

# APPENDIX D

## REASSESSMENT REPORT ERRATA

Comments received on the Reassessment Report that resulted in changes to the Reassessment Report are presented here.

Notes regarding changes are numbered and presented in *bold italics*. Unless otherwise noted, page references are to the Draft Reassessment Report as published on October 17, 2012. Changes to the Reassessment Report text are shown with underline for new text and ~~striketrough~~ for deleted text. Text changes are shown in the order that the text appears in the Reassessment Report.

Errata items reflecting letters received through November 7, 2012, and including comments at the public workshop on October 30, 2012, are presented with numbered notes: *1.*

Errata items added after the FORA Board packet was prepared (based on letters received after November 7, 2012 and through November 15, 2012) are indicated by boxed capital letters: **A**.

Errata items reflecting changes brought up at or immediately prior to the November FORA Board meeting are indicated by boxed lowercase letters: **a**.

Notes for errata items that were added at two stages or at all three of these stages are shown with two or three identifiers: *1. a.*

### 3.1 GLOBAL CHANGES

*1. A reference numbering system will be added for topics in Category III, Category IV, and Category V for ease of reference.*

**a.** *The title of Section 3.2, and references elsewhere in the report, are revised for clarity, as follows:*

3.2 Category I – ~~Modifications and~~ BRP Corrections and Updates

## 3.2 CHANGES TO CHAPTER 3.0

- To clarify the source of public comments presented as a synopsis, the introduction to Chapter 3 on Page 3-1 is revised, as follows:*

This Chapter presents topics and potential options for modifications to the BRP and to FORA Board procedures. These topics have been distilled from the factual findings, Market Study results, and public input presented in the Scoping Report, as well as public input received during the Reassessment Report preparation process to date. As described in Section 1.3, Reassessment Report Methodology, the topics and potential options have been placed into five categories. The topics correspond to those listed in Table 3, Index to Topics Addressed in the Reassessment Report, and in Table 4, Index to Additional Topics Addressed in the Reassessment Report. Each of the five categories and the related subjects, topics, and potential options are described in the individual subsections of this Chapter. Where a Synopsis of Public Comment is presented, it includes a representative summary of public comments obtained through a review of letters, emails, and verbal comments received during the public input period on the Scoping Report; these public comments are not necessarily attributable to any particular person or organization. All public comments are included in the Scoping Report. The comments reflect opinions of those commenting and are not necessarily factually correct.

- A discussion of the potential that some of the topics presented provide opportunities for coordinated consideration is added to Page 3-1, as follows:*

This Chapter presents a wide range of topics for consideration by the FORA Board. The topics are presented by general complexity (i.e. Category I through Category V) as well as by subject area in Category IV. Regardless of the range of variation of the topics presented, there are opportunities where two or more topics may be appropriately considered in concert. For reasons of efficiency, synergy, or comprehensive treatment of related issues, this approach may be preferable. Several examples of these potential relationships are presented below. The FORA staff and FORA Board may wish to consider these and other potentially related topics in developing a program for addressing the topics in this Reassessment Report.

### **Example: Category I – BRP Corrections and Updates ⇔ Category IV – Specific Applicability of Programs/Policies to Del Rey Oaks and Monterey**

If the FORA Board were to decide to expand the policy and program presentation within the BRP to specifically include the cities of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey, this could be efficiently performed in conjunction with implementation of the modifications and corrections suggested in Category I.

**Example: Category IV – Refinement of Integrated Mixed Use Concepts ⇔ Category IV – Prioritization of Multimodal (Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit) Transportation**

If the FORA Board were to determine to address these topic areas, a synergy of policy effect could be achieved by addressing them together. The typically higher development intensity of a mixed use area is often well-served by a well-designed multimodal transportation network; each enhances the value and success of the other.

**Example: Category IV – Capitalization on Existing Infrastructure – Consider Costs/Benefits/Efficiencies of Capital Improvement Program ⇔ Category V Assess Infrastructure Maintenance Cost Issues**

Consideration of these two topics together could result in a comprehensive approach to infrastructure that would address both capital and maintenance costs, and could potentially yield savings both in implementation of the items and in future infrastructure development and maintenance costs.

**b.** *The title and heading rows of Table 5 on Pages 3-3 and 3-4 are revised to match the revised title of Section 3.2, as follows:*

**Table 1 Index of BRP Corrections and Updates**

<b>Corrections and Updates</b>
--------------------------------

**c.** *For consistency with the text, the last row of Table 5 on Page 3-4 is revised, as follows:*

Figure Corrections (Various map <del>Map</del> formatting and content inconsistencies-(various))
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**d.** *Corrections of typographical errors, clarifications, and an additional map revision are added on Page 3-14, as follows:*

**Volume I, Page 97 3.3-2 Proposed Land Use and Regional Context**

- Legend does not include regional context land uses (i.e. land uses outside the former Fort Ord)
- SF Low Density Residential color in legend does not match color on map
- University Medium Density Residential color in legend does not match color on map
- Inconsistent labeling: Monterey County vs. Monterey Co.

**Volume I, Page 114 3.5-1 Proposed 2015 Transportation Network**

- Remove Highway 68 Bypass
- Remove Prunedale Bypass
- Relocate Multimodal Corridor per prior FORA Board approval
- Remove realignment of Reservation Road at East Garrison to reflect adopted Specific Plan

**Volume I, Page 117 3.5-2 Roadway Classification and Multimodal Network**

- Fort Ord Boundary (in green on map) not identified on legend/not consistent with other figures
- Add proposed Monterey Road State Route 1 interchange, per current Caltrans plans
- Relocate Multimodal Corridor per prior FORA Board approval

**Volume I, Page 137 3.6-3 Open Space & Recreation Framework**

- Change BLM to Fort Ord National Monument
- CSUMB on map is shown in two different shades of blue (only one shade of which is identified in legend)
- Light Green & Lime Green colors on map are not identified on legend
- Dark Brown item in legend is not shown (clearly) on map
- Golf Course Item on Legend is not shown on map
- Equestrian Center item on legend is not shown on map
- Visitor/Cultural item on legend is in now not shown on map
- Fort Ord boundary (in green on map) not identified on legend/not consistent with other figures
- Update trailhead locations to reflect existing conditions and current plans

**e.** *Clarifications are added on Page 3-16, as follows:*

**Volume II, Page 294 4.2-2 Proposed 2015 Transportation Network**

- Remove Highway 68 Bypass per current Caltrans plans
- Remove Prunedale Bypass per current Caltrans plans

- Relocate Multimodal Corridor per prior FORA Board approval
- Remove realignment of Reservation Road at East Garrison to reflect adopted Specific Plan

**Volume II, Page 296 4.2-3 Buildout Transportation Network**

- Add proposed Monterey Road State Route 1 interchange per current Caltrans plans
- Relocate Multimodal Corridor per prior FORA Board approval
- Remove realignment of Reservation Road at East Garrison to reflect adopted Specific Plan

**f.** *A typographical error is corrected and an additional map revision is added on Page 3-17, as follows:*

**Volume II, Page 325 4.3-2 Seaside Recreation and Open Space Element**

- Jurisdiction lines on ~~my~~ map do not include city name label (inconsistent with other maps)
- CSUMB Legend Color does not match color on Map
- Other public Open Space/Rec legend color does not match color on map
- “Trail” Legend items are color coated in Legend, but one color (black) on map
- Trails marker on map displays poorly
- Black arrows on map not identified in legend and inconsistent with Marina map
- Equestrian and Visitor Center shown in legend not shown on map
- Change BLM to Fort Ord National Monument (legend)
- North Arrow mistake
- Remove color from hatching in legend

**Volume II, Page 329 4.3-3 County Recreation and Open Space Element**

- Jurisdiction lines on map do not include city name label (inconsistent with other maps)
- “Trail” Legend items are color coated in legend, but one color (black) on map
- Trails marker on map displays poorly
- Black arrows on map not identified in legend and inconsistent with Marina map
- Change BLM to Fort Ord National Monument

- Golf Course and Equestrian items in legend are not shown on map
- “Other Public Open Space – Habitat Management” areas shown in green, not consistent with other maps (where it’s shown as brown)
- Fort Ord Dunes State Park identified as State Beach
- Remove color from hatching in legend
- Update trailhead locations to reflect existing conditions and current plans

**g.** *Typographical errors are corrected on Page 3-19, as follows:*

Category II options address two types of possible modifications to the BRP. The first type of modifications is based on actions the FORA Board has already taken. These actions address the subjects of modifications to BRP Figure 3.3-1, Land Use Concept Ultimate Development and modifications to BRP transportation related figures and text. The second type of modifications addresses the subject of adding new policies or programs or expanding existing BRP policies or programs to ensure the BRP is consistent with regional and local plans. Past consistency determinations and consistency of the BRP with regional and local plans are addressed in the Scoping Report. This chapter of the Reassessment Report includes discussion of the above-noted subjects, identifies topics to be considered for each subject as summarized in [Table 6, Prior Board Action and Regional Plan Consistency Topics](#), and includes potential optional action items for each topic for FORA Board consideration.

**h.** *Clarification is added to the Description and Key Issues relating to Land Use Concept map modification based on prior consistency determinations, on Page 3-21, as follows:*

**Description and Key Issues.** Implementation of this item would involve the FORA Board formally acting to modify the Land Use Concept map to reflect land use modifications made as a result of the FORA Board’s prior consistency determinations. Changes to the Land Use Concept come up as an issue because of provisions in the Master Resolution that allow for the rearrangement of land uses by the jurisdictions, provided an overall density balance is maintained. Therefore, with some consistency determinations, there have been locations where the jurisdiction’s land use map does not match the BRP Land Use Concept map. Since the FORA Board consistency determinations did not speak to BRP Land Use Concept changes to keep the maps consistent, the question arises as to whether the Land Use Concept map should now be officially updated to reflect these jurisdictional differences that have been found consistent with the BRP. Lists of prior consistency determinations for the cities of Del Rey Oaks, Marina, and Seaside that result in the need to review and consider modifications to the Land Use Concept map to reflect the determinations are shown in [Tables 7, 8, and 9](#), respectively.

4.i. *An additional potential option relating to past consistency determinations is added on Page 3-21, as follows:*

- Review parcel-specific BRP policies and programs to identify those affected by specific changes in land use (such as re-configuration of the POM annex), and revise for consistency with plans previously found consistent with the BRP.

5.j. *Additional background is added regarding modifications to the circulation maps and text on Page 3-23, as follows:*

**Background.** As described in Scoping Report Section 4.6, Other Completed Actions Affecting the BRP, two completed transportation planning related actions affect circulation improvements included in the BRP. These actions were the realignment of a segment of the Intermodal Corridor and CSUMB's approval of its 2007 Campus Master Plan that indirectly enables elimination of a planned circulation network improvement defined in the BRP. Additionally, according to its June 2012 draft Transportation Concept Report, Caltrans retains its State Route 68 bypass corridor for potential future development of a new highway segment. The City of Monterey has requested modifications to the alignment through its territory to align with existing parcel lines. Related to this, there are several BRP references to State Route 68 that are out of date in comparison with current Caltrans plans and may need revision, including BRP Page 115.

6.k. *Clarification is added to the discussion of consistency with regional plans on Page 3-24, as follows:*

**Background.** As described in Scoping Report Section 4.4, Consistency with Regional and Local Plans, the Authority Act provides mandates that the BRP be consistent with regional ~~and local~~ plans. Section 67675(f) of the Authority Acts states:

In preparing, adopting, reviewing, and revising the reuse plan, the board shall be consistent with approved coastal plans, air quality plans, water quality plans, spheres of influence, and other county-wide or regional plans required by federal or state law, other than local general plans, including any amendments subsequent to the enactment of this title, and shall consider all of the following:

(1) Monterey Bay regional plans.

(2) County and city plans and proposed projects covering the territory occupied by Fort Ord or otherwise likely to be affected by the future uses of the base.

(3) Other public and nongovernmental entity plans and proposed projects affecting the planning and development of the territory occupied by Fort Ord.

Consistency with Monterey Bay regional plans, ~~County and city plans and proposed projects covering land within Fort Ord or otherwise likely to be affected by the future uses of the base, and other public and nongovernmental entity plans and proposed projects~~ affecting the planning and development of the territory occupied by Fort Ord is to be ensured.

This subject of the Reassessment Report addresses the topic of possible modifications to the BRP to ensure its consistency with regional ~~and local~~ plans as described in Section 67675(f) of the Authority Act.

**Description and Key Issues.** Since the BRP was adopted in 1997, regional and local plans existing at that time have been amended or modified and new regional and local plans have been developed. The BRP has not been directly modified to ensure its consistency with current regional ~~and local~~ plans, although such plans are taken into account as part of the approval process for actions brought before the FORA Board for determination of consistency with the BRP. Actions to ensure consistency could include developing and adopting new policies and programs where needed and/or expanding existing policies and programs where these already directly or indirectly address related policy or program modification needs. If the FORA Board determined that amendments to the BRP were necessary to ensure its consistency with regional ~~and local~~ plans, FORA staff could be directed to develop the necessary new policies or programs and to propose modifications to existing policies and programs for subsequent review and consideration by the FORA Board. Note that the regional plans are updated from time to time, and revisions to the BRP for consistency with these plans should be coordinated with the appropriate agency.

**7. *An additional potential option for consistency with local and regional plans is added on Page 3-25, as follows:***

- Direct staff to coordinate the development of new policies with appropriate agency staff at regional agencies for which plan consistency is required.

**8.<sup>l</sup> *Clarification is added to the discussion of Category III topics on Page 3-32, as follows:***

The BRP contains a multitude of policies and programs that provide guidance for reuse of the former Fort Ord. Implementation of these policies and programs is enforced through deed notices recorded to alert land owners of the BRP policies, programs, and development constraints, in accordance with Master Resolution sections 8.01.010 (j) and (k). This chapter presents those policies and programs identified in the Scoping Report as incomplete. Some of the policies or programs are incomplete because events that would trigger implementation (such as



development of a specific area) have not yet occurred. Other policies or programs are not contingent on triggering events, and should be implemented as soon as feasible. However, implementation of BRP policies and programs needs to be considered in the context of a plan with an anticipated lifespan of 40 to 60 years, and it must be recognized that jurisdictions will need to implement these incrementally over time.

Policies and programs identified in the Scoping Report as ongoing are not included in this section. Ongoing programs are those that are implemented on an as-needed basis (for example, archaeological monitoring for development projects) and have no finite program-wide beginning or end point, whereas this section focuses on policies and programs that have either not yet begun or have begun but not completed. Because implementation of the ongoing programs is no less important, and jurisdictions are encouraged to refer to the Scoping Report for a list of those programs, because as continued implementation is necessary. The policies and programs are presented in the order they appear in the BRP. Additionally, several mitigation measures from the BRP EIR are identified in the Scoping Report as incomplete, and these are included in this section.

**m.** *A new second sub-bullet is added on Page 3-32, as follows:*

- Review the following language from page 4 of FORA Board Resolution 01-5 (March 22, 2001) concerning a Marina General Plan consistency determination, and similar language that may be contained in other consistency determination resolutions, to identify for Board consideration a course of action addressing any outstanding requirements related to implementing this prior direction: “Chapter 8 of the Master Resolution should be adjusted within 180 days to clarify and eliminate any inconsistencies between the Base Reuse Plan and the [jurisdiction’s] General Plan.”

**9.** *An error is corrected in Table 11 on Page 3-33, as follow: row 6 for City of Marina is deleted.*

~~Recreation/Open Space Land Use Program C-3.1 – Habitat Protection Area for Community Park in Seaside Residential Planning Area~~

**A.** *A wording change is made to a policy option on Page 3-41, as follows:*

- developing an action strategie plan and schedule for completing implementation of programs and policies; and/or

**10.** *Clarification is added on Page 3-49 regarding Recreation / Open Space Land Use Program D-1.3, as follows:*

*Status – Seaside:* These areas have not been designated as Special Design Districts. The City has adopted a specific plan for Polygon 15, which includes design standards

for that area. The FORA State Route 1 Design Guidelines are applicable within the designated State Route 1 design corridor. The South Village area is within CSUMB territory and outside the jurisdiction of Seaside.

**11. An error is corrected on Page 3-49 relating to Institutional Land Use Program A-1.2, as follows:**

**Program A-1.2:** The City of Seaside [jurisdiction] shall designate the land surrounding the CSUMB Planning Area for compatible use, such as Planned Development Mixed Use Districts, to encourage use of this land for a university and research oriented environment and to prevent the creation of pronounced boundaries between the campus and surrounding communities.

**12. Clarification is added on Page 3-50 regarding Institutional Land Use Program A-1.4, as follows:**

*Status – Seaside:* The City adopted the Projects at Main Gate Specific Plan in August 2010. Coordination of this process with Marina and CSUMB is not documented in the specific plan; however, both of these agencies raised significant issues in comment letters on the EIR. In addition, meetings between the jurisdictions were held during the development of the Specific Plan.

**B. Clarification is added on Page 3-50 regarding the Marina Equestrian Center, as follows:**

*Status – Marina:* ~~The City has~~ Marina General Plan Policy 2.16 indicates ~~that it considers the Marina Equestrian Center to be~~ is an interim use. The City has not otherwise indicated an intention to relocate these facilities or minimize their impacts.

**C. Typographical errors are corrected and a clarification is added on Page 3-54 regarding inter-jurisdictional coordination on parks, as follows:**

*Status – Marina:* There are not known formal programs for coordination of parklands, although coordination does occur outside of formal programs.

*Status – Seaside:* There are not known formal programs for coordination of parklands, although coordination does occur outside of formal programs.

*Status – Monterey County:* There are not known formal programs for coordination of parklands, although coordination does occur outside of formal programs.

**D. Clarifications are added on Page 3-55 regarding Biological Resources Program A-1.3, as follows:**

*Status – Marina:* Annual ~~monitoring~~ reports have not been submitted to BLM/CRMP, as required by the 1997 HMP.

*Status – Marina:* The City has not contracted for the management of the Salinas River Habitat Area, as required by the 1997 HMP.

- E.** *Clarifications are added on Page 3-56 regarding Biological Resources Programs A-2.1 and A-2.5, as follows:*

*Status – Marina:* An implementation plan has not been prepared or submitted to the USFWS or CDFG for the Airport Reserve habitat management area.

*Status – Marina:* Annual ~~monitoring~~ reports have not been submitted to BLM/CRMP the Coordinated Resource Management and Planning program, as required by the 1997 HMP.

- F.** *Clarification is added on Page 3-57 regarding Biological Resources Program A-3.3, as follows:*

*Status – Marina:* Annual monitoring reports, ~~or the annual survey reports from 2006 to 2008 are the only annual reports completed thus far, have not been submitted to the Coordinated Resource Management and Planning program.~~

- G.** *Clarification is added on Page 3-58 regarding Biological Resources Program A-4.1, as follows:*

*Status – Marina:* Barriers to prevent access to some, but not all habitat areas have ~~not~~ been constructed to date. Partial fencing has been installed around UC's North and South FONR, but barriers to the Salinas River HMA, Marina Northwest Corner HMA, and Airport HMA have not been constructed.

- n.** *A clarification on the status of Biological Resources Program A-4.2 is made on Page 3-58, as follows:*

*Status – Monterey County:* No vehicular access is currently available because the design and planning for the Community Park has not occurred, and therefore, the County has not implemented the required barriers.

- H.** *Clarifications are added on Page 3-66 regarding Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Programs C-1.1 and C-1.3, as follows:*

*Status – Marina:* The City of Marina does not have adopted evacuation routes. The Monterey County Catastrophic Earthquake Mass Transportation/Evacuation Plan designates Reservation Road as a priority transportation route.

*Status – Marina:* The City is ~~not known to have prepared~~ currently preparing inventories ~~or~~ and operations plans for critical facilities, and has an emergency preparedness plan in place. The Cities of Seaside and Marina and CUSMB have

recently formed a joint Emergency Operations Center on CSUMB through an MOU for joint emergency planning and operations purposes.

*Status – Seaside:* The City is not known to have prepared inventories or operations plans for critical facilities. Emergency response is coordinated through the City’s fire department. The Cities of Seaside and Marina and CUSMB have recently formed a joint Emergency Operations Center on CSUMB through an MOU for joint emergency planning and operations purposes.

*Status – Monterey County:* The County is not known to have prepared inventories or operations plans for critical facilities. The Monterey County Office of Emergency Services coordinates emergency response throughout Monterey County, and has prepared response plans for several emergency scenarios.

**I.** *Clarifications are added on Page 3-67 regarding hydrology and water quality mitigation, as follows:*

*Responsible Agencies:* FORA, Marina, County

*Status – FORA:* Hydrology and Water Quality Program A-1.2 was not ~~added to~~ listed in the BRP for the City of Marina or the County. Hydrology and Water Quality Program A-1.2 was ~~added to~~ listed in the BRP for the City of Seaside. FORA has prepared a master drainage plan for storm water.

*Status – Marina:* The City has not adopted this program because it was not ~~added to~~ listed in the BRP. However, the City practices the intent of the measure.

*Status – Monterey County:* The County has not adopted this program because it was not added to the BRP. However, the County practices the intent of the measure.

**13.** *Two additional policy options are added, one policy option is revised, and a typographical error is corrected on Page 3-75, as follows:*

**Description and Key Issues.** This topic relates to the potential to develop policies that would support the needs of disadvantaged communities at the former Fort Ord. Efforts to implement this topic could focus on economic and housing related programs and/or health and wellness related programs. Implementation of this topic would entail identifying community needs, potential funding sources, and feasible programs implementable at the BRP level. Typical programs to assist disadvantaged communities would be aimed at increasing economic opportunities; increasing social capital; reducing exposure to harmful substances; and improving access to education, child care ~~ear~~, health care, and other basic needs. For example, improved access to vocational training, affordable housing, and multimodal transportation would

economically benefit many within disadvantaged communities. Promoting/developing job training relating to tangible skills and trades for persons in lower socioeconomic-status groups is important in replacing jobs lost from base closure. Likewise, programs to promote exercise, child wellness, or reduced obesity rates would have health benefits. New or refined BRP programs or policies that may improve opportunities and services to members of disadvantaged communities could be explored in conjunction with a new committee.

- Highlight the needs of disadvantaged communities and the need for environmental justice in consideration of the economic development vision of the three E's.
- Establish a clearinghouse for job development and opportunities, and health and other resources and information for disadvantaged communities.
- Prioritize existing BRP programs and/or establish new BRP programs relating to community sustainability and job development/training to promote and enable self-sufficiency within disadvantaged communities.

**14. *Additional discussion is added to the Refinement of Integrated Mixed Use Development Concepts on Page 3-75, as follows:***

**Description and Key Issues.** This topic relates to establishing new, or refining existing policies or programs to better define the expectations for the character and mixture of uses within areas with a BRP designation of Planned Development Mixed Use. To date, very little development has taken place within areas with the BRP Planned Development Mixed Use designation. Primarily reuse of a few existing buildings has occurred to date, and some of these uses may be considered interim until the area is redeveloped. Some development has recently begun at East Garrison. The Dunes Shopping Center in Marina is the first phase of a much larger mixed use development. The reassessment's Market Study suggested that mixed use neighborhoods, including housing, are a key attractant for potential middle income research and development/office employment, a sector that is desirable in efforts to revitalize the economy on the Monterey Peninsula. Implementation of this policy direction would likely take the form of strengthening existing BRP policies or identifying potential incentives to encourage mixed use development. Identification of desired parameters for mixed use development would be established. High density mixed use development is beneficial to and benefit from multimodal transportation options. Refer also to the Prioritization of Multimodal (Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit) Transportation topic.

**15. *Additional potential options for Climate Action and Greenhouse Gas Reduction is added on Page 3-77, as follows:***

- Coordinate with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments in the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy.

- Establish policy requiring consistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy.
- Consider facilitation of Community Choice Aggregation for clean electricity production.

**16. *Additional background is added to the Policy on Land Use Compatibility Adjacent to CSUMB Campus topic on Page 3-80, as follows:***

**Background.** The CSUMB campus includes 1,387.7 acres of land straddling the Seaside/Marina city limits. The campus core is located in the westward portion of the campus property. The BRP designates most of the land adjacent to the campus core area for Planned Development/Mixed Use, with an area of Regional Retail at Lightfighter Drive and Second Avenue. BRP Design Principle 1 calls for creating a unique identity for the community around the educational institutions, noting that these institutions will be a centerpiece of the former Fort Ord. The campus population will provide a market for services development adjacent to the campus, as well as provide an amenity for the surrounding residential community. BRP Design Principle 3 foresees a village-based mixed use development in the areas around CSUMB. These principals are echoed in the Comprehensive Business Plan, which considers CSUMB as a critical component of the BRP economic development strategy. The City of Seaside General Plan designates its land to the south of CSUMB as Mixed Use and the area at Lightfighter Drive as Regional Commercial. The City of Marina General Plan includes several designations adjacent to CSUMB: High Density Residential, University Villages Residential, Parks and Recreation, and Commercial – Multiple Use. \

**J. *An additional potential option for Policy on Land Use Adjacent to CSUMB Campus is added on Page 3-81, as follows:***

- Encourage local jurisdictions to adopt policies regarding land use adjacent to CSUMB.

**K. o. *The discussion of Reversal of the Loss of Middle Class Job and Housing Opportunities on Page 3-82 is expanded to specifically identify affordable and workforce housing, and to better address job development, as follows:***

**Description and Key Issues.** This topic relates to the potential to develop policies that would encourage the development of jobs and housing targeted to middle-income households, to improve the economic balance with more opportunities for middle-income households. Economic circumstances (lack of appropriate jobs and affordable or workforce housing) have resulted in many of these households leaving the Monterey Peninsula for more affordable housing areas, resulting in a demographic that is relatively concentrated in the lower and higher income ranges (bifurcated). Households that relocate to lower housing cost areas within the Monterey Bay region frequently need to commute into the Monterey Peninsula for jobs. Households also relocate outside the Monterey Peninsula area for lack of job opportunities.

Exploration of this set of policy issues would likely include identification of appropriate residential price points, development patterns/trends, unit types, and establishment of development incentives. Outreach to developers known to target the relevant types of housing could be undertaken. Job development entails several aspects: establishment of policies, incentives, marketing, or other approaches to attract new employers; facilitation of the expansion of existing businesses to provide additional jobs; and job training and placement services to assist the local unemployed population to become qualified for and/or find employment. Job development efforts may concentrate on one particular sector, but it should be recognized that jobs along a range of income levels are important to a balanced economy. “First generation” construction work at the former Fort Ord, as defined in the Master Resolution, is subject to FORA’s prevailing wage provisions.

- 17. The discussion of Promotion of Economic Development through Outdoor Recreational Tourism/ Ecotourism topic on Page 3-84 is expanded to include discussion of the value of entry-level jobs, as follows:*

**Description and Key Issues.** The reassessment’s Market Study considers the tourism sector as strong, with potential for expansion. Much of the tourist draw in Monterey County is related to scenic beauty and outdoor recreation. The elevated stature of the Bureau of Land Management lands and surrounding open space areas could provide additional recreational tourism components within the former Fort Ord, as well as economic opportunities in related sectors such as hospitality, retail, and services in the overall vicinity. Although tourism sector jobs are frequently lower paying, they offer important entry-level job opportunities, and there is the potential for increased tourism employment to act as a bridge to other economic opportunities, including better paying jobs with greater skill requirements. Additionally, many of the improvements necessary to promote or facilitate outdoor tourism can be implemented at relatively low cost. Implementation of this topic would involve a focused study to identify specific actions that could be taken to enhance access to ecotourism opportunities, promote visitation, recognize the potential for beneficial economic outcomes, and develop strategies to capitalize on that potential.

- 18. The Capitalization on Existing Regional Strengths to Promote Expansion of Office and Research Sectors topic on Page 3-85 is expanded to include discussion of creative jobs, as follows:*

### **Capitalization on Existing Regional Strengths to Promote Expansion of Creative, Office and Research Sectors**

**Background.** The Monterey Peninsula is considered to have a very strong existing research base, associated with the several institutions of higher education that are located in the area. The region’s established reputation for research institutes has not translated into significant job

growth in that sector. Jobs that could employ graduates of the area's higher education programs do not exist in sufficient numbers to provide employment for many of the graduates. Many businesses are reluctant to establish in the Monterey Bay region because of the high cost of housing (among other factors), concerned that potential employees cannot afford to live in the area. See the related topic on cost of housing under the Housing subject heading. On the other hand, the Monterey Bay region is an attractive location for those who seek to live near natural and cultural quality-of-life amenities, including professionals and support staff in creative and research sectors. "Creative," in this context, encompasses a wide range of occupational opportunities in diverse fields such as science, engineering, education, computer programming, research, arts, design, media, healthcare, and the legal sector.

**Description and Key Issues.** This topic relates to the development of policies that would promote a synergistic relationship between existing research and educational institutions, dominant economic sectors, and job development. The desired outcome would combine existing attractors (educational and research base and desirable location) with strategies to overcome constraints (such as a high cost of living and conducting business) to attract creative and research workers and jobs. Implementation of this policy is likely to require additional targeted marketing and economic study, collaboration with the various existing research institutions, and a commitment to ongoing outreach and marketing efforts. A generalization of the strategy outlined in the reassessment's Market Study involves three basic steps: build on the existing tourism sector; expand housing (and mixed use neighborhoods) targeted at middle-income households to attract entrepreneurs and similar creative workforce classifications; and increase the research and development sector when support, such as housing and workforce, is in place. In order that adequate development options are available, the Market Study recommends that at least one area designated for office and research development be ready for building in addition to the UC MBEST Center.

- Prepare a study of potential marketing opportunities for promotion of creative and office and research land uses, focusing on the components necessary to create a business cluster at the former Fort Ord.
- Adopt policies/programs to encourage development of creative and office and research land uses.
- Establish a liaison with educational institutions to promote the creation of creative and research and development jobs.

**19. *Comment in the Public Comment Synopsis is determined not applicable to the topic and is deleted from Page 3-87.***

~~Replace UC MBEST with an experienced job development organization.~~



**L.** 20. *Additional potential options for Establishment of a Marketing Brand are added on Page 3-87, as follows:*

- Contract with a marketing firm or develop in-house capabilities to vigorously implement marketing strategies.
- Establish an action plan to implement the existing Comprehensive Business Plan marketing program

21. *Additional potential options for Prioritization of Funding for and Removal of Blight are added on Page 3-88, as follows:*

- Establish policies to protect visual qualities at sites approved for development, in the period prior to construction.
- Establish funding mechanisms to cover or reduce the jurisdictional costs of caretaker expenses at abandoned buildings.

22. *Additional discussion is added to the Prioritization of Multimodal (Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit) Transportation topic on Page 3-98, as follows:*

**Description and Key Issues.** This topic relates to prioritization of multimodal transportation projects within the FORA Capital Improvement Program. Multimodal prioritization could take the form of an increased share of overall transportation funding, or shifting of funding to earlier fiscal years. Presentation of the Capital Improvement Program could also be modified to break out the multimodal aspects of road improvement projects. Multimodal transportation options are beneficial to and benefit from high density mixed use development. Refer also to the Refinement of Integrated Mixed Use Development Concepts topic.

23. **p.** *An additional potential option for Evaluation of Base Cleanup Efforts and Methods is added on Page 3-90, as follows:*

- Request a report on the parameters for munitions cleanup in areas where excavation is anticipated, and the potential for munitions residues or other contaminants to migrate to groundwater.
- Request information on the groundwater contamination clean-up progress to date and anticipated timelines for completion, to provide an understanding of the percent complete to date.

**M.** *A typographical error on Page 3-96 is corrected.*

**Background.** The Capital Improvement Program establishes the program for infrastructure improvements, including prioritization, timing, and funding, based on a master improvement plan from the Public Facilities Implementation Plan (part of the Comprehensive Business Plan, Appendix B of the BRP). The transportation component is closely tied to the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC)'s Regional Transportation Plan. Originally based on a 1997 regional needs study, the transportation program was updated with a new study in 2005 (see discussion of regional transportation demands). The ~~Capital~~ Capital Improvement Program has a 20-year horizon, but is updated annually. There are five obligatory project categories to be funded by developer fees: transportation/transit, water augmentation, storm drainage, habitat management, and fire fighting enhancement. A sixth obligatory component, building removal, is funded through land sales.

**N.** *Information on CSUMB Transportation Demand Management is added to the Background information for Prioritization of Multimodal (Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit) Transportation on Page 3-98, as follows:*

**Background.** The BRP provides for a network of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit routes, including a multimodal corridor connecting the Main Garrison, East Garrison, Monterey, and Salinas. Implementation of all of these types of multimodal facilities is prioritized and programmed through development of the Capital Improvement Program, in conjunction with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC). Projects included within the Capital Improvement Program are based on the Fort Ord transportation needs study, updated by TAMC in 2005. The Capital Improvement Program includes a total of \$376.2 million (95 percent) for road projects and \$18.8 million (5 percent) for transit projects. Note that the road project costs often include costs for parallel sidewalks and bikeways. About half of the transit funding is programmed between 2013 and 2017, compared to 65 percent of the roadway funding (FORA Capital Improvement Program Fiscal Year 2012/13 through 2021/22, pages 10, 11). CSUMB has a transportation demand management program to reduce private automobile trips and encourage alternative modes of transportation. CSUMB also targets on-campus residency for a high percentage of students to reduce trips and trip lengths.

**24.** *Additional potential options for Prioritization of Multimodal (Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit) Transportation is added on Page 3-99, as follows:*

- Coordinate with TAMC to prepare a traffic needs assessment update, with an emphasis on providing increased light rail or other enhanced transit options.
- Add the Intermodal Corridor to the Capital Improvement Program.

**25.****O.** *An updated water allocation table is added on Page 3-99. Additional discussion is provided regarding water rights.*

**Background.** The former Fort Ord has a ~~6,600~~ 6,600 acre-foot water supply allocation from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, which traces to the U.S. Army's agreement with the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA) to join Zone 2. The U.S. Army paid \$7.4 million to MCWRA to join Zone 2. At the time of the agreement, it was anticipated that a project would be developed which would supply Salinas Valley groundwater from a location farther from Monterey Bay, and that groundwater pumping within the former Fort Ord boundaries would eventually be discontinued. Pumping from the 140-foot and 400-foot aquifers is limited to 5,200 acre-feet per year. Groundwater pumping is also contingent on its effects on seawater intrusion. Average water use by the U.S. Army (1988-1992) was about 5,200 acre feet, with a peak use of 6,600 acre-feet in 1984. Current annual water use on the former Fort Ord is 2,220 acre-feet. The following table provides information on water allocations and sub-allocations. [table to be inserted]

**Description and Key Issues.** This topic relates to re-evaluating the status and reliability of the water supply from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. Implementation of this topic could include reviewing actual water use rates by existing water users at the former Fort Ord, recalculating/re-estimating future project water needs, reviewing existing studies and current available information on seawater intrusion, reviewing the history of water use and water rights on the former Fort Ord, and considering the feasibility of a project to import water from outside of the former Fort Ord as anticipated by the Zone 2 annexation. A principal purpose of this topic would be to establish a level of certainty regarding the reliability of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin water supply.

**26. A clarification is provided on Page 3-100 regarding the regional urban water augmentation program, as follows:**

**Background.** In addition to the 6,600 acre-feet of water from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, the BRP anticipates the need for an additional 2,400 acre-feet from a supplemental supply. In 2005, the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) and FORA Boards endorsed the "hybrid" alternative for the Fort Ord Water Augmentation Program, which would provide approximately 2,400 acre-feet per year of recycled and desalinated water to augment the former Fort Ord water supply. MCWD will provide this water through its Regional Urban Water Augmentation Program ("RUWAP"). The RUWAP would have several sources (desalination, recycling, surface water) and will also provide water for other communities within the Monterey Peninsula. The FORA Board allocated 1,427 acre-feet per year of recycled water from the RUWAP's recycled water component to jurisdictions. The MCWD is currently developing the recycled water project. FORA's Capital Improvement Program includes funding for a share of the water augmentation project - \$23,469,361 is identified as a CEQA obligation and the FORA Board has added another \$21,655,302 of funding.

27. **q.** *Clarification and new information is added on Page 3-108 and Page 3-109 regarding the Veteran's Cemetery location and the history of Veterans' Cemetery, as follows:*

**Background.** Currently the nearest veterans' cemetery is located in Santa Nella, in Merced County, approximately 75 miles from the former Fort Ord. The planned location for a veterans' cemetery at the former Fort Ord is shown on the BRP Land Use Concept as within Polygon 21a, south of Parker Flats Road near Parker Flats Cut-off Road and Normandy Road. This location straddles the boundary between Seaside and Monterey County. A site selection committee considered and rejected several sites, including sites within the urban footprint, before the Polygon 21a location was selected in 1996. The City of Seaside requested a 200-acre reservation for a veterans' cemetery on October 17, 1996. The currently proposed location was endorsed by Monterey County on December 3, 1996 and by FORA on December 13, 1996.

A veterans' cemetery location is not shown in the 1996 public draft version of the BRP, nor in the BRP EIR, but is included on the 2001 BRP Land Use Concept map. The response to comments to the EIR (Letter 44 and response to Letter 44) refers to a 156-acre cemetery site at the currently proposed location; the resulting change to the BRP, noted as part of the response to this EIR comment letter, is the addition of cemeteries as an allowable use in residential districts. BRP Table 3.4-1 Permitted Range of Uses for Designated Land Uses was revised to add cemeteries. The Response to Letter 44 compares the potential impacts of a cemetery at the site to the potential effects of residential uses (the BRP designation for the site). Letter 44 and the response to Letter 44 are presented in Appendix E.

The City of Seaside denoted the proposed location on its general plan land use map in 2004. The proposed cemetery at Fort Ord was authorized by the State legislature in 2006 (Assembly Bill 3035), provided, however, that a privately funded operating endowment was first established; California Military and Veterans Code sections 1450-1457 provide for the construction of a veterans' cemetery on the former Fort Ord (no specific location is given), and require establishment of an endowment fund. A 2009 Memorandum of Understanding between City of Seaside, Monterey County, and FORA established a means of funding the endowment, whereby the City of Seaside would sell a 30.4-acre parcel adjacent to the cemetery site, now referred to as the "endowment parcel." Revenue from sale of the endowment parcel would be used to establish the fund from which the cemetery's operations and maintenance costs would be paid. In 2011, Assembly Bill 629 allowed FORA to act on behalf of the California Department of Veteran Affairs to manage the design and construction of the veterans' cemetery. FORA, Monterey County, the City of Seaside, and the Veterans Cemetery Foundation entered into a Memorandum of Understanding in 2011 to establish funding and development commitments among the parties.

**Description and Key Issues.** This topic relates to re-locating the cemetery site within the Fort Ord National Monument, or annexing the present site into the National Monument. Public comment during the reassessment process has included requests to relocate the cemetery to a location with fewer oak trees and requests to include the veterans' cemetery within the National Monument. Other commenters have stated that relocating the veterans' cemetery at this point would result in long delays, ~~and~~ that the veterans have worked hard over many years to establish the cemetery at this location, and that both state and federal support actions are tied to the current location. Note, however, that the state approval (California Military and Veterans Code sections 1450-1457), is not site specific within the former Fort Ord. Implementation of this topic should take into consideration the potential for alternative sites with fewer biological resources impacts, past actions and endorsements associated with the current site, the terms of the various authorizations and agreements relating to establishing the veterans' cemetery in its current location, and potential effects on the timeframe to implement the veterans' cemetery.

**r.** *The Veterans' Cemetery Land Use Designation topic on Pages 3-109 and 3-110 is revised to incorporate information from the November 2012 FORA Board meeting, as follows:*

**Background.** The veterans' cemetery site indicated on the 2001 BRP Land Use Concept (denoted with "VC" on the 2001 Land Use Concept map) straddles the boundary between Seaside and Monterey County. Within Seaside, the veterans' cemetery location is shown on the 2001 BRP Land Use Concept as Military Enclave; however, the reconfiguration of the POM Annex that occurred following adoption of the BRP put several polygons in this area under City of Seaside jurisdiction. The Seaside General Plan designates the cemetery site as Parks and Open Space (the same designation as ~~their~~ the City's existing cemetery), which Seaside and the FORA Board found consistent with the BRP in 2004 (refer to Pages 4-180 and 4-181, and Figures 5 and 6 in the Scoping Report). Within Monterey County, the BRP and the Fort Ord Master Plan designate the veterans' cemetery location as Low Density Residential.

The area ~~within Seaside~~ designated for the cemetery includes land ~~intended~~ anticipated for a habitat reserve-development area with habitat restoration opportunity (45.9 acres) and land intended for an endowment parcel (31.54 acres). The endowment parcel is intended to be used to generate funding for the operating endowment. The FORA Board discussed land use designations for the veterans' cemetery at its September and October 2012 meetings. At the request of the ~~The City of Seaside has requested that~~ the FORA Board voted at the November 2012 Board to include this topic in the Reassessment Report and to further address this issue in 2013. Figure Veterans' Cemetery Land Use and Boundaries, shows the cemetery site boundary and proposed uses, and the 2001 BRP Land Use Concept, City of Seaside, and Monterey County land use designations.

**Description and Key Issues.** This topic relates to establishment of a BRP land use designation for the veterans' cemetery. ~~Currently the~~ The cemetery location is identified by the letters "VC" on the 2001 BRP Land Use Concept map, but and although no underlying land use specific to a cemetery is included on the BRP Land Use Concept map, the current designations do not preclude development of a cemetery. BRP Residential land uses specifically allow cemeteries (refer to BRP Table 3.4-1) and a veterans' cemetery is assumed to be compatible within the Military Enclave designation for two reasons: it is a military-related use, and because much of the Military Enclave is developed with houses, and cemeteries are a listed compatible use in residential areas, cemeteries would logically be considered acceptable along with housing in the Military Enclave. Two other existing BRP designations are potentially suitable: Public Facility/Institutional and Open Space/Recreation. Further, the parcel ~~intended to potentially be used for a development area with habitat restoration opportunity~~ habitat reserve could be designated for habitat or open space in the BRP, and the endowment parcel, which has been intended for residential use could be designated either by the local jurisdiction in their general plan, or by the FORA Board in the BRP.

Discussion of the City of Seaside General Plan land use map, the BRP Land Use Concept map, and past actions relating to a veterans' cemetery is necessary to understand the full context of this topic.

As noted earlier, the re-configuration of the Army's POM Annex after adoption of the BRP significantly affected the City of Seaside's land use designations in the area. Much of the land within Seaside's portion of the former Fort Ord is shown on the BRP Land Use Concept map (both 1997 and 2001) as Military Enclave. However, the U.S. Army elected to retain a different set of polygons than is shown on the Land Use Concept map, so when the City of Seaside adopted its general plan in 2004, it assigned land uses consistent with the re-configured POM Annex. Hence, many of the areas that carry Military Enclave designations in the BRP, have civilian land uses assigned in the Seaside General Plan (and vice-versa). In anticipation of the veterans' cemetery, the City of Seaside assigned a Park and Open Space designation for the cemetery site on its land use map, with "Veteran's Cemetery" overprinted.

The public draft BRP Land Use Concept maps (May 1996) do not indicate a veterans' cemetery or a land use designation specifically for cemeteries. The cemetery site was identified in FORA Board actions on December 13, 1996, but not included on the BRP Land Use Concept map adopted on June 13, 1997. The 1997 adoption action included certification of the BRP Final EIR (which references the cemetery site in response to comment letter 44), and added "cemeteries" as an acceptable land use within residential designations (also in response to comment letter 44). Following adoption, a revised BRP was prepared in 2001, at which time the "VC" symbol was added to the BRP Land Use Concept map. Monterey County endorsed the cemetery site in Board action on December 3, 1996, and included a veterans' cemetery on its Fort Ord Master

Plan land use map (Figure LU6a) in 2010. No cemetery-specific land use designation was added to the BRP Land Use Concept map, but cemeteries was added to the table of uses for residential districts.

**Potential Options:**

- Do not modify the land use designation at the veterans' cemetery location, ancillary parcels, development area with habitat restoration opportunity habitat parcel, or endowment parcel).
- Adopt suitable land use designations for the veterans' cemetery location, only.
- Adopt suitable land use designations for the veterans' cemetery, endowment parcel, and development area with habitat restoration opportunity habitat parcel locations.
- Adopt new land use designations as outlined in Table 1 to Agenda Item 8d at the November 16, 2012 FORA Board meeting (refer to Appendix E) and add additional text to BRP table 3.4-1 'Permitted Range of Uses for Designated Land Uses' to include cemeteries as one of the uses allowed within the Open Space/Recreation land use designation.

**s.** *The introduction to Category V on Page 3-111 is revised for clarification and the table is re-numbered to reflect earlier insertion of a water allocation table, as follows:*

Category V includes topics and potential options for modification of FORA Board procedures and operations. In this section, the Reassessment Report goes beyond the BRP itself, and considers the procedures and operations that result in and effect BRP implementation. Table 14 13, FORA Procedures and Operations Topics, lists topics for consideration by the FORA Board. Two of the topics are derived from the Scoping Report and are indexed in Table 3 of this Reassessment Report. Several new topics are also included that were identified during public input at community workshops and/or in written communications related thereto. FORA Board procedures and operations were not within the scope of topics addressed in the Scoping Report. To ensure that the new topics are included in the overall reassessment process, they have been included directly in the Reassessment Report. Two additional topics identified in the scoping process (coordinated oversight of jurisdictions and progress of water augmentation) and indexed in Table 3, are addressed within two of the new topics and, therefore, are not individually included in Table 14 13.

A discussion of each topic follows Table 14 13. The discussions are brief summaries intended to provide an overview for the FORA Board and do not constitute an exhaustive treatment of all possible aspects of each topic. Following completion of the reassessment process, if requested by the FORA Board, FORA staff will develop more detailed information on each topic. A subsection entitled, "Other Procedures Related Comments" also follows Table 14 13. This

subsection includes topics related to FORA Board procedures that were raised in public comments, but that are not addressed as individual topics due to the nature of the comments or because responses to the comments are provided.

**t.** *Table 13 on Page 3-112 is renumbered as Table 14 to reflect earlier insertion of a water allocation table, as follows:*

**Table 14 13 FORA Procedures and Operations Topics**

**28.** *An additional potential option for FORA Board Composition, Representation and Voting Process is added and one option is revised on Page 3-112, as follows:*

- Create restrictions on the term for which FORA Board members and/or ex-officio representatives may serve; ~~and/or~~
- Modify the membership of the FORA Board to be limited only to local government (or local government and other entities) with authority for land use jurisdiction on the former Fort Ord; and/or
- Modify the voting process to eliminate or modify the need for consensus/unanimous vote of the FORA Board to approve FORA Board actions.

**u.** *A cross-reference is added to Page 3-114, as follows:*

**Background.** The BRP contains numerous policies and programs that provide guidance for reuse of the former Fort Ord. The extent to which the policies and programs have been implemented or are in the process of being implemented is a key measure of the overall progress in implementing the BRP. Refer to Section 3.4 of this Reassessment Report and to Section 4.1 of the Scoping Report.

**v.** *Clarifications are made to the third Potential Option and a fifth Potential Option is added on Page 3-115, as follows:*

- In combination with or independent of the first two options noted above, identify a methodology and rationale for how consistency is to be addressed for policies and programs in BRP that have not yet been implemented or are only partially implemented and which provide guidance for reuse project development (refer to Master Resolution sections 8.02.010(a)(3), 8.02.030(a)(3), and 8.02.040);
- Review the following language from page 4 of FORA Board Resolution 01-5 (March 22, 2001) concerning a Marina General Plan consistency determination, and similar language that may be contained in other consistency determination resolutions, to identify for Board



consideration a course of action addressing any outstanding requirements related to implementing this prior direction: “Chapter 8 of the Master Resolution should be adjusted within 180 days to clarify and eliminate any inconsistencies between the Base Reuse Plan and the [jurisdiction’s] General Plan.”

**P.** *Page 3-122 is revised to add discussion, as follows:*

Temporal concentrations of development activity, associated revenue generation, and infrastructure construction are to be expected as various projects move through the planning and development stages. As a result, member jurisdictions experiencing greater levels of development are more likely to initially incur higher development financing responsibilities, but also benefit from sales tax and other revenue generation as well as infrastructure improvements. These imbalances will vary by jurisdiction over time and will approach equilibrium over time. The FORA Board could consider commissioning an independent review to establish relative historic levels of fiscal impacts and capital improvement spending within each jurisdiction.

*This side intentionally left blank.*