



FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

8:30 a.m. Wednesday, January 4, 2017

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933 (FORA Conference Room)

AGENDA

THE FORA BOARD AND STAFF WISH YOU A HAPPY, HEALTHY, AND PEACEFUL 2017!

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

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

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

ACTION

- a. December 14, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes

6. JANUARY 13, 2017 BOARD AGENDA PACKET REVIEW

7. BUSINESS ITEMS

- a. Capital Improvement Program
 - i. Development Forecasts Request
 - ii. Caretaker Costs Reimbursement Policy

8. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

9. ADJOURNMENT

NEXT MEETING: January 18, 2017

-START-

DRAFT BOARD
PACKET

**REGULAR MEETING
FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Friday, January 13, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

910 2nd Avenue, Marina, CA 93933 (Carpenters Union Hall)

AGENDA

ALL ARE ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT QUESTIONS/CONCERNS BY NOON JANUARY 12, 2017.

THE FORA BOARD AND STAFF WISH YOU A HAPPY, HEALTHY, AND PEACEFUL 2017!

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. CLOSED SESSION

- a. *Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation, Gov. Code 54956.9: Keep Fort Ord Wild v. Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA), County of Monterey Superior Court Case No.: M114961*
- b. *Conference with Legal Counsel – Pending Litigation, Gov. Code 54956.9: Successor Agency to Redevelopment Agency of the County of Monterey v. Michael Cohen, in his official capacity as Director of the State of California Department of Finance (DOF), etc. County of Sacramento Superior Court Case No.: 34-2016-80002403*
- c. *Potential Litigation*

3. ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION ACTION

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

5. ROLL CALL

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND CORRESPONDENCE

7. CONSENT AGENDA **INFORMATION/ACTION**

CONSENT AGENDA consists of routine items accompanied by staff recommendation.

- a. Approve November 4, 2016 Board Meeting Minutes
- b. Approve December 9, 2016 Board Meeting Minutes
- c. Administrative Committee
- d. Veterans Issues Advisory Committee
- e. Water/Wastewater Oversight Committee
- f. Travel Report
- g. Public Correspondence to the Board
- h. 2017 Board Officers Election
- i. Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement-Quarterly Report Update
- j. Building Removal Update

8. BUSINESS ITEMS

- a. Economic Development Quarterly Status Update
- b. Habitat Conservation Plan Report Update
- c. Authorize Water Augmentation Study Solicitation

9. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

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

10. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

11. ADJOURNMENT

NEXT BOARD MEETING: February 10, 2017

**FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**
Friday, November 4, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.
910 2nd Avenue, Marina, CA 93933 (Carpenters Union Hall)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair O'Connell called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair O'Connell led the pledge of allegiance.

3. CLOSED SESSION

- a. *Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation, Gov. Code 54956.9: Keep Fort Ord Wild v. Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA), County of Monterey Superior Court Case No.: M114961*
- b. *Conference with Legal Counsel – Pending Litigation, Gov. Code 56956.9: Successor Agency to Redevelopment Agency of the County of Monterey v. Michael Cohen, in his official capacity as Director of the State of California Department of Finance (DOF), etc. County of Sacramento Superior Court Case No.: 34-2016-800002403*

4. ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Closed session was conducted between 2:05 – 2:13 p.m. Jon Giffen, Authority Counsel advised that there were no items to report from the closed session.

5. ROLL CALL

Mayor Joe Gunter (City of Salinas)
Council member Alan Haffa (City of Monterey)
Mayor David Pendergrass (City of Sand City)
Pro-Tem Ian Oglesby (City of Seaside)
Council member Janet Reimers (City of Carmel)
Mayor Pro-Tem Frank O'Connell (City of Marina)
Council member Casey Lucius (City of Pacific Grove)

Mayor Ralph Rubio (City of Seaside)
Mayor Jerry Edelen (City of Del Rey Oaks)
Council member Gail Morton (City of Marina)
Supervisor Dave Potter (County of Monterey)
Supervisor John Phillips (County of Monterey)

Ex-officio (Non-Voting) Board Members Present: Dr. Eduardo Ochoa (CSUMB), Tom Moore (MCWD), Bill Collins (Ft Ord BRAC Office), Colonel Brown (US Army), Vicki Nakamura (MPC), Donna Blitzer (UCSC), Erica Parker (29th State Assemblymember Stone), Nicole Charles (17th State District Senator Monning), Dr. PK Diffenbaugh (MPUSD), Dr. Scott Brandt (UCSC), Lisa Rheinheimer (MST),

Absent: Alec Arago (20th Congressional District)

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND CORRESPONDENCE

Michael A. Houlemard Jr. announced the great success of the Prevailing Wage Jurisdictional Training that was held November 1st, 2016. Also, Mr. Houlemard provided notice that the FORA offices would be closed on November 10th for staff training/development retreat in preparation for 2017 and also on November 11th in observance of Veteran's Day.

Public comment was opened, there were no comments received.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

Chair O'Connell reviewed the items on the consent agenda and made mention of corrections to the minutes that were provided in advance of the meeting.

- a. October 14, 2016 Board Meeting Minutes
- b. Administrative Committee
- c. Veterans Issues Advisory Committee
- d. Water/Wastewater Oversight Committee
- e. Travel Report
- f. Public Correspondence to the Board

***MOTION:** On motion by Board member Rubio and seconded by Board member Edelen and carried by the following vote the Board approved Consent Agenda items 6a-6f with amendments to item 6a – 10/14 Board Meeting minutes to reflect corrections submitted by TAMC.*

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

8. BUSINESS ITEM

a. Eastside Parkway Environmental Review Contract 2d Vote

Jonathan Brinkmann, Principal Planner, reviewed the recommendation for the item and the motion presented during the first vote. Mr. Brinkmann also informed the Board that further communications were received on the item on November 3rd after business hours. Public comment was opened, there were no comments received.

***MOTION:** On motion by Board member Rubio and seconded by Board member Edelen and carried by the following vote, the Board authorized the Executive Officer to negotiate and execute a professional services agreement FC-05102010 for the oversight and completion of the Eastside Parkway Environmental Review, not to exceed \$568,100 in additional funding and allow the Executive Officer to work with Whitson Engineering on the final structure of the environmental review based on the 90% design work already completed.*

***NOES:** Morton, O'Connell, Haffa*

MOTION PASSED

b. University of California Monterey Bay Education Science and Technology Center Status Update

Josh Metz, Economic Development Manager, introduced Dr. Scott Brandt, University of California Santa Cruz, Vice Chancellor. Dr. Brandt provided an update about the partnerships and efforts of UCMBEST, FORA and Monterey County representatives.

Mr. Metz informed the Board that the meetings held are not formal and/or Brown Act committees.

Public comment was opened and there were no comments received. This item was for information only.

c. Consistency Determination: Del Rey Oaks Monument RV Resort

Jonathan Brinkmann provided a brief presentation on the item and reminded the Board and informed the public that on October 21st Del Rey Oaks submitted the RV Resort for consistency determination and was distributed in the Administrative Committee packet. Del Rey Oaks adopted the Monument RV Resort Initiative Measure at its May 24, 2016 City Council meeting. Per the California Elections Code sections 9215 and 1405(b), it allows jurisdictions to adopt General Plan and Zoning amendments through initiative measures which also makes these projects exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Staff recommended the Board to conduct a public hearing regarding the City of Del Rey Oaks General Plan and Zoning Code amendments, the recreational vehicle park development entitlements, and their consistency with the Base Reuse Plan.

Staff answered questions from the Board regarding the initiative measure process. Del Rey Oaks Attorney, Brian Finegan provided information about the exemptions that initiative measures provide jurisdictions.

Public comment was opened and there were no comments received.

***MOTION:** On motion by Board member Rubio and second by Board member Edelen the Board voted to certify the RV Resort as consistent with the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan.*

***AYES:** O'Connell, Gunter, Haffa, Pendergrass, Oglesby, Reimers, Lucius, Rubio, Edelen, Phillips, Potter*

***NOES:** Morton*

A second vote will be conducted at the next scheduled Board meeting.

d. Transition Task Force Committee Recommendation

Steve Endsley, Assistant Executive Officer, provided a presentation on the background and work of the Transition Task Force (TTF) since its formation in April 2016. Sheri Damon, Prevailing Wage Coordinator, provided details regarding the obligations and cost in a power point presentation. As presented and recommended through the Administrative and Executive Committees, the Board is asked to recommend legislative extension through 2037 by initiating the legislative amendment process and continue 2020 transition planning.

Public comment was received on the item.

***MOTION:** On motion by Board member Rubio and seconded by Board member Haffa to authorize the Executive Officer to explore options with the State Legislation offices for considering and*

initiating the extension of the Fort Ord Reuse Authority through 2037 and sustain through 2020 transition planning, risk financial analysis, and identify resource options.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: *On motion by Board member Morton and seconded by Board member O'Connell and carried by the following vote, the Board authorized the Executive Officer to coordinate and seek support from the State Legislator (17th State Senate District and 29th State Assembly District) to assure post FORA funding for jurisdictions following FORA sunset on or before June 30, 2020 in compliance with Title 7.85 of the California Government Code entitled Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act and the pursuing of a FORA extension for a reasonable period of time but not to a date beyond June 30, 2037 and secondly, to reconvene the Transition Task Force to commence the steps necessary for a transition plan in compliance with Title 7.85 of the California Government Code.*

The Board provided comments on the item and the motions made.

The chair received a call for the question, which has to be accepted by a majority vote. All Ayes for a call for the question. Motion Passed Unanimously

Vote on the Substitute Motion:

AYES: Morton, O'Connell

NOES: Gunter, Haffa, Pendergrass, Oglesby, Reimers, Lucius, Rubio, Edelen, Phillips

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Potter (only at time of vote)

Vote on the Motion:

AYES: Gunter, Haffa, Pendergrass, Oglesby, Reimers, Rubio, Edelen, Phillips

NOES: Morton, O'Connell, Lucius

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Potter (only at time of vote)

A second vote will be conducted at the next scheduled Board meeting.

e. Authorize Industrial Hygienist Professional Services Solicitation

(moved to item 8f for discussion)

Stan Cook, Senior Program Manager, provided a presentation overview of the building removal solicitation status on "Surplus II" in Seaside and the "Stockade" in Marina. Per the October 2016 FORA Board report on Building Removal, staff prepared an open solicitation for professional Industrial Hygienist services that includes sampling, testing, characterizing hazardous materials and removal at the Stockade. Staff is requesting authorization to allow the Executive Officer to solicit, negotiate and execute a Professional Services contract for an Industrial Hygienist to support the former Fort Ord Stockade building removal not to exceed \$110,000.

MOTION: *On motion by Board member Morton and seconded by Board member Rubio and carried by the following vote, the Board authorized the Executive Officer to solicit, negotiate and execute a Professional Services contract for an Industrial Hygienist to support the former Fort Ord Stockade building removal not to exceed \$110,000.*

Public comment was opened and none was received.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

f. 2017 Legislative Agenda (Moved to item 8e for discussion)

Mr. Houlemard reviewed the legislative agenda and pointed out that the revised draft 2017 Legislative Agenda sent to the Board members (and available for public review) was different from the one included in the packet and presented to the Legislative Committee. The revised draft agenda was the product of the Legislative Committee meeting held on October 31st.

The following corrections were noted on the final 2017 Legislative Agenda:

- Public Safety Officer Training item is label "I."
- Item J – Legislative Coordination Regarding FORA Transition Issues – the proposed position adopted by the Legislative Committee indicates "Coordinate and seek support from State Legislature (17th State Senate District and 29th State Assembly District) to assure post-FORA funding for jurisdictions and reuse obligations."
- Item E – Augmented Water Supply – added a specific coordination item for potential Monterey Bay Region water bond funding and FORA augmentation needs.
- Item C – Economic Recovery Support – add additional discussion about adding creative financing for building removal.

Public comment was opened and none was received.

***MOTION:** On motion by Board member Edelen and seconded by Board member Rubio to adopt the 2017 Legislative Agenda.*

***SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** On motion by Board member Morton and seconded by O'Connell and carried by the following vote the Board moved to adopt the Legislative Agenda with change to the proposed position of the "Legislative Coordination Regarding FORA Transition Issues," to read "coordinate and seek support from State Legislature (17th State Senate District and 29th State Assembly District) to assure post-FORA funding for jurisdictions following FORA sunset on June 30, 2020 in compliance with Title 7.85 of the California Government Code entitled "Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act" and pursuing of a FORA extension for a reasonable period of time, but not for a date beyond June 2037."*

SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

9. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public comment was opened, there were no comments received.

10. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

Board member Lucius announced that this would be her last FORA Board meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT

12. The meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES
 2:00 p.m., Friday, December 9, 2016 | Carpenters Union Hall
 910 2nd Avenue, Marina, CA 93933

1. CALL TO ORDER at 2:02 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Led by Chair O'Connell

3. ROLL CALL

(* = Voting Members)

Present

Mayor Pro-Tem
Frank O'Connell
(Chair)*

Supervisor John
Phillips*

Mayor Jerry
Edelen*

Supervisor Dave
Potter*

Council member
Gail Morton*

Hunter Harvath
(MST)

William Lee
(MCWD)

Mayor Ralph
Rubio*

Mayor Pro-Tem
Ian Oglesby*

Mayor David
Pendergrass*

Mayor Joe
Gunter*

Council member
Jan Reimers*

Dr. Walter
Tribley (MPC)

Erica Parker (20th
Congressional
District)

Todd Muck
(TAMC)

Dr. P.K.
Diffenbaugh
(MPUSD)

Donna Blitzer
(UCSC)

Dr. Eduardo
Ochoa (CSUMB)

Col. Lawrence
Brown (US Army)

Absent

Supervisor Jane Parker*
Council member Casey
Lucius*

Alec Arago

Nicole Charles

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

a. Resolutions Acknowledging Service

Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Executive Officer, Michael Houlemard read resolutions acknowledging service for Board members Casey Lucius, Dave Potter and Ian Oglesby. Mr. Potter and Mr. Oglesby provided comments expressing gratitude for their opportunities to serve and the value of FORA's work for the region.

On motion by Board Member Rubio, second by Board Member Phillips and carried by the following vote the Board moved to approve the resolutions acknowledging service for Board members Casey Lucius, Dave Potter and Ian Oglesby.

Motion Passed Unanimously

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Approve November 4, 2016 Board Meeting Minutes
- b. Administrative Committee
- c. Veterans Issues Advisory Committee
- d. Water/Wastewater Oversight Committee
- e. Public Correspondence to the Board
- f. 2017 Board of Directors Meeting Calendar
- g. Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Audited Annual Financial Report
- h. Agency Reimbursement Agreements Status Report (Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency & Pure Water Monterey Reimbursement Agreement)
- i. Habitat Conservation Plan Update

Item 5a – Approve November 4, 2016 Board Meeting Minutes was pulled from the agenda to allow further review of specific wording to ensure the record is complete and accurate.

Public comment was opened and received. There were no comments from the Board.

On motion by Board Member Gunter, second by Board Member Rubio and carried by the following vote, the Board moved to approve the consent agenda and to move item 5a – Approve November 4, 2016 Board Meeting Minutes to the January meeting.

Motion Passed Unanimously

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

- a. Transition Task Force Recommendation 2nd Vote

There were no comments from the Board or the public.

On motion by Board Member Rubio, second by Board Member Phillips and carried by the following vote, the Board moved to accept the Transition Task Force recommendation.

*Ayes: O'Connell, Phillips, Edelen, Potter, Rubio, Oglesby, Pendergrass, Gunter, Reimers
Noes: Morton*

Motion Passed

- b. Consistency Determination: Del Rey Oaks Monument RV Resort 2nd Vote

There were no comments from the Board or the public.

On motion by Board Member Gunter, second by Board Member Rubio and carried by the following vote, the Board voted to certify the RV Resort as consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

Ayes: O'Connell, Phillips, Edelen, Potter, Rubio, Oglesby, Pendergrass, Gunter, Reimers

Noes: Morton

Motion Passed

c. Water Augmentation Status Update

Peter Said, Project Manager, presented on the Water Augmentation status and the next steps which include:

- January – Approve Alternatives Study Solicitation
- February – Advertise & Select Consultant
- March – Board Approval of Contract

There were no comments from the Board or the public. This item was information only.

d. Authorize General Engineering Services Agreement Solicitation

Mr. Said at reviewed the needs for General Engineering Services to support existing projects in building removal, transportation and urgent/emergency needs, etc.; to provide engineering/construction management and to assist on-going operations/program definition. This methodology serves as an alternative to hiring staff to fulfill these duties, which would exceed the estimated consultant cost of \$160,000 a year for 5 years or until transition.

Staff answered questions from the Board regarding the details and what support would be included in the services agreement. Mr. Houlemard provided comments about the concerns Board members had regarding the PERS liability. Pursuing this services agreement averts increased PERS liability by not creating positions.

On motion by Board member Rubio, second by Board member Edelen, the Board authorized the Executive Officer to solicit qualifications, select a firm, and negotiate a professional services contract for General Engineering and Construction Management support of CIP projects not to exceed \$800,000.

Motion Passed Unanimously

7. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

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

Comments were received from two Marina residents about blight in the former Fort Ord in City of Marina's jurisdiction asserting FORA had not provided building removal support to Marina and a comment from Seaside resident, Tom Mancini regarding the wait time for the new restaurants on 2nd Avenue.

8. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

Board member Rubio and Edelen thanked Board members Oglesby & Potter for their service contributions to the Board and to the community.

9. ADJOURNMENT at 2:36 p.m.

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT		
CONSENT AGENDA		
Subject:	Administrative Committee	
Meeting Date:	January 13, 2017	INFORMATION
Agenda Number:	7c	

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive a report from the Administrative Committee.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The Administrative Committee met on December 14, 2016. The minutes approved at this meeting are attached (**Attachment A**).

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by the FORA Controller_____

Staff time for the Administrative Committee is included in the approved annual budget.

COORDINATION:

Administrative Committee

Prepared by_____ Approved by_____

Dominique Jones Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
8:30 a.m., Wednesday, November 30, 2016 | FORA Conference Room
920nd Avenue, Suite A, Marina CA 93933

1. **CALL TO ORDER at 8:36 a.m.**

Michael Houlemard called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. The following were present:

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

Members Present:

Layne Long (Marina)*AR
Craig Malin (Seaside)
Melanie Beretti (Monterey
County)*
Steve Matarazzo (UCMBEST)
Anya Spear (CSUMB)
Vicki Nakamura (MPC)
Todd Muck (TAMC)
Bill Collins (US ARMY BRAC)
Lisa Rheinheimer (MST)

FORA Staff: Michael

Houlemard Steve
Endsley Dominique
Jones Jonathan
Brinkmann Mary
Israel
Josh Metz
Peter Said

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Led by Anya Spear

3. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

a. Oak Woodlands Community Meetings

Mary Israel, Associate Planner, provided a verbal report on the Oak Woodlands community meetings held in Seaside (6 p.m. November 15) and in Monterey County (10 a.m. November 19). Ms. Israel invited the Committee and the public to visit www.oakwoodlands.org for more information and further details on the next steps and how to get involved.

Anya Spear introduced new CSUMB Senior Planner, Matt McCluney.

Josh Metz, Economic Development Manager, advised the Committee and public that the Regional Coworking Space Market Feasibility Study had been released and available on FORA's website. Also, Mr. Metz informed the Committee that the Economic Development department would be kicking off its job survey in January 2017 and present its results/findings at the April Board meeting.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There were no comments received from the public.

5. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

a. November 16, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes

On motion by Committee member Beretti and Seconded by Committee member Malin and carried by the following vote, the Administrative Committee approved the regular meeting minutes for the November 16, 2016 Administrative Committee meeting with the corrections to the roll call in which Melanie Beretti (Monterey County) was present and Carl Holm was absent.

Motion passed unanimously

There was no comment received on the item.

6. DECEMBER 9, 2016 BOARD PACKET REVIEW

Mr. Houlemard reviewed each of the items on the draft board packet for December 9. Peter Said, Project Manager, provided further insight on the business item 7c (Water Augmentation Status Update) and answered questions from the committee in regards to information/documentation to be made available from MCWD. Inquires/Request have been made for MCWD to provide the requested information to be distributed to the FORA Board. Mr. Said also reviewed the purpose of business item 7d - Authorize General Engineering Services Agreement Solicitation. No changes were made to the agenda.

7. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Capital Improvement Program

Jonathan Brinkmann, Principal Planner, reviewed the item and walked the committee and public through the items provided in the packet. First, a memorandum providing the committee with information regarding the process of the annual update of the CIP and also the development forecast and the forecasts received from the jurisdictions in 2015. The CIP background information and a 5- year land sales landscaping tool.

i. Development Forecast Request

The 2016 jurisdictional forecast are due to be submitted to FORA by December 16. Comments were received from the public. Staff answered.

ii. Caretaker Cost Reimbursement Policy

Mr. Brinkmann reviewed the caretaker cost policy and worksheet. Comments were received from the public. Staff answered.

b. Transportation Agency of the Monterey County (TAMC) Fee Allocation Study Mr. Houlemard introduced the item and the participants/support of the presentation: Consultant Kimley-Horne, TAMC Deputy Executive Director, Todd Muck and TAMC Principal Transportation Planner, Mike Zeller, and FORA Principal Planner, Jonathan Brinkmann.

Mr. Brinkmann reviewed the background, project schedule, jurisdiction coordination and the next steps. In 1997 the Fort Ord Reuse Plan established a "fair share financing program" in which it states that FORA will fund its "fair share" of "on-site", "off-site", and "regional" roadway and transit capital improvements based on the nexus analysis of the TAMC regional transportation model.

Every 10 years a fee reallocation study is completed. The 2005 FORA fee reallocation study identified need for FORA transportation obligations to be reviewed in context with regional and local planning. As a result, in 2012 FORA Jurisdictions implementation agreements were amended and established that transportation/transit obligation was to be fixed at \$112.7 million (though may be indexed with CCI).

On July 8, 2016, the FORA Board approved the CIP and requested that staff return with a revised CIP after the Fee Reallocation study and Biennial Formulaic Fee Review were completed. Initially, the study was expected to be released in August 2016. The revised schedule currently indicates the study to be available in early 2017.

Staff and consultants answered questions for the committee and public regarding the maps and tables provided.

8. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

- a. Request for copy of Kimley-Horn presentation.
- b. December 28 Administrative Committee meeting – canceled.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:35am

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT		
CONSENT AGENDA		
Subject:	Veterans Issues Advisory Committee	
Meeting Date:	January 13, 2017	INFORMATION
Agenda Number:	7d	

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive an update from the Veterans Issues Advisory Committee (VIAC).

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The VIAC met on December 14, 2016. The agenda included a status of the California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery, fundraising efforts, VA/DoD Veterans Clinic status, Veterans Transition Center Housing construction and the historical preservation project. The VIAC approved the meeting minutes of September 22, 2016 (**Attachment A**) and October 27, 2016 (**Attachment B**).

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

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

COORDINATION:

VIAC

Prepared by _____
Dominique Jones

Approved by _____
Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

**FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY
VETERANS ISSUES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (VIAC)
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES**

3:00 P.M. Thursday, September 22, 2016

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A., Marina California | FORA Conference Room

1. CALL TO ORDER

Confirming quorum, Chair Jerry Edelen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

James Bogan, Disabled American Vets

Colonel Lawrence Brown, Presidio of Monterey

Mayor Jerry Edelen, City of Del Rey Oaks (Chair)

Richard Garza, Central Coast Veterans Cemetery Foundation (CCVC Foundation)

Edith Johnsen, Veterans Families

Jack Stewart, Fort Ord Veterans Cemetery Citizens Advisory Committee

Sid Williams, Monterey County Military & Veterans Advisory Commission (VAC)

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE led by Erica Parker

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Robert Norris, FORA Principal Analyst, provided information to the Committee regarding the Veteran of the Year Award on November 5 and Heroes Open on October 29. Chair Edelen announced that Col. (Ret.) Terry Bear is no longer with the Veterans Transition Center and recognized his impact, great contribution and thanked him for his service to the organization.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no comments received from the public.

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

a. July 28, 2016 (Correction to the agenda)

The agenda was posted with the error that the minutes to be approved were for August 25, 2016; Nicole Valentino (FORA) advised the Committee that a correction should be noted that the minutes to be approved are for July 28, 2016.

On motion by Jack Stewart and seconded by Richard Garza and carried by the following vote, the VIAC moved to approve the meeting minutes of July 28, 2016.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery Status Report

Mr. Norris led the Committee through each of the business items.

i. Cemetery Administrator's Status Report

Close to 1,000 applications have been received and about 900+ approvals with the schedule for services going well into the early part of 2017.

ii. Cemetery Advisory Committee (CAC) Working Meeting Agenda

Planning Committee has been meeting weekly for about 3 weeks, program has been completed, including details like order of speaker preliminary meeting announcements and media releases are scheduled for distribution.

iii. Endowment Parcel MOU

A meeting with the County is still in the works to be scheduled and the purpose would be to clarify the MOU regarding the use of the land that was dedicated to fund the expansion operations of the cemetery; and that's the agreement is primarily between Seaside, County, the foundation and FORA – regarding the use of the parcel.

iv. Opening Ceremony

A tentative order of events/agenda has been established, invitations and parking/transportation details are being developed and coordinated with the planning committee. Once the VIP list is confirmed other elements will be coordinated in conjunction with the City of Seaside and the Army. Handicap/Disabled transportation will also be provided from the drop off point to the site of the ceremony – Monterey Bay Vets has contributed greatly to that effort. Benches were donated by various individuals through the Marina Foundation and currently there is a backlog of orders that are waiting to be placed. A banner has been proposed that will recognize the supporters of the site. Mr. Norris did confirm that there will be Color Guard present at the ceremony and provided through the California National Guard. Colonel Brown requested information about the status of a canon salute. Also, the commemorative lapel pin was also discussed and that the size of the pin will be between 1" to 1.5." Media has expressed interest in having a presence at the ceremony.

v. Military and Veterans Affairs Pre-Enrollment Report-not at this time.

b. Fundraising Status

i. CCVCF Status Report

Richard Garza provided updated the fundraising efforts that have been done and the importance of continuing those efforts. A fundraising booth was set up at the Monterey County Fair and several speaking engagements have been set up in Santa Cruz County. There is an ongoing effort to diversify the outreach and fundraising efforts.

c. VA/DoD Veterans Clinic Status Report

Jack Stewart, James Bogan and Col. Brown provided input regarding the VA/DoD Clinic status.

i. Historic Flag Pole Variance Update

ii. Construction Schedule

- d. Veterans Transition Center Housing Construction
Robert – the letter is at the very final stages and perhaps that there is positive and definite approval of the housing construction. Mr. Fagan added that Marina has put in a request for Environmental Review and hoping for a resolution next week and a letter is being prepared and facilitate approval.
- e. Historical Preservation Project
Cliff Guinn – No report

7. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

- a. Jack Stewart – Mr. Guinn is now the Chairman of the Fort Ord retiree council.
- b. COL Brown announced DLI 75th anniversary (same day as veterans).
- c. Richard Garza – request for 501 c3 status has been granted, backdated to 2002.
- d. James Bogan – Monterey Bay Vets is opening dive program; Fishing derby - Oct 1.
- e. J. Fagan – In-kind contributions for VTC event; Col. Brown was directed to write a national article of the event.
- f. Cliff Guinn – shared a story about a vet that missed his bus and was provided a free ride by an Uber driver to Santa Clara.

8. ADJOURNMENT at 3:33pm

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: October 27, 2016



**FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY
VETERANS ISSUES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (VIAC)
MEETING MINUTES**

3:00 P.M. Thursday, October 27, 2016

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A., Marina California | FORA Conference Room

1. CALL TO ORDER

Confirming quorum, Chair Jerry Edelen called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Committee Members:

James Bogan, Disabled American Vets

Colonel Lawrence Brown, Presidio of Monterey

Mayor Jerry Edelen, City of Del Rey Oaks (Chair)

Richard Garza, Central Coast Veterans Cemetery Foundation (CCVC Foundation)

Edith Johnsen, Veterans Families

Jack Stewart, Fort Ord Veterans Cemetery Citizens Advisory Committee

Sid Williams, Monterey County Military & Veterans Advisory Commission (VAC)

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE led by Robert Norris

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Robert Norris, FORA Principal Analyst, announced correspondence received – a letter of thanks from the Secretary of California Veterans Affairs for FORA's work and a letter from Col. (Ret.) Terry Bear, seeking approximately 6 volunteers for the Kiwanis Club at the "Taylormade" Pebble Beach Invitational Golf Event on November 17-19. Edith Johnsen provided details regarding the 10 year anniversary memorial services in honor of her late husband, Major (Ret.) Frederick William Johnsen at the Veterans Cemetery in Seaside. The burial services for Master Chief Abel Quinones, US Navy, was also announced and will take place on December 9.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no comments received from the public.

5. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. California Central Coast Veterans Cemetery Status Report

Mr. Norris led the Committee through each of the business items. Some of the information in the status report was provided by updates from Daria Maher and Dan Fahey, Veterans Outreach, Memorials and Cemeteries California Department of Veterans Affairs.

- i. Cemetery Administrator's Status Report

Approximately 1,076 applications have been processed covering over 1,800 people which includes 1,033 veterans, 17 veteran couples, 809 spouses and 7 children of veterans. These numbers lead to more work to be done for future considerations. These issues will have to be covered between the VIAC and Cemetery Advisory Committee (CAC) to review the existing cemetery master plan and revise certain elements before a pre-application can be accepted. Certain considerations will be made regarding the ratio of in-ground burials, comment on "green burial" options and look at the getting a pre-application submitted in the spring of 2017.
- ii. Cemetery Advisory Committee (CAC) Working Meeting Agenda

The working group received materials (available to those that express interest) from Mr. Norris regarding the draft pre-application for the expansion phase. A meeting for the working group to review and complete the "needs statement" is likely to be scheduled prior to the next CAC meeting.
- iii. Endowment Parcel MOU

FORA Executive Officer, Michael Houlemard, will be meeting with the County Administrator in regards to a list of issues that have been stagnant, including but not limited to the Endowment Parcel.
- iv. Opening Ceremony

With updates from Daria Maher, it was estimated that over 600 people attended the Opening Ceremony for the Veterans Cemetery on October 11. Comments were received about their experience and appreciation of the opening ceremony service.
- v. Military and Veterans Affairs Pre-Enrollment Report

No report at this time. Question regarding the application – in-ground burial is not provided as an option for applicants to choose. Mr. Norris will follow up with more information at the next meeting.
- b. Fundraising Status
 - i. CCVCF Status Report

Despite challenges that have delayed the progress of the fundraising efforts, the CCVCF has gained some momentum since being identified as a 501(3)c organization. There has been a significant change in the response from other organizations.
- c. VA/DoD Veterans Clinic Status Report

Mr. Norris reported that Mr. Houlemard and other FORA staff attended the "soft ribbon cutting" ceremony for the VA/DoD Veterans Clinic on October 14. The ceremony centered on thanking legislators and other key people for their contributions on getting the clinic established. The clinic will not be operational until February 2017. Many dignities and elected officials spoke in support of the establishment and opening.

 - i. Historic Flag Pole Variance Update

Mr. Sid Williams informed the committee and public that Marina Community Partners are looking at the issue since the task is unlikely to be pursued by the VA. There are still challenges to overcome and some safety issues that need to be resolved. A report

as not been completed but is expected to be forthcoming at the next VIAC meeting.

ii. Construction Schedule

The expectation is that the clinic would be operational for February 2017. In the future, this item title should appear to say "Operation Schedule".

d. Veterans Transition Center Housing Construction

Mr. J. Allen Fagen ("Jay"), reported that he recently spoke with the developer and indicated that a water transfer installation command is in San Antonio and the VA in Palo Alto has signed on in support since it will help regionally with veteran housing problem. Also, the US Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) has been approved the designation from transitional housing to permanent; and has also approved a quicker process to make sure all of the neighborhood restrictions and other components are handled. There is a March 2017 deadline to submit the public tax credit application and then it will be possible to move forward and the goal is to break ground in 2018. The four (4) unit Monterey Quad transitional housing project, has submitted grant applications that are now in with the DAV and community foundation for operational funding that will focus on transitional housing and case management services for female veterans. The public bid process is out and open, with a "contractors walk" being scheduled for November 8. In the Martinez Hall, job center is expected to be completed within the next week or so and will be available to help support the public. The VTC Executive Officer vacancy job opening is still until October 31.

e. Historical Preservation Project

Mr. Norris was assigned to assist Cliff Guinn in drafting a letter to the Marina City Manager to get Historical Preservation group assistance in obtaining a location to further their efforts. The letter will be reviewed at the next VIAC meeting.

6. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

- a. Hero's Open Golf Tournament on October 29 and banquet
- b. VTC is seeking a donation of a commercial freezer – contact: Jay Fagan
- c. Veteran of the Year Awards Luncheon – November 5
- d. Country Store & Silent Auction at the VA Clinic – November 7
- e. Appreciation Dinner for UVC - November 17

7. ADJOURNMENT at 3:47pm

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: December 15, 2016

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT		
CONSENT AGENDA		
Subject:	Water/Wastewater Oversight Committee	
Meeting Date:	January 13, 2017	INFORMATION
Agenda Number:	7e	

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive an update from the Water/Wastewater Oversight Committee (WWOC).

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The WWOC met on December 14, 2016. The agenda included the Q1 Quarterly report, review of the budget approval calendar, adoption of the 2017 meeting schedule and various update items from Marina Coast Water District. The committee approved the November 16, 2016 meeting minutes and are included (**Attachment A**).

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

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

COORDINATION:

WWOC, Marina Coast Water District

Prepared by _____ Approved by _____
Peter Said Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

**FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY
WATER/WASTEWATER OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A, Marina CA 93933 | FORA Community Information Center
9:30 a.m., Wednesday, November 16, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER

Confirming quorum, Chair Rick Riedl called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. The following were present:

Committee Members:

Nick Nichols, Monterey County
Steve Matarazzo, University of California
Santa Cruz (UCSC)
Rick Riedl, City of Seaside
Mike Lerch, CSUMB
Brian McMinn, City of Marina

Andy Sterbenz, Schaaf & Wheeler
Consulting Civil Engineers
Bob Schaffer
Ken Nishi
Doug Yount
Kelly Cadiente

Other Attendees:

Mike Wegley, Marina Coast Water District
(MCWD)
Patrick Breen, MCWD

FORA Staff:

Jonathan Brinkmann
Steve Endsley
Ikuyo Yoneda-Lopez

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Nick Nichols led the pledge of allegiance.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Chair Rick Riedl welcomed Brian McMinn to the meeting, representing the City of Marina.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None

5. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

a. October 19, 2016

MOTION: Committee member Nick Nichols moved, seconded by Mike Lerch, to approve the October 19, 2016 Water/Wastewater Oversight Committee (WWOC) minutes. One abstention by Brian McMinn.

MOTION PASSED.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

a. Q4 Quarterly Report

Kelly Cadiente of Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) presented the Q4 Quarterly Report and informed the committee that a revised Quarterly Financial Activity report would be provided in December as year-to-date actuals for administrative expense and interest expense are not accurate due collection of data/information timing. Mike Wegley provided the committee with MCWD Capital Improvement Program updates.

The Committee requested MCWD present an Ord Community capital improvement recommendation to better track transfers at the inter-tie.

MOTION: Nick Nichols moved to approve the presentation of the Q4 Quarterly report.

Seconded by Mike Lerch.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

b. Set 2017 Meeting Schedule

MOTION: Committee member Nick Nichols moved to approve the schedule as 'tentative', as MCWD budget schedule is being finalized in December and may impact currently proposed dates. Seconded by Steve Matarazzo.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. ITEMS FROM MCWD

None

8. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

a. Discuss MCWD Notice of Pending Recycled Water Availability

Mike Wegley of MCWD updated the committee on MCWD's notice sent to potential users of reclaimed/recycled water regarding pending availability. MCWD held a meeting with potential users on November 15, 2016 hosted at FORA offices to discuss schedules, location of water distribution facilities, pricing, allocation, sale of water to others should there be insufficient requests, and other related topics. Mr. Doug Yount expressed that information from this meeting could be helpful, and requested that it be shared. Peter Said of FORA will request MCWD to share the presentation with the committee and public.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Riedl adjourned the meeting at 10:45 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: December 14, 2016

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT		
CONSENT AGENDA		
Subject:	Travel Report	
Meeting Date:	January 13, 2017	INFORMATION/ACTION
Agenda Number:	7f	

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Receive a travel report from the Executive Officer.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

Per the FORA Travel Policy, the Executive Officer (EO) submits travel requests to the Executive Committee on FORA Board/staff travel. The Committee reviews and approves requests for EO, Authority Counsel and board members travel; the EO approves staff travel requests. Travel information is reported to the Board.

UPCOMING TRAVEL

Dates: Late January or early February 2017

Location: Washington D.C.

Purpose: Discussion with U.S. Army BARCO regarding the Grant Amendment for ESCA

Attendees: Michael Houlemard Jr., Stan Cook, select FORA Board members

Dates: Late January or early February 2017

Location: Sacramento & San Francisco (SF)

Purpose: ESCA Leadership Meeting & Joint ESCA Leadership Meeting with DTSC (SF)

Attendees: Michael Houlemard Jr., Stan Cook, select FORA Board members

Dates: May 6-9, 2017

Location: New York City

Purpose: American Planning Association/National Planning Conference

Attendees: Michael Houlemard Jr., Josh Metz, and Mary Israel

Dates: June 19-21, 2017

Location: Washington D.C.

Purpose: 2017 Annual Summit

Attendees: Michael Houlemard Jr., two (2) FORA Board members

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

Travel expenses are paid/reimbursed according to the FORA Travel policy.

COORDINATION:

Executive Committee

Prepared by _____ Approved by _____
Dominique Jones Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT		
CONSENT AGENDA		
Subject:	Public Correspondence to the Board	
Meeting Date:	January 13, 2017	ACTION
Agenda Number:	7g	

Public correspondence submitted to the Board is posted to FORA's website on a monthly basis and is available to view at <http://www.fora.org/board.html>

Correspondence may be submitted to the Board via email to board@fora.org or mailed to the address below:

FORA Board of Directors
920 2nd Avenue, Suite A
Marina, CA 93933

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT

CONSENT AGENDA

Subject: 2017 Elect Board Officers

Meeting Date: January 13, 2017

Agenda Number: 7h

ACTION

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Receive a report from the 2017 Nominating Committee.
2. Seek nominations from the Board/Public; and the Executive Officer will conduct an election.
3. If no additional Board or Public nominations are received; approve the Nominating Committee's proposed slate is provided in **Attachment A** and as follows:
 - i. Elect two voting Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Board members to serve as Board Chair and Vice-Chair and FORA Executive Committee members for a one year term.
 - ii. Elect two voting FORA Board members to serve as members-at-large on the FORA Executive Committee for a one year term.
 - iii. Elect a past Board Chair to serve on the Executive Committee for a one year term.
 - iv. Elect one ex-officio Board member to serve as a non-voting member of the Executive Committee for a one year term.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The FORA Master Resolution states that the two Board officers shall be elected annually at the end of the first regular Board meeting in January. The Board officers serve for a term of one year and may be reelected for no more than one consecutive, additional term in the same office. Under that policy, the current Board officers are eligible for reelection to their current positions. The Master Resolution also establishes a Board policy of succession from 1st Vice Chair to Chair. The Board may appoint other officers as deemed necessary. The 2017 Nominating Committee met on November 30, 2016 and their summary nomination is attached hereto (**Attachment A**).

VOTING PROCEDURE: A summary nomination covering all offices is offered by the Nominating Committee Chair or any Board member before voting for the individual offices commences. In the absence of a summary nomination, or in the event of additional nominations from the Board/Public, the Chair will accept nominations for each office, starting with the Chair, and conduct an election as noted in **Attachment B**. A majority of votes cast confirms election.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

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

COORDINATION

Nominating Committee and Executive Committee

Prepared by _____ Approved by _____
Dominique L. Jones Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.



MEMORANDUM

Attachment A to Item 7h
FORA Board Meeting 1/13/17

TO: FORA Board of Directors
FROM: Frank O'Connell, Chair and Dominique L. Jones, Deputy Clerk
RE: 2017 Nominating Committee Report
DATE: January 13, 2017

The 2017 FORA Nominating Committee met on November 30, 2016.

The January 13, 2017 Board item 2017 Board Officers Election considered appointments for Board Chair and Vice Chair positions, including the four additional members of the Executive Committee (EC), which include Past Chair, two Members-at-large, and an Ex-Officio/Non-Voting member.

The Committee unanimously recommended the following EC slate for Board consideration:

Chair:	Seaside Mayor Ralph Rubio
Vice Chair:	Monterey County Supervisor Jane Parker
Past Chair:	Marina Mayor Pro-Tem Frank O'Connell
Member-at-Large:	Del Rey Oaks Mayor Jerry Edelen
Member-at-Large:	Salinas Mayor Joe Gunter
Ex-Officio (Non-Voting) Member:	CSUMB President Eduardo Ochoa

FORA VOTING PROCEDURES

Election of Officers

1. The Executive Officer opens the election by confirming that the Nominating Committee slate and nominations are received.
2. The Board may elect the Chair, Vice-Chair, Past Chair, and the two “at-large” Executive Committee Members by a summary nomination, wherein a motion to fill all five positions is made (typically by the Nominating Committee Chair) seconded, and carries with majority support.
3. If there is no summary nomination or if the summary nomination fails to receive majority approval, the Executive Officer will request nominations from the floor. The Chair will receive all nominations for a given position and allow nominees to make a short statement before ordering a roll-call vote. Voting results are announced by the Deputy Clerk. The Executive Officer, as designated FORA Elections Official, will verify and confirm the election.
4. Each nomination must pass with majority Board approval before the next position is considered. The order of the election shall be the Chair, Vice-Chair, Past Chair, at-large positions.

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT		
CONSENT AGENDA		
Subject:	Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement-Quarterly Report Update	
Meeting Date:	January 13, 2017	INFORMATION/ACTION
Agenda Number:	7i	

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive an Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement (ESCA) quarterly update.

BACKGROUND:

In Spring 2005, the U.S. Army (Army) and the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) entered negotiations toward an Army-funded Environmental Services Cooperative Agreement (ESCA) for removal of remnant Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) on portions of the former Fort Ord. FORA and the Army entered into a formal ESCA agreement in early 2007. Under the ESCA terms, FORA received 3,340 acres of former Fort Ord land prior to regulatory environmental sign-off and the Army awarded FORA approximately \$98 million to perform the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) munitions cleanup on those parcels. FORA also entered into an Administrative Order on Consent (AOC) with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) defining contractual conditions under which FORA completes Army remediation obligations for the ESCA parcels. FORA received the "ESCA parcels" after EPA approval and gubernatorial concurrence under a Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer on May 8, 2009.

In order to complete the AOC defined obligations, FORA entered into a Remediation Services Agreement (RSA) with the competitively selected LFR Inc. (now ARCADIS) to provide MEC remediation services and executed a cost-cap insurance policy for this remediation work through American International Group (AIG) to assure financial resources to complete the work and to offer other protections for FORA and its underlying jurisdictions.

The ESCA Remediation Program (RP) has been underway for nine years. The FORA ESCA RP team has completed the known ESCA RP field work, pending regulatory review.

DISCUSSION:

The ESCA requires FORA, acting as the Army's contractor, to address safety issues resulting from historic Fort Ord munitions training operations. This allows the FORA ESCA RP team to successfully implement cleanup actions that address three major past concerns: 1) the requirement for yearly appropriation of federal funding that delayed cleanup and necessitated costly mobilization and demobilization expenses; 2) state and federal regulatory questions about protectiveness of previous actions for sensitive uses; and 3) the local jurisdiction, community and FORA's desire to reduce, to the extent possible, risk to individuals accessing the property.

Under the ESCA grant contract with the Army, FORA received approximately \$98 million in grant funds to clear munitions and secure regulatory approval for the former Fort Ord ESCA parcels (see table below). FORA and ARCADIS executed the RSA, a guaranteed fixed-price contract for ARCADIS to perform the ESCA grant Technical Specifications and Review Statement work. As part of the RSA, FORA paid \$82.1 upfront, to secure an AIG "cost-cap" insurance policy. Under the terms of the ESCA grant, the EPA AOC requirements and AIG insurance provisions, AIG controls the \$82.1 million in a commutation account and pays ARCADIS directly as work is

performed. In addition, AIG provides up to \$128 million to assure additional work (both known and unknown) is completed to the Regulator's satisfaction. Under these agreements, AIG pays ARCADIS directly while FORA oversee ARCADIS compliance with the grant and AOC requirements.

Current status follows:

Item	Revised Allocations	Accrued through September 2016
FORA Self-Insurance or Policy	\$ 916,056	
Reimburse Regulators & Quality Assurance	3,280,655	
State of California Surplus Lines Tax, Risk Transfer, Mobilization	6,100,000	
Contractor's Pollution Liability Insurance	477,344	
Work Performed ARCADIS/AIG Commutation Account	82,117,553	
FORA Administrative Fees	4,837,001	
Total	\$ 97,728,609	
	ESCA Remainder	

Data collected during the ESCA investigation stage remains under regulatory review to determine if remediation is complete. The review and documentation process is dependent on Army and regulatory agency responses and decisions. They will issue written confirmation that CERCLA MEC remediation work is complete (known as regulatory site closure).

On November 25, 2014, EPA signed the Record of Decision (ROD) for the ESCA Group 3 properties located in County of Monterey (at Laguna Seca); City of Monterey (south of South Boundary Road); Del Rey Oaks (south of South Boundary Road); and, Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) Military Operations in Urban Terrain property. On February 26, 2015, the Regulators signed the ROD for the ESCA Group 2 California State University Monterey Bay property (south of Inter-Garrison Road). The ROD records the EPA, DTSC and Army's decision on the cleanup of these properties and what controls are required to continue to protect public health and safety.

The process for implementing, operating and maintaining ROD controls is prescribed under a Land Use Control Implementation, Operation and Maintenance Plan (LUCIP OMP) document based on site conditions and historic MEC use. LUCIP OMP documents are approved by the Regulators prior to issuing regulatory site closure. The ESCA team and Regulatory agencies held workshops with the FORA Administrative Committee in May; June; July 2015; and, June and July 2016, to help the jurisdictions understand and develop comments to the Group 2 and Group 3 LUCIP OMP documents. The Group 3 Draft LUCIP/OMP comment period ended on August 23, 2016. Currently, the ESCA team is preparing responses to the Group 3 LUCIP comments.

Future Actions:

Until regulatory review, concurrence and site closure is received, the ESCA property is not open to the public. Regulatory approval does not determine end use. When regulatory site closure is received, FORA will transfer land title to the appropriate jurisdiction for reuse programming. Underlying jurisdictions are authorized to impose or limit zoning, decide property density or make related land use decisions in compliance with the FORA Base Reuse Plan.

The ESCA team completed collecting information, site inspections and providing content for the draft ESCA sections to support the Army's fourth Fort Ord CERCLA Five Year Review. The ESCA team contacted jurisdiction staff, via the FORA Administrative Committee, to collect this information. The CERCLA Five Year Review is performed to collect information on the Fort Ord land use controls operation and maintenance for the Regulatory agency review and to determine if the controls remain effective. The Army's fourth Five Year Review will be completed and released in 2017.

The ESCA team continues to actively monitor biological resources and track restoration activities on ESCA properties and anticipates publishing the ESCA 2016 Annual Natural Resource Monitoring, Mitigation and Management Report in January 2017. The ESCA RP provides environmental stewardship on a yearly basis for 3,340 ESCA acres through erosion control; managing trespassing and illegal dumping; and, performing Army sensitive species monitoring and reporting.

In December 2016, FORA requested and hosted two ESCA management meetings for Army Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Headquarters, EPA Region 9 and DTSC management to meet and discuss pressing ESCA issues. The first meeting focused on identifying, coordinating and committing to procedures and processes that will optimize opportunities in the CERCLA process to sustain ESCA site-closeout schedule. FORA and Army BRAC Headquarters staff held a second meeting to discuss the potential need for additional ESCA funding for administration, Regulatory oversight reimbursement and long term obligations. The agency leadership have committed to regular periodic communications, while staff has been assigned weekly check-in conference calls to support optimization efforts. Army BRAC Headquarters agreed to review a draft Grant Amendment funding request package with the ESCA Grant Administrator and, if appropriate, outline the process for requesting additional grant funding.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

The funds for this review and report are part of the existing FORA ESCA funds. Potential grant adjustments may be forthcoming to address items reviewed in this report.

COORDINATION:

Administrative Committee; Executive Committee; FORA Authority Counsel; ARCADIS; U.S. Army EPA; and DTSC.

Prepared by _____ Approved by _____
Stan Cook Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT

BUSINESS ITEMS

Subject: Building Removal Update

Meeting Date: January 13, 2017

Agenda Number: 7j

INFORMATION

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Receive a Building Removal Update.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

In 2006, the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Board included building removal in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and identified Surplus II in the City of Seaside (Seaside), and the Stockade in the City of Marina (Marina) as remaining obligations. Between 2006 and 2016, the Seaside and Marina explored alternatives to building removal.

Marina currently owns and leases the Stockade property. Early in 2016, FORA and Marina staff began Stockade removal discussions. FORA staff prepared an open solicitation for professional Industrial Hygienist services to sample, test, characterize hazardous materials and monitor removal at the Stockade. In coordination with Marina, FORA staff is evaluating responsive proposals and anticipates bringing forward a recommendation in February.

Seaside owns the Surplus II properties. In 2016, FORA performed a Hazardous Materials assessment of the site and presented the results and a course of action to Seaside. Seaside has concurred with the plan to utilize FORA's \$5.2M CIP obligation to remove 17 of the 27 buildings at Surplus II enabling economic development of the site. In December 2016, FORA staff issued a Request for Qualifications for General Engineering Services. Once selected, the consultant will assist in preparing specifications and plans for the abatement and removal of the buildings. FORA staff expects to bring forward a recommendation on contract selection in February.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

Funding for these building removal efforts is included in the approved FY 15-16 Capital Improvement Program and FY 15-16 FORA Budget.

COORDINATION:

Administrative Committee, Seaside, Marina

Prepared by _____ Reviewed by _____
Peter Said Stan Cook

Approved by _____
Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT

BUSINESS ITEMS

Subject: Economic Development Quarterly Status Update

Meeting Date: January 13, 2017

Agenda Number: 8a

INFORMATION/ACTION

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Receive Economic Development ("ED") Quarterly Status Update.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The 2012 Base Reuse Plan Reassessment Report ("RR") identified job creation through economic recovery from the Fort Ord base closure as a crucial but yet-to-be complete Base Reuse Plan ("BRP") obligation. Beginning in January 2015, the FORA Board reviewed and deliberated several economic recovery strategies/options and concluded by adopting an overall/multi-component program that included funding a new ED staff position. Following a successful recruitment process, former FORA Senior Planner Josh Metz was appointed as ED Coordinator in June 2015.

The primary goal of FORA's ED effort, as referenced in the BRP and RR, is to assist the three county region in general and FORA jurisdictions specifically in economic recovery from the employment, business, and other economic losses resulting from the departure of soldiers, civilians, and families after the base closure. BRP projections for full recovery include 37,000 replacement population, 15-18,000 jobs to replace military employment, 11-12,000 homes (6160 new units), and approximately 3 million square feet of commercial/office space.

FORA's ED strategy, outlined during the ED recruitment and again at the September 2015 Board meeting, includes the following key components:

- **Build upon Regional Economic Strengths** (Agriculture, Tourism, Higher Education/Research, Military Missions)
- **Pursue New & Retain Existing Businesses/Enterprises.**
- **Engage Internal & External Stakeholders** (i.e. FORA Jurisdictions, California State University Monterey Bay ("CSUMB"), University of California Santa Cruz ("UCSC"), Monterey Bay Economic Partnership ("MBEP"), Monterey County Business Council ("MCBC"), Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce (MPCC), and others).
- **Develop and Maintain Information Resources.**
- **Report Success Metrics.**

Per Board ongoing direction and following the strategy outlined above, staff pursued a number of projects during 2016 to make ED progress. The following notes summarize and highlight progress since the October 14, 2016 Quarterly Status Update:

- **Business Recruitment/Retention.** FORA staff continues efforts to both respond to and broadly refer inquiries from businesses/contacts interested in location or relocation and reuse of former Fort Ord real estate. Working with the Monterey County Economic Development office, staff explored potential recruitment of: a new winery incubator project, winery/wine warehouse relocation and development, greenhouse R&D, medical foods R&D, educational facilities, high tech R&D, and tourism oriented businesses. During Q2 2016 American Biosciences, Inc. relocated R&D and production facilities to

Salinas following a site search supported primarily by FORA and County Economic Development staff. While a suitable former Fort Ord site was not found, initial efforts focused on University of California Monterey Bay Education Science and Technology (UCMBEST) Center parcels. Potential relocation and/or expansion remains possible once UCMBEST parcels become actionable. Staff continues working with relevant jurisdiction staff and elected officials where appropriate to advance new and emerging opportunities.

A number of high profile openings happened in the fall of 2016 including: Phase 1 of the Central Coast Veterans Cemetery in the City of Seaside and Monterey County on October 11; Ribbon cutting for the Joint Veterans Administration/Department of Defense General Gourley Clinic on October 14; Opening of the Shops at the Dunes/Fast Casual Restaurants in November. Marriott-Springhill Suites in the City of Marina is planned to open in the spring 2017. These openings represent significant reuse milestones and along with direct employment and economic impacts are catalyzes continued economic recovery. These newly established “enterprises” offer supply and other medical, supply, service or culinary connections and locational opportunities.

- **UCMBEST.** The vision for UCMBEST as a regional R&D tech innovation and regional employment center has yet to be realized. Even after 21 years of UC ownership only a small fraction of new venture and employment opportunities exist on the lands conveyed for that purpose. FORA has a critical interest in seeing progress made on the UCMBEST vision. To that end, Executive Officer Michael Houlemard and Mr. Metz have taken active roles in convening relevant stakeholders to infuse the effort with new energy and craft a viable route forward. Advancing existing planning efforts to conclusion and entitlement for future sale, lease or other transfer, as well as exploring a wide range of future ownership/management structures are key areas of staff/stakeholder focus.

Vice Chancellor Scott Brandt provided a UCSC-UCMBEST Status Report at the November 14, 2016 Board meeting. Since then Mr. Metz has continued to represent FORA in bi-weekly status update calls with UC Santa Cruz and Monterey County representatives. An executive level meeting with Chancellor Blumenthal and the UCSC team with Supervisor Potter, Supervisor Phillips, Mr. Houlemard, Mr. Spaur and Mr. Metz was held at UCSC on Dec 12, 2016. The outcome of this meeting was an acknowledgement of the 2016 progress and commitment to build on the momentum during the year ahead. In particular, discussion focused on a planned near-term auction of West Campus parcels, as well as potential mixed-use development including job generating and affordable housing on the East Campus. Staff was directed to further develop these initiatives, schedule future meetings to include additional County and FORA representatives and report back at a planned spring 2017 meeting.

- **Start-up Challenge Monterey Bay/CSUMB Collaboration.** FORA continues to support expansion of regional entrepreneurship through support of CSUMB and Start-up Challenge Monterey Bay. This multi-day competitive pitch event cultivates entrepreneurship skills and identifies promising start-up concepts. The 2016 Start-up Challenge grew 25% from 2015 with 89 participants. FORA hosted 2 pitch workshops in partnership with CSUMB faculty, which enabled approximately 50 participants to refine and practice pitch content. Preparation for the 2017 Startup Challenge is underway, with a target of 100 participants. FORA staff led to development and completion of a new Startup Challenge website to improve information access and marketing power of the event. The new website went live on Dec 1, 2017 at TheStartupChallenge.org.

Collaborating with CSUMB Institute for Innovation and Economic Development (iiED) faculty, Mr. Metz led a Coworking Space Market Feasibility Study. This completed study demonstrates

Monterey Bay region market readiness for additional shared workspaces, with particular emphasis on the Monterey Peninsula to Salinas sub-region. The study is available to interested parties via the FORA website - results were presented to the Monterey Tech Meetup and MBEP Workforce Committee meetings. The study has generated active interest from entrepreneurs advancing plans to open coworking facilities as well as developers interested in potential inclusion of coworking facilities in evolving plans. . In addition, Mr. Metz continues work with CSUMB colleagues on strategic initiatives to expand the University's economic development impact including -CSUMB "partnership" opportunities and increasing the Startup Challenge impact through program/schedule refinements, strengthening event marketing, continued financial support of the CSUMB Small Business Development Center ("SBDC" in Salinas, and other means.

- **Community Engagement/Jurisdiction Support:** FORA staff sustain work to increase public knowledge about reuse activities/opportunities. To this end committee and Board meetings are noticed via our growing 400+ person email list, posted to the FORA.org website, shared on all FORA social media outlets, and posted at the FORA offices. All FORA contracting and employment opportunities are also posted on the FORA website and shared via social media outlets. In addition, Mr. Metz continues to represent FORA on regional committee's including MBEP Workforce Committee and the MPCC Economic Vitality Committee. Community engagement and outreach efforts are core ongoing ED activities.

The MBEP staff and Workforce Committee in partnership with the Bright Futures program at CSUMB recently launched CareerCoachMB.org as a new web resource to help students and the community at large navigate career planning. This valuable web resource provides tools to explore specific career pathways, required education, salary information and links directly to posted vacancies. This new resource will enable students to plan for specific careers and open position and close the gap between job seekers and employers.

- **Metrics: Housing Starts:** New residential development at the Dunes on Monterey Bay, Marina Heights, and East Garrison continues to gain momentum. A summary of CFD fees collected over the past 3 years is provided below:

New Residential (NR) Development	FY 14/15 Full year	FY 15/16 Full year	FY 16/17 To-date(<i>projected</i>)
Total Units	89	256	59 (300)
Total NR Community Facility District Fees Collected	\$1,982,669	\$5,202,626	\$1,155,645 (\$7,096,500)

Jobs: The 2015 FORA Jobs Survey indicates there are a total of 3541 Full-time Equivalent and 722 Part-time jobs on the former Fort Ord. In addition, we estimate there are in excess of 10,000 students (7122 at CSUMB). The 2017 FORA Jobs Survey is planned for Q1/Q2 2017 with a presentation of findings at the April 2017 Board meeting.

During 2017 the FORA ED program will build on these key program components and the momentum generated during 2016 in the following ways:

- **Business Recruitment/Retention:** Reconstitute the Central Coast Marketing Team as a "regional" business attraction/retention organization/entity. Develop a new website; TeamCentralCoast.org. Integrate the use of OppSites as a resource to attraction/retention

work. License ESRI Business Analyst to develop site metrics. Prepare/package marketing content for sites in collaboration with partners.

- **UCMBEST:** Continue working with UCSC development team and FORA partners to advance planning and site utilization. Focus on: Moving West Campus parcels to auction in Q1/Q2 2017; Completing North Central Campus sub-division map and specific plan (City of Marina) – then water and environmental – targeting completion in Q3/Q4 2017; advancing East Campus mixed-use development planning with UCSC and County.
- **Startup Challenge/CSUMB Collaboration:** Continue working with campus partners to grow Startup Challenge quantity and quality; Support entrepreneur and developer efforts to realize new coworking facilities; Support campus economic development staff in realizing goals; Continue support of CSUMB-SBDC.
- **Community Engagement/Jurisdiction Support:** Continue serving as technical and information resource to support jurisdiction economic development initiatives. Specific examples include: Securing ESRI Business Analyst license to support site characterization and marketing; Participating in Main Gate RFP review and developer recruitment; Work with City of Marina staff to advance economic development projects; Continue support and engagement with City of Salinas staff in the growth of the agtech sector and other economic development efforts.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

Funding for staff time and ED program activities is included in the approved FORA budget.

COORDINATION:

Administrative and Executive Committees

Prepared by _____ Approved by _____
Josh Metz Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT

BUSINESS ITEMS

Subject: Habitat Conservation Plan Update	
Meeting Date: January 13, 2017	INFORMATION/ACTION
Agenda Number: 8b	

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Receive a United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and State of California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2081 Incidental Take Permit status report.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

Item 5g from the July 8, 2016 Board meeting is included as additional background and may be found at: <http://www.fora.org/Board/2016/Package/070816BrdPacket.pdf>.

On July 29, 2016, FORA received a comment letter from USFWS Ventura Office Field Supervisor Stephen P. Henry outlining nine general recommendations for changes to the draft Fort Ord HCP. USFWS representatives recognize the 20-year history of FORA working toward a basewide HCP and affirmed their continued support for FORA's Public Review Draft HCP schedule. At its September 9, 2016 meeting, the FORA Board authorized contract amendments for HCP consultant Inner City Fund (ICF) International and Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) consultant Denise Duffy & Associates (DDA) to address these nine USFWS recommendations/comments and prepare a public review draft HCP and its accompanying EIS/EIR.

Since the September 9, 2016 meeting, FORA staff and consultants met with USFWS and CDFW representatives five times. FORA staff and consultants have received sufficient guidance to prepare the public review draft HCP and its EIS/EIR. Key revisions include: (1) removing non state or federally listed species, or listed species not known to occur outside of the Fort Ord National Monument (Monument); (2) that add mitigation measures to benefit HCP species within the Monument; and (3) rewriting the HCP only rely on Monument lands for mitigation when Permittee's additional mitigation measures provide a link for the reliance. USFWS and CDFW representatives have agreed to meet an HCP schedule (**Attachment A**) allowing one review period prior to publishing the public review draft HCP and its accompanying EIS/EIR before June 30, 2017.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

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

COORDINATION:

Authority Counsel, Administrative Committee, Permittees, ICF, DD&A, and wildlife agencies.

Prepared by _____ Approved by _____
Jonathan Brinkmann Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

Status			2017												2018											
			J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
HCP																										
11	Review Screen-check Draft HCP (Wildlife Agencies)	Done																								
	Prepare 2nd Screen-check Draft HCP		Blue																							
	Agencies and Permittee Review 2nd Screen-check Draft (60 days)			Red	Red																					
12	Prepare Public Draft HCP				Blue	Blue																				
13	Prepare and publish Notice in Federal Register for HCP, EIS, IA						Orange																			
14	Public/Agencies Reviw Period (90 days)							Red	Red	Red																
15	Conduct Public Outreach							Green					Green													
16	Prepare Final HCP								Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue														
17	See Approval process steps																									

Status			2017												2018											
			J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
	EIR/EIS																									
4	Solicitor review (3 weeks)	Done																								
5	Prepare screencheck Public Review EIS/EIR		■																							
6	Agencies and Permittee Review 2nd Screen-check Draft (60 days)			■	■																					
7	Prepare Public Review EIS/EIR				■	■																				
8	Prepare and publish Notice of Availability in Federal Register (see HCP-7 above)						■	■																		
9	Prepare and publish CEQA Notice of Availability (1 - 2 months)						■	■																		
10	Public/Agencies Review Period (90 days)							■	■	■																
11	Respond to public comments/Prepare 1st Admin Draft Final EIS/EIR								■	■																
12	Review Period											■														
13	Prepare Final Public Draft EIS/EIR - clear for publication												■	■												
14	Publish Notice of Final EIS, HCP and IA Availability in Federal Register - 30 day comment period														■	■										
15	Publish CEQA Notice of Determination - Permit Applicants - 30 day challenge period														■	■										
16	CEQA Notice of Determination--CDFG - 30 day challenge period															■	■									
17	See Approval Process steps																									
18	Federal Prep and Pub of <i>Record of Decision (ROD)</i> - 30 day wait period															■	■									

Status			2017												2018											
			J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
	Implementing Agreement																									
10	Review 3rd Admin Draft IA (Permit Applicants, BLM, Wildlife Agencies)	Done																								
11	Prepare 2nd Screen-check Draft IA		■																							
12	Review Screen-check Draft IA (Wildlife Agencies)			■	■																					
13	Prepare Public Draft IA				■	■																				
14	Prepare and publish Notice of Availability in Federal Register (see HCP-12 above)						■																			
15	Public/Agencies Review period (90 days)							■	■	■																
16	Prepare Final IA									■	■	■														
17	See Approval Process steps																									

Status			2017												2018											
			J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Approval Process																										
1	Permit Applicants and BLM Approval of Final Plan, Final EIR/EIS and Final IA																									
2	Establish Implementing Entity																									
3	Implementing Entity approves Final Plan. EIR/EIS and Implementing Agreement																									
4	See EIR/EIS steps 11, 12 and 13																									
5	Local Agencies Adopt Imp Ordinances																									
6	Wildlife Agencies Approval of Plan, EIR and EIS and IA																									
7	FG Findings Preparation																									
8	FWS Findings/Biological Opinion																									
9	Permits Issued by FWS																									
10	Permits issued by CDFG																									

FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY BOARD REPORT

BUSINESS ITEMS

Subject: Authorize Water Augmentation Study Solicitation

Meeting Date: January 13, 2017

Agenda Number: 8c

ACTION

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Authorize Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Executive Officer to solicit, negotiate, and select a professional services contract for a Fort Ord Water Augmentation Planning Alternatives Study, not to exceed \$157,000.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION:

On June 10, 2005, FORA and Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) Board of Directors approved the Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project (RUWAP) Hybrid Alternative, consisting of recycled water & desalinization water components. FORA and MCWD then agreed upon a modified RUWAP Hybrid Alternative to provide 1,427 AFY of recycled water to the Ord Community, resulting in FORA Board Resolution No. 07-10 (May 2007), allocating the recycled water to the land use jurisdictions. On October 9, 2015, the FORA Board of Directors unanimously endorsed a joint water supply planning process among FORA, Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA), and MCWD. On May 13, 2016, MCWD, MRWPCA and FORA agreed in a memorandum of understanding to each fund one-third of initial consultant costs up to \$50,000 during Fiscal Year 2016/17 and reimburse FORA as the managing agency in studying alternatives to supply the additional 973 AFY of water augmentation.

MCWD, MRWPCA, and FORA agreed to study a mix of different solutions to meet the additional water augmentation component, including water conservation, a possible increase or decrease to the advanced treated water component, and other available options. FORA staff and the water augmentation Technical Advisory Group (TAG) prepared a request for proposals (**Attachment A**) to solicit professional services to perform the study. The scope of work includes a background assessment, alternative identification, and analysis of options.

Staff recommends the Board authorize the Executive Officer to solicit, negotiate, and select a professional services contract for a Fort Ord Water Augmentation Alternatives Study, not to exceed \$157,000.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Reviewed by FORA Controller _____

Funding is included in the approved FORA budget.

COORDINATION:

TAG, MCWD, MRWPCA, Administrative Committee, and Executive Committee

Prepared by _____
Peter Said

Reviewed by _____
Steve Endsley

Approved by _____
Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.

Fort Ord Reuse Authority
920 2nd Ave
Marina, CA 93933

January 23, 2017

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - TO PERFORM A WATER AUGMENTATION ALTERNATIVES STUDY.

Dear Consultant,

The Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) is the managing agency in a three-party planning process (TPP) including Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) and Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) to identify water augmentation solutions from which the FORA Board may select and MCWD may implement.

FORA is requesting proposals from qualified individuals or firms to perform a Water Augmentation alternatives study to MCWD's Desalinization Project component of the Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project (RUWAP) and to recommend alternatives, including an 'all of the above' alternative, to meet the area's economic, energy usage, and environmental needs. Consultants may propose modifications to the scope, but must include rationale for doing so.

FORA's intent is to negotiate and enter into a Professional Services Contract with a respondent who will use the necessary disciplines, and/or qualified sub-contractors/consultants, to accomplish the scope provided in **Attachment A** and required by FORA. The statement of qualifications (SOQ's) will be screened by a Selection Committee and the most qualified firms providing the best value may be invited to an oral interview or selected on the basis of the proposal only. Provided are selection criteria in **Attachment B**; and a sample contract is included in **Attachment C**.

Background

FORA was created by State legislation to oversee civilian reuse and redevelopment of the former Army base and remains the Department of Defense recognized local reuse authority for the former Fort Ord. It is FORA's responsibility to complete the planning, financing and implementation of reuse as described in the adopted 1997 Base Reuse Plan (BRP) including the Water Augmentation mitigations set forth therein. The 1998 FORA-MCWD Facilities Agreement assigns FORA responsibility to select a water augmentation solution, and MCWD responsibility to implement the chosen solution.

On June 10, 2005 the FORA and MCWD Board of Directors approved the RUWAP Hybrid Alternative, consisting of Recycled & Desalinization components providing 1,200 AFY each. FORA and MCWD then agreed upon a modified RUWAP Hybrid Alternative to provide 1,427 AFY of recycled water to the former Fort Ord resulting in FORA Board Resolution No. 07-10 (May 2007), allocating 1,427 AFY of RUWAP recycled water to the land use jurisdictions. On October 9, 2015 the FORA Board of Directors endorsed a joint water supply planning process among FORA, MRWPCA, and MCWD to identify the "Additional Water Augmentation Component." On May 13, 2016, MCWD, MRWPCA and FORA agreed in a

Memorandum of Understanding to fund one-third of initial consultant costs up to \$50,000 for Fiscal Year 2016/17 and reimburse FORA as the managing party in identifying alternatives to supply the additional 973 AFY of Water Augmentation.

The Three Parties (FORA, MCWD, and MRWPCA) recognize there could be a mix of different solutions to meet the Additional Water Augmentation Component. The purpose of this study is to identify what these options are.

Purpose

The estimated magnitude for the Scope of Work is between \$80,000 and \$120,000. It is estimated the work will take between six (6) and nine (9) months. FORA's cost limitations for the joint effort is \$157,000. Specifically FORA is seeking qualified individuals or firms to perform the scope of work provided in **Attachment A** which includes:

- Review the historical, regulatory, statutory and contractual framework pertaining to water policies in the region.
- Develop a work plan to include a re-assessment of the former Fort-Ord water needs, alternatives development, ground rules, metrics, alternatives analysis, report writing, and presentation.
- Perform alternatives analysis to include economic analysis, cost benefit analysis, decision-making analysis, and impact analysis.
- Prepare Technical Memo's (TM), Reports, Administrative Draft, Draft, and Final documents; and,
- Attend meetings, coordinate and communicate with staff.

SCHEDULE

Event	Dates
Qualified Vendor Notification and Request for Qualification	01/19/2017
Pre-Proposal Conference	02/02/2017
Deadline To Submit Questions & Clarifications	17:00pm PST 02/07/2017
Deadline to Submit Proposal	12:00pm PST 02/17/2017
Selection Committee Review of Proposals	02/23/2017
Interview Notification	02/24/2017
Interview Date	03/13-17/2017
Notice of Intent to Award	03/24/2017
Board Review & Vote	04/07/2017

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

Submission and Delivery Instructions

Six (6) hard copies of the proposal shall be submitted to Peter Said, Project Manager, no later than 02/13/2017 at 12:00pm at Fort Ord Reuse Authority, 920 2nd Ave, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933. At least one copy shall be identified as "master copy" and shall contain original signatures. Proposers will submit one copy electronically on a CD, DVD, or flash drive to the above address. FORA reserves the right to duplicate or disseminate for internal use any material provided. All submittals become the property of FORA. Each proposal shall be a maximum of fifteen (15) double-sided sheets. Appendices and references do not count towards the page limitation. The proposals shall include:

1. **Cover Letter.** Provide a one page Executive Summary of the Proposal
2. **Narrative.** Provide a Narrative of the project, management and technical approaches to be used over the course of the study. Please provide a brief description of the evidence based means/methods employed to identify problems/concerns/requirements, determine alternatives, analyze solutions, determine value and draw conclusions. The Narrative should outline how the respondent will prevent cost over-runs, schedule over-runs, and ensure quality of deliverables. Lastly, key assumptions shall be clearly identified as well as any exclusions or exceptions taken to the proposal.
3. **Costs.** Provide a fee schedule that includes each position classification required to provide the services described in the scope of work, and all reimbursable fees and expenses. Provide the direct labor cost, fringe rate, overhead rate, G&A rate and fee.
4. **Schedule.** Respondent must submit a milestone matrix, PERT or Gantt chart identifying the deliverable dates to a sufficient level as to clearly show how the work will be performed in a timely manner.
5. **Work Scope Critique.** FORA's intent is to identify realistic alternatives which will provide the former Fort Ord with 973 AFY of augmented water. Respondents are encouraged to critique the proposed Scope of Work (**Attachment A**) and present solutions/opportunities. Further, respondents have the opportunity to list these additional scope elements as options in the attachments. FORA suggests options be detailed separately from the proposal and be accompanied by cost/time estimates and a narrative explaining the need, and how it might integrate with the proposed scope. Please review the sample contract and address any concerns so they may be dealt with early in the process.
6. **Cost Proposal.** Provide a cost proposal in a separately sealed envelope. Provide an itemized cost summary per task including subtotals of hours and charges attributable to each deliverable, as well as a project grand total on a fixed fee, not-to exceed time and materials basis.
7. **Statement of Qualifications (SOQ).** The SOQ must be submitted in the format identified below. The SOQ must be indexed and bound separate from the proposal. Please note that the maximum number of pages allowed under each section as stated below; also, please make sure the font size is no smaller than 11 point, Arial.

A. QUALIFICATIONS

This section should provide a description of the firm's professional qualifications and licensing/certification of key personnel & sub consultants, specifically provide:

- The name and title of key staff members assigned to manage or otherwise play a major role(s) in this project.
- Include their resumes and copies of all certifications.
- Identify key staff member's assigned role and responsibilities.
- Qualifications of any sub-consultants proposed on this project; clearly explain their role and the percentage of involvement.

B. EXPERIENCE

A minimum of five (5) years of professional experience, under the same company name and license required. Less than 5 years will be grounds for disqualification.

- List three (3) successfully completed public agency projects in California within the last five (5) years, and with a minimum contract value of \$80,000
- List at least two (2) projects successfully completed for a county or jurisdiction on the California Coast (San Diego, Orange County, Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Mateo, San Francisco, Marin, etc...)
- Successful experience working with three (3) or more jurisdictions and agencies on the same project

C. REFERENCES

Provide four (4) references from previous projects of similar scope and delivery method. Please provide project descriptions and current contact information for the Project Manager and Owner of each project. Please include verifiable project metrics and websites if possible. All references and projects will be verified, if contact information is not current, then provided project will not be evaluated as part of the scoring. Each project described above should provide current information for the following:

- Value of the contract and indicate if your firm was a subcontractor
- Start date & completion date
- Was the contract completed on time? If no, provide explanation

D. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY

This section should demonstrate an understanding of the requirements of the project, the firm's ability to meet them and the firm's commitment of resources to achieve them.

E. PROJECT BUDGETING & SCHEDULING HISTORY

Provide evidence of the firm's history of meeting or beating established budgets, cost control processes, quality control processes, and include strategies to prevent change orders to scope.

F. ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

Include an organizational chart showing, at a minimum, the key personnel assigned to the study and their reporting relationship within the organization. Include consultants proposed to be used, their education/experience/certifications and describe their role (Copies of certifications to be included are in addition to the 1 page requirement.)

G. ORGANIZATIONAL PRIORITIES

Explain the organizations programs/projects/contracts which run concurrently or in parallel with the proposed schedule. Identify key personnel and their time commitments. It is preferred, but is not mandatory, that respondents provide a statement to the effect of, "if awarded, the FORA contract will take precedence over other obligations."

Evaluation Process

FORA staff will determine responsiveness and evaluate all proposal submittals. Please review the evaluation criteria (**Attachment B**). The evaluation process will consider all required information. Each criterion will be scored based upon a pre-determined point system. Interviews with the highest ranking teams may be scheduled at the sole discretion of FORA staff. The Selection Committee will be made up of staff members from FORA, MCWD and MRWPCA.

Please contact Peter Said if you have any questions about this Request for Proposal.

Sincerely,

Peter Said
Project Manager
peter@fora.org
(831) 883-3672

1. **Attachment A: Scope of Work**
2. **Attachment B: Selection Criteria & General Provisions**
3. **Attachment C: Sample Contract**
4. **Attachment D: Cost Basis Template**

ATTACHMENT A: PROPOSED WORK SCOPE

1. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

a. Project Management.

This work package includes all project management activities and meeting attendance required by the consultant to facilitate the study, including but not limited to:

- Kickoff Meeting
- Maintaining progress schedules
- Budget oversight
- Monthly progress reports to Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) staff
- Coordination / meetings with Technical Advisory Group (TAG) & Stakeholders

b. Technical Review – Quality Assurance/Control.

Utilize an internal review process prior to control and release of all deliverables such that no (0-5) mistakes in grammar, punctuation or content are found.

c. Coordination/Facilitation.

Coordinate, Notify and Facilitate meetings and workshops with TAG, Jurisdictions, and Boards as needed, throughout the study. It is anticipated that the key stakeholders will be the TAG, Marina Coast Water District (MCWD), Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) and FORA.

d. Regular Progress Reporting.

Provide monthly reports including but not limited to:

- Actions completed
- Current Status
- Updated schedule
- Updated budget (printed copy and in excel)
- Proposed action plans

Anticipated Deliverables:

1.1 *Monthly reports.*

1.2 *Agendas & Minutes of public meetings as needed.*

2. BACKGROUND SURVEY

- a. Review the developments that led to this Initial Alternatives Analysis.
Investigate prior relevant analyses and reference the applicable document(s) identifying the need. Highlight gaps to be addressed in this study. The summaries will be incorporated into the Final Report.
 - i. Review and summarize the basis for FORA Base Reuse Plan (BRP) Water Augmentation mitigation.
Review the BRP, The U.S. Army's 1993 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the BRP Environmental Impact Report (EIR), The Public Facilities Implementation Plan (PFIP), and associated documents. Clearly identify the basis for the Water Augmentation program and identify as many of the assumptions used to determine the various mitigation amounts and demand.
 - ii. Research and summarize Water Supply and Demand for the former Fort Ord area.
Alternatives studies have been performed by different jurisdictions. The BRP established mitigation requirements and water demand for the Former Fort Ord area. Review BRP assumptions and compare it to previous studies. Compile and compare existing studies, see links provided. Build upon prior studies and reassess the underlying assumptions. Summarize the existing and projected thirty (30) year water demand for the Former Fort Ord area and Compare it to previous studies.
 - iii. Review and summarize the RUWAP background.
The Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project (RUWAP) approved by the FORA board in 2005, was a hybrid project of Recycled Water and Desalinization. This Initial Alternatives Analysis intends to study the water supply options to the Desalinization portion of the RUWAP. Review the RUWAP history and summarize the political environment, assumptions, constraints, risks, issues and opportunities with the project.
 - iv. Reassess the forecasted demand basis for 2,400 AFY of recycled water.
Review the BRP Appendix B (Volume 3), PFIP figure 2-7 and the assumptions used to determine the need for 2,400 AFY. Reassess the demand forecast for recycled water given, but not limited to, the jurisdictional general plans, the long-term strategic goals, and the land use jurisdictions development forecasts over a thirty (30) year horizon.

b. Jurisdictional Summary and Analysis.

Research jurisdictions and agencies with the right to deliver water, collect and treat sewage, or provide other public services within the vicinity of the former Fort Ord. Map their service area boundaries and develop a summary list of the jurisdictions and agencies, their rights, responsibilities and expected roles in the context of the RUWAP. Provide 1 map per jurisdiction/agency. Provide 1 composite map of all jurisdiction/agencies. Provide maps in a vector (.eps, or .pdf) and in a .GIS file.

c. Data Compilation & Database development.

Numerous water feasibility studies, water supply assessments, alternative studies, and technical reports have been completed within Monterey County. To prevent re-doing work completed in previous studies, and to benefit from the valuable data collection and analysis already completed, FORA, MCWD, & MRWPCA will work collaboratively with the consultant to obtain all available studies during the data compilation phase.

Review previously completed water source, supply and augmentation studies including feasibility, conservation and water demand studies from Santa Cruz County and San Luis Obispo County. Compile a list of previously studied alternatives. Review existing policy framework and identify state and county laws and policies that guide water augmentation planning in Monterey County. Develop an electronic database of available resources, pertinent policies, and information identified while performing the background survey. The database must include a bibliography and previously completed: feasibility studies; technical reports; recycled water ordinances; etc. The database should include a .pdf of each study/report and a hyperlink to the location found.

Quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) of the data shall be conducted for any duplicate records and general checking of the data from various sources for uniform formats, parameters, and spatial information. The summary of the available data, identified data gaps, and associated data management systems will be incorporated into the Final Report.

Anticipated Deliverables:

- 2.1 *Jurisdictional Summaries and Analysis.*
- 2.2 *Technical memorandum (TM) summarizing the regulatory action triggering the need for an initial alternatives analysis.*
- 2.3 *TM explaining the basis for the FORA's BRP Water Augmentation mitigation, the original analysis & its underlying assumptions, and the BRP forecast demand reassessment.*
- 2.4 *Stakeholder /Agency summary list and points of contact. (in Excel)*

- 2.5 *Database of available resources, pertinent policies, and information identified while performing the background survey. (in Excel)*

3. ECONOMIC CONSTRAINTS AND STRATEGY ASSUMPTIONS

a. Stakeholder Impacts & Benefits Assessment.

The former Fort Ord area is made up of a diverse group of stakeholders which include The Ord Military Community, five coastal cities, Monterey County, CSUMB, UCSC, and MPC Community College. It is necessary to identify and summarize the various stakeholders, and provide a stakeholder analysis for the TAG.

Identify and summarize the apparent beneficiaries of the FORA water augmentation program in order to inform cost allocation considerations for the TAG. For each identified beneficiary, characterize the realized benefit(s) that would accrue because of FORA's water augmentation program. This summary should be qualitative in nature. The identified impacts and benefits will be incorporated into the Final Report.

b. Identify Public Funding and Financing Options

Provide a summary of public funding and financing options that may be relevant to consider when developing a water augmentation program financial plan, such as federal and state grant and subsidized loan programs. Provide a concise summary of public funding and financing sources applicable for water augmentation options/alternatives that include the: issuing agency(ies); rates and terms; application requirements; applicability; timelines for application and award; and other relevant considerations. The information will be incorporated into the Final Report.

c. Identify Funding Mechanisms and Rate Structure Options

- i. Review/interview peer agency revenue mechanisms and rate structures. Assess water and sewer user charges, recycled connection fees and user charges, benefit assessments, developer fee/contributions, etc...
- ii. Summarize and prioritize potential revenue mechanisms and their constraints. Provide a summary for each water augmentation option/alternative, for the 'FORA selected Top 3', and the preferred recommendation. Summarize implementation considerations & requirements. Outline pros and cons. Summarize cost allocations
- iii. Compare revenue mechanisms, constraints and rate structures to peer agencies & similar structures.

Anticipated Deliverables:

- 3.1 *TM identifying Public Funding, Mechanisms and Rate Structure Options.*
- 3.2 *TM summarizing impacts and benefits to stakeholders.*
- 3.3 *Stakeholder impacts and benefits. (in Excel)*
- 3.4 *TM describing possible economic strategies for implementing alternative water augmentations projects for the primary stakeholders.*

4. ESTABLISH THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS GROUND RULES

- a. Plan, Organize, and Facilitate workshops for/with the TAG:
Develop a plan to engage member agencies. Identify and define key Risks, Issues and Opportunities (RIO) including identifying gaps, constraints and benefits. Identify and define regional long-term (30-year) strategic goals. Define measurable, time-bound objectives, resultant milestones and applicable constraints.
- b. Establish a Work Plan.
Identify the Baseline. Develop at least four (4) viable alternatives to be compared against a baseline. Water conservation must be included as one of the alternatives. Define the critical questions; list assumptions and constraints. Define criteria for viable/non-viable; identify representative solutions (systems/programs); and develop operational scenarios to use for comparisons/evaluation.
- c. Develop Measures and Evaluation Criteria.
Work with the staff(s) to come to consensus on evaluation criteria by which alternatives will be assessed. Develop weighting and measures for, but not limited to, the following criteria: Cost Effectiveness; Value; Ability to Engage with Other Alternatives; Ability to Engage with Existing Systems; Percentage of Solution Contribution (of the remaining recycled water); Economic Feasibility; Implementation Feasibility; Energy Usage; Environmental Acceptance; Ease of Risk Mitigation; Maintainability; and Time to Implement. Attention should be given to the economic and energy impacts of global climate change (seawater rise, aquifer impacts), and changes due to geography (erosion, gravity, inland locations etc..).

Anticipated Deliverables:

- 4.1 *TM that summarizes key Challenges (Risks), Issues, and Opportunities.*
- 4.2 *TM that summarizes thirty (30) year strategic goals with five year increments.*
- 4.3 *Time-bound objectives, milestones, and applicable constraints. (in Excel)*

- 4.4 *TM that summarizes alternatives, critical questions, assumptions & constraints, viability, representations, and operational scenarios.*
- 4.5 *Evaluation criteria and weightings summary. (in Excel)*

5. WATER AUGMENTATION AND ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

The analysis of alternatives should be sufficiently detailed and rigorous to permit independent comparative evaluation of the benefits, costs, and environmental risks of the baseline and each reasonable alternative.

- a. Develop Baseline Metrics.
Review the BRP and various RUWAP studies and plans. Develop the baseline metrics by which to compare alternatives. Review the metrics with the TAG prior to moving forward with the alternatives analysis.
- b. Develop an 'all-of-the-above' or 'portfolio' of water augmentation options/alternatives solutions.
Use stakeholder input, the identified need, background, and evaluation criteria to develop no more than 3 'portfolio' alternatives. A 'Portfolio Alternative' consists of 2 or more alternatives which, when mixed, can meet the augmentation requirement. At least one 'Portfolio Alternative' must include conservation as an alternative.
- c. Perform a Feasibility Analysis for each Alternative, and 'Portfolio Alternative'.
Perform a preliminary review to determine whether the selected Alternatives are technically, financially, regulatory constraints, and operationally viable.
- d. Perform a Cost Analysis for each Alternative, and 'Portfolio Alternative'.
Describe the planned approach for addressing the fully burdened cost to implement. Describe the approach to the life-cycle cost (or total ownership cost). Estimate in constant dollars, adjust for discounting (time value of money) and account for the distribution of the costs over 30 years. The cost estimates should account for any life cycle costs associated with capital assets that have remaining useful value at the end of the period of analysis. Perform a sensitivity analysis for the critical assumptions and identify the upper and lower cost bounds (or stochastic distribution) for each alternative.
- e. Perform Effectiveness Analysis for each Alternative, and 'Portfolio Alternative'.

Spell out the analytic approach to the analysis, which should be built upon the measures and evaluation criteria, the economic constraints, and the nature of the selected alternatives to assess the effectiveness of the alternative and its outcomes. Address sensitivity analyses in the overall effectiveness analysis. Typically, there are a few critical assumptions that often drive the results of the analysis, and it is important to understand and point out how variations in these assumptions affect the results. In such cases, the effectiveness analysis should describe how sensitive the outcomes are to the assumed performance estimates.

- f. Perform Cost vs. Effectiveness Comparative Analysis.
Compare Alternative Costs to Alternative Effectiveness. Reduce Analysis down to a simple chart.

Anticipated Deliverables:

- 5.1 *TM that summarizes the Proposed Alternatives including 'Portfolio Alternatives'.*
- 5.2 *TM that summarizes the Feasibility Analysis.*
- 5.3 *TM that summarizes the Cost Analysis.*
- 5.4 *TM that summarizes the Effectiveness Analysis.*
- 5.5 *TM that summarizes the Cost Effectiveness Comparative Analysis.*
- 5.6 *Excel File with all forecast demand data, cost analysis assumptions and equations, effectiveness criteria/weighting calculations, and Comparative analysis.*

6. STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. Evaluate the Top 3 Alternatives.
Evaluate the Top 3 Alternatives in terms of the program's operations, implementation, and service delivery capacity. Identify Benefits and Gaps for each. Develop a list of strategies and prioritizations for implementing each alternative.
- b. Facilitate Decision Making Process for recommending the Preferred Alternative.
Coordinate, Notify and facilitate a workshop with the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), to determine the TAG's preferred Alternative. Facilitate a Decision Making Process with the TAG over 3 meetings.
- c. Recommend a Preferred Alternative.
Identify and recommend an approach to be presented to FORA, MCWD and MRWPCA Boards for input. Plan for up to 10 meetings.

Anticipated Deliverables:

- 6.1 *Detailed Evaluation of the Top 3 configuration including deficiency analysis.*
- 6.2 *TM summarizing Evaluation and Recommendation of a Preferred Augmentation Approach.*

7. FINAL REPORTS

- a. Incorporate Technical Memos into Final Water Augmentation Initial Alternatives Report.

Upon Notice of Board Consensus, and in coordination with MCWD, incorporate the TM's and relevant information including, but not limited to, regional descriptions, objectives, stakeholder outreach and coordination into a final report. Expect to support incorporation through Final Release.

- b. Develop a draft implementation strategy from which others may prepare a CIP development plan.

Prepare water augmentation strategy for the former Fort Ord area based on the recommended water augmentation approach. The strategy should be sufficient for the development of a Project Phasing approach to draft a CIP development plan by others.

Anticipated Deliverables:

- 7.1 *Technical Memo (TM) proposing an implementation strategy sufficient for another entity to develop Capital Improvement Project plans.*
- 7.2 *Water Augmentation Report Incorporation Administrative Draft.*
- 7.3 *Water Augmentation Report Incorporation Draft.*
- 7.4 *Water Augmentation Report Incorporation Final Release.*

DELIVERABLES LIST (SUMMARIZED)

1. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1. Monthly reports.*
- 1.2. Agenda's & Minutes of public meetings as needed.*

2. BACKGROUND SURVEY

- 2.1. Jurisdictional Summary and Analysis.*
- 2.2. Technical memorandum (TM) summarizing regulatory action triggering the need for analysis*
- 2.3. TM explaining the basis for the FORA's BRP Water Augmentation mitigation.*
- 2.4. Stakeholder /Agency summary list and points of contact. (in Excel)*
- 2.5. Database of available resources, pertinent policies, and information identified. (in Excel)*

3. ECONOMIC CONSTRAINTS AND STRATEGY ASSUMPTIONS

- 3.1. TM identifying Public Funding, Mechanisms and Rate Structure Options.*
- 3.2. TM summarizing impacts and benefits to stakeholders.*
- 3.3. Stakeholder impacts and benefits. (in Excel)*
- 3.4. TM identifying describing possible economic strategies for implementing alternative water augmentations projects for the primary stakeholders.*

4. ESTABLISH THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS GROUND RULES

- 4.1. TM that summarizes key Challenges (Risks), Issues, and Opportunities.*
- 4.2. Summary of the twenty-year strategic goals with two year and five year increments.*
- 4.3. List of time-bound objectives, milestones, and applicable constraints (in Excel).*
- 4.4. TM that summarizes Alternatives, critical questions, assumptions & constraints, viability, representations, and operational scenarios.*
- 4.5. Summary of Evaluation Criteria and Weightings. (in Excel)*

5. WATER AUGMENTATION AND ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

- 5.1. TM that summarizes the Proposed Alternatives including 'Portfolio Alternatives'.*
- 5.2. TM that summarizes the Feasibility Analysis.*
- 5.3. TM that summarizes the Cost Analysis.*
- 5.4. TM that summarizes the Effectiveness Analysis.*
- 5.5. TM that summarizes the Cost Effectiveness Comparative Analysis.*
- 5.6. Excel File with all forecast determination data, cost analysis assumptions and equations, effectiveness criteria/weighting calculations, and Comparative analysis.*

6. STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1. Detailed Evaluation of the Top 3 configuration including deficiency analysis.*
- 6.2. TM summarizing Evaluation and Recommendation of a Preferred Augmentation Approach.*

7. FINAL REPORTS

- 7.1. TM proposing an implementation strategy sufficient for another entity to develop Capital Improvement Project plans.*
- 7.2. Water Augmentation Report Incorporation Administrative Draft.*
- 7.3. Water Augmentation Report Incorporation Review Draft.*
- 7.4. Water Augmentation Report Incorporation Final Release.*

Reference Material:

Click + Control to follow the hyperlink:

Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA)

1. [FORA Database of Governing Documents](#)
2. [FORA Base Reuse Plan](#)
3. [FORA Public Facilities Implementation Plan \(PFIP\)](#) See PFIP Section 3

Marina Coast Water District (MCWD)

1. [MCWD Engineering Documents](#)
2. [MCWD 2015 Urban Water Management Plan](#)
3. [MCWD 2004 Ord-Community Water Distribution Master Plan](#)

ATTACHMENT B: SELECTION CRITERIA

Evaluation Process

FORA staff will determine responsiveness and evaluate all proposal submittals. The evaluation process will consider all required information. Each criterion will be scored based upon a pre-determined point system described below. Interviews with the highest ranking teams may be scheduled at the sole discretion of Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) staff.

Interview Questions:

- Please explain your firm's understanding of FORA's problem and needs.
- Please describe experience with the FORA, the Fort Ord Area, Marina Coast Water District (MCWD), and/or Monterey Peninsula Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA).
- Please describe experience with the Monterey County, San Luis Obispo County, Monterey County Water Resource Agency, Salinas basin and associated aquifers.
- Please describe your organization in terms of purpose, structure, and financial health.
- Would you tell us about the key personnel assigned to this project, their professional qualifications and how much of their time will be committed to this project?
- What obligations does your firm have, or expect to have, which run concurrently with our project?
- What is the level of effort for those obligations?
- How are unanticipated complications and delays handled? How will you ensure un-interrupted delivery of service?
- What technical problems have you had on similar jobs and how did you overcome these problems in respect to cost, schedule, and quality?
- Please briefly tell us about a project of similar size and scope to this study.
- Did you meet or beat schedule/cost on your last project? How? Do you track Schedule Performance Index (SPI) and Cost Performance Index (CPI)?
- What is the proposed work plan?
- Please explain the schedule, milestones, expected results and deliverables timelines.
- FORA requires regular reporting on project status. Please identify the Project Manager and explain their communications plan.
- Please provide an example of your invoice and explain your invoicing process in terms of the identified deliverables.
- Please provide an example of a report that was completed for an agency on the California Coast.

FORA reserves the right to ask further clarifying questions, as needed.

Preliminary Proposal Evaluation Criterion & Weights

Criteria	Points	
Narrative	1-10	What is the level of experience the firm has with FORA's problems and need?
	1-10	How realistic are the proposed methods to keep costs low, manage costs, and keep project on schedule?
	1-10	How reasonable and feasible is the approach to the problem, recommended method, and procedure? Do they present solutions to decrease cost and schedule?
	1-10	What is the level of the organizations management capability and competency, fiscal and personnel resources, and experience to perform the services?
	1-10	What are the professional qualifications of the personnel that the firm will commit to the project? Has the proposer allocated sufficient staff resources?
	50	Narrative Sub total
Cost	300	Grand Total Not to Exceed: <i>Lowest Cost Estimate/Other Cost Estimate x (Max Points) = 'Other Proposal' awarded points.</i>
Schedule	1-50	Does the proposal include PERT and GANTT charts? Do they list clear durations, timelines and deliverable dates?
	1-50	Do the expected results, outcomes, and deliverables appear to be achievable in a timely manner, given the approaches, methods and procedures proposed?
	1-50	Does the proposer appear to be capable of handling and resolving unanticipated complications and delays without interrupting the delivery of services?
	1-50	How feasible are the proposed timelines for performance?
	200	Schedule Sub total
Fully Responsive	100	How responsive is the proposal to the goals, objectives, service demands, and required deliverables specified in the RFP?
Interviews	1-50	What is the level of experience the firm has with FORA's problems and need?
	1-50	How free is the organization and its staff from other obligations over the course of the project?
	1-50	What is the level of evidence the firm has showing its ability to communicate, plan and manage/prevent changes to scope, budget, and schedule?
	1-50	What is the level of positive performance on past projects?
	1-50	What is the level of experience the firm has performing work of a similar nature, size, and scope on the California Coast?
	1-50	How well does the proposer's experience and qualifications complement the services being sought?
	1-50	What is the level of confidence in the proposer's ability to perform the work well?
	350	Interview Subtotal
Total	1000	[Narrative + Cost + Schedule + Responsiveness + Interviews]

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Statement of Qualifications (SOQ's)

To be considered responsive to the RFP requirements, proposal submissions shall be complete and Respondents shall furnish verifiable evidence that their firm and their personnel, meet the qualifications set forth. In general, the SOQs shall provide the professional and technical experience, background, qualifications, professional licensing and expertise of key personnel. The Respondent shall show that the team and its intended personnel possess demonstrated skills and experience in all areas of the Scope of Work (**Attachment A**). FORA reserves the right at its sole discretion to reject all SOQs, to waive non-material defects and to limit the number of Respondent teams selected for interview.

2. Question and Clarification Process

Inquiries and request regarding this RFP shall be submitted in writing to Peter Said at peter@fora.org, Subject line: *RFP1-WA02 Clarification*. Written questions will be answered in writing via an addendum posted on the FORA website www.fora.org and sent to RFP respondents. Oral statements concerning the meaning or intent of the contents of this RFP by any person will be considered invalid. The last day questions and clarifications will be accepted is February 08, 2017 at 17:00pm PST.

3. Errors and Omissions

If a Respondent discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission or other error in the RFP or any of its attachments, Respondent shall notify FORA in writing of such error(s) and request modification or clarification of the RFP. Modifications and Clarifications will be made per the questions and clarifications process above.

4. Cancellation

While it is the intent of FORA to proceed with the study, this RFP does not obligate FORA to enter into an agreement. FORA retains the right to cancel this RFP at any time should the study be cancelled, lose funding, or it is deemed in FORA's best interest. No obligation either expressed or implied, exists on the part of FORA to make an award or to pay any cost incurred in the SOQs preparation or submission.

5. Award of Contract

A "Notice of Intent to Award" will be posted publicly for five (5) consecutive FORA business days prior to an award. Written/e-mail notification will be made to the unsuccessful respondents. SOQs will become public documents subject to disclosure laws and submittal disposition below. Evaluation methodology and basis for qualification are described in Section IV.

6. Submittal Disposition

Qualifications submitted become the property of FORA. Information contained in the received SOQs becomes public property and may be subject to disclosure laws. In order to protect any proprietary information from public disclosure, the Respondent must identify any information as such upon submission, must request protection of such information, and must

state the reasons why protection is necessary. FORA reserves the right to make use of any information or ideas contained in the submittals. All materials, ideas, and formats submitted in response to the RFP will become the property of FORA on receipt and may be returned at FORA option and at the Respondent's expense.

7. Non-Endorsement

If a submittal is accepted, the Respondent agree to not issue any news releases or other statements which state or imply FORA endorsement of the Respondent's services.

8. Prevailing Wage

If applicable, the respondent must demonstrate compliance with the following FORA Prevailing Wage Requirement per FORA Master Resolution §1.01.050 and §3.03.090, as determined by the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations under Division 2, Part 7, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code to workers performing "First Generation Construction."

9. Standard Agreement.

The successful respondent will be required to execute the FORA standard form of Professional Service Agreement (**Attachment B**). Proposals should include confirmation that your firm understand and accepts all the requirements in that agreement, including but not limited to the requirements regarding insurance and indemnity.

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

1. Reference Documents: (Hyperlinks provided)

Online Resources

In carrying out this work a number of documents from various sources may be reviewed:

- [Fort Ord Reuse Authority, MASTER RESOLUTION, Adopted March 14, 1997, Amended February 13, 2014](#)
- [The Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan \(BRP\)](#), Appendices and Reassessment
- [1998 Water/Wastewater Facilities Agreement](#)
- [2005 Memorandum of Agreement among US ARMY, Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency, Fort Ord Reuse Authority, Marina Coast Water District](#)
- [2007 Potable Water Allocations to the Jurisdictions](#)

Agreement for Professional Services

This Agreement for Professional Services (hereinafter "Agreement") is by and between the Fort Ord Reuse Authority, a political subdivision of the State of California (hereinafter "FORA") and _____ (hereinafter "Consultant").

The parties agree as follows:

1. SERVICES. Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement, Consultant shall provide FORA with _____ services as described in Exhibit "A." Such services will be at the direction of the _____.
2. TERM. This Agreement shall be from _____ through _____. The term of the Agreement may be extended upon mutual concurrence and amendment to this Agreement.
3. COMPENSATION. The overall maximum amount of compensation to Consultant over the full term of this Agreement is not-to-exceed \$_____ (_____ Dollars) including travel / out of pocket expenses.

FORA shall pay Consultant for services rendered pursuant to this Agreement at the times and in the manner set forth in Exhibit "A."
4. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT. Consultant is not required to use FORA facilities or equipment for performing professional services. Consultant shall arrange to be physically present at FORA facilities to provide professional services at least during those days and hours that are agreed upon by the parties to deliver the services noted in the Scope of Services attached hereto in Exhibit "A."
5. GENERAL PROVISIONS. The general provisions set forth in Exhibit "B" are incorporated into this Agreement. In the event of any inconsistency between said general provisions and any other terms or conditions of this Agreement, the other term or condition shall control only insofar as it is inconsistent with the General Provisions.
6. EXHIBITS. All exhibits referred to herein are by this reference incorporated.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, FORA and CONSULTANT execute this Agreement as follows:

FORA

CONSULTANT

By _____
Michael A. Houlemard, Jr.
Executive Officer

_____ Date

By _____
_____ Date

Approved as to form:

Jon R. Giffen
Authority Counsel

SCOPE OF SERVICES

EXHIBIT A

DRAFT

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT. At all times during the term of this Agreement, CONSULTANT shall be an independent Consultant and shall not be an employee of FORA. FORA shall have the right to control CONSULTANT only insofar as the results of CONSULTANT'S services rendered pursuant to this Agreement.

2. TIME. CONSULTANT shall devote such services pursuant to this Agreement as may be reasonably necessary for satisfactory performance of CONSULTANT'S obligations pursuant to this Agreement. CONSULTANT shall adhere to the Schedule of Activities shown in Exhibit "A".

3. INSURANCE. The CONSULTANT shall provide the following minimum insurance coverage:

General Liability

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| • Products | \$1 million |
| • Personal and ADV Injury | \$1 million |
| • Each Occurrence | \$2 million |
| • Property Damage per Occurrence | \$100,000 |
| • Property Damage Aggregate | \$2 million |
| • Medical Expenses | \$ 5,000 |

Professional Liability

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| • Each Occurrence | \$1 million |
|-------------------|-------------|

Automobile:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| • Combined Single Limit | \$250,000/\$500,000 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|

Workers Compensation and Employer's Liability

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------|
| • Worker Compensation | Statutory Limits |
| • Occupational Disease | Statutory Limits |

- a. ENDORSEMENTS. All policies shall provide or be endorsed to provide that coverage shall not be canceled, except after prior written notice has been provided to FORA in accordance with policy provisions. Liability, umbrella and excess policies shall provide or be endorsed to provide the following: 1) For any claims related to this project, CONSULTANT'S insurance coverage shall be primary and any insurance, or self-insurance maintained FORA shall be excess of the CONSULTANT'S insurance and shall not contribute with it; and, 2) FORA, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers are to be covered as additional insured on the CGL policy. General liability coverage can be provided in the form of an endorsement to CONSULTANT'S insurance at least as broad as ISO Form CG 20 10 11 85 or if not available, through the addition of both CG 20 10 and CG 2037 if a later edition is used.

4. CONSULTANT NO AGENT. Except as FORA may specify in writing, CONSULTANT shall have no authority, express or implied to act on behalf of FORA in any capacity whatsoever as an agent. CONSULTANT shall have no authority, express or implied, pursuant to this Agreement, to bind FORA to any obligation whatsoever.

5. ASSIGNMENT PROHIBITED. No party to this Agreement may assign any right or obligation pursuant to this Agreement. Any attempted or purported assignment of any right or obligation pursuant to this Agreement shall be void and of no effect.

<Name> may use assistants, under its direct supervision, to perform some of the services under this Agreement. Consultant shall provide FORA fourteen (14) days' notice prior to the departure of <Name> from Consultant's employ. Should he/she leave Consultant's employ, FORA shall have the option to terminate this Agreement, within three (3) days of the close of said notice period. Upon termination of this Agreement, Consultant's compensation shall be payment for actual services performed up to, and including, the date of termination or as may be otherwise agreed to in writing between FORA and the Consultant.

6. PERSONNEL. CONSULTANT shall assign only competent personnel to perform services pursuant to this Agreement. In the event that FORA, in its sole discretion, at any time during the term of this Agreement, desires the removal of any person or persons assigned by CONSULTANT. CONSULTANT shall remove any such person immediately upon receiving notice from FORA of the desire for FORA for the removal of such person or person.

7. STANDARD OF PERFORMANCE. CONSULTANT shall perform all services required pursuant to this Agreement in the manner and according to the standards observed by a competent practitioner of the profession in which CONSULTANT is engaged in the geographical area in which CONSULTANT practices his profession. All products and services of whatsoever nature, which CONSULTANT delivers to FORA pursuant to this Agreement, shall be prepared in a thorough and professional manner, conforming to standards of quality normally observed by a person practicing in CONSULTANT'S profession. FORA shall be the sole judge as to whether the product or services of the CONSULTANT are satisfactory but shall not unreasonably withhold its approval.

8. CANCELLATION OF AGREEMENT. Either party may cancel this Agreement at any time for its convenience, upon written notification. CONSULTANT shall be entitled to receive full payment for all services performed and all costs incurred to the date of receipt entitled to no further compensation for work performed after the date of receipt of written notice to cease work shall become the property of FORA.

9. PRODUCTS OF CONTRACTING. All completed work products of the CONSULTANT, once accepted, shall be the property of FORA. CONSULTANT shall have the right to use the data and products for research and academic purposes. All documents, maps, plans and other materials prepared pursuant to this agreement, although they are the consultants instrument of professional service, shall be considered, by this contract, the exclusive property of FORA, and originals of all such materials shall be presented to FORA within ten (10) days after its request. CONSULTANT may retain copies of such materials.

10. INDEMNIFY AND HOLD HARMLESS. CONSULTANT is to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless FORA, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind and description, brought forth on account of injuries to or death of any person or damage to property arising from or connected with the willful misconduct, negligent acts, errors or omissions, ultra-hazardous activities, activities giving rise to strict liability, or defects in design by the CONSULTANT or any person directly or indirectly employed by or acting as agent for CONSULTANT in the performance of this Agreement, including the concurrent or successive passive negligence of FORA, its officers, agents, employees or volunteers.

It is understood that the duty of CONSULTANT to indemnify and hold harmless includes the duty to defend as set forth in Section 2778 of the California Civil Code. Acceptance of insurance certificates and endorsements required under this Agreement does not relieve CONSULTANT from liability under this indemnification and hold harmless clause. This indemnification and hold harmless clause shall apply whether or not such insurance policies have been determined to be applicable to any of such damages or claims for damages.

FORA is to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless CONSULTANT, its employees and sub-consultants, from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind and description, brought forth on account of injuries to or death of any person or damage to property arising from or connected with the willful misconduct, negligent acts, errors or omissions, ultra-hazardous activities, activities giving rise to strict liability, or defects in design by FORA or any person directly or indirectly employed by or acting as agent for FORA in the performance of this Agreement, including the concurrent or successive passive negligence of CONSULTANT, its officers, agents, employees or volunteers.

11. PROHIBITED INTERESTS. No employee of FORA shall have any direct financial interest in this agreement. This agreement shall be voidable at the option of FORA if this provision is violated.

12. CONSULTANT- NOT PUBLIC OFFICIAL. CONSULTANT possesses no authority with respect to any FORA decision beyond the rendition of information, advice, recommendation or counsel.

13. DISPUTES. Disputes arising under this agreement shall be submitted to one non-binding mediation session upon demand of either party after a reasonable attempt to resolve any dispute. The parties shall select a mediator by mutual agreement. Failing agreement on the selection of a mediator, the mediations shall be conducted under the Judicial, Arbitration and Mediation Services ("JAMS") Rules and Procedures, but not necessarily under the auspices of JAMS. Unless the parties mutually agree otherwise, the cost of said mediation shall be divided evenly between the parties.

If the dispute is not resolved in mediation, the dispute shall be submitted for binding arbitration by a single arbitrator to the Judicial Arbitration and Mediation Services ("JAMS") in San Jose, California, with the hearing to be held in Monterey, California or at such other location(s) mutually agreed upon by the Parties. The mediator may not serve as the arbitrator. The costs of the arbitration, including all arbitration fees, and costs for the use of facilities during the hearings, shall be advanced equally by the parties to the arbitration. All such fees and costs together with attorneys' fees and costs, including expert witness costs of the Parties and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in enforcing any judgment, shall be awarded to the prevailing Party (or most prevailing Party, as decided by the arbitrator). The provisions of Sections 1282.6, 1283, and 1283.05 of the California Code of Civil Procedure shall apply to the arbitration. The arbitrator shall issue a final decision within thirty (30) days of the conclusion of testimony unless otherwise agreed to by the Parties.

-END-

DRAFT BOARD
PACKET



FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A, Marina, CA 93933

Phone: (831) 883-3672 | Fax: (831) 883-3675 | www.fora.org

MEMORANDUM

TO: Administrative Committee
FROM: Jonathan Brinkmann, Principal Planner
RE: Item 7a – Capital Improvement Program Development Forecasts Methodology & Request
DATE: November 16, 2016

On an annual basis, FORA updates its Capital Improvement Program (CIP) document. This process begins with requesting and receiving updated development forecasts from the FORA land use jurisdictions. These development forecasts are the basis for planning FORA's CIP. Accurate and realistic development forecasts will help FORA to program its BRP mitigations using the best available information. FORA receipt of development forecasts is a necessary step before implementing the Administrative Committee's CIP Development Forecasts Methodology.

CIP Development Forecasts Methodology

In 2014, FORA Administrative and CIP Committees formalized a methodology for developing jurisdictional development forecasts: 1) Committee members recommended differentiating between entitled and planned projects and correlate accordingly, 2) Market conditions necessary to moving housing projects forward should be recognized and reflected in the methodology. On average, a jurisdiction/project developer will market three or four housing types/products and sell at least one of each type per month, 3) As jurisdictions coordinate with developers to review and revise development forecasts each year, FORA staff and committees review submitted jurisdiction forecasts, using the methodology outlined in #2, translated into number of building permits expected to be pulled between July 1 and June 30 of the prospective fiscal year and consider permitting and market constraints in making additional revisions; and 4) FORA Administrative and CIP Committees confirm final development forecasts, and share those findings with the Finance Committee.

At the November 16, 2016 Administrative Committee meeting, FORA staff will present CIP background information and a 5-year land sales forecasting tool. Staff will request input from the committee concerning the CIP Development Forecasts Methodology.

Please send development forecasts information to FORA Project Manager Peter Said at Peter@fora.org by Friday, December 16, 2016. Last year's forecasts are attached to this memo for reference.

Enclosure (1)

Table 5 Land Sales Revenue

Land Sale = Table 8 Estimated Acreage x \$188,000 per Acre | Indexed 1.5% to account for Land Value Increase over time

Estimated Land Sales

Land Use		2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	Post-FORA	Forecast Total
Location & Description	Jurisdiction																
<u>Office</u>																	
Del Rey Oaks (Planned)	DRO	\$ -	\$ 5,081,524	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,081,524
Monterey (Planned)	MRY	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,362,659	\$ 3,188,184	\$ 4,058,492	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,246,676	\$ 9,609,335
Cypress Knolls (Planned)	MAR	\$ -	\$ 203,261	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 203,261
Marina (Planned)	MAR	\$ -	\$ 374,762	\$ 380,384	\$ 386,090	\$ 4,746,263	\$ 397,759	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,144,022	\$ 6,285,258
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,315,226	\$ -	\$ 1,328,410	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,328,410	\$ 2,643,636
<u>Industrial</u>																	
Monterey (Planned)	MRY	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 824,530	\$ 836,898	\$ 852,696	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,689,595	\$ 2,514,125
Cypress Knolls (Planned)	MAR	\$ -	\$ 66,695	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,695
TAMC (Planned)	MAR	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 197,445	\$ 200,407	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 397,852
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,435,141	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,435,141
<u>Retail</u>																	
Cypress Knolls (Planned)	MAR	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,162,027	\$ -
TAMC (Planned)	MAR	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 676,954	\$ 687,109	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,018,005	\$ 1,364,063
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,415,635	\$ 12,670,283	\$ 21,732,018	\$ 6,512,464	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29,934,076	\$ 46,330,399
Ord Shopette	MCO	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,645,529	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,579,605	\$ 4,645,529
<u>Hotel (rooms)</u>																	
Del Rey Oaks (Planned)	DRO	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,888,026	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,888,026
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,293,339	\$ 1,050,191	\$ -	\$ 1,136,030	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,136,030	\$ 3,479,560
<u>New Residential</u>		**6,160 unit cap on new residential until 18,000 new jobs on Fort Ord per BRP 3.11.5.4 (b) 2) & 3.11.5.4 (c)															
TAMC (Planned)	MAR	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marina	MAR	\$ -	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,276,459	\$ 3,325,606	\$ 3,375,490	\$ 3,426,122	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,801,612	\$ 14,403,677
Seaside	SEA	\$ -	\$ 484,206	\$ 3,931,751	\$ 3,325,606	\$ 13,164,411	\$ 12,676,652	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,841,063	\$ 33,582,625
Del Rey Oaks	DRO	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,000,000
Various	Various	\$ -	\$ -													\$ -	\$ -
CSUMB: Land Sales	CSU	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Sub-total - Estimated Land Sales		\$ 1,000,000	\$ 7,210,448	\$ 16,487,192	\$ 46,155,647	\$ 52,017,202	\$ 29,060,215	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 123,881,119	\$ 151,930,706
FORA Share (50% of Total)		\$ 500,000	\$ 3,605,224	\$ 8,243,596	\$ 23,077,824	\$ 26,008,601	\$ 14,530,108	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 61,940,560	\$ 75,965,353
Discounted Cash Flow 4.1% Bond Buyers Index		\$ 480,187	\$ 3,325,170	\$ 7,301,955	\$ 19,631,709	\$ 21,248,147	\$ 11,400,233	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 32,648,380	\$ 63,387,402

Table 5 Land Sales Revenue

Land Sale = Table 8 Estimated Acreage x \$188,000 per Acre | Indexed 1.5% to account for Land Value Increase over time

Residential Annual Land Use Construction *(dwelling units)*

Land Use Location & Description	Juris- diction	Land Transfer Type	Built To Date	FORECAST YEAR															Post FORA	Forecast + Built
				2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30			
NEW RESIDENTIAL																			**6,160 unit cap on new residential until 18,000 new jobs on Fort Ord per BRP 3.11.5.4 (b) 2) & 3.11.5.4 (c)	
Marina																				
Marina Heights (Entitled)	MAR	EDC		76	144	180	186	180	284	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	464	1,050	
The Promontory (Entitled)	MAR	EDC		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Dunes (Entitled)	MAR	EDC	261	30	90	90	90	50	626	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	676	1,237	
TAMC (Planned)	MAR	EDC	-	-	-	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200	
Marina Subtotal			261	106	234	370	376	230	910	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,140	2,487	
Seaside																				
UC (Planned)	UC	EDC	-	-	-	-	110	110	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	130	240	
East Garrison I (Entitled)	MCO	EDC	319	160	140	120	100	100	531	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	631	1,470	
Seaside Highlands (Entitled)	SEA	Sale	152	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	152	
Seaside Resort (Entitled)	SEA	Sale	5	2	2	4	6	53	53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	106	125	
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	EDC	-	-	15	120	100	390	370	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	760	995	
Seaside Subtotal			476	162	157	244	316	653	974	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,627	2,982	
Other																				
Del Rey Oaks (Planned)	DRO	EDC		-	-	-	130	287	274	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	561	691	
Other Residential (Planned)	Various	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Other Subtotal			-	-	-	-	130	287	274	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	561	691	
TOTAL NEW RESIDENTIAL			737	268	391	614	822	1,170	2,158	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,328	6160**	
EXISTING/REPLACEMENT RESIDENTIAL																			-	
Preston Park (Entitled)	MAR	EDC	352	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	352	
Cypress Knolls (Planned)	MAR	EDC		-	-	100	100	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200	400	
Abrams B (Entitled)	MAR	EDC	192	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	192	
MOCO Housing Authority (Entitled)	MAR	EDC	56	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56	
Shelter Outreach Plus (Entitled)	MAR	EDC	39	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	
VTC (Entitled)	MAR	EDC	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	
Interim Inc (Entitled)	MAR	EDC	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	
Sunbay (Entitled)	SEA	Sale	297	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	297	
Bayview (Entitled)	SEA	Sale	225	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	225	
Seaside Highlands (Entitled)	SEA		228	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	228	
TOTAL EXISTING/REPLACE			1,413	-	-	100	100	100	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200	1,813	
																			-	
CSUMB (Planned)				-	-	-	150	150	192	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	342	492	
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS			2,150	268	391	714	1,072	1,420	2,450	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,870	8,465	

Table 5

Table 5 Land Sales Revenue

Land Sale = Table 8 Estimated Acreage x \$188,000 per Acre | Indexed 1.5% to account for Land Value Increase over time

Non-Residential Annual Land Use Construction (building square feet or hotel rooms per year)

Land Use Location & Description	Juris- diction	Built To Date	FORECAST YEAR															Forecast + Built
			2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	Post FORA	
NON-RESIDENTIAL																		
<u>Office</u>																		
Del Rey Oaks (Planned)	DRO	-	-	400,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400,000
Monterey (Planned)	MRY	-	-	-	-	180,524	240,000	301,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	541,000	721,524
East Garrison I (Entitled)	MCO	-	14,000	-	10,000	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	34,000
Imjin Office Park (Entitled)	MAR	28,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dunes (Entitled)	MAR	190,000	50,000	50,000	100,000	100,000	-	270,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	270,000	570,000
Cypress Knolls (Planned)	MAR	-	-	16,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16,000
Interim Inc. (Entitled)	MAR	14,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marina (Planned)	MAR	-	29,500	29,500	29,500	29,500	29,500	29,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59,000	177,000
TAMC (Planned)	MAR	-	-	-	20,000	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	14,900	-	-	102,000	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	202,000
UC (Planned)	UC	-	-	60,000	80,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	360,000	680,000
<u>Industrial</u>																		
Monterey (Planned)	MRY	-	-	-	-	72,000	72,000	72,275	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	144,275	216,275
Marina CY (Entitled)	MAR	12,300	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dunes (Entitled)	MAR	-	-	30,000	30,000	54,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	114,000
Cypress Knolls (Planned)	MAR	-	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,000
Marina Airport (Entitled)	MAR	250,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TAMC (Planned)	MAR	-	-	-	17,500	17,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	-	-	-	-	125,320	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	125,320
UC (Planned)	UC	38,000	-	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	100,000
<u>Retail</u>																		
Del Rey Oaks (Planned)	DRO	-	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,000
East Garrison I (Entitled)	MCO	-	20,000	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,000
Cypress Knolls (Planned)	MAR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dunes (Entitled)	MAR	418,000	40,000	30,000	30,000	24,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	124,000
TAMC (Planned)	MAR	-	-	-	37,500	37,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75,000
Seaside Resort (Entitled)	SEA	-	-	16,300	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16,300
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	-	-	-	300,000	691,500	330,000	345,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	675,000	1,666,500
UC (Planned)	UC	-	-	-	62,500	82,500	82,500	82,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	165,000	310,000
		965,200	158,500	677,800	839,000	1,634,344	1,064,000	1,300,275	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,364,275	5,673,919
HOTEL ROOMS																		
<u>Hotel (rooms)</u>																		
Del Rey Oaks (Planned)	DRO	-	-	-	-	550	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	550
Dunes (Entitled)	MAR	108	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dunes (Entitled)	MAR	-	-	-	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400
Seaside Resort (Entitled)	SEA	-	-	40	28	262	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330
Seaside Resort TS (Entitled)	SEA	-	-	-	-	-	-	170	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	170	170
Seaside (Planned)	SEA	-	-	-	250	200	-	210	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	210	660
UC (Planned)	UC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		108	-	40	678	1,012	-	380	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	380	2,110

Appendix C: Jurisdiction-Incurred Caretaker Costs Reimbursement Policy

Caretaker costs were first described in the Fiscal Year (FY) 01/02 FORA Capital Improvement Program (CIP) as: “Costs associated with potential delays in redevelopment and represent interim capital costs associated with property maintenance prior to transfer for development.”

FORA Assessment District Counsel opined that FORA Community Facilities District Special Tax payments cannot fund caretaker costs. For this reason, caretaker costs would be funded through FORA’s 50% share of land sale proceeds on former Fort Ord, any reimbursements to those fund balances, or other designated resources.

As a result of the FY 11/12 and FY 12/13 Phase II CIP Review analysis prepared by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., FORA agreed to reimburse its five member jurisdictions (County of Monterey and Cities of Seaside, Marina, Del Rey Oaks, and Monterey) for these expenses based on past experience, provided sufficient land sale revenue is available and jurisdictions are able to demonstrate property management/caretaker costs. Based on previous agreements between the U.S Army and the City of Marina, City of Seaside and County of Monterey, *examples* of caretaker costs include the following: tree trimming, mowing, pavement patching, centerline/stenciling, barricades, traffic signs, catch basin/storm drain maintenance, vacant buildings, vegetation control/spraying, paving/slurry seal, and administration (10% of total costs).

For clarification purposes, FY 15/16 caretaker costs funding is limited to the amount listed in the FORA FY 15/16 CIP (Table 5 – Land Sales Revenue), which is \$150,000. Future FORA annual CIP’s will establish caretaker costs reimbursement funding as described in the next paragraph.

For implementation, this policy clarifies that FORA funding for caretaker costs shall be determined by allocating a maximum of \$500,000 in the prior fiscal year’s property taxes collected and designated to the FORA CIP. For example, if \$525,000 in property taxes is collected and designated to the FORA CIP during FY 15/16, then FORA will program a maximum of \$500,000 for the five member jurisdictions’ eligible caretaker costs. Each subsequent year, the maximum funding for caretaker costs may be decreased assuming that, as land transfers from jurisdictions to third-party developers, jurisdictions’ caretaker costs will decrease. If FORA does not collect and designate to the CIP sufficient property taxes in a given fiscal year to fund the maximum amount of caretaker costs allowed that fiscal year, the actual amount of property taxes collected and designated to the CIP during the fiscal year shall be used to determine the amount of caretaker costs funding. FORA shall set caretaker costs funding through the approved FORA CIP.

For a member jurisdiction to be eligible for caretaker costs reimbursement:

- 1) Costs must be described using the Caretaker Costs Worksheet (**Exhibit A**) and submitted to FORA by January 31 (1st deadline) and March 31 (2nd deadline) of each year;
- 2) FORA staff must provide a written response within 30 days denying or authorizing, in part or in whole, the Caretaker Costs Worksheet in advance of the expenditure. FORA may request additional information from the member jurisdiction within 15 days of receiving the Caretaker Costs Worksheet. FORA shall provide reasons for caretaker costs reimbursement denial in its written response;

- 3) Eligible costs must be within the total amount approved in the current CIP, which shall be divided into five equal amounts, one for each of the five member jurisdictions. For example, if FORA is able to allocate \$100,000 in caretaker costs in a fiscal year, each jurisdiction shall have the ability to request up to \$20,000 in caretaker cost reimbursements. If a member jurisdiction does not submit a Caretaker Costs Worksheet to FORA by January 31 of each year, it forfeits its caretaker costs allocation for the fiscal year. Such unallocated dollars shall be available through March 31 (2nd deadline) (see #1 above) to the jurisdictions who submitted Caretaker Costs Worksheets to FORA by January 31; and
- 4) FORA staff must verify completion of caretaker costs work items through site visits prior to work initiation and after work completion.

FORA shall establish an emergency set aside of up to \$75,000 in the FY 16/17 CIP budget for urgent and unforeseen caretaker costs. The process for requesting these funds shall be the same as described above except there will not be a deadline for submitting the request.

**FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY CARETAKER COST WORKSHEET**

Date: _____

Jurisdiction: _____

Point of Contact: _____

Contact number/email: _____

Please answer the following questions and submit to the Fort Ord Reuse Authority for a determination of eligibility for caretaker cost reimbursement:

1. Is the property where the Caretaker Costs are planned owned by the jurisdiction?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
2. What is/are the Army Corps of Engineers parcel number(s)? _____
3. Check all Caretaker Cost work item categories that apply to the current request:
 - ☐ Tree trimming
 - ☐ Mowing
 - ☐ Pavement patching
 - ☐ Centerline/stenciling
 - ☐ Barricades
 - ☐ Traffic signs
 - ☐ Catch basins/storm drain maintenance
 - ☐ Barriers to vacant buildings
 - ☐ Vegetation control/spraying
 - ☐ Paving/slurry seal
 - ☐ Administration (up to 10% of total costs)
 - ☐ Other: _____
4. Provide a specific description of the proposed Caretaker Cost work:

5. Provide a description of potential benefit from completion of Caretaker work items (such as improved public health, public safety, reduced fire risk, etc.):

6. Provide a detailed budget of proposed Caretaker Costs with estimated costs (if caretaker work is approved for reimbursement, FORA staff will use this budget to verify work completion and issue reimbursements):

