



FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

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

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

REGIONAL URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES (RUDG) TASK FORCE MEETING

1:00 p.m., Thursday, April 28, 2016, *FORA Conference Room*

AGENDA

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

4. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

a. April 14, 2016

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Individuals wishing to address matters within the Committee's jurisdiction, but not on this agenda, may do so during this period for up to three minutes. Comments on a specific agenda item, are heard under that item.

6. **BUSINESS ITEMS**

a. Draft RUDG content review/edit/recommendations

ACTION

i. Landscaping

ii. Checklist v9.3 Review

iii. Gateways

iv. Cross-sections

7. **ITEMS FROM MEMBERS**

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

NEXT MEETING: 1:00pm Thursday May 12

For information regarding items on this agenda or to request disability related modifications and/or accommodations please contact the FORA office 48 hours prior to the meeting.

Agendas are available on the FORA website at www.fora.org.



FORT ORD REUSE AUTHORITY

REGIONAL URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES TASK FORCE REGULAR MEETING NOTES

1:00 p.m., Thursday, April 14, 2016

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Michael Houlemard Jr. called the meeting to order at 1:08 a.m. The following were present:

Committee Members:

Layne Long, City of Marina
Anya Spear, California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB)
Carl Holm, Monterey County

Other Attendees:

Mike Bellinger, BFS Landscape Architects (BFSLA)
Kathy Biala, Marina Planning Commission
Steve Matarazzo, University of California Santa Cruz
Karyn Wolfe, Citizens for Sustainable Marina
Levonne Stone, Fort Ord Environmental Justice Network
Bob Schaffer, member of the public
Brian Boudreau, member of the public
Beth Palmer, member of the public
Wendy Elliott, Dunes at Monterey Bay

FORA Staff:

Michael A. Houlemard, Jr. (Chair)
Steve Endsley
Jonathan Brinkmann
Mary Israel
Josh Metz
Ted Lopez

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mike Bellinger led the pledge of allegiance.

3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Houlemard announced that FORA will be interviewing candidates for the new Prevailing Wage position next week.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

a. **March 29, 2016 Minutes**

MOTION: Layne Long moved, seconded by Carl Holm, to approve the March 29, 2016 RUDG Task Force meeting minutes.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None.

6. BUSINESS ITEMS

a) **DRAFT RUDG content review/edit/recommendations**

i. **Checklist**

RUDG Project Manager Josh Metz presented a working draft RUDG checklist. He noted specific edits including: a new "Applicable" checkbox to indicate relevant guidelines; staff retained the "Yes/No" and "Notes" columns for each measure, added Measure numbers corresponding to RUDG Measure numbers, and formatted keywords to bold. Finally, he noted that staff had

distilled and added FORA's (2005) adopted Highway 1 Corridor guidelines as part of the checklist.

Staff also addressed the following questions from the Task Force and public:

Will the checklist be fillable online? There will be a PDF form to download and fill in, as well as an online form. Mr. Houlemard noted the material submission timestamping requirements in the Master Resolution Chapter 8 remain unchanged.

Could someone not meet one out of ten of the guidelines and still have their project accepted? Assistant Executive Officer Steve Endsley said the checklist is not meant to be a pass/fail test. Rather, it would represent project RUDG compliance after discussions with planners and FORA staff, and be one component of the total consistency determination packet.

Could LEED for Neighborhood Development inform the RUDG checklist? Task Force member Anya Spear advocated for using the LEED for Neighborhood Development standard to strengthen the RUDG by further incorporating national planning best practices. Staff agreed to take this under consideration and return a recommendation at the next meeting.

UCMBEST Planning Director, Steve Matarazzo, suggested the best development project might use both a checklist and submit 4-5 pages of narrative so jurisdictional staff can see how they alternatively meet Objectives. Mr. Houlemard asked staff to add a sentence in the 'How to Use This Checklist' section to the effect that where a Legislative Land-use Consistency Determination has been made referring to a specific measure, attach a document to explain how the project meet these requirements.

Mr. Holm asked where 'applicability' will be noted, per measure or per guideline. Mr. Metz explained that some guidelines are not-applicable for any given planning area or location and therefore jurisdiction staff can check "No" on the top right corner before conveying the checklist to an applicant. Mr. Holm also suggested the measures be itemized with alpha-numeric code, i.e. change Complete Streets measure 1 to "CS1," for clearer communications.

Mr. Metz asked the Task Force to submit all comments and questions on the checklist by the end of the following week (April 22nd). Mr. Houlemard reminded the Task Force that the checklist planning tool for jurisdiction staff and developers is not for FORA Board Approval.

ii. Landscaping

Mike Bellinger of BFSLA presented an updated draft plating palette. Following from previous street tree discussion, he reiterated his intent to offer durable trees with limited irrigation needs. He clarified that the plant palette is for public right-of-way only, such as parkway strips, medians and shoulders. Therefore, he chose to offer as few as possible, so as not to burden the agencies planting these areas with elaborate layouts and high-level care.

A representative of Citizens for a Sustainable Marina requested the development areas and regional corridor plant palette be based on the Fort Ord National Monument native plant list. She specifically requested madrone, flannel bush, native oak species, and said that *Leptospermum* and *Echium* are invasive and problematic. She spoke against Cypress trees. She offered her organization's support in sourcing native plants. Mr. Houlemard said that jurisdictions and developers can include more native plants if desired.

A representative of Fort Ord Environmental Justice asked for trees that are known to absorb air pollution to be included in the palette. She also said that the Army sprayed the native oak trees with Agent Orange.

A representative of the Dunes at Monterey Bay asked if microclimates of Fort Ord could be specified for a plant palette atlas. Mr. Bellinger said the main driver in his tree selections was the ability to survive and remain aesthetically appealing in the high winds that are typical in the former Fort Ord area.

A member of the Marina Planning Commission said she brought plant palette notes from Bruce Delgado and Rob Dupree for Mr. Bellinger and FORA staff to review. She asked for the RUDG Task Force to start looking at natural natives, then supplement them from an ecosystem approach. Staff agreed to review the notes. Mr. Bellinger offered to add notes about preserving native soils and delineate lead time for collection and propagation of native plants in the plant palette. Mr. Houlemard said that the plant palette will not cover 100% of the development area, but only about 5%.

Mr. Endsley asked staff to share the deadline for the plant palette input. Mr. Metz said the final draft is set to go to the June 10th Board Meeting, therefore a final public release needs to be May 16th, all other outstanding work must be done in early May. Mr. Houlemard said all plant palette feedback must be in to Mr. Bellinger and FORA staff by the end of next week (April 22nd).

b) Draft RUDG upcoming review/discussion

i. Gateways

Mr. Metz reminded members the Gateway content needed further attention. Mr. Houlemard asked for the Gateways landscaping palette to be part of Mr. Bellinger's assignment. He also said that the jurisdictions agreed to have military themes in gateways signage in the 1990s. He asked for language in the RUDG that encourages the jurisdictions to have monument-level signage or wayfinding at the gateways to recognize they are entering former Fort Ord.

Mr. Holm said there should be a consistent palette both in the landscaping and in the signage materials and colors of Gateways. Layne Long said the design of the gateway signage should be consistent across all jurisdictions. Ms. Spear said to refer to the TAMC wayfinding palette. Mr. Houlemard said the decision is already made to use the graphics that are in the RUDG and he suggested staff add language about the two gateways from the BRP as examples. He said the guidelines be kept generic and up to the jurisdictions.

ii. Cross-sections

Mr. Metz asked if the Task Force would like to include the cross-sections as they were provided by the consultants, although the road type titles do not match the BRP road types or FORA Fee Reallocation Study terms. Mr. Houlemard asked staff to come back to the Task Force at the next meeting with recommendations.

7. ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

None.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 3:03 p.m.

NEXT MEETING DATE: 1:00 p.m. April 28th, 2016

Landscape Palette

The landscape character of the former Fort Ord roadway corridors within the footprint of the Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG) is comprised of remnant military infrastructure. These corridors have been excavated, trenched, graded and paved, leaving strands of native soil and limited vegetation. Erosion control grasses, mixed vegetation, and cypress trees were imported to stabilize the disrupted landscape that remained between roads, parking lots and buildings. Roadways reaching out of the original base development area are more intact with a mosaic of oak woodlands and maritime chaparral.

The proposed corridors envisioned by the RUDG for the Urban Town Centers depict limited areas for planting that will be surrounded by buildings, parking lots, roadways, sidewalks and bike trails. The buildings of these new neighborhoods will provide the dominant features of the landscape, incorporating planting that complements the urban, and at times, rural setting of this newly developing community. Outside the new Town Centers, the public roadway corridors will contain linear segments of ground level planting and can include trees. A unifying visual character along these roadways will connect varying neighborhoods within the former base lands.

Embedded within the design guidelines is a theme of a vibrant community with a local “fort ord” landscape character that is unique to this central California coast region.

These Landscape Palette guidelines provide a series of plant lists that acknowledge the different geographic proximity to Monterey Bay for plants and, the new landscape settings along the regional roadway corridors that will be created by anticipated urban development. Plant selection acknowledges a desire to strengthen the visual quality of the public landscape using a predominate mix of California natives and, integrating more local native plants in the urban landscape.

The criteria for plant recommendations are based on

- Plant suitability to area climate (wind and salt tolerant)
- Plant appropriateness to built conditions (building/sidewalk/parkway strip/ medians)
- Plant establishment and long term maintenance (private vs public)
- Consistent with preferred landscape character

Town Centers

In the Town Centers, public spaces will be created which include shrub planting and street trees associated with new development. Planting design in these areas will be integral to the identity of each mixed use development proposal, with design review approval by the local land use jurisdictions. If approved, these guidelines strongly recommend, not only the use of the plant list but also that the long term maintenance remain the responsibility of the private sector developer.

Street Trees

- Arbutus ‘Marina’
- Geijera parviflora
- Lyonothamnus floribunda
- Melaleuca quinquenervia
- Melaleuca linarifolia
- Metrosideros excels

Planter Trees / Tree – Shrubs

- *Fremontodendron californicum*
- *Heteromeles arbutifolia*
- *Quercus agrifolia**
- *Rhamnus californica*
- *Rhus integrifolia*

Planter Shrubs

- *Arctostaphylos edmundsii* – Little Sur manzanita
- *Baccharis pilularis* – Coyote Bush
- *Ceanothus thrysiflorus* – Blue Blossom Ceanothus
- *Ceanothus thrysiflorus griseus* ‘Yankee Point’ – Carmel Ceanothus
- *Diets grandiflora* - Fortnight Lily
- *Eriogonum latifolium* – Coast Buckwheat
- *Lavatera maritima* – Sea Mallow
- *Lupinus arboreus* – Yellow Bush Lupine
- *Lupinus excubitus* – Coastal Bush Lupine
- *Salvia ‘Allen Chickering’* – Allen Chickering salvia
- *Salvia mellifera* – Black Sage
- *Vaccinium ovatum* – Evergreen Huckleberry

Groundcovers

- *Achillea millefolium* - Common yarrow
- *Arctostaphylos hookeri* – Monterey manzanita
- *Armeria maritima californica* – Sea Pink
- *Baccharis pilularis* ‘Pidgeon Point’
- *Ceanothus griseus* ‘horizontalis’ – Carmel Creeper
- *Ericameria ericoides* – Mock Heather
- *Erigeron glaucus* – Seaside Daisy
- *Fragaria chiloensis* – Coastal Strawberry
- *Iris douglasiana* – Pacific Coast iris
- *Polystichum munitum* – Sword Fern
- *Salvia spathacea* – Hummingbird Sage

Grasses

- *Festuca idahoensis* – Blue Bunch grass
- *Juncus patens* – California Gray Rush
- *Koeleria marantha* – June Grass
- *Leymus triticoides* – Creeping Wild Rye
- *Leymus condensatus* ‘Canyon Prince’ – Canyon Wild Rye
- *Muhlenbergia rigens* – Deergrass

Regional Circulation Corridors

Public roadway corridors are maintained by the land use jurisdictions. The resources required for nurturing new planting and management of urban landscapes suggest a greatly simplified approach to plant selection and design.

AVENUE / 4 Lane Urban Arterial (2nd Avenue and California Avenue)

Trees - Parkway Planting Strip at *Village Centers Only* (8' wide minimum)

- Arbutus 'Marina'
- Cupressus macrocarpa
- Geijera parvifolia
- Lyonothamnus floribundus
- Melaleuca linarifolia
- Melaleuca quinquenervia
- Metsideros excelsus
- Quercus agrifolia (in protected areas)

Trees - Parkway Planting Strip (8' wide minimum)

- Cupressus macrocarpa
- Quercus agrifolia (in protected areas)

Trees – Median (12' wide minimum)

- Cupressus macrocarpa

Shrubs – Parkway Planting Strips

- Achillea millifolium
- Arctostaphylos edmundsii
- Arctostaphylos hookeri
- Ceanothus griseus 'horizontalis'
- Fragaria chiloensis

Grasses/Perennials – Median

- Escholscholia californica
- Leymus Triticoides
- Leymus condensatus

BOULEVARD / 4 Lane Urban Arterial

(*General Jim Moore Blvd, Gigling Road, Imjin Parkway, Reservation Road, Lightfighter Drive*)

Trees - Parkway Planting Strip (8' wide minimum)

- Cupressus macrocarpa
- Quercus agrifolia (in protected areas, except Lightfighter Drive)

Trees – Median (12' wide minimum)

- Cupressus macrocarpa
- Grasses/Perennials – Median
- Escholscholia californica
- Leymus triticoides

Roadways with wide medians, road shoulders and parkway planting areas, are typically outside the developed commercial and residential neighborhoods. These roadway corridors provide an opportunity to utilize a dominant native plant palette.

PARKWAY OR RURAL BOULEVARD / 2 or 4 Lane Arterial

(Eucalyptus Road, South Boundary Road, Intergarrison Road, Blanco Road, Eastside Parkway, Reservation Road)

Trees - Parkway Planting Strip Only (8' wide minimum)

- Quercus agrifolia (in protected areas)

Trees – Median

- none

Shrub Understory /Roadway shoulders (1)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baccharis pilularis – Coyote Bush • Ceanothus thrysiflorus – Blue Blossom • Ceanothus • Fremontodendron californicum | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heteromeles arbutifolia • Rhamnus californica • Rhus integrifolia |
|---|---|

Grasses/Perennials – Median

- Eschscholzia californica
- Leymus triticoides

Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA)

Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG) Compliance Checklist

Draft v9.3

4/25/16

Table of Contents

Purpose	3
How to Use This Checklist	3
Review Procedure	3
Project Information Form	4
Relevant Guidelines by Location	5
Town & Village Centers	5
Gateways	5
Regional Circulation Corridors	5
Trails	6
Guidelines	7
Complete Streets	7
Connectivity	8
Trails	9
Transit Facilities	10
Corridor	11
Highway 1 Design Corridor	11
Building Orientation, Types, Setbacks, & Heights	12
Landscaping: Palettes & Lighting	13
Signage: Gateways & Wayfinding	14
Public Spaces	15
Centers	16

Purpose

This checklist provides a tool for FORA jurisdictions, developers, and the public to evaluate Legislative Land-use Decision (LLD) and Development Entitlement (DE) conformance with FORA Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG) for Town & Village Centers, Gateways, Regional Circulation Corridor, & Trails.

How to Use This Checklist

It is incumbent upon jurisdictional staff to represent that a project/plan and/or entitlement is consistent with the 1997 Base Reuse Plan (BRP). This checklist is one component of the complete set of evaluation criteria used to determine BRP consistency.

This checklist provides discrete Measures for each of the RUDG Objectives. While the Guidelines and accompanying Measures provide guidance to jurisdictions and developers, the RUDG Objectives convey BRP policies. As such if a plan can meet the Objectives with innovative design solutions use the Notes sections in this checklist to make that case. In order to increase planning efficiency, this checklist can be used at the earliest planning stages, as well as when to complete final consistency determination documents.

Use the RUDG Locations maps to locate your project/plan area and determine potential relevant guidelines. While not every relevant guideline will apply to every project, it is important each potentially relevant guideline is explicitly addressed in completing this checklist.

The Checklist includes Measures for each Guideline and is the basis for explicit plan or project evaluation. If Measures are not implemented directly, describe how the Objectives are being met or if alternatives are required and why. For each Measure include a page reference to the plan/project document section that addresses that Measure. Indicate (using N/A) cases where the potential applicable guidelines are not applicable, and provide additional Notes for clarification.

Ensure the following components are included in the consistency determination submittal:

1. **Project Information Form** (*provided in next page*)
2. **Site Plan:** showing significant features including building locations (with heights identified in text), driveways, drive aisles, garage entrances, or parking areas. Site plans with more than one building, street or public space should label each building with a letter, number, or name.
3. **Preliminary Building Elevations:** showing heights, window and door locations, and any special appurtenances or details.
4. Other relevant information requested by FORA.

Review Procedure

FORA staff will review each LLD and DE for RUDG compliance. Each Guideline sets forth Objectives and Measures. Objectives are implemented through the Measures (and/or other means) and are used, along with the Measures, by FORA to make consistency determinations. Measures are the quantitative basis for jurisdiction and FORA staff BRP consistency evaluations.

Project Information Form

To be completed by the local jurisdiction/ applicant. Please include a detailed project map that shows surveyed boundaries and relevant public infrastructure with the completed submittal.

Applicant: _____

Jurisdiction: _____

Jurisdiction Contact Name: _____

Contact Phone: _____

Contact Email: _____

Project/Parcel # (APN and/or COE): _____

Project/Parcel Location: _____

Size (sq. ft. /acres): _____

Project Description and Attachments (maps, elevations, other diagrams):

DRAFT

Relevant Guidelines by Location

Relevant guidelines vary depending on plan/project Location and scope of proposal. Use the lists below and the RUDG Locations maps to assess which guidelines may apply to a given plan/project area.

Town & Village Centers	
Complete Streets	Landscaping Palette
Connectivity	Lighting
Trails	Gateways
Transit Facilities	Wayfinding
Highway 1 Design Corridor	Public Spaces
Building Orientation	Centers
Building Types, Setbacks, and Heights	

Gateways	
Highway 1 Design Corridor	Gateways
Landscaping Palette	Wayfinding
Lighting	Centers

Regional Circulation Corridors	
Complete Streets	Building Types, Setbacks, and Heights
Connectivity	Landscaping Palette
Trails	Lighting
Transit Facilities	Gateways
Highway 1 Design Corridor	Wayfinding
Building Orientation	Public Spaces

Trails			
	Complete Streets		Landscaping Palette
	Connectivity		Lighting
	Trails		Gateways
	Transit Facilities		Wayfinding
	Highway 1 Design Corridor		Centers

DRAFT

Guidelines

Complete Streets	Applicable?	Yes	No
Objectives			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage scale and pattern of development which is appropriate to a village environment and friendly to pedestrians and cyclists (BRP p.65). Minimize street scale to facilitate pedestrian movement while providing adequate circulation and parking opportunities (BRP p.66). Promote a sense of community and connectedness in new neighborhoods by minimizing street widths, providing comfortable pedestrian environments, and encouraging housing design to embrace the public street (BRP p. 67). 			
Measures	YES	NO	NOTES
1. Bicycle facilities provided on every street			
2. FORA approved roadway configurations used			
3. Pedestrian-scaled lighting fixtures used on all streets within walkable areas. Intersection-scaled fixtures may be used in addition to pedestrian-scaled lights as necessary on major thoroughfares			
4. On-street parking on both sides of streets			
5. Parking lots, garages, or service bay openings not facing regional corridors			
6. Continuous sidewalks on both sides of streets			
7. Space provided along sidewalks for a variety of activity zones on retail or mixed-use blocks. Sidewalks ≥ 10 feet wide, maintain a minimum clear path of 5', on retail or mixed use blocks; Sidewalks ≥ 5 feet wide on all other blocks, with furniture, trees, lighting at appropriate intervals			
8. Outer access lanes for slower speeds and through-lanes for faster speeds on multi-way boulevards with medians			
9. Low- speed street design, ≤ 25 mph in Centers; and pedestrian crosswalks installed at intervals < 800 feet on multi-way boulevards			
10. Durable, drought-tolerant street trees to provide shade within 10 years			
<p><i>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Complete Streets Objectives</u> (attach additional pages as needed):</i></p>			

Connectivity	Applicable?		Yes	No
Objectives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link new neighborhoods to surrounding cities' development fabric (BRP p.62). • Maintain the fine-grained development pattern of existing areas of the Main Garrison (BRP p. 65). • Create strong physical linkages from villages to CSUMB and other major activity areas (BRP p.66). • Reinforce linkages among existing neighborhoods and establish linkages to new neighborhoods and village centers (BRP p. 67). • Connect new residential neighborhoods via continuous streets and/or open space linkages to surrounding neighborhoods and districts (BRP p. 67). • Connect individual open space parcels into an integrated system for movement and use of native plant and animal species and people (BRP p. 13). 				
Measures	YES	NO	NOTES	
1. New streets with minimal street bends to minimize block length/travel distances				
2. Maximum block perimeter 1,800 linear feet				
3. Street configuration responsive to local context				
4. Dead-ends and cul-de-sacs minimized				
5. Minimum of 140 intersections per square mile				
6. New streets connect to adjacent streets				
7. Streets end with street stubs to provide future new street connections				
Non-vehicular Circulation:				
8. Trail, pedestrian and transit facilities connect centers, public open spaces, educational institutions and other relevant locations				
9. Open space areas connect to allow movement of native plants, animals, and people				
10. Major former Fort Ord recreation and open space assets connected to each other and adjacent regional resources				
<i>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Connectivity</u> Objectives (attach additional pages as needed):</i>				

Trails	Applicable?		Yes	No
Objectives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish trail systems for non-motorized transit alternatives to former Fort Ord neighborhoods (BRP p.136). Design trail systems to reinforce the BRP strategy of using recreation and open space assets to make the former Fort Ord attractive to potential users by interconnecting and increasing access (BRP p.137). Reserve adequate Right-of-Way (ROW) along planned transportation corridors to accommodate planned trails in addition to the entire planned road cross section (BRP p.137). Design the Fort Ord trails system as an integral part of a larger regional trails network which includes, but is not limited to, the Toro Regional Park trails, existing and proposed Carmel Valley trails, the existing Highway 68 corridor (used as a bike route) (BRP p.137). Link former Fort Ord trails to regional bike/pedestrian trails wherever possible (BRP p.137). 				
Measures				
1. Former Fort Ord trails connect to regional networks and trail alignments pass through and link Town & Village Centers	YES	NO	NOTES	
2. Trail character transitions with rural or urban context				
3. New trails connect to existing networks as coordinated with local jurisdiction planning				
4. Trails separated from roads wherever feasible to maximize safety				
5. Major Trails surfaced with asphalt or concrete (wood plank surface permitted on causeways or boardwalks). Minor Trails surfaced with concrete. Equestrian trails surfaced with dirt or sand				
6. Trailhead facilities sited for key access points to the Fort Ord National Monument and Fort Ord Dunes State Park				
7. Multi- use and segregated trails, eg. equestrians and hiker/bikers, provided to accommodate variety of user types				
8. Regional viewsheds and nature experiences maximized				
9. Wayfinding signage consistent with Monterey County Bike & Pedestrian Sign Design standards				
10. Major Trails have a minimum width of 12'. Minor Trails have a minimum width of 10'. Equestrian trails have a minimum width of 20'				
<i>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Trails</u> Objectives (attach additional pages as needed):</i>				

Transit Facilities	Applicable?	Yes	No
Objectives			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustain a transit and pedestrian friendly development pattern. The core of each village will consist of services and amenities for districts and neighborhood, from retail and service establishments to transit stops and parks (BRP p. 59). Link villages by transit routes and open space corridors suited for cycling and walking (BRP p. 59). Locate concentrations of activity and density along future transit rights-of-way (BRP p. 63). Provide transit accessibility at major development sites by orienting highest concentrations of activity along transit rights-of-way and providing easy pedestrian access to these points (BRP p. 70). 			
Measures	YES	NO	NOTES
1. Shelter, seating, route information and lighting amenities provided			
2. Transit hubs sited to concentrate transit-oriented development			
3. Concentrated development located along transit rights-of-way			
4. New transit facilities (hubs, transfer points, and bus stops) and routes coordinated with Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) design guidelines and Americans with Disabilities Act requirements			
5. Routing and facilities planning coordinated with MST and jurisdictions			
6. Academic and nature themes used for design identity			
7. Regionally common architectural style applied to reinforce identity			
8. Transit stops located within ¼ mile of all homes for easy pedestrian access			
9. Transit stops located adjacent to mixed use, schools and commercial areas			
10. Transit stops located near neighborhoods, schools and commercial centers			
<p><i>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Regional Transit Facilities Objectives</u> (attach additional pages as needed):</i></p>			

Highway 1 Design Corridor	Applicable?	Yes	No
Objectives			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish specific design and signage standards for the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor to minimize the visual impact of development (BRP p. 62). Prohibit the use of billboards in the Highway 1 Corridor. Preserve landscape character of the Highway 1 Design Corridor as a buffer between the Highway 1 right-of-way and development. Except as noted in the Highway 1 Corridor Design Guidelines, “establish a maximum building height related to an identified mature landscape height to accommodate higher intensity land uses appropriate to this location without detracting from the regional landscape character of the State Highway 1 Scenic Corridor.” 			
Measures	YES	NO	NOTES
1. <u>Marina:</u> Building heights limited to 40’ maximum, with exception of optional heights designated in the Marina General Plan OR <u>Seaside:</u> Buildings in excess of 40’ tall may be built at the Main Gate, where regional retail use is permitted by the BRP and Seaside General Plan, if it is determined by the Seaside City Council that said taller buildings will serve as attractive landmarks and/or enhance the economic development prospects of this area.			
2. Buildings and signs setback 100’ from Caltrans right-of-way			
3. Sign support structures for all freestanding signs located outside 100’ Caltrans right-of-way setback and additional 100’ off-ramp and on-ramp setback at Lightfighter Drive and Imjin Parkway.			
4. Signage is stationary and not changing, flashing or animated			
5. Signs mounted on buildings below 40’ and eave or parapet line			
6. Sign illumination and glare minimized; down-lighting utilized			
7. Base of signs designed to blend with coastal dune character (i.e. earth-tone colors tan, brown, forest green, gray or dark blue)			
8. Average 25’ landscape setback provided along Highway 1 to accommodate and protect mature trees			
9. Trees (≥ 6” trunk diameter and in reasonable condition) preserved within 25-feet of Caltrans right-of-way and at gateways			
<p>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Highway 1 Design Corridor Objectives</u> (attach additional pages as needed):</p>			

Building Orientation, Types, Setbacks, & Heights		Applicable?	Yes	No
Objectives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide design guidelines to address architectural qualities, building massing and orientation, parking, fencing, lighting, and signage (BRP p. 154). • Orient buildings to ensure public spaces have natural surveillance, enhance sociability where people know their neighbors, and promote walking by providing safe, appealing, and comfortable environments. • Encourage development patterns that mix uses horizontally and vertically for active streetscapes (BRP p.65). • Implement the BRP mixed-use development vision. • Encourage establishment of life-cycle or multi-generational neighborhoods with a variety of building types that allow residents to trade-up or downsize their homes. 				
Measures		YES	NO	NOTES
1. Building backs , parking lots, garage doors, service entrances and blank walls not facing street				
2. Four or more of the following building types included: <i>Single Family House, Accessory Dwelling Unit, Cottage, Duplex, Apartment House, Courtyard Apartment, Townhouse, Mixed-Use Building, Corner Store, Small Market/Gas Station, Park-Under Building, Large-Footprint Building</i>				
3. Building fronts face either street, public spaces, or thoroughfares designed to accommodate the most pedestrians; secondary entrances on sides or rear facades				
4. Fronts of buildings face fronts or sides of other buildings				
5. Principal building facades parallel or tangent to front lot lines				
6. <u>Commercial</u> heights up to 5 stories (except as otherwise permitted); lot frontage at least 40 feet except for convenience store (20'-40')				
7. <u>Residential</u> heights up to 2.5 stories except Park-Under Bldgs., Townhouses, and Apartment Bldgs. (≤ 5 stories); lot frontage under 80' except Apartment Houses, Apartment Buildings				
8. Multiple buildings clustered and design elements used to transition from large building masses to human scale				
9. <u>Commercial</u> front setbacks vary: 25' and up large-footprint bldg., 5'-25' Park-Under Bldg., 0-5' all others; side and rear setbacks vary: 25' and up large-footprint bldg., 0 side and 18' rear Convenience Stores, 5' Park-Under Bldg., others variable				
10. <u>Residential</u> front setbacks up to 25'; side setbacks 5' except Townhouses (0'), Courtyard Apartment Bldg. (15'); Single Family, Accessory Dwelling Unit, Duplex, Cottage setbacks variable; rear setbacks are set for Apartment House (65'), Courtyard Apartment Bldg. (15'), Park-Under Bldg. (5'); others variable.				
Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Building Orientation, Types, Setbacks & Heights Objectives</u> (attach additional pages as needed):				

Landscaping: Palettes & Lighting	Applicable?		Yes	No
Objectives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the former Fort Ord will be developed over time, major vegetation and landscaping should be introduced or enhanced in development areas to create or strengthen an inviting and pedestrian scale environment, and to integrate the site as a whole into the larger Monterey Bay Region environment (BRP p. 71). Establish a pattern of landscaping of major and minor streets, including continuous street tree plantings to define gateways to the former Fort Ord and enhance the visual quality and environmental comfort within the community (BRP p. 71). Enhance physical appearance of existing neighborhoods with street and landscaping treatments (BRP p. 67). Provide appropriate illumination to meet community orientation and safety needs to compliment architectural aesthetics and the surrounding coastal environment. Maximize community sustainability by using energy efficient fixtures and programming. 				
Measures	YES	NO	NOTES	
1. Environmental quality and biodiversity of the Monterey Bay region preserved and existing healthy trees integrated into landscaping				
2. Low-water plant species serving a variety of functions (shade, soil conservation, aesthetics) used				
3. Consistent FORA-RUDG landscape layouts				
4. Native vegetation use maximized				
5. Consistent with FORA-RUDG plant palettes				
6. Consistent lamp & fixture style within blocks, neighborhoods, and corridors				
7. Placement of lighting fixtures coordinated with sidewalk organization, street furniture, landscaping, building entries, curb-cuts and signage				
8. Energy -efficient lamps used				
9. Centers, transit stops, edges, and focal points well-lit to maximize safety and highlight identity				
10. Pedestrian- scaled fixtures in walkable areas, height ≤ 15'				
<i>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Landscaping Objectives</u> (attach additional pages as needed):</i>				

Signage: Gateways & Wayfinding	Applicable?	Yes	No
Objectives			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a pattern of landscaping of major and minor streets, including continuous street tree plantings to define gateways to the former Fort Ord and enhance the visual quality and environmental comfort within the community (BRP p. 71). Assure that the 8th Street Bridge serves as a major gateway to the Fort Ord Dunes State Park (BRP p. 154). Coordinate development plans to provide for integrated, well-designed gateway design concepts to the former Fort Ord and CSUMB (BRP p 165). Provide design guidelines to address architectural qualities, building massing and orientation, parking, fencing, lighting, and signage (BRP p. 154). Establish regional wayfinding signage that supports for unique jurisdiction and community identities. Encourage connectivity to communities and regional destinations, such as parks, trails, educational institutions, employment centers, transit, park and ride lots, and tourist destinations. Create safer pedestrian and bicyclists facilities by using wayfinding signage to make bicycle and pedestrian routes more visible. 			
Measures	YES	NO	NOTES
1. Gateway character and signage is welcoming and signifies former Fort Ord military history and academic reuse			
2. Gateway landscape and development plans are coordinated among relevant jurisdictions and agencies			
3. Distinctive design elements mark monument signage, architectural features, roadway surface materials, and interpretive facilities			
4. Gateways mark edges , boundaries, and transitions			
5. Entryways placed to inform transitions to and thru former Fort Ord lands			
6. Seamless connection between RUDG Locations provided			
7. Signage is coordinated with regional agencies and other jurisdictions			
8. Signage is consistent with Monterey County Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding Signage Design standards			
9. Wayfinding signage clear and legible to the intended audience (i.e. pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, equestrians)			
10. Signage is safely placed in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices standards			
<p><i>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Signage</u> Objectives (attach additional pages as needed):</i></p>			

Public Spaces	Applicable?	Yes	No
Objectives			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish an open space system to preserve and enhance the natural environment and revitalize the former Fort Ord by adding a wide range of accessible recreational experiences for residents and visitors (BRP p. 17). Ensure that open space connections link major former Fort Ord recreation and open space amenities and adjacent regional resources (BRP p. 71). Provide a generous pattern of open space and recreation resources through public facilities and publicly accessible private development (BRP p. 71). Use spaces between buildings to establish outdoor public uses. Coordinate public space development through specific plans or other planned development mechanisms to achieve integrated design between public and private spaces. 			
Measures	YES	NO	NOTES
1. Civic buildings in prominent locations near or in centers			
2. Civic buildings in prominent location (i.e. ends of street, tops of hills, land adjacent to parks)			
3. Rural- context public open spaces as well as community gardens, playing fields open and un-bounded by buildings on most edges			
4. Public open space opportunities provided in urbanized contexts			
5. Landscaping, hardscaping, lighting, signage, furniture, and accessory architecture use coordinated palette and design elements			
6. Access to public spaces facilitated through coordinated public facilities (parking, streets, transit)			
7. Urban-type public open spaces (playground, plaza, square) placed in or close to Centers and/or enclosed by buildings			
8. Rural-type public open spaces (green, park) placed closer to the edge of development			
9. Public spaces within walking proximity of every home: ¼ mile to plaza, ½ mile to square, green or park			
10. Public open space in close proximity to transit centers and trails			
<i>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Public Spaces Objectives</u> (attach additional pages as needed):</i>			

Centers	Applicable?	Yes	No
Objectives			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Former Fort Ord centers will feature concentrated activity and be located in the vicinity of the CSUMB campus, within the jurisdictions of Marina and Seaside, and capitalize on the inherent campus vitality (BRP p. 63). Centers should complement university amenities, such as performance and athletic facilities with cafes and restaurants, shops and other student and local-serving uses (BRP p. 64). Maintain the fine-grained development pattern of the existing areas of the Main Garrison (BRP p. 65). Locate the highest retail, office and housing density on the former Fort Ord in town and village centers with a pedestrian orientation and ready access to transit opportunities (BRP p. 65). Encourage a scale and pattern of development which is appropriate to a village environment and friendly to the pedestrian and cyclists (BRP p. 65). 			
Measures	YES	NO	NOTES
1. Maximum average block perimeter \leq 1,600' with street intervals \leq 500' apart along any single stretch			
2. A mix (\geq 3) of building types provided within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of center			
3. Civic buildings located on high ground, adjacent to public spaces, within public spaces, or at the terminal axis of a street			
4. A mix (\geq 3) of housing types provided within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of center			
5. On-site parking shared between uses with different peak hours			
6. Lighting, trees, street furniture provided to enhance pedestrian comfort and safety			
7. At least one outdoor public space provided in Center			
8. Space provided along sidewalks for a variety of activity zones.			
9. Functional and attractive retail storefronts with at least 80% of ground floor within 5' of front property line			
10. Provides routes for multiple modes of transportation including non-motorized alternatives			
<p><i>Describe additional actions used to meet <u>Centers</u> Objectives (attach additional pages as needed):</i></p>			

Table 1. Cross-walk of draft RUDG Regional Circulation Corridors with BRP Roadway Design Standards, Figure 4.2-4, and Draft RUDG Corridor Cross-Sections

RUDG Regional Circulation Corridors	Base Reuse Plan			Fig 4.2-4	RUDG
	Lanes	Urban/Rural	Type		Regional Corridor Cross-Sections
2nd Ave	4	Urban	Arterial	4-Lane Urban Arterial	Avenue
Blanco Rd	4	Rural	Arterial	4-Lane Rural Arterial	Parkway
California Ave	2	Urban	Collector	2-Lane Urban Collector	Avenue
Eastside Parkway <i>(CSUMB to Eucalyptus Rd)</i>	2	Rural	Arterial	2-Lane Rural Arterial	Parkway
Eastside Parkway <i>(Intergarrison Rd to CSUMB)</i>	4	Rural	Arterial	4-Lane Rural Arterial	Parkway
Eucalyptus Rd	2	Rural	Arterial	2-Lane Rural Arterial	Parkway
Gen Jim Moore Blvd	4	Urban	Arterial	4-Lane Urban Arterial	Parkway
Gigling Rd	4	Urban	Arterial	4-Lane Urban Arterial	Avenue
Imjin Parkway <i>(Imjin Rd to Highway 1)</i>	4	Urban	Arterial	4-Lane Urban Arterial	Parkway
Imjin Parkway <i>(Reservation Rd to Imjin Rd)</i>	2	Urban	Arterial	2-Lane Urban Arterial	Parkway
Inter-Garrison Rd <i>(7th Ave to Eastside Parkway)</i>	2	Rural	Collector	2-Lane Rural Collector	Parkway
Inter-Garrison Rd <i>(Eastside Parkway to Reservation Rd)</i>	4	Urban	Arterial	4-Lane Urban Arterial	Parkway
Lightfighter Dr	4	Urban	Arterial	4-Lane Urban Arterial	Boulevard
Reservation Rd	4	Rural	Arterial	4-Lane Rural Arterial	Avenue
South Boundary Rd	2	Rural	Arterial	2-Lane Rural Arterial	Parkway

Corridor Type Definitions

Avenues

An avenue is a walkable, low-speed street that carries a mixture of through-going and local traffic. Avenues provide access to abutting commercial, residential, and mixed land uses, and accommodate cars, pedestrians, and cyclists. Avenues may have between two and four travel lanes and can have planted medians and side planting strips. They can also have on-street parking, and will have sidewalks and some form of on- or off-street bicycle facilities. Avenues have sidewalks on both sides of the street, and a more formal planting scheme with trees on a regular spacing. Target speeds for avenues are typically 30 mph or less.

Boulevards

A boulevard contains central lanes for through-going traffic and two access lanes for local traffic. Boulevards have ample sidewalks, occur primarily in developed areas, and can be fronted by a variety of uses, including residences. Bicycles may be in a path, shared-use lane, mixed with traffic in an access lane, or all three. Boulevards can handle a great deal of traffic while still providing high-quality commercial, office and residential frontage along the access lanes. Boulevards have long rows of trees which make them attractive and comfortable places to be as well as pass-through.

Parkway

A parkway is a regional facility intended to carry traffic from point to point with little interruption in the way of driveways and intersections. Parkway can occur in rural contexts or on the edge of urban places. Parkway respect the natural environment, with a more informal landscape scheme in keeping with their rural setting. Parkway can have two or four travel lanes, with a target speed of between 30 and 45 mph. Bicycles and pedestrians are accommodated on a separated shared use path, but within the overall right-of-way. The configuration of a Parkway can change according to local context and in keeping with environmental restrictions. Travel lanes of 12 to 14 feet are to be avoided because they will encourage highway speeds and lead to potentially lethal outcomes.