

From: [pMahony](#)
To: senator.monning@senate.ca.gov; Assemblymember.stone@assembly.ca.gov; [FORA Board](#); [Hermelinda Flores](#)
Cc: [Supervisor Parker](#)
Subject: Transition Plan for Fort Ord Reuse Authority Now (AB # 1614)
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2017 8:21:24 PM

It appears that the F.O.R.A. board is actively seeking to extend their mission instead of preparing a plan to transfer their authority and to sunset their activity in June 2020.

I am asking that F.O.R.A. readies a transition plan in accordance with AB # 1614.

Thank you,
Pat Mahoney
3050 BOSTICK Ave
Marina, CA 93933

Fort Ord Reuse Authority
Attn: Board of Directors
920 Second Ave., Suite A
Marina, CA 93933

Subject: FORA Sunset and follow on options

As we rush toward 2020 FORA and its Board of Directors are charged with recommending what should happen after the current sunset date in June of that year. It seems there are three options. One is working to produce a legislative action which would extend FORA's sunset, the second is to allow all of FORA's assets and liabilities to become the responsibility of the local land use jurisdictions designated to receive lands according to the Base Reuse Plan and the third is to determine if a follow-on Joint Power Authority should be created and what that should look like. According to the meetings I have attended the Board has decided to pursue Option 1 and to work to create what Option 2 or 3 should be simultaneously. While logical, the mood of the electorate and the legislature seem to dictate that Option 1 will be a struggle. Therefore, lets address 2 and 3.

There are many detractors who believe FORA should sunset and the local jurisdictions should assume the responsibilities cited under the Base Reuse Plan and it's CIP. I believe that would be catastrophic for the region. In order for that scenario to work each jurisdiction would be required to hire employees or consultants to perform the remaining tasks, many of which are not normally performed by small cities and towns. Items such as monitoring the removal of UXO and other dangerous items from the lands, ensuring the required habitat management plan remains funded and is followed, developing cross jurisdictional infrastructure projects and others would be a quagmire with the jurisdictions working to provide for their needs individually at the expense of the needs of the region as a whole. The institutional knowledge and expertise of the staff assembled by FORA would be lost requiring further delay in completing the Base Reuse Plan. Perhaps most important in this option is finding a method of providing for funding the remaining programs under the Base Reuse Plan. FORA cannot at this point just apportion what comes from the current Community Facilities District. I believe these issues are sufficient to warrant the continuation of FORA's responsibilities through some region authority to be created and ready to function by June 2020.

Some feel that there are sufficient local agencies that are regional in nature which could perform ~~the functions~~ which are currently FORA's responsibilities. ~~Examples would be TAMC and LAFCO.~~ In fact, the rules governing FORA's sunset require the plan to be submitted to LAFCO. Why would that be? LAFCO has the responsibility to determine the boundaries of the various jurisdictions in the County and to ensure that any changes to those areas of influence are beneficial and properly funded before approval. Without FORA it would be LAFCO's responsibility to make those determinations prior to approving any land transfers. However, this does not mean they would be an appropriate body to ensure the issues described above are carried out according to the plan. They have no particular expertise, knowledge or staffing to

perform those functions. While TAMC certainly has the required expertise to oversee the completion of the remaining regional transportation infrastructure it also does not possess the other skills and knowledge required for the remaining issues. Therefore, a new body which has been euphemistically called FORA Lite is required. Without such a body the local jurisdictions would quite likely devolve into the same situation we experienced many years ago when everyone argued about what should be done to ensure fairness in the reuse of historic Ft. Ord. Do we really want to go through that again before we can continue to recover from the base closure?

If a new JPA is the way forward what should it look like. Most importantly it should do everything possible to ensure the knowledge and skills of the current FORA staff are maintained. Even if the number of employees is reduced the skill sets of each department must be transferred to the new body. Should everyone who is on the Board today be part of the new JPA? Well, look to history. Everyone on the Board now certainly believed they should have a say in what was going to be created. Now, to reduce expenses, many jurisdictions would prefer to bow out. I would caution that the expenses saved will be spent on the law suits to come when the new body takes an action someone does not like. While this may be peripherally important for most, it is critical for the university, cities and county who have received lands and will receive more in the future. To not include these agencies is short sighted and will come back to cause future unintended consequences and certain delay in completing the base reuse plan. Of course, financing rears its ugly head again with a JPA. However, it may be easier trying to convince the legislature to allow the continuation of the Community Facilities District if there is a regional authority assuming responsibility for its management.

In closing I would like to remind the Board that the three major objectives of the base reuse plan remain in place, the fulfilling of those objectives is uneven at best. Two of the Three E's, Education and Environment, have received a lot of service and are for the most part functioning well. The third E of Economic Redevelopment is as yet woefully lacking. In order to fulfill that promise we need to provide for the continued management of the Habitat Management Plan to allow for the construction of housing, businesses and infrastructure required to fully recover. This cannot be accomplished by each jurisdiction independently. Just look at what is happening right now with the consideration of preservation of the Oak Woodlands and how those actions could impact existing agreements. Please consider the regional nature of what you are tasked to do. Without regional cooperation we are doomed to never fully recover from base closure. Without a method to ensure that regional cooperation in place, you will have failed in what is now your single most important responsibility as a board.



Sid Williams

From: [John](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Old Barracks Bldgs on 2nd Ave
Date: Sunday, November 12, 2017 3:34:33 PM

Good Afternoon,

Can you please tell me who owns and has the responsibility for all of the degrading Army barracks and associated Bldgs on 2nd Avenue behind the chain linked fence.

Thank You,
John Haecker
US Army, Retired
Pacific Grove

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Virgil Piper](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Board meeting November 17, 2017
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2017 1:46:16 PM
Attachments: [Should FORA be allowed to die 2017-2A.docx](#)

A complete copy of this letter is attached:

FORA Board of Directors
920 2nd Avenue
Marina, CA. 934933
Board@fora.org

TO: Members of the FORA Board of Directors.

FORA, which has already been extended past the original 2014 termination date, wants to extend their cozy arrangement for a few more years and, according to a recent Herald editorial, the FORA Board has voted for another regional agency (i.e. a “Joint Powers Authority”) to replace the existing organization which costs the local jurisdictions more than \$3-million annually.

Questions arise: ***“How much will it cost us taxpayers to pay for this new Joint Powers thing? And, will the Directors be the same voting board members as well as the 12 “Ex-Officio Members as currently exists? And to man this agency, will FORA personnel be transferred in to manage this boondoggle under a new name?”*** To be honest, **this procedure does have a distinctive aroma . . .**

As stated in an earlier letter, LAFCO is currently involved in resolving certain problems related to the water and sewer issues on Fort Ord. TAMC is another “Special District” agency charged with the responsibility to handle road and traffic problems. Arcadis US, Inc. was given a \$100-million contract to clean up unexploded ordinance - Monterey County is fully able to implement the terms of this contract without FORA.

Marina Community Partners is obligated to clean up much of the deteriorating buildings within the Dunes project. FORA receives one-half of the selling price of land sold for development; this is to be applied for removal of the remaining deteriorating buildings. This responsibility should be turned over to the jurisdiction of those cities involved with this blight.

It doesn't take a genius to realize that asking FORA to ***“end itself”*** has all the elements of conflict of interest. Possibly, an outside agency is required to complete transition plans to end FORA in accordance to provisions of Assembly Bill 1614; however, there already exists in Monterey County, agencies which can properly handle residual problems left undone by the

termination of FORA.

Termination of FORA means just that – **TERMINATION!** We do not need to create another beauracracy to replace this one - so get on with it!

ss: *Virgil M. Piper*

cc: State Senator Bill Monning
Representative Mark Stone