

From: [Liz Hibbard](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, February 08, 2018 2:45:42 PM

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hibbard Salinas, Ca

From: [Jon Giffen](#)
To: [Michael DeLapa](#)
Cc: [Michael Houlemard](#); [Sheri Damon](#); [Dominique Jones](#); [Ralph Rubio](#); [Steve Endsley](#); [Jonathan Brinkmann](#); [Robert Norris](#); [Mary Israel](#); [Diane Johnson](#); [David Willoughby](#); [FORA Board](#)
Subject: RE: FORA Policy Concerning Public Testimony
Date: Thursday, February 08, 2018 6:48:54 PM

Michael:

You are correct in understanding that members of the public who have already commented on the Eastside Parkway will not be precluded from again offering commentary at tomorrow's meeting.

Each person requesting to address the Board is ordinarily allowed up to three minutes in which to make his or her comments. In extraordinary circumstances, that time limit may need to be reduced in order to allow the meeting to be concluded within a reasonable period or before a quorum will be lost. So, for example, if an unusually large number of people express a desire to comment, it may be necessary to further limit the time allowed per speaker (so as to allow all or the greatest number of speakers to be accommodated within the time available).

I may have been a bit imprecise when I indicated in my earlier email that the Board Chair will make the decision as to whether the three minute limit needs to be cut down based on the number of people attending the meeting. You are correct that a better measure is the number of people desiring to comment (so that in a well-attended meeting in which most of the people are there merely as observers, there may not be a need to reduce the time limit applicable to those who choose to speak).

I look forward to an orderly and productive meeting tomorrow.

Best Regards,

Jon

Jon R. Giffen | Kennedy, Archer & Giffen | 24591 Silver Cloud Court, Suite 200 | Monterey, CA 93940 | Tel: 831-373-7500 | Fax: 831-373-7555 | jgiffen@kaglaw.net | www.kaglaw.net

This message may be protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. If you have reason to believe it has been sent to you in error, please do not read it. Please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error and then delete it. Thank you.

From: Michael DeLapa [mailto:execdir@landwatch.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 11:32 AM
To: Jon Giffen
Cc: Michael Houlemard; Sheri Damon; Dominique Jones; rafa@redshift.com; Steve Endsley; Jonathan Brinkmann; Robert Norris; Mary Israel; Diane Johnson; David Willoughby; FORA Board
Subject: Re: FORA Policy Concerning Public Testimony

Hi Jon,

Thank you for your reply. As I understand your reply, all members of the public will be allowed to testify on the Eastside Parkway tomorrow, regardless of whether they testified in January. Is that right? If not, what criteria and when will the Board Chair decide whether to allow public testimony on the Eastside Parkway from people who gave testimony at the last

FORA meeting? If the answer is that he will decide before testimony starts, you can understand why that would discourage people from attending and participating in the hearing because they wouldn't know until they showed up whether they would be allowed to testify.

With regard to the duration of testimony, what criteria will the Board Chair use to decide on the duration of public testimony? For example, how many people interested in testifying would it take to trigger less than 3 minutes per speaker? Why would the number of people in attendance be relevant to limiting public testimony? Wouldn't the appropriate criteria be the number of people who are interested in testifying? If the answer is that there are no criteria and it is at the whim of the Board Chair, that, too, would discourage people from testifying because they wouldn't know how long to prepare their remarks — 3 minutes, 2 minutes, 1 minute, or something less.

Thank you for clarifying.

Regards,

Michael

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director
[LandWatch Monterey County](#)
execdir@landwatch.org
650.291.4991 m

[Sign-Up](#) | [Get Involved](#) | [Donate](#)

[Like Us on Facebook!](#)

On Feb 6, 2018, at 4:31 PM, Jon Giffen <jgiffen@kaglaw.net> wrote:

Hi Michael:

FORA Board Chair Ralph Rubio and Executive Officer Michael Houlemard asked me to respond to your inquiry seeking clarity and certainty to FORA's policy on public testimony.

FORA's policy on public testimony has always been and will continue to be to encourage the public to appropriately comment during public meetings. FORA recognizes the right of the public to express its views as fundamental to a free society, but also knows that right is not absolute and is subject to valid regulation. So, in conformance with the Brown Act, FORA will continue to allow an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on any item of interest to the public that is within FORA's jurisdiction, and to comment on a specific business item before it is considered by the Board. FORA will also allow the public, near the conclusion of its meetings, to comment for up-to-three (3) minutes on jurisdictional matters not on the agenda.

The up-to-three (3) minute allowance for public comment is desired by the FORA Board, but the FORA Board Chair has the discretion given in FORA's Master Resolution to allocate the length of time

for public discussion of any matter in advance of each discussion, with the concurrence of the Board, and to limit the amount of time a member of the public may address the Board in order to accommodate the number of people desiring to speak while facilitating the orderly conduct of business by the Board.

So, given the number of people in attendance at a FORA meeting, the FORA Board Chair will recognize, and balance, the right of the public to speak with the interest of facilitating the orderly conduct of business by the FORA Board.

Given the public interest in the Eastside Parkway, the FORA Board Chair recognizes the right of those members of the public who wish to speak the opportunity to express themselves for up-to-three minutes. However, if he feels at the time of the meeting that orderly FORA Board business will not be facilitated by allowing every interested member of the public to speak for the full three (3) minutes, he has the authority to limit that time.

If you have any questions, I am happy to discuss this issue with you directly before or at the next meeting, and look forward to that opportunity.

Best Regards,

Jon Giffen

Jon R. Giffen | Kennedy, Archer & Giffen | 24591 Silver Cloud Court, Suite 200 | Monterey, CA 93940 | Tel: 831-373-7500 | Fax: 831-373-7555
| jgiffen@kaglaw.net | www.kaglaw.net

This message may be protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. If you have reason to believe it has been sent to you in error, please do not read it. Please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error and then delete it. Thank you.

From: [Michael DeLapa](#)
To: [Jon Giffen](#)
Cc: [Michael Houlemard](#); [Sheri Damon](#); [Dominique Jones](#); [Ralph Rubio](#); [Steve Endsley](#); [Jonathan Brinkmann](#); [Robert Norris](#); [Mary Israel](#); [Diane Johnson](#); [David Willoughby](#); [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Re: FORA Policy Concerning Public Testimony
Date: Thursday, February 08, 2018 7:20:55 PM

Jon,

Thank you for the helpful clarifications. I appreciate knowing that I and others who testified in January will have an opportunity to comment tomorrow.

I still don't understand what constitutes "extraordinary circumstances." I also don't see a reference to that language in the Brown Act. At FORA's January meeting, it didn't seem that the circumstances were "extraordinary" yet the Board Chair changed the three minute limit to two minutes immediately prior to testimony starting. I don't recall him asking for a show of hands that would offer some insight into what he felt were "extraordinary circumstances."

In the interests of providing precision and predictability for the public, would you please clarify the number of potential speakers that would trigger a reduction from three to two or fewer minutes. Would there ever be an occasion when the Board Chair would reduce the limit to less than two minutes? If so, would you please explain those circumstances.

One other clarification, please. Following my testimony in January the Board Chair attempted to correct something I said, offering his unsubstantiated opinion ostensibly as fact. In your opinion, is it appropriate for the Board Chair to offer an opinion on an individual's testimony? If so, how does the Board Chair avoid prejudicing that testimony when his opinion is critical?

I, too, look forward to an orderly and productive meeting tomorrow.

Regards,

Michael

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director
[LandWatch Monterey County](#)
execdir@landwatch.org
650.291.4991 m

[Sign-Up](#) | [Get Involved](#) | [Donate](#)

[Like Us on Facebook!](#)

On Feb 8, 2018, at 6:48 PM, Jon Giffen <jgiffen@kaglaw.net> wrote:

Michael:

You are correct in understanding that members of the public who have already commented on the Eastside Parkway will not be precluded from again offering commentary at tomorrow's meeting.

Each person requesting to address the Board is ordinarily allowed up to three minutes in which to make his or her comments. In extraordinary circumstances, that time limit may need to be reduced in order to allow the meeting to be concluded within a reasonable period or before a quorum will be lost. So, for example, if an unusually large number of people express a desire to comment, it may be necessary to further limit the time allowed per speaker (so as to allow all or the greatest number of speakers to be accommodated within the time available).

I may have been a bit imprecise when I indicated in my earlier email that the Board Chair will make the decision as to whether the three minute limit needs to be cut down based on the number of people attending the meeting. You are correct that a better measure is the number of people desiring to comment (so that in a well-attended meeting in which most of the people are there merely as observers, there may not be a need to reduce the time limit applicable to those who choose to speak).

I look forward to an orderly and productive meeting tomorrow.

Best Regards,

Jon

Jon R. Giffen | Kennedy, Archer & Giffen | 24591 Silver Cloud Court, Suite 200 | Monterey, CA 93940 | Tel: 831-373-7500 | Fax: 831-373-7555 | jgiffen@kaglaw.net | www.kaglaw.net

This message may be protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. If you have reason to believe it has been sent to you in error, please do not read it. Please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error and then delete it. Thank you.

From: Michael DeLapa [<mailto:execdir@landwatch.org>]

Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 11:32 AM

To: Jon Giffen

Cc: Michael Houlemard; Sheri Damon; Dominique Jones; rafa@redshift.com; Steve Endsley; Jonathan Brinkmann; Robert Norris; Mary Israel; Diane Johnson; David Willoughby; FORA Board

Subject: Re: FORA Policy Concerning Public Testimony

Hi Jon,

Thank you for your reply. As I understand your reply, all members of the public will be allowed to testify on the Eastside Parkway tomorrow, regardless of whether they testified in January. **Is that right?** If not, what criteria and when will the Board Chair decide whether to allow public testimony on the Eastside Parkway from people who gave testimony at the last FORA meeting? If the answer is that he will decide before testimony starts, you can understand why that would discourage people from attending and participating in the hearing because they wouldn't know until they showed up whether they would be allowed to testify.

With regard to the duration of testimony, what criteria will the Board Chair use to decide on the duration of public testimony? For example, how many people interested in testifying would it take to trigger less than 3 minutes per speaker? Why would the number of people in attendance be relevant to limiting public testimony? Wouldn't the appropriate criteria be the number of people who are interested in testifying? If the answer is that there are no criteria and it is at the whim of the Board Chair, that, too, would discourage people from testifying because they wouldn't know how long to prepare their remarks — 3 minutes, 2 minutes, 1 minute, or something less.

Thank you for clarifying.

Regards,

Michael

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director
[LandWatch Monterey County](#)
execdir@landwatch.org
650.291.4991 m

[Sign-Up | Get Involved | Donate](#)

[Like Us on Facebook!](#)

On Feb 6, 2018, at 4:31 PM, Jon Giffen <jgiffen@kaglaw.net> wrote:

Hi Michael:

FORA Board Chair Ralph Rubio and Executive Officer Michael Houlemard asked me to respond to your inquiry seeking clarity and certainty to FORA's policy on public testimony.

FORA's policy on public testimony has always been and will continue to be to encourage the public to appropriately comment during public meetings. FORA recognizes the right of the public to express its views as fundamental to a free society, but also knows that right is not absolute and is subject to valid regulation. So, in conformance with the Brown Act, FORA will continue to allow an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on any item of interest to the public that is within FORA's jurisdiction, and to comment on a specific business item before it is considered by the Board. FORA will also allow the public, near the conclusion of its meetings, to comment for up-to-three (3) minutes on jurisdictional matters not on the agenda.

The up-to-three (3) minute allowance for public comment is desired by the FORA Board, but the FORA Board Chair has the discretion given in FORA's Master Resolution to allocate the length of time for public discussion of any matter in advance of each discussion, with the concurrence of the Board, and to limit the amount of time a member of the public may address the Board in order to accommodate the number of people desiring to speak while facilitating the orderly conduct of business by the Board.

So, given the number of people in attendance at a FORA meeting, the FORA Board Chair will recognize, and balance, the right of the public to speak with the interest of facilitating the orderly conduct of business by the FORA Board.

Given the public interest in the Eastside Parkway, the FORA Board Chair recognizes the right of those members of the public who wish to speak the opportunity to express themselves for up-to-three minutes. However, if he feels at the time of the meeting that orderly FORA Board business will not be facilitated by allowing every interested member of the public to speak for the full three (3) minutes, he has the authority to limit that time.

If you have any questions, I am happy to discuss this issue with you directly before or at the next meeting, and look forward to that opportunity.

Best Regards,

Jon Giffen

Jon R. Giffen | Kennedy, Archer & Giffen | 24591 Silver Cloud Court, Suite 200 | Monterey, CA 93940 | Tel: 831-373-7500 | Fax: 831-373-7555 | jgiffen@kaglaw.net | www.kaglaw.net

This message may be protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. If you have reason to believe it has been sent to you in error, please do not read it. Please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error and then delete it. Thank you.

From: [Bonnie Brooks](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: subscriptions@landwatch.org
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Friday, February 09, 2018 7:34:52 AM

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,
Bonnie Brooks. Carmel. Ca

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mark Anicetti](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Landwatch Monterey County Land Watch](#)
Subject: I oppose the Eastside Parkway
Date: Friday, February 09, 2018 10:47:59 AM

Dear FORA Board Members:

I'm writing to express my opposition to the goals and objectives related to the proposed Eastside Parkway, which were developed without an analysis of regional transportation needs and continue to prioritize the ill-conceived Eastside Parkway, a senseless and expensive road through valuable oak woodlands. As an alternative to the goals advanced by your staff, I urge you to adopt those proposed by LandWatch, which focus on regional transportation needs and make it a priority to improve existing roads to address those needs.

FORA has wasted an enormous amount of time and public funds promoting the Eastside Parkway, the freeway to nowhere. It is time to stop the waste and listen to the public.

Sincerely,

From: [Jim Lambert](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: landwatch@mclw.org; [State of California](#); CynthiaGarfield93950@gmail.com
Subject: East Side Park Way
Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 9:50:15 PM

If the East Side Park Way road was built it would impact Seaside with increase traffic; congested thoroughfares; producing noise throughout the city.

The traffic would become horrible on Coe Avenue with cars coming from Eucalyptus 9,000 vehicles. The residents on Coe Avenue would have a difficult time commuting in and out of their homes on this small single lane road; and would find it unpleasant even going to Sand City shopping center.

General Jim Moore Boulevard is projected having 16,000+ vehicles daily. That traffic merging on the end of the road would cause major traffic congestion on Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. People would look for alternative roads and that traffic would be using all the different roads coming off GJMB in the city. Many vehicles could use Broadway Avenue. Is this the vision; because of the business interest there? This would decrease retail sales in Sand City, Marina, Monterey and Carmel.

FORA Mayors, please consider expressing improvements about *U.S. Highway One*; the main thoroughfare on the peninsula. *U.S. Highway One*; needs widening to three lanes in both directions.

It time FORA stop wasting tax payer money for personal gains.

Please vote **NO**; on East Side Park Way road.

From: [stevepetro](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: East side parkway
Date: Thursday, February 22, 2018 7:29:05 AM

Please stop the opening of East side Parkway. It would be a hazard to wildlife and cause to much traffic in effected areas. Thanks for reading this. Steve Petro

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: [Dave Whipple](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: "[Dave Whipple](#)"
Subject: Stop the road kill; East Side Park Way
Date: Thursday, February 22, 2018 10:22:34 AM

FORA Board:

If the East Side Park Way road was built it would impact Seaside with increase traffic; congested thoroughfares; producing noise throughout the city. The traffic would become horrible on Coe Avenue with cars coming from Eucalyptus 9,000 vehicles. The residents on Coe Avenue would have a difficult time commuting in and out of their homes on this small single lane road; and would find it unpleasant even going to Sand City shopping center.

General Jim Moore Boulevard is projected having 16,000+ vehicles daily. That traffic merging on the end of the road would cause major traffic congestion on Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. People would look for alternative roads and that traffic would be using all the different roads coming off GJMB in the city. Many vehicles could use Broadway Avenue. Is this the vision; because of the business interest there? This would decrease retail sales in Sand City, Marina, Monterey and Carmel.

FORA Mayors, please consider expressing improvements about *U.S. Highway One*; the main thoroughfare on the peninsula. *U.S. Highway One*; needs widening to three lanes in both directions.

It time FORA stop wasting tax payer money for personal gains.

Please vote NO; on East Side Park Way road.

Thanks.

Dave

Dave Whipple
President
Statcon Consultants
831-594-6635 (mobile)
dwhipple@statconcorp.com

From: al.schader@gmail.com
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Fwd: East Side Park Way
Date: Friday, February 23, 2018 12:37:21 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jim Lambert** <lambertj4@yahoo.com>
Date: Tue, Feb 20, 2018 at 9:49 PM
Subject: East Side Park Way
To: "board@fora.org" <board@fora.org>
Cc: "landwatch@mclw.org" <landwatch@mclw.org>, State of California
<senator.monning@outreach.senate.ca.gov>, "CynthiaGarfield93950@gmail.com"
<CynthiaGarfield93950@gmail.com>

If the East Side Park Way road was built it would impact Seaside with increase traffic; congested thoroughfares; producing noise throughout the city.

The traffic would become horrible on Coe Avenue with cars coming from Eucalyptus 9,000 vehicles. The residents on Coe Avenue would have a difficult time commuting in and out of their homes on this small single lane road; and would find it unpleasant even going to Sand City shopping center.

General Jim Moore Boulevard is projected having 16,000+ vehicles daily. That traffic merging on the end of the road would cause major traffic congestion on Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. People would look for alternative roads and that traffic would be using all the different roads coming off GJMB in the city. Many vehicles could use Broadway Avenue. Is this the vision; because of the business interest there? This would decrease retail sales in Sand City, Marina, Monterey and Carmel.

FORA Mayors, please consider expressing improvements about *U.S. Highway One*; the main thoroughfare on the peninsula. *U.S. Highway One*; needs widening to three lanes in both directions.

It time FORA stop wasting tax payer money for personal gains.

Please vote **NO**; on East Side Park Way road.

From: [C.G](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway Goals
Date: Saturday, March 03, 2018 8:55:40 PM

Hello and thank you for reading.

My name is Colin Gremillion. I'm a resident of Schoonover Park, I work at the Seaside DoD Center and my wife works at CSUMB. We're very much a Fort Ord family.

I was not able to attend the previous Board of Directors meeting, but was able to watch the video afterward and found a peculiarity in the TAMC presentation that got me looking through documents, including the Base Reuse Plan that was being referenced.

The TAMC presentation made reference to the original priority of the Eastside Road being a connection between Inter-Garrison Road and Imjin Parkway. This is not what is being proposed, so, in reference to the corridor in the Base Reuse Plan I found: "For the year 2015, this facility will extend as far south as Gigling Road, with access to State Highway 68 via State Highway 218 and the existing General Jim Moore Boulevard."

Later references to the Eastside Road have it connecting to the unbuilt Highway 68 freeway and serving to provide access to lands that were to be developed.

So the slide in the TAMC presentation I spotted appears to be correct, and the goal was originally to provide a northern connection between Inter-Garrison and Imjin.

My point here is that I'm not sure how the goal of building a road connection between Inter-Garrison and Imjin - something which I think most will agree is necessary since that traffic currently has to cut through on roads that have seen little if any improvement in the 25 years since base decommission - turned into the line on the map we're being shown now. The corridor that is laid out in the Base Reuse Plan makes sense to me: it initially serves the existing Fort Ord developments with the intention of extension into newer areas when those areas are built, as well as the eventual opening of a connection to Highway 68. The goal now seems to be either misguided or misrepresenting the original intention behind the Eastside Road laid out in the Base Reuse Plan. Even the name, which has never made sense to me, makes more sense after reading into this, as "Eastside" refers to the east side of the main development area, including CSUMB, providing an eastern bypass of campus.

What this version of the Eastside Parkway will do is to dump additional traffic into my neighborhood and into East Garrison on the east, and into the back streets of Seaside on the west, while providing no real or proper solutions to regional or local traffic issues, nor will it address the goal of reducing vehicle trips, as specified by the Base Reuse Plan.

What the version of Eastside Road laid out in the Base Reuse Plan would do is to push traffic off of Imjin Road, 8th Avenue and 8th Avenue Cut-Off - thus further removing it from the CSUMB campus area - and allow for a more fluid evolution as a corridor in the future. It would be a Fort Ord-serving roadway that compliments the regional network.

I ask that, on March 9th, the board vote to deny the advancement of the Eastside Parkway goals and objectives as outlined due to their clear contradiction with the goals outlined in the Base Reuse Plan, and the intention of the Eastside Road. See the forest for the trees here, please.

Thank you again for reading. I hope to have a chance to attend the March 9th meeting in person.

-Colin Gremillion

From: [Michael DeLapa](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Spin vs. fact on Monterey County's Eastside Parkway (Royal Calkins)
Date: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 2:19:53 PM

<https://voicesofmontereybay.org/2018/03/06/the-partisan-2/>

The Partisan

*Spin vs. fact on Monterey County's Eastside Parkway
Darryl Choates' incredible luck*

OPINION |

By Royal Calkins

DOWNLOAD | [2018 TAMC FORA Eastside Parkway Presentation](#)

Decisions on when and where to build a highway have always been l traffic issues, money, politics and, in at least some cases, logic. Polit in because a chosen route can raise or lower property values and mak development plans on nearby parcels. Fortunately for the taxpaying p process usually includes traffic studies and careful cost-benefit analy compare the worthiness of various alternatives. That's the logic part.

Now, not surprisingly, some involved in the debate over the propose Parkway apparently would like to see the process depend more on pc less on traffic counts and cost-benefit calculations. The logic part.

They didn't put it quite that way, but that's the gist of recent public c

by CSU Monterey Bay President Eduardo Ochoa, hospitality industry executive Gary Cursio and John Phillips, the Monterey County superintendent also sits on two key boards central to this story — the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) board and the board of the Transportation Agency Monterey County (TAMC).

The long-discussed Eastside Parkway, a three-mile thoroughfare link Monterey-Salinas Highway to Fort Ord, would be a creation of FORA, an exception to most major traffic projects in the county because it does not involve TAMC or its funding sources. FORA plans to use its own development fees to cover the \$18 million price tag — an estimate that almost assuredly is out of date.

What set off Ochoa, Cursio and Phillips was a Feb. 9 presentation to the board from the TAMC technical staff. What the staff said was that the Eastside Parkway would do relatively little to ease congestion on often-congested Highway 68 and Highway 1 and that other upcoming TAMC projects would be more effective. Those include the planned widening of the Imjin Park area, construction of roundabouts on Highway 68, and creation of special lanes on Highway 1.

The staff also calculated that the vast majority of trips utilizing the parkway would begin or end on Fort Ord property, weakening FORA's argument that it would significantly reduce the traffic crunch for Peninsula-Salinas corridor.

One of the TAMC slides presented to FORA said the parkway “bene

trips and Fort Ord development with some regional transportation re
Almost no change to Hwy. 68 commute.”

Phillips raised his objections at that FORA meeting. Although the TA
analysis has hardly been kept secret from the TAMC board, Phillips
inappropriate for the TAMC staff to have said such things without th
approval of the TAMC directors and/or executive committee.

Cursio manages the Laguna Seca golf course and is a power within th
hospitality industry. He repeated Phillips’ argument at a TAMC board
Wednesday. He complained that the TAMC staff had made a similar
presentation to the airport board, also apparently without formal dire
TAMC’s board of elected and appointed officials. He complained th
opponents of the parkway are now using the staff’s analysis as a wea
against the project.

The parkway opposition, principally environmentalists and users of I
trails, argue that the venture is an unnecessary expense that would wi
tens of thousands of trees and help lead to subdivision development
questionable worth and dubious water supply.

Ochoa, the university president, raised the issue later in the same TA
meeting, shortly after he was seated on the board as an ex-officio me
University officials have tended to support the parkway in large part
would relieve pressure to construct a traffic-soothing highway throug
Ord campus, a position that Seaside City Councilman Jason Campbe

labeled “extreme NIMBYism.”

Ochoa said the TAMC staff presentation had “really striking policy implications.” He said he was surprised to learn it had not been vetted by the TAMC board. As a result, he said, the presentation has become a “policy factor.”

Despite TAMC’s cautions about the project, the FORA board voted to support the “goals and objectives” of the project without evaluating the potential of other projects. The board is scheduled to take the issue up on Friday.

There you have it. In the debate over the Eastside Parkway, some key players want to rely on spin instead of facts and figures.

Here’s my thinking: Call me naïve, but I hope that when the professional staff of an important government agency presents the results of its analysis and studies, it isn’t shaping things to suit the political leanings or personal interests of the politicians above them. Sure, at the national level, in these days of Trump, everything’s about whim and politicking, but it shouldn’t have trickled down to this level quite yet.

If Ochoa, Cursio and Phillips think that the existing studies and numbers support their position, perhaps they should encourage the TAMC staff to dig deeper and crunch more numbers. What they should not do is lean on their buddies on the TAMC board to make the staff shut up.

FORA officials stumbled early in the parkway process, resulting in an order requiring them to study the project objectively instead of steering in a preconceived direction. FORA boss Michael Houlemard keeps saying that it needs to be an “open process.” He’s right about that, but apparently needs to send out some reminders.

++++

Darryl Choates is a lucky fellow.

Some will recall back when he was a member of the Seaside City Council as a strong advocate for the 380-home Seaside Highlands development. There was so much hype that the early buyers were selected by lottery. Choates' name was picked and he bought one even though friends and relatives questioned whether he could afford it. (Later he bought a second home in Texas, from the same developer.)

Fast forward, past Choates’ 16 years on the council and there he was awarded a hefty SBA loan through a competitive process, a loan that enabled him to build and expand Ord Market on former Fort Ord property.

And now the wheel of fortune is pointing at Choates again, this time in the form of a city of Seaside permit to open a marijuana dispensary.

Initially, it looked as though Choates’ luck had run out this time. Cal

enterprise Rare Earth, he and young partner Sahand Sultan-Qurraie v among 19 applicants for three marijuana dispensary permits to be awarded by the Seaside City Council in December. The city was hoping to get a marijuana industry going quickly to take advantage of new state law allowing the sales of recreational marijuana as well as medical marijuana. Most other jurisdictions in the area have been slow to embrace above-board marijuana ventures, but Seaside was spurred by the potential tax windfall.

The applicants, mostly experienced marijuana operators in other cities, were required to prepare detailed business and security plans, spell out their marijuana and business backgrounds, detail their plans for contributing to the community and provide staffing plans and sales projections.

Of all the applications, the one from Rare Earth contained the least amount of financial information. It also showed the principals to be seriously short on marijuana-related experience. Choates, who describes himself mainly as an investor in the venture, listed none and his partner, Sultan-Qurraie, said that he has been involved in a marijuana-delivery operation in Palm Beach. He indicated that the rest of his business experience has been in markets completely unrelated to marijuana.

The city staff weighed the various elements and ranked each application. Initially, Choates' Rare Earth venture placed 11th out of 19 applications because some of the income projections were deemed unrealistic, they were crunched again but the Choates plan maintained its below-average

At the City Council's last meeting of 2017, the council settled initial applicants — Higher Level of Care, which will operate on Amador Avenue near the Embassy Suites hotel; Cannedge, which will be on Broadway Avenue; and Canopy/Reef, which is going into the old Shadow Box property on East Fremont.

The discussion wasn't over, however. Mayor Ralph Rubio and Choates minister had argued that at least one of the operations should be led by a Seaside resident, and the only person fitting that description was Choates Councilman Dave Pacheco, with encouragement from Rubio, made a motion to award permits to two more vendors, PharmHouse and Rare Earth, a local concern, which plans to move into office space at 575 Broadway.

Councilman Jason Campbell said he was fine with those additions but suggested one more, Planteca, also headed for Broadway. All that was wrapped into a motion approved unanimously over the objections of the three operations selected initially.

One of the early victors noted that the competition had grown significantly stiffer and he wondered if the licensees would be held to their original commitment to donate proceeds to community organizations. City Manager Craig Malin replied that as long as the total amount of contributions remained the same, all would be well.

In an interview last week, Choates denied receiving any special treatment except for an appropriate amount of consideration for being local.

“If anyone on the council helped me,” he said, “good for them.”

While the other permit winners plan to offer a range of marijuana products including medicinal salves and non-intoxicating tinctures, Choates and his company said they will focus on high-quality cannabis intended for the marijuana connoisseur.

Although some city officials and others have expressed concerns about the potential concentration of dispensaries along the Broadway corridor, once it is rehabilitated, other officials say they envision Seaside becoming a major tourism destination once the dispensaries receive the required state licenses later this year.

Calkins writes a weekly column focusing on local politics and public affairs. Reader comments are encouraged (see below). The writer also welcomes reader communications at calkinsroyal@gmail.com.



About Royal Calkins

Contributing writer Royal Calkins has worked for newspapers in Santa Cruz and Monterey. For the past couple of years, he has produced a local news and commentary blog, the Monterey Bay Partisan. He can be reached at calkinsroyal@gmail.com.

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director
[LandWatch Monterey County](http://LandWatchMontereyCounty.org)
exedir@landwatch.org
650.291.4991 m

From: [Michael DeLapa](#)
To: [Dominique Jones](#)
Cc: [Jon Giffen](#); [Sheri Damon](#); [FORA Board](#)
Subject: Re: Follow up EXT Response to 02.15.18 PRR RE All FORA Records.pdf
Date: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 3:32:45 PM

Dear Ms. Jones,

With respect to item #1, the annual reports you provided are not responsive to our request, except for the 2012 Reassessment document. LandWatch asked for annual reports on implementation of mitigation measures and policies. Please either forward such annual reports or confirm that they were never produced.

As background, a Mitigation Monitoring Plan was included in the FEIR for the BRP (Table 2.5-1). The following CEQA provisions apply:

15097. MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING.

(a) This section applies when a public agency has made the findings required under paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 15091 relative to an EIR or adopted a mitigated negative declaration in conjunction with approving a project. In order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR or negative declaration are implemented, the public agency shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity which accepts the delegation; *however, until mitigation measures have been completed the lead agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program.* [Emphasis added]

(b) Where the project at issue is the adoption of a general plan, specific plan, community plan or other plan-level document (zoning, ordinance, regulation, policy), the monitoring plan shall apply to policies and any other portion of the plan that is a mitigation measure or adopted alternative. The monitoring plan may consist of policies included in plan-level documents. *The annual report on general plan status required pursuant to the Government Code is one example of a reporting program for adoption of a city or county general plan.* [Emphasis added]

Thank you.

Regards,

Michael

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director
[LandWatch Monterey County](#)
execdir@landwatch.org
650.291.4991 m

[Sign-Up](#) | [Get Involved](#) | [Donate](#)

[Like Us on Facebook!](#)

On Mar 6, 2018, at 2:25 PM, Dominique Jones <Dominique@fora.org> wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. DeLapa,

Please see the attached response to your February 15, 2018 Public Records Act Request.

Thank you,
Dominique

From: Michael DeLapa [<mailto:execdir@landwatch.org>]

Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 12:33 PM

To: Dominique Jones <Dominique@fora.org>

Cc: Jon Giffen <jgiffen@kaglaw.net>; Sheri Damon <Sheri@fora.org>

Subject: Re: Follow up EXT Response to 02.15.18 PRR RE All FORA Records.pdf

Dear Ms. Jones,

Thank you for advising me of a delay in responding to my Public Records Request until March 5. Please prioritize my request in the following order:

1. Annual reports on implementation of mitigation measures and policies for the Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan since the adoption of the Plan.
2. Amendments to the Base Reuse Plan since its adoption.
3. California State University Monterey Bay submittals to the Fort Ord Reuse Authority in compliance with the Stipulation to Discharge Preemptory Writ of Mandate ordered by the Monterey Superior Court (Case M41781, consolidated with M41795) on Sep 14, 2009, including but not limited to Section 4(i) requiring CSUMB to "report annual traffic increases to the Chancellor, FORA, and Marina."
4. Professional services contracts issued since January 1, 2010 for each outside/contract lawyer, accountant, engineer, planner, lobbyist or other professional services contractor who has received more than \$50,000 in total compensation since January 1, 2010 from the Fort Ord Reuse Authority. For each contractor, please provide a) copy of their contract(s), b) a description of contractor's responsibilities, c) contractor's compensation and benefits if any; d) annual IRS 1099 forms, and e) summary of cumulative compensation since January 1, 2010.

Please provide items #1, 2, and 3 at your earliest convenience as they should be readily available.

Regards,

Michael

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director
[LandWatch Monterey County](#)
execdir@landwatch.org
650.291.4991 m

[Sign-Up | Get Involved | Donate](#)

[Like Us on Facebook!](#)

On Mar 5, 2018, at 5:18 PM, Dominique Jones
<Dominique@fora.org> wrote:

Mr. DeLapa,

Please see the attached follow up to your February 15, 2018 Public Records Request.

Thank you,
Dominique

Dominique L. Jones | Fort Ord Reuse Authority | **Deputy Clerk / Executive Assistant**

920 2nd Avenue, Suite A | **Marina, CA 93933** | Phone: 831-883-3672
| Fax: 831-883-3675 | www.fora.org |

Please note that email correspondence with Fort Ord Reuse Authority, along with attachments, may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and therefore may be subject to disclosure unless otherwise exempt.

<Follow up EXT Response to 02.15.18 PRR RE All FORA Records.pdf>

<2nd Follow up Response to 02.15.18 PRR RE All FORA Records.pdf>

From: [Denyse Frischmuth](#)
To: [FORA Board](#)
Cc: [Denyse Frischmuth](#)
Subject: Eastside Parkway
Date: Thursday, March 08, 2018 11:48:06 AM

Dear FORA Board Members

These are the comments I intended to make tomorrow but won't be able to deliver in person due to a previously scheduled appointment tomorrow afternoon.

I urge you to vote NO on the proposed Guidelines and Objectives for the Eastside Parkway for the following reasons:

TAMC concluded from its regional traffic studies that the vast majority of trips utilizing the Eastside parkway would begin or end on Fort Ord property and therefore would not ease significantly congestion on Highway 68 and Highway 1, and that more effective remedies could be implemented, e.g the planned widening of the Imjin Parkway, construction of roundabouts on Highway 68, and creation of special bus lanes on Highway 1.

To ignore the results of studies conducted by highly competent professionals is not fiscally responsible, the alternatives not having been evaluated and taken into consideration.

Respectfully

Denyse Frischmuth