CSUMB FORA (Plan/Spec Sale)	100,000 11,112
c)	07-49-04072.02 (Round 2 (1997))	2,551,048	84	2,142,880	16	408,168	MCWD MCWD FORA (DAM)*	225,000 48,000 135,168
d)	07-01-03734 (FORA/UCMBEST Co-Grant – 1998)	3,104,500	80	2,483,600	20	620,900	UCSC	620,900
e)	07-49-04072.03 (Round 3 (1998))	2,705,529	75	2,029,147	25	676,382	FORA (Preston Park Proceeds) Marina Monterey	10,846 321,285 344,251
f)	07-49-03853 T.A. (Design) (1999) (T.A. = Technical Assistance)	1,333,334	75	1,000,000	25	333,334	FORA (DAM)* CSUMB Seaside FORA (Preston Park Proceeds)	150,000 26,033 8,933 148,368
g)	07-49-03853.01 Construction Supplement #1, 1999 07-49-03853.02 Construction Supplement #2, 2000	2,397,959 6,718,677	98 96	2,350,000 6,468,677	2 4	47,959 250,000	FORA (DAM)* FORA (DAM)*	47,959 250,000
h)	07-79-03954 T.A.(S.D. Design) 1999 (S.D. = Storm Drainage)	137,500	80	110,000	20	27,500	FORA (DAM)* Seaside	13,700 13,800
i)	07-79-04202 T.A. (C.E.) 1999 (C.E. 2000 Supplement No. 1) (C.E. = Credit Enhancement)	142,856 1,250,000	70 80	99,999 1,000,000	30 20	42,857 250,000	FORA (DAM)* FORA (DAM)*	42,857 250,000
	TOTALS	26,682,515	90 (rounded)	23,914,303	10 (rounded)	2,768,212	*State of California Defense Adjustment Matching Grants	2,768,212

Appendix B

Fort Ord Reuse Authority Economic Development Administration Grant Program (Capital Improvement Projects)

A grant-by-grant, project-by-project summary for all U.S. Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration (“EDA”) Grants (awarded and pending) is provided in the descriptions that follow:

a) EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects – Round 1 (FY 1995)

Project Descriptions:

The 1995 EDA Grant (aka “Fort Ord Round I”) provided \$5.2M for the completion of improvements to the water, wastewater, roadway and metering systems on the former Fort Ord. All project elements have been completed. A brief description of each follows:

i) Metering Project

The metering project provided for the installation of gas, water and electric meters to 22 existing buildings at the Marina Municipal Airport/University of California Monterey Bay Education Science & Technology (“UC MBEST”) Center. Construction of this project commenced August 15, 1996, and was completed in December 1996. Monterey Peninsula Engineering, Inc., served as the contractor. **Notice of Completion filed by FORA January - 1997.**

ii) Roadway Project

The Round 1 Roadway Project provided safety upgrades to over 27 miles of existing roadway, including signing, striping, pavement repair and weed control. Also included in this package were installation of turning lanes/traffic signals on Reservation Road and Class II bicycle lane facilities on Intergarrison Road. Construction of this project began mid-August 1996. The work was completed in August 1997. The Don Chapin Company, Inc., served as contractor. **Notice of Completion filed by FORA September - 1997.**

iii) Water System Improvements

This project provided for the repair and upgrade of the three main operating wells and the installation of a new treatment facility. Construction of the project commenced on February 22, 1997, and was completed in August 1997. Monterey Peninsula Engineering, Inc., served as contractor. **Notice of Completion filed by FORA September -1997.**

iv) Wastewater Collection System

This project provided for the repair and upgrading of nine existing lift/pump stations, and construction of a new pump station to serve development in the Marina Municipal Airport/UCMBEST areas. Bids were opened February 7, 1997. Construction commenced March 26, 1997, and was scheduled for completion in October 1997. Time of completion was extended through November to account for additional

mechanical work required at several lift stations and the project was completed in early December 1997. Anderson-Pacific Engineering and Construction served as contractor. **Notice of Completion filed by FORA December - 1997.**

v) General Jim Moore Blvd./Hwy 218 Gateway Project

Following effective completion of the above-noted projects, an account balance of approximately \$0.7M allowed for the design and construction of the General Jim Moore Blvd./State Highway 218 signalization project. The construction of this gateway project is complete (RGW, Inc., served as contractor.). **Notice of Completion filed by FORA May - 2000.**

b) EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects - Round 1 Amended (FY1996)

Project Description:

As noted herein, the EDA Grant of 1995 provided \$5.2M for construction of improvements to water, wastewater, roadway, utility meters and the signalized intersection at General Jim Moore Blvd./Hwy 218. The 1996 EDA Grant provided an additional \$1M (as an amendment to the first grant) for additional improvements to the roadways. This additional funding was made available to FORA, in cooperation with CSUMB, through the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) and administered by EDA.

The coordinated project was developed in cooperation with the FORA Infrastructure Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), CSUMB staff, and the FORA Administrative Committee, and included full reconstruction of North-South Road (now General Jim Moore Blvd.), from Light Fighter Drive to Third Street. A contract was awarded to Granite Construction by the FORA Board at the July 1997 meeting, and construction was completed by mid December 1997. **Notice of Completion filed by FORA in January - 1998.**

c) EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects - Round 2 (FY 1997)

Project Description:

A pre-application for EDA Round 2 grant funds was submitted on August 13, 1996. This pre-application contained a prioritized project list, endorsed by the FORA Board, totaling \$15.3M in projects. However, due to Department of Commerce/EDA budgetary limits, the Grant award was scaled back to \$2.5M.

Given the funding limits, FORA staff developed, in conjunction with ITAC, the affected jurisdictions and the Administrative Committee, the following re-prioritized list of projects:

	Estimated Project <u>Cost (\$M)</u>	<u>Cumulative Total (\$M)</u>
1) Wastewater gravity main, force main and lift station serving Marina Municipal Airport, UCMBEST Center and East Garrison area.	1.5	<u>1.5</u>
2) Roadway Intersection Entry Access serving Marina Municipal Airport and UCMBEST Center	0.7	<u>2.2</u>
3) Wastewater collection system telemetry improvements	0.3	<u>2.5</u>

The FORA Board endorsed the revised list for submittal to EDA in April 1997, and the grant for these projects was awarded in August 1997. Design Services were subsequently secured through formal RFP processes, with contracts awarded by the FORA Board to Reimer Associates at the January 1998 Board meeting (project elements 1 and 2) and to Westin Engineers, Inc., at the April 1999 Board meeting (project element 3).

Project Timeline:

- 1) The wastewater gravity main, force main, and lift station component has been designed, bid and constructed under contract awarded to Mauldin-Dorfmeier, Inc. **Notice of Completion filed by FORA March 2000.**
- 2) The Roadway Intersection and Traffic Signal (Blanco Road and Research Drive (UCMBEST Center) component has been designed and will be bid concurrently with the designs underway under Item “f”), herein.
- 3) The wastewater telemetry improvement component was bid in March, with bids opened June 13, 2000. All bids received exceeded the budget for the work, requiring the bid package to be “down-scoped” to accommodate the budget limitation. At the August 2000 meeting the Board rejected all bids and authorized advertisement of the modified bid package. Since that time, the project has been re-advertised, bids opened (9/28/00) (only a single bid received), and again base bid was in excess of funds available. The Board rejected the bid received at the November 2000 Board meeting. FORA Staff, under board authorization, is working with EDA and Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) staff to effect telemetry system work under a time and materials basis, sole source contract. EDA has approved this approach under provisions of its statutory procurement process.

d) EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects - FORA/UCMBEST Co-Application (FY 1998)

Project Description:

In February 1998, the FORA Board endorsed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology Center (UCMBEST) and FORA. Under the MOA, FORA will manage the design and construction of \$3.2M in capital improvements (roadway and utility systems) that would serve the UCMBEST Center, the Marina Municipal Airport, and adjacent areas. A co-application (FORA and UCMBEST) was submitted to EDA and a grant was awarded in April 1998.

The roadways and utility systems are the initial capital improvements at the UCMBEST Center Central North Campus, consistent with the UCMBEST Center Master Plan and Marina Municipal Airport, and the FORA Base Reuse Plan.

Project Timeline:

- Design work commenced on August 18, 1998, and was completed in August 1999.
- FORA Board authorized construction contracts with Monterey Peninsula Engineering, Inc., on December 10, 1999.
- Work commenced in January 2000 and is now 100% complete. The Board authorized the filing of the Notice of Completion at the October 13, 2000 Board Meeting. **The Notice of Completion was filed by FORA in November 2000.**

e) EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects - Round 3 (FY1998)

Project Description:

FORA was authorized by EDA to submit a pre-application in January 1998 in the amount of \$3M.

The priority projects listed below were developed by the FORA staff, the ITAC committee, and the Administrative Committee, and endorsed by the FORA Board at the January 1998 Board meeting.

Priority Project List:

	Estimated Project <u>Cost (\$M)</u>	Cumulative <u>Total (\$M)</u>
1) Extension of California Avenue from Reindollar Ave. southerly to Twelfth St. connecting City of Marina street network to former Fort Ord.		
Phase 1 - Reindollar Ave to Third Ave.	0.8	
Phase 2 - Third Ave. to Twelfth St.	0.6	<u>1.4</u>
1a) York Road (Eight mile gate) extension between existing York Road and South Boundary Road connecting proposed industrial/commercial and recreational/lodging developments to existing Hwy 68 and industrial/commercial and residential development adjacent to Ryan Ranch.	0.8	<u>2.2</u>
2) East Garrison Gateway between Reservation Road and the existing arterial road system of the former Fort Ord, providing access to commercial/institutional, residential, and recreational land uses.	0.8	<u>3.0</u>

EDA authorized FORA to submit a formal application for projects 1, 1a, & 2 in the amount of \$2.67M. In September 1998, FORA accepted the offer of award by EDA, and subsequently, the FORA Board, at its December 11, 1998 meeting, authorized a professional service contract with Sandis Humber Jones (SHJ), Salinas, CA, to perform design and environmental assessment for the three (3) project elements.

Design options were developed for all three project elements by FORA staff and SHJ with the following results, most during the past calendar year:

- 1) The California Avenue Project designs, environmental assessments and construction are proceeding on the schedule noted below.
- 2) The FORA Board approved a reassignment of funds for the South Boundary connection road at York to Upper Ragsdale at its meeting in January 2000.
- 3) Monterey County has agreed to postpone improvements at the East Garrison due to realignment work (unfunded) on Reservation Road that will be necessary to create a signalized intersection at this location. Grant funds will be applied to South Boundary Road with local match provided by the City of Monterey.

Project Timeline:

California Avenue:

- Detailed design and environmental assessments - completion by March 2001.
- Bid period and contract award - April through May 2001.
- Construction commencement - by June 2001
- Construction completion - by April 2002

Upper Ragsdale Connector to South Boundary Road and South Boundary Road:

- Detailed design and environmental assessments - completion by April 2001
- Bid period and contract award - April through June 2001
- Construction commencement - by July 2001
- Construction completion - by May 2002.

f) EDA Technical Assistance Grant [Roadway Corridors] – (Design FY 1999)

Project Description:

In June 1998, EDA invited FORA to submit a pre-application for a FY 1999 Technical Assistance (Design) Grant. Towards the goal of preparing the pre-application as invited, the FORA Board endorsed the following re-prioritized list of projects at the July 1998 Board meeting:

	Estimated Project Cost (\$M)	Cumulative Total (\$M)
1) Blanco Road, widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes from north of City of Marina proposed roadway, southerly to Reservation Road.	1.1	<u>1.1</u>
2) Imjin Road, widen from 2 lanes to 5 lanes from north of UCMBEST “L” Street Roadway to Reservation Road, and modify traffic signals.	0.9	<u>2.0</u>
3) Reservation Road, widen from 4 lanes to 5 lanes (add one westbound lane) from Imjin easterly to Blanco Road.	1.3	<u>3.3</u>
4) Twelfth Street Gateway	1.0	<u>4.3</u>
5) North-South Road from PX Gas Station to 2 nd Ave.	3.2	<u>7.5</u>

The Technical Assistance (“TA”) Application in the amount of \$1.3M was submitted to EDA on August 28, 1998, with an offer of award subsequently made by EDA, and accepted by the FORA Board at its meeting of January 8, 1999.

Since that time, FORA staff has concluded negotiations with the pre-qualified consultants Creegan & D’Angelo, Inc., Monterey, CA, and Bestor Engineers, Inc., Monterey, CA, to perform design and environmental assessment for the following project elements:

- 1) Creegan & D’Angelo, Inc.:
 - a) Blanco Road widening from two lanes to four lanes (from Reservation Road to the Salinas River Bridge);
 - b) Blanco Road Extension (new four lane roadway) from Reservation Road to Imjin Road (along Old County Road alignment);
 - c) Reservation Road widening from four lanes to six lanes (from Blanco Road to West of Imjin Road); and
 - d) Imjin Road widening from two lanes to four lanes (from Neeson Road to 8th Street).
- 2) Bestor Engineers, Inc.:
 - a) 12th Street four lane corridor (12th Street Bridge/Highway 1 to Imjin Road); and
 - b) North-South Road Realignment and 2nd Avenue widening (from the 12th Street Corridor to North-South Road at the POMA Post Exchange/Gas Station).

At its meeting of March 12, 1999, the FORA Board voted 9-2 on the requested authorization to execute the two professional service contracts to accomplish the work. The FORA Board cast its second vote on the requested authorization at the April 1999 Board meeting, authorizing execution of the professional service contracts.

Project Timeline:

- Design work is currently underway, to be completed by the end of March 2001.
- Construction funding has been requested and received from EDA (See Item “g” herein).

g) EDA Grant Infrastructure Improvement Projects - Round 4 [Construction of Roadway Corridors] (Construction, FY 1999/2000 and 2000/2001)

Project Description:

At the July 9, 1999 FORA Board meeting, the Board authorized staff to submit an application to the EDA for construction funds. The construction funds would be utilized to build priority projects, in the order endorsed by the Board, for those roadway corridor projects currently under design (See Item “f”) above).

An application was submitted in August, upon invitation by the EDA, as a supplement to the FY 1999 Technical Assistance Grant discussed in Item “f” above.

The application supplement was in the amount of \$2.35M additional federal funds with a required additional local match of \$47,959. This amount will provide funds for the widening of Blanco Road and Imjin Road. This requested amount brings the EDA 1999 total to \$3.35M federal participation (90%) of \$3.73M in estimated probable costs.

FORA received an offer from EDA for the supplemental amount of \$2.35M. The Board accepted the offer at the October 8, 1999 Board meeting.

In addition, the FORA Board, at its February 2000 meeting, authorized the submittal of a pre-application to EDA for a \$2.5 million grant for construction, which was provided to EDA in April 2000. In June at EDA’s invitation, the grant application was modified to add an additional \$3 million in grant funding requests. Again in September at EDA’s invitation, the grant request was modified upward to \$6.47M, with a \$ 250,000 local match requirement. The subject grant has since been offered, and accepted by the FORA Board (September Board Meeting)

Project Timeline:

- Complete design work by March 2001
- Process and complete environmental assessments by April 2001
- Bid period/Award contract May to July 2001
- Construction period August 2001-June 2002

h) EDA Technical Assistance Grant [Storm Drainage System] - (Design FY 1999)

Project Description:

In February 1999, the EDA invited the City of Seaside, working in conjunction with FORA, to submit an application for a Technical Assistance Grant for addressing the storm drainage system and associated outfalls. Grant proceeds would be used to fund planning, design and environmental assessment services toward the goal of creating an alternative storm water runoff disposal system. More particularly, ponding/percolation areas would

be designed on the State Parks property west of Highway 1, to allow for removal of the storm drainage outfalls that currently discharge runoff into the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

An application in the amount of \$137,500 (\$110,000 EDA/\$27,500 local match) was submitted to EDA in April 1999. In July 1999 the FORA Board authorized FORA staff to accept design-management responsibilities for the grant to be awarded to the City of Seaside. In September, the City of Seaside was offered the subject grant, which was approved by the Seaside City Council on September 16, 1999. Subsequently, at their December 1999 meeting the FORA Board authorized the advertisement of a RFP for design/environmental professional services. The selection process has since been completed, and the FORA Board authorized a professional service agreement with Schaaf and Wheeler, Inc., at its April 2000 meeting.

Additionally, at its meeting in February 2000, the FORA Board authorized the filing of a Construction Grant pre-application to EDA (in the amount of \$3.3 million), which has since been submitted. A formal application has since been invited and submitted (April 16, 2001). FORA is awaiting EDA's review and response, expected to occur this summer.

Project Timeline:

- FORA/Seaside execute transfer of Grant Management (subgrant) Agreement December 1999
- Circulate RFP/Negotiate with selected consultant January - March 2000
- Award consultant agreement April 2000
- Perform design/environmental assessment work May – December 2000
- Finalize design/environmental assessment work (Grant Dependent)
- Bidding/Construction Period (grant dependent) (Grant Dependent)

i) EDA Technical Assistance Grant [Financial Analysis & Model Program for Credit Enhancement] - (FY 1999)

Project Description:

As part of its overall Finance Program, FORA has made an effort to develop a financial leveraging component that allows a limited universe of revenue sources to be used to attract additional revenues from private and other lending sources, and which will be used equitably for reuse projects in all parts of the base. To make such financial leveraging cost effective, credit enhancement mechanisms have been explored.

Following meetings between FORA and EDA staff, FORA was invited by the EDA to apply for funds to be used to design a pilot demonstration project for providing credit enhancement to expected issuance of bonds. Funds would also be used to investigate how this program can be coordinated with attempts to leverage FORA's disparate revenue sources through the use of various mechanisms, including collaboration with the Federal Home Loan Bank.

EDA awarded FORA a grant for \$ 142,856 (\$ 99,999 EDA / \$ 42,857 Local Match) and the FORA Board accepted the grant offer at the October 8, 1999 board meeting. A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for consultants was issued in February 2000; finalists were interviewed by a selection panel; and a consultant was selected in March 2000. A workshop funded by the San Francisco branch of the Federal Home Loan Bank was held at the Embassy Suites in Seaside on April 12, 2000. The consultant delivered its preliminary findings in August 2000 and the final report was completed in February 2001. In addition, a subsequent application for funding of a \$1 million letter of credit has also been awarded by EDA as the implementation phase of this program. The \$1 million grant has been augmented by a \$ 250,000 Local Match provided by the State of California Trade and Commerce Agency and FORA.

Project Timeline:

- RFQ process to select consultants/Award services contract February – March 2000
- Develop program/Prepare analysis/Publish Programmatic report Dec 1999 – Dec 2000
- Make pre-application for implementation phase July 2000
- Award of \$1 Million for implementation phase September 2000
- Close out of credit enhancement Technical Assistance Grant and issuance of Final Report Dec 2000 – Feb 2001
- Issuance of Revenue Bond using EDA credit enhancement features and implementation monies Spring/Summer 2001
- Funding Available for Designated Projects Summer 2001

Appendix C
Protocol for “Candidate Projects”
as replacements to listed mitigative transportation projects

(Revision # 5, 01/17/01, Final Version)

Introduction and Background

The Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan (BRP), adopted by the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Board of Directors in 1997, carried with it off-site and regional transportation network obligations to alleviate its fair share of traffic impacts on the regional transportation network within northern Monterey County.

A number of those obligatory projects identified are projects which have only the Fort Ord Development financial obligation secured by means of Development Fees adopted by the FORA Board. The majority of funds required to effect design, environmental review, and construction remain unsecured.

It is likely that development will proceed on the former Fort Ord before full funding is secured for those off-site and regional improvements identified in the 1997 TAMC study entitled The Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study.

Recognizing this potential eventuality, the BRP provides for the flexibility to allocate funds, earmarked as obligatory funding contributions to these off-site and regional projects, to alternative projects that can be designed, environmentally reviewed and constructed to alleviate traffic congestion and impacts associated with the development on the former Fort Ord.

Capital Improvement Program Reprioritization

One of the series of tasks assigned, as a requirement of the BRP, is the annual revisiting of the BRP Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which was adopted as a component of the BRP and entitled the Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP). This annual approval of a CIP is required to assure that as development occurs, the requisite infrastructure is timed to be implemented to support the developments that will occur on the former Fort Ord.

A joint committee of the Administrative Committee (AC), the Infrastructure Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), the Planners Working Group, the Water/Wastewater Oversight Committee (WWOC) and staff representatives from Caltrans, TAMC, AMBAG and Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) are conducting a series of working sessions to conclude in recommendations to the FORA Board on project reprioritizations within the CIP. This reprioritization of obligatory projects has as its basis the most recent forecasts available to the land use jurisdictions on size, density and geographic location of development within the former Base.

Regional Transportation Modeling

During the course of development of the BRP, both TAMC and AMBAG performed regional transportation modeling. It was TAMC that developed and concluded the Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study, 1997, from which the “preliminary nexus” obligations for transportation and transit projects were assigned to the BRP.

Since that time, TAMC is no longer conducting regional transportation modeling.

The McTam model, utilized by TAMC to conduct the regional transportation model analyses for the Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study is no longer in use. The AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model, covering three Central Coast Counties, is available for use through AMBAG. The McTam model was developed from the regional model platform.

Toward the goal of exercising the provision of the BRP noted above which provides flexibility to mitigate traffic impacts with alternative (“candidate”) projects, a process protocol is necessary to identify alternative projects that can be implemented.

AMBAG will be initiating a regional model users group via the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) of the region’s three Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. The users group, comprised of interested TAC members from the three counties, will be the regional model technical expert group that will provide technical analysis and input to the continued use and development of the model.

That process protocol, as recommended by the Joint Committee, follows.

1. Identify “candidate” projects as traffic mitigative projects in addition to obligatory projects. Attachment A “candidate projects” are projects that may be used as traffic mitigative projects. Traffic mitigative projects, if certified by the process protocol, may be added to the list. Attachment A includes “candidate projects” that have been recommended by members of the CIP joint committee. Additional “candidate projects” may be proposed for evaluation by this process.
2. Confirm, via the regional transportation model, the mitigative potential of project(s).
 - a. Model runs, with and without proposed segment(s), should be performed to quantify any trip reductions on “obligatory” project corridor segments. This quantification can then be used as the basis to determine if the “candidate” project(s) provide traffic impact mitigation as anticipated by the “obligatory” project(s) intended to be substituted, in part or in whole, by the “candidate” project(s).

AMBAG regional model users group confirms the validity of the mitigative potential of the proposed alternative projects.

- b. TAMC, as part of its work program, will perform the requisite model runs to quantify mitigative potential of the candidate projects.

- c. The FORA Board should then be requested to approve the use of (the quantified) development fees for the requested alternative project(s). This request should be made only if TAMC concurs with the mitigative potential of project(s) as alternatives to obligatory projects.

Prior to FORA Board approval, any recommendations regarding alternative projects should be discussed at regularly scheduled public forum meetings at FORA and within the affected jurisdictions so that ample input can be received from policy makers and members of the public.

3. An alternative approach is to have specific development(s) install the alternative (candidate) project(s) in addition to contributions via FORA development fees to the obligatory projects. This requirement can be as a condition of development permitting by the land use jurisdiction.

Attachment A

- a.) Golf Boulevard (City of Marina) - Evaluate mitigative potential against the Reservation Rd obligatory segments (from Del Monte Boulevard to Crescent and from Salinas Ave to Imjin Rd.), as well as any mitigative potential on other obligatory corridors such as Blanco and Davis Roads.

- b.) South Boundary Road (includes connection at York Road) (City of Del Rey Oaks)- Evaluate mitigative potential of proposed 2-lane urban collector upgrade against the Highway 68 (off-corridor) expressway, as well as any mitigative potential on other obligatory corridors such as Highway 218.

- c.) Highway 1 interchange (City of Seaside) between Coe/Fremont and Lightfighter interchanges-Evaluate mitigative potential of this interchange against the 6-laning of Highway 1 from Coe/Fremont interchange southerly to Del Monte Boulevard interchange, as well as any mitigative potential on other obligatory corridors such as the five-laning of Del Monte Boulevard within the City of Seaside.

- d.) Highway 68 improvements between Hwy 218 and York Road (City of Monterey) - Evaluate mitigative potential of additional lane in each direction (between Hwy 218/Ragsdale Drive); addition of traffic signal at Ragsdale Drive and signal modifications at York Road.

Appendix D

CIP Revenue Discussion

As noted throughout this CIP document, the primary funding sources for the CIP obligations are land sale (and lease) revenues and special taxes paid through a Community Facilities District (FORA's Development Fee). However, another essential element in funding CIP projects is tax increment revenue (or a jurisdiction's substitute, as per the Implementation Agreements) from the adoption of Redevelopment at the former Fort Ord. Note that this revenue source is relatively small vis a vis the other two main sources, does not accrue in any significant amounts for several years, and is subject to a 12-18 month lag behind project completion and revenue receipt by FORA. Therefore, while a key element in keeping development fees under control, tax increment revenue serves as a back up to the primary sources of capital. This is illustrated as follows:

Over the development horizon of the BRP, the noted funding sources are sufficient to fully fund the CIP obligations based on current cost and revenue estimates. However, both of these funding sources are obviously dependent on the pace of development and the pattern/type of development. Consequently, available funding in particular interim years may be insufficient to fund requisite costs in that year, as is evidenced by this reprogrammed CIP based on the current forecasts of development type, timing and patterns. To bridge the interim negative cash flow years, a number of resources are available to FORA, including the following two-funding/financing tools, which can be employed to bridge the deficit years:

- 1.) Tax increment revenue surpluses (available after funding FORA operating costs), and
- 2.) Issuance of tax increment bonds funded by future tax increment surpluses.

It is also anticipated that FORA will continue to seek State and Federal Grant funding to offset obligatory costs. To date this funding tool has proven valuable in reducing the magnitude of the FORA capital obligations. The FORA Board will also be asked to index development fees to inflation. Note that the capital improvement costs outlined in this report have increased approximately 16% since first compiled in 1995.

Additionally, as FORA performs its reviews of development timing and patterns, the opportunity to defer placement of projects to later years may become apparent. This would allow the land sale and impact fees to accrue in greater magnitudes to cover cost obligations. The most obvious candidate for such cash flow "smoothing out" would be the building removal program, for which an assumption has been made of an annual expenditure of \$9 million a year, for an 8 year period. These expenditures could be timed more precisely to eliminate any potential deficit years. In addition, efforts to reduce the overall magnitude and impact of the building removal program, through the Army financed Thermo-Chemical conversion demonstration program, or other cost saving devices, will likely be employed. Finally, significant portions of the building removal program will be accomplished by individual developers themselves, as they clear impediments to their projects in exchange for credits to their land purchases. This will allow for further smoothing out of any individual cash flow issues.

With these tools, or a combination thereof, the FORA Board should be able to fully implement the capital project mitigations and obligations that are its responsibility under the BRP and accompanying FEIR.