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CEQA REQUIREMENTS

CEQA Guidelines section 15123 requires an EIR to contain a brief summary of the proposed project and its consequences. The summary identifies each significant effect and the proposed mitigation measures and alternatives to reduce or avoid that effect; areas of controversy known to the lead agency; and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

PROPOSED PROJECT

Location and Setting

The 115.53-acre project site is located on the former Fort Ord, north of Inter-Garrison Road, east of Seventh Avenue, and east of the city limits of Marina in unincorporated Monterey County. The project site is comprised of two Assessor's parcels, APNs 031-101-056, and 031-101-041.

The project site is within unincorporated Monterey County and has a County land use designation of Public and Quasi-Public and a County zoning designation of PQP-D-S. The project site is adjacent to the Marina city limits on the west, and within the Marina sphere-of-influence. Development within the former Fort Ord is subject to the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, which is administered by FORA. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan land use designation for the project site is Planned Development Mixed Use District.

The project site is essentially undeveloped and predominantly covered in coast live oak woodland. Minor improvements, including two narrow paved roads, several unpaved roads, and a few small structures are located on the project site.
**Project Description**

The proposed project is a rezoning and business park subdivision, with development to be controlled by two general development plans. The Whispering Oaks General Development Plan would cover the entire business park and a separate general development plan would be specific to the Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) bus yard and maintenance facility. A total of about 58 acres would be developed, with about 695,500 square feet of building anticipated. About 58 acres would be dedicated as open space preserve.

The following specific components are included in the proposed project, and are described in greater detail in the sections that follow:

1. Amendment to the Monterey County Zoning Map to change the designation for the development portions of the project site from Public and Quasi-Public to Heavy Commercial.

2. Phased vesting tentative map to create 20 parcels including a lot for the MST Administrative and Maintenance Facility (24.37 acres), 15 additional business park lots (24.44 acres), two open space parcels, one parcel for a detention basin, and one parcel for private streets.

3. Disposition and development agreement.


5. General Development Plan and Use Permit for development of the MST Administrative and Maintenance Facility.

6. Use permits for the removal of coast live oak trees.

7. California Department of Fish and Game 2081 incidental take permit for sand gilia.

8. Amendments to the Fort Ord Circulation Plan and off-site road construction.


**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

This draft EIR identifies significant or potentially significant environmental impacts in several areas as identified below. The impacts are presented in a summarized format in Table S-1, with the full text of the mitigation measure. The full text of the environmental setting, project analysis, and impacts and the mitigation measures can be found in Section 2.0 Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.
**Significant Project Impacts**

Project-level significant impacts are anticipated in the following areas:

**Air Quality**

**Significant Impact – Construction PM\(_{10}\) Generation from Fugitive Dust.** Construction activities, such as demolition, clearing, excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic on unpaved ground, and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate dust and particulate matter. Development of the project site would involve grading in excess of the MBUAPCD thresholds of 2.2 acres daily. This is a significant impact. The implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

AQ-1. Prior to issuance of the tree removal, grading, or building permits, the applicant shall prepare a dust control plan for submittal to and approval of the Monterey County planning director.

The dust control plan shall be implemented for all construction sites when total project area under grading exceeds 2.2 acres per day. The dust control plan shall limit onsite construction emissions to 82 pounds per day. As more detailed construction information becomes available, emissions from grading activities should be reassessed to determine if the area of grading could be increased.

The following measures shall be included in the dust control plan:

1. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to existing businesses should be kept damp at all times. If necessary, during windy periods, watering is to occur on all days of the week regardless of onsite activities.

2. Cover all trucks hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

3. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

4. Sweep daily all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

5. Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.
6. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).

7. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.

8. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.

9. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

10. Suspend excavation and grading activity when hourly-average winds exceed 15 mph and visible dust clouds cannot be contained within the site.

**Potentially Significant Impact – Construction Exhaust Emission.** Construction activities would involve use of the heavy-duty off-road equipment and large trucks that use diesel fuel resulting in a cumulative contribution to emissions of diesel particulate matter in the region. This is a potentially significant impact. The implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

AQ-2. All off-road construction vehicles/equipment greater than 100 horsepower that will be used on site for more than one week shall: 1) be manufactured during or after 1996, and 2) shall meet the NO\(_X\) emissions standard of 6.9 grams per brake-horsepower hour. Alternatively, the project shall implement a combination of the following emission reduction measures on some or all of the above described vehicles and equipment, subject to approval by the MBUAPCD:

1. Use alternative fuels (such as biodiesel blends);

2. Require diesel particulate matter filters on equipment;

3. Require diesel oxidation catalyst on equipment;

4. Install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g. compressors).

5. Enforce state required idle restrictions (e.g., post signs). Diesel equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks may keep their engines running continuously as long as they were onsite and staged away from residential areas.

6. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.
7. Stage large diesel-powered equipment at least 100 feet from any active land uses (e.g., residences).

8. Limit the hours of operation for heavy-duty equipment to daytime periods.

**Biological Resources**

**Potentially Significant Impact: Sand Gilia and Monterey Ceanothus.** Sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus occur immediately adjacent to the northwest corner of the MST parcel outside of project boundaries. These species are both CNPS List 1B and HMP species. Sand gilia is also a federal endangered and state threatened species. Impacts to the sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus outside of the proposed development area may occur as a result of construction activities. Sand gilia also occurs within the area of Lots 2-11. Impacts could include elimination of the entire population during vegetation removal, grading, and other ground-disturbing construction activities. These are considered potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

BIO-1. For the MST project: The sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus shall be flagged for avoidance and included in the offsite maritime chaparral area fenced for avoidance, as described in Mitigation Measure BIO-13.

BIO-2. For Lots 2-11: The County of Monterey has consulted with the CDFG regarding the potential for take of sand gilia within the entire landfill site, including the Lots 2-11, and the agencies have agreed upon an acceptable mitigation strategy for the proposed impacts. Under this mitigation strategy, none of the project site would need to be preserved or restored, and the site could be developed in its entirety. However, the County has not obtained a permit for incidental take of sand gilia on the landfill parcel, including the project site, at this time. Therefore, no vegetation removal, grading, or other ground-disturbing construction activities that may result in take of the sand gilia populations within Lots 2-11 shall occur prior to the issuance of a Section 2081 permit.

BIO-3. For the extension of Engineer’s Equipment Road or off-site drainage basins east of Eighth Avenue: Prior to ground disturbance activities, surveys for Monterey spineflower, sand gilia, coast wallflower, and Kellogg’s horkelia will occur during the blooming period in spring. Additional surveys for Seaside bird’s beak and Yadon’s rein orchid will occur during the blooming period in the summer. If individuals of this species are found, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted to determine the appropriate course of action. If removal of the species cannot be avoided, authorization for take will be obtained and any loss will be
mitigated in habitat replacement and enhancement areas at a minimum of a 3:1 replacement ratio. A habitat restoration plan shall be prepared to identify the exact amount and location of impacted habitat, identify the appropriate location for replacement or restoration habitat, and provide specifications for installation, maintenance, and monitoring of the replacement habitat. The use of locally-obtained native species shall be specified in the habitat restoration plan, as appropriate.

**Potentially Significant Impact: California Tiger Salamander.** This species only has a high potential to occur within the habitat types located in the proposed Lots 12-16. This is because Lots 12-16 are located within 1.24 miles of a breeding population, which is considered to be a distance that California tiger salamander could cover to breed and/or forage for resources. The other areas of the project site are deemed too geographically distance from the breeding population to be suitable habitat. This species is listed as federally threatened, a state candidate species and a state species of special concern. Impacts to this species may include loss of habitat and direct mortality of individuals as a result of vegetation removal, grading, and other ground-disturbing activities. This would be considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

**BIO-4.** For Lots 12-16: Prior to the initiation of any ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal and grading, the applicant shall comply with one of the following three approaches:

1. Conduct protocol surveys to determine the presence or absence of California tiger salamander within Lots 12-16. Protocol surveys conducted in compliance with the protocols outlined in the /Interim Guidance on Site Assessment and Field Surveys for Determining Presence or a Negative Finding of the California Tiger Salamander /(USFWS October 2003). Two consecutive years of upland drift fence studies are required. Fencing arrays shall be installed and approved by USFWS prior to October 15 of each survey year. Surveys shall continue until individuals are found or the criteria for a Negative Finding are met. If individuals are found, either approach 2 or 3 shall be implemented;

2. If the presence of California tiger salamander is documented or the applicant chooses to assume the species is present, the project shall comply with the ESA and CESA and obtain Incidental Take Authorization from the USFWS and CDFG for the loss of California tiger salamander individuals and upland habitat associated with construction and operation of the project; or
3. Following adoption of the Fort Ord HCP and issuance of base-wide federal and state incidental take permits, all applicable conditions of the HCP shall be followed and individual incidental take permits are not required.

**Potentially Significant Impact: Monterey Dusky-footed Woodrat, American Badger, White-tailed Kite, Nesting Raptors, and Coast Horned Lizard.** Construction activities within the project site may result in impacts to special status wildlife species, including the Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, American badger, white-tailed kite and other nesting raptors, and coast horned lizard. Impacts to these species may include direct mortality of individuals, destruction of nests or dens, and loss of habitat as a result of vegetation removal and grading. These are considered significant impacts. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

BIO-5. For all development areas: prior to construction activities, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to monitor construction. The biological monitor shall conduct an Employee Education Program for the construction crew. The biologist shall meet with the construction crew at the project site at the onset of construction to educate the construction crew on the following:

- A review of the project boundaries;
- All special-status species that may be present, their habitat, and proper identification;
- The specific mitigation measures and success criteria that will be incorporated into the construction effort (Measures BIO-6 through BIO-9);
- The general provisions and protections afforded by the USFWS and CDFG; and
- The proper procedures if a special-status animal is encountered within the project site.

BIO-6. For all development areas: The biological monitor shall be onsite during initial grading and vegetation removal activities to protect any special-status species encountered. The qualified biologist shall identify and explain the protection methods during the Employer Education Program as described in Mitigation Measure 5. These methods could include, but are not limited to, stopping work in the area where the animal is encountered until it has moved on its own outside of the project site or moving individuals outside of the project site to adjacent appropriate habitat.
BIO-7. For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, project proponents shall retain a qualified, CDFG-approved biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys within three days prior to construction for woodrat nests within the project area and in a buffer zone 100 feet out from the limit of disturbance. All woodrat nests shall be flagged for avoidance of direct construction impacts, where feasible. Any active nests that will not be in areas of grading or vegetation removal will be avoided and protected during project activities with a minimum 25-foot buffer. Nests that cannot be avoided shall be manually deconstructed prior to land clearing activities to allow animals to escape harm and to reestablish territories for the next breeding season. Nests shall be dismantled during the non-breeding season, between October 1 and December 31. Dismantling shall be done by hand, allowing any animals to escape either along existing woodrat trails or toward other available habitat. If a litter of young is found or suspected, nest material shall be replaced, and the nest left alone for two to three weeks before rechecking the nest to verify that young are capable of independent survival before proceeding with nest dismantling.

BIO-8. For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the American badger, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused pre-construction surveys for badger dens in all areas proposed for construction, ground disturbance, or staging no more than two weeks prior to construction. If no potential badger dens are present, no further mitigation is required. If potential dens are observed, the following measures are required to avoid potential significant impacts to the American badger:

- If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens are inactive, the biologist shall excavate these dens by hand with a shovel to prevent badgers from re-using them during construction.

- If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens may be active, the entrances of the dens shall be blocked with soil, sticks, and debris for three to five days to discourage the use of these dens prior to project disturbance. The den entrances shall be blocked to an incrementally greater degree over the three to five day period. After the qualified biologist determines that badgers have stopped using active dens within the project boundary, the dens shall be hand-excavated with a shovel to prevent re-use during construction.

BIO-9. For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the white-tailed kite and other nesting raptors, construction activities can be timed to avoid the nesting season period. Specifically, tree removal can be scheduled after September 1 and before January 31 to avoid impacts to these species. Alternatively, if avoidance of the nesting period is not feasible, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for nesting raptors within 300
feet of proposed construction activities if construction is to be initiated between February 1 and August 31. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction. If nesting raptors are identified during the pre-construction surveys, the CDFG shall be contacted and an appropriate no-disturbance buffer imposed within which no construction activities or disturbance shall take place (generally 300 feet in all directions for raptors) until the young of the year have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival, as determined by a qualified biologist and the CDFG.

**Significant Impact: Coast Live Oak Woodland.** Coast live oak trees and oak woodland habitat are protected under Monterey County Zoning Ordinance Title 21, Chapter 16.60 of Title 16 of the Monterey County Code (Ordinance 3420), Section 21.64.60, PRC 21083.4, and the Oak Woodland Management Act. Approximately 37.4 acres of coast live oak woodland would be removed as a result of construction activities. This is considered a significant impact. Additionally, off-site drainage improvements could occur in locations with oak trees, and construction of these improvements could result in the loss or disturbance of oak trees. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

The Reuse Plan EIR determined the impacts to oak woodland as a result of redevelopment of the former Fort Ord are less than significant due to the establishment of the base-wide conservation area and the habitat preservation and management of these spaces in perpetuity as required by the HMP. The project site is within a parcel designated as “development with reserve areas or restrictions” in the HMP, which allows for development of approximately 81 acres of the 309 acre landfill parcel. The project site is within the allowable development area, and therefore the project is consistent with the HMP and the associated impact analysis of the Base Reuse Plan EIR. These base-wide conservation easements combined with the proposed on-site easements also satisfy Alternative 1 of PRC 21083.4 with the required payment of FORA development fees, a portion of which goes to management of the open space.

In addition, establishment of an on-site conservation easement on the 8.71-acre Parcel D has been proposed by the project applicant, and implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level in coordination with the conditions set forth in the tree removal permit.

**Mitigation Measures**

BIO-10. The applicant shall comply with the measures included in the Forest Management Plans that were prepared for the MST and Whispering Oaks Business Park sites. The Forest Management Plans include measures to avoid tree removal and/or transplant trees whenever possible as well as suitable mitigation ratios and planting areas. If off-site improvements result in disturbance to oak trees, the provisions of the MST Forest
Management Plan shall apply to that off-site location. In addition, a program shall be established for the applicant to submit a special fee to FORA to fund tree replacement elsewhere within Fort Ord.

BIO-11. For both projects: The appropriate strategy for compliance, as identified in the *Preliminary Oak Woodland Habitat and Tree Removal Mitigation Strategy Plan for the MST Facility/Whispering Oaks Business Park* (Denise Duffy & Associates, Inc., 2009) for this project is as follows:

- The maximum amount of native oak trees as feasible for screening and habitat purposes shall be retained in coordination with a qualified arborist.
- Construction best management practices (as identified in the appropriate FMP) to protect retained trees and trees adjacent to the project site shall be implemented.

BIO-12. Two, five, and eight years following mitigation plantings, the applicant shall arrange for a qualified arborist to inspect replacement tree plantings following project completion. Any trees that have died or are in poor condition in the judgment of the arborist shall be replaced and inspected on a two, five and eight year schedule beginning with the next inspection on the original schedule, and with the same replacement location requirements.

**Potentially Significant Impact: Central Maritime Chaparral.** Central maritime chaparral occurs immediately adjacent to the MST Parcel, within proposed Lots 2-11, along the off-site section of Engineer's Equipment Road, and may occur within the area of the alternative drainage improvements. Central maritime chaparral is designated as a sensitive habitat on the California Natural Diversity Database's working list of high priority and rare natural communities. Impacts to central maritime chaparral habitat outside of the proposed development area may occur as a result of construction activities. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Habitat set-aside completed throughout the former Fort Ord in accordance with the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* and the Fort Ord HMP, establishment of on-site conservation easements over half the project site as proposed by the project applicant, implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-3, and implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

BIO-13. For the MST project, Lots 2-11, Engineer's Equipment Road, and off-site drainage improvements: The maritime chaparral vegetation immediately adjacent to the construction area shall be protected during construction. This includes the use of exclusionary fencing of herbaceous and shrubby vegetation, such as hay bales and
protective wood barriers for trees. Only certified weed-free straw shall be used to avoid the introduction of non-native, invasive species. A biological monitor shall supervise the installation of protective fencing. The monitor shall remain on-site during the initial grading activities and vegetation removal. After these activities are completed, the biological monitor shall check at least once per week until the construction is complete that the protective fencing remains intact and that all construction work is maintained within the limits of construction.

Geology and Soils

Potentially Significant Impact – Seismic Ground Shaking. The known seismicity of the project site, coupled with the project site soils profile type described in the Fugro West report, may result in seismically-induced hazards for the proposed project. This is a potentially significant impact. The implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

GEO-1. All future development within the project site shall be designed using the parameters for code-based design listed in the Fugro West report and shall be designed in accordance with the requirements for Seismic Design Category “D.”

Potentially Significant Impact – Soil Instability and Seismic Settlement. The project site is located on cohesionless dune sand materials and may be subject to surficial instability and seismically-induced settlement. Future development on the project site may be at risk due to the instability of the soil. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

GEO-2. All future development within the project site shall be designed consistent with the latest edition of the California Building Code as adopted by Monterey County and its related seismic standards, as well as any additional standards required as standard conditions of approval by the County of Monterey. Future development on the MST site shall incorporate all recommendations from the geotechnical report, and if necessary, a supplemental exploration may be required depending on the final layout of the proposed structures and facilities. A geotechnical report shall be required prior to development on any lot within the Whispering Oaks Business Park. Final improvement plans and building plans shall be based on recommendations in the geotechnical report, and subject to review and approval of Monterey County prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. A geotechnical report may be prepared to apply to more than one lot.
**Summary**

**Potentially Significant Impact – Soil Erosion.** Although the project site soils have a moderate erosion risk, during construction, when soils are disturbed or bare, the erosion hazard would increase. New storm drainage outfalls could result in increased or concentrated storm water flows that could cause erosion. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

GEO-3. Each applicant shall prepare an erosion control plan consistent with the requirements of Monterey County Code Chapter 16.12 prior to approval of tree removal, grading, or building permits. All erosion control measures required by the approved erosion control plan shall be in place until work is completed. Grading, excavating, and other activities that involve substantial soil disturbance shall be planned and carried out in consultation with a qualified hydrologist, engineer, or erosion control specialist, and shall utilize standard erosion control techniques to minimize erosion and sedimentation to native vegetation. Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, permanent erosion control measures shall be in place and approved by the Resource Management Agency. An erosion control plan may be prepared to apply to more than one lot or for related projects at different sites.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

**Potentially Significant Impact – Hazardous Materials Transport and Use.** The proposed project would involve the transport and handling of a variety of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials, including solvents, propane, and vehicle fuel. The transport and use of these materials is carefully regulated by several government agencies. The MST site plan places the fueling station and hazardous waste storage areas at the opposite side of the project site from the proposed residences at CSUMB minimizes the potential for adverse effects at the nearest sensitive receptors. Transport of hazardous materials could occur adjacent to or through the CSUMB, University of California, or Golden Gate University campuses, and could expose students at these facilities to risks resulting from a spill or accident. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

H-1. As part of its Business Response Plan, MST shall develop a designated transport route for hazardous waste deliveries and removal, subject to the review and approval of the Monterey County Environmental Health Department.
**Potentially Significant Impact – Munitions and Explosives.** Although the project site was not used for military training exercises, the potential exists to discover isolated munitions or explosives during tree removal and grading operations. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

H-2. Construction supervisors and crews shall attend a U.S. Army sponsored munitions and explosives safety briefing prior to commencement of construction. This briefing shall identify the variety of munitions and explosives that are known to exist on the former Fort Ord and the actions to be taken if a suspicious item is discovered. This requirement for briefing shall be included in construction documents.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

**Potentially Significant Impact – Soil Erosion during Construction.** The proposed project would expose large areas of soil through tree removal and grading during construction. The project site soils have a moderate potential for erosion, and this erosion risk would be significantly elevated when the soils are disturbed. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-3 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Potentially Significant Impact – On-site Storm Drainage Basin Capacity.** The proposed project includes on-site basins and galleries for infiltration of on-site storm water run-off. The basins and galleries that are specifically proposed are sized adequately to accept flows during the 100-year storm event. However, no specific basins or basin capacities have been proposed for Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8. Therefore, it cannot be determined if these lots would be able to adequately retain storm water and prevent flooding. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

HY-1. Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permits, the developer(s) for Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8 shall provide the Water Resources Agency a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site impacts with supporting calculations and construction details. The plan shall include retention facilities to mitigate the impact of impervious surface storm-water runoff. Pond(s) shall be fenced for public safety. Oil-grease/water separators shall be installed for the pre-treatment of storm-water runoff from paved parking areas. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Water Resources Agency.
Potentially Significant Impact – Water Quality at Percolation Basins. The high percolation rate of the soil necessitates the inclusion of passive water quality pre-treatment measures for storm water, generally categorized as storm water best management practices. The general development plans do not specify pre-treatment of storm water. Storm water that percolates into the groundwater without pre-treatment is considered a significant environmental impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

HY-2. Prior to filing the final map, the applicant shall provide the Water Resources Agency a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site and off-site impacts with supporting calculations and construction details. The plan shall include retention facilities to mitigate the impact of impervious surface storm-water runoff. Pond(s) shall be fenced for public safety. Oil-grease/water separators shall be installed for the pre-treatment of storm-water runoff from paved parking areas. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Water Resources Agency.

HY-3. Prior to filing the final map, a copy of a signed and notarized Road and Drainage Maintenance Agreement shall be provided to the Water Resources Agency for approval. The agreement shall be recorded concurrently with final map. The responsibility for care, maintenance, and repair of road and drainage improvements in the subdivision shall be the joint and several personal obligation of each and every owner of a lot in the Subdivision. The obligation includes preparation of an annual drainage report by a registered civil engineer which shall include analysis of the subdivision drainage facilities and recommendation of any maintenance. The report shall be submitted to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency for review and approval by the 15th day of August, and any recommended maintenance activities shall be completed by the 15th day of October of the same year.

Transportation and Circulation

Significant Impact – Unacceptable LOS (Phase 1). The first phase of the proposed project would result in additional trips and increased delays at intersections already operating at LOS E or F. although it would not result in a reduced level of service at any of these already deficient intersections. The affected intersections and the improvements necessary to achieve acceptable levels of service would be:

- *Davis Road/Reservation Road*: signalize intersection; add second eastbound left-turn lane; re-channelize the southbound right turn as a formal right;
- *Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway:* add a southbound California Avenue right turn lane;
- Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway: signalize intersection;
- *General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue:* add a northbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second northbound through lane; add a southbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second southbound through lane; add an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane;
- *Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway:* add a second eastbound Imjin Parkway through lane; and add a second westbound Imjin Parkway through lane;
- *Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road:* add a third northbound Imjin Parkway right turn lane;
- *Blanco Road/Reservation Road:* add a second westbound Reservation through lane.

Phase 1 contributions to these impacts would be a significant impact. Implementation of the Mitigation Measure T-1 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Potentially Significant Impact – Vehicle Queues (Phase 1).** The first phase of the proposed project would result in left-turn queues extending into traffic and a potential safety impact at the following intersection:

- *Imjin Parkway/Imjin Road.* Movements at the westbound Imjin Parkway left turn onto Imjin Road that would exceed the left-turn pocket storage capacity.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-2 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

T-1. Prior to issuance of building permits, MST shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the fees listed below (fair share costs for project-level impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).

- FORA development impact fees.
- City of Marina traffic impact fees.
- County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:
  - Davis Road/Reservation Road (1.3% of $1,825,600 = $23,389)
Blanco Road/Reservation Road (2.0% of $263,400 = $5,288).

City of Marina fair share costs for lane improvements at the following intersection:

- Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway – eastbound right (17.5% of $466,888 = $81,791)
  Note: this fee would be reimbursable to Whispering Oaks Business Park – see Mitigation Measure T-6.

City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:

- Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road (1.3% of $222,700 = $2,788).

City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue (0.4% of $300,000 = $1,054)

Caltrans fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Northbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (1.2% of $151,428 = $1,875)
- Southbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (0.8% of $965,308 = $7,958)

**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-2. MST shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 1 (lot 1) improvements:

- Construct a second westbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Imjin Road and Imjin Parkway.

MST shall be owed reimbursement of 11.6 percent of the cost of this improvement by the Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor ($107,189 based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index) – see Mitigation Measure T-3.
Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 1 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 1, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.

Phase 2 and Phase 3 Impacts.

Significant Impact – Unacceptable LOS (Phases 2 and 3). The second and third phases of the proposed project would result in additional trips and increased delays at intersections already operating at LOS E or F although they would not result in a reduced level of service at any of these already deficient intersections. The affected intersections and the improvements necessary to achieve acceptable levels of service would be:

- **Davis Road/Reservation Road**: signalize intersection; add second eastbound left-turn lane; re-channelize the southbound right turn as a formal right;
- **Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway**: add a southbound California Avenue right turn lane;
- **Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway**: signalize intersection;
- **Imjin Road/8th Street**: Signalize intersection; and add a second southbound Imjin Road left turn lane, and corresponding second eastbound Eighth Street receiving lane, or alternatively, realign Imjin Road as a fourth approach to the Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road intersection;
- **General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue**: signalize intersection; add a northbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second northbound through lane; add a southbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second southbound through lane; add an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane;
- **Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway**: add a second eastbound Imjin Parkway through lane; and add a second westbound Imjin Parkway through lane;
- **Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road**: add a third northbound Imjin Parkway right turn lane;
- **Blanco Road/Reservation Road**: add a second westbound Reservation through lane.
Phase 2 and 3 contributions to these impacts would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures T-3, T-4, and T-5 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Significant Impact – Vehicle Queues (Phases 2 and 3).** The second and third phases of the proposed project would result in left-turn and right-turn queues extending into traffic and a potential safety impact at the following intersection:

- **Imjin Parkway/Imjin Road.** Although overall operations would be within acceptable levels, Phase 2 and 3 of the proposed project would add sufficient traffic to the westbound Imjin Parkway left turn movement at this intersection to cause the westbound left turn lane to overflow into the adjacent through lane. In addition, the high traffic volume for the eastbound Imjin Parkway right turn movement would also contribute to the long vehicle queues for the eastbound Imjin Parkway outer through lane, especially during the AM peak hour.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-3 and T-6 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Significant Impact – LOS at Engineer’s Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Drive (Phase 3).** Worst movement level of service at this intersection would drop to LOS F at project build-out during the AM peak hour. This would be a significant impact. Implementation Mitigation Measure T-7 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

**T-3.** Prior to issuance of building permits, the Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor(s) shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the specific development’s pro-rata share of fees listed below (fair share costs for project-level impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).

- FORA development impact fees.
- City of Marina traffic impact fees (includes improvements at Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway, Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway, Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway, Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway, and signalization at the Imjin Parkway/southbound State Route 1 ramps).
- County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:
  - Davis Road/Reservation Road (4.3% of $1,825,600 = $78,375)
  - Blanco Road/Reservation Road (4.6% of $263,400 = $12,056).
City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:

- Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway – second westbound left (11.6% of $925,453 = $107,189)
  Note: this fee would be reimbursable to MST – see Mitigation Measure T-2.

City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:

- Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road (2.9% of $222,700 = $6,481).

City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersection:

- General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue (4.0% of $300,000 = $12,119)

Caltrans fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Northbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (3.2% of $151,428 = $4,797)
- Southbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (2.6% of $965,308 = $24,759)

**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to execution of the development agreement, a pro-rata division of costs shall be assigned to each lot (lots 2-16) within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.

Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-4. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvements prior to acceptance of Phase 2 (lots 2-12) improvements:

- Signalize intersection of Imjin Road/Eighth Street and add a southbound Imjin Road left turn lane, and corresponding second eastbound Eighth Street receiving lane, or
- Construct the re-alignment of Imjin Road between Imjin Parkway and Eighth Street, realigning Imjin Road as a fourth approach to the Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road intersection.

The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer is responsible for 78.2% of the cost of this improvement and MST is responsible for 21.8% of the cost of this improvement (see Mitigation Measure T-9).
**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 2 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 2, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-5. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:

- add a westbound right-turn lane at the Imjin Road/Eighth Street intersection, or
- Construct the re-alignment of Imjin Road between Imjin Parkway and Eighth Street, realigning Imjin Road as a fourth approach to the Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road intersection.

The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer is responsible for 78.2% of the cost of this improvement and MST is responsible for 21.8% of the cost of this improvement (see Mitigation Measure T-9).

**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 3, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-6. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 2 (lots 2-12) improvements:

- Construct an eastbound right-turn lane at the intersection of Imjin Road and Imjin Parkway.
The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor shall be subject to reimbursement of 17.5 percent of the cost of this improvement by MST ($81,791 based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index) – see Mitigation Measure T-1.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 2 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 2, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.

Mitigation Measure

T-7. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:

- Signalize intersection of Whispering Oaks Drive/Engineer’s Equipment Road. The signal light shall be coordinated with the signal light at Engineer’s Equipment Road and Inter-Garrison Road.
- construct northbound and southbound left turn lanes.
- construct eastbound and westbound right turn lanes.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 3, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements to the RMA – Planning Department.

Less than Significant Impact – Need for Transit and Pedestrian Facilities. *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* policies require adequate pedestrian, bicycle, and transit provisions for all new development. The proposed project indicates the provision of pedestrian facilities within and adjacent to the MST facility (including reservation of land for the multi-modal corridor), new bus stops at both the MST and Whispering Oaks locations, and sidewalks within the business park. This would be a less than significant impact.
**Potentially Significant Impact – Non-service Bus Traffic within Campus Core.** Bus traffic heading to/from route initiation/termination points west of the CSUMB campus core could increase out-of-service bus traffic through the CSUMB campus core area on Inter-Garrison Road and other campus roads. This would increase the potential for traffic congestion and conflict with pedestrians and bicyclists. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

**T-8.** MST shall include a policy in the General Development Plan to require out-of-service buses traveling to and from the beginning or ends of their day’s runs to use routes that avoid the following streets within the CSUMB campus core area: Inter-Garrison Road/Third Street (Sixth Avenue to General Jim Moore Boulevard) and Divarty Street (east of General Jim Moore Boulevard). The restriction shall not apply to routes serving CSUMB.

**Monitoring Action**

**Prior to approval of the MST GDP,** a policy shall be added to the GDP or condition placed upon the approval to require the policy prior to project development.

**Significant Cumulative Effects**

Significant cumulative impacts are anticipated in the following areas:

**Climate Change**

Refer to the section on significant unavoidable impacts regarding cumulative climate change impacts.

**Transportation and Circulation**

**Significant Cumulative Impact – LOS Below Standards.** The proposed project would contribute traffic to 19 intersections with level of service below standards during cumulative conditions. One additional intersection is listed for which Whispering Oaks Business Park would provide mitigation at Phase 2 and 3, but for which MST would represent a cumulatively considerable share of traffic. The proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to LOS degradation at the following intersections.

*Davis Road/Reservation Road.* Signalize Intersection; and add second westbound Reservation left turn lane.
Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road. Add northbound Inter-Garrison right turn overlap signal phase; add second westbound Reservation Road left turn lane; add a second northbound Inter-Garrison right turn lane.

Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway. Add an eastbound Imjin Parkway right turn lane; add a second westbound Imjin Parkway left turn lane; add a northbound Imjin Road right turn overlap signal phase; and add third eastbound and third westbound Imjin Parkway through lanes.

Fifth Avenue-California Avenue/Imjin Parkway. Add a southbound California right turn lane.

Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway. Signalize intersection.

Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway. Add an eastbound right turn overlap signal phases.

Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway: Signalize intersection.

Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway: Signalize intersection.

General Jim Moore Boulevard/Light Fighter Drive. Add a southbound General Jim Moore Boulevard right turn lane; and add a second eastbound Light Fighter Drive left turn lane.

Second Avenue/Light Fighter Drive. Add a southbound right turn overlap signal phase.

First Avenue/Light Fighter Drive. Add a second northbound left turn lane.

General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue. Signalize intersection; add a northbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second northbound through lane; add a southbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second southbound through lane; add an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane.

Seventh Avenue/Inter-Garrison Road. Add a northbound right turn lane.

Engineers Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Drive. Add northbound and southbound Engineering left turn lanes; signalize intersection; and add eastbound and westbound right turn lanes.

Whispering Oaks Way/Inter-Garrison Road. Add a southbound Whispering Oaks right turn lane; an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane; a westbound Inter-Garrison Road right turn lane; second eastbound and second westbound Inter-Garrison Road through lanes; and a median left turn acceleration lane on Inter-Garrison Road.

Engineers Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road. Signalize intersection; add a second southbound left turn lane; a westbound right turn lane; and a second eastbound Inter-Garrison Road through lane.
**Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineers Equipment Road.** Signalize Intersection; add a single northbound Sixth Avenue left turn lane, two southbound Imjin Road left turn lanes; two eastbound Eighth Street left turn lanes, a single westbound Engineer’s Equipment Road left turn lane; a southbound Imjin Road right turn lane, an eastbound Eighth Street right turn lane, a westbound Engineer’s Equipment Road right turn lane; and southbound and westbound right turn overlap signal phases.

**Eastside Parkway/Gigling Road.** Add an eastbound Gigling Road left turn lane; a westbound Gigling Road left turn lane; a northbound Eastside Parkway left turn lane; a southbound Eastside Parkway left turn lane; and a southbound Eastside Parkway right turn lane.

** Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway.** Add second westbound and second eastbound Imjin Parkway through lanes.

**Imjin Road/Eighth Street.** MST would contribute traffic to this intersection that would require mitigation under Phase 2 and 3 conditions and be improved by the Whispering Oaks Business Park (see Mitigation Measures T-4 and T-5).

Payment of the development impact fees and fair share fees as required by Mitigation Measures T-1 and T-3, construction of improvements as required by Mitigation Measures T-2, T-4, T-5, T-6, and T-7 in Section 2.9 Traffic and Circulation, and implementation of Mitigation Measures T-9, T-10, and T-11 presented below would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

**T-9.** Prior to issuance of building permits, MST shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the fees listed below (fair share costs for cumulative impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).

County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road (1.8% of $612,100 = $11,056)
- Engineer’s Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Way (17.8% of $300,000 = $53,251)
- Engineer’s Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road (3.6% of $300,000 = $10,827)

City of Marina fair share costs for reimbursement to Whispering Oaks Business Park at the following intersection (Note: this amount may be bonded or otherwise assured, and the cost could change if an alternate improvement is constructed):

- Imjin Road/Eighth Street (21.8% of $1,136,064 = $247,689)
Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department.

Mitigation Measure

T-10. Prior to issuance of building permits, the Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor(s) shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the specific development’s pro-rata share of fees listed below (fair share costs for cumulative impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).

County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road (3.3% of $612,100 = $20,468)
- Engineer’s Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Way (82.2% of $300,000 = $248,749)
- Engineer’s Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road (7.8% of $300,000 = $23,298)

City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- General Jim Moore Boulevard/Light Fighter Drive (1.1% of $654,185 = $7.416)
- Second Avenue/Light Fighter Drive (0.9% of $18,000 = $159)
- First Avenue/Light Fighter Drive (1.1% of $102,600 = $1,141)

Monitoring Actions

Prior to execution of the development agreement, a pro-rata division of costs shall be assigned to each lot (lots 2-16) within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.

Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department.
Mitigation Measure

T-11. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvements prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:

- a southbound Whispering Oaks right turn lane;
- an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane;
- a westbound Inter-Garrison Road right turn lane;
- second eastbound and second westbound Inter-Garrison Road through lanes; and
- a median left turn acceleration lane on Inter-Garrison Road.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified improvements for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 3, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements to the RMA – Planning Department.

** Significant Unavoidable Impacts **

Significant and unavoidable impacts are anticipated in the following areas:

**Climate Change**

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact – Project Related GHG Emissions.** There are no existing local or applicable regional plans in place that identify thresholds of significance or mitigation approaches for reducing the impacts of local development on climate change. In the absence of such plans, AB 32 becomes the applicable plan with which the proposed project should be consistent in order to meet the threshold of significance identified earlier, which is as follows:

result in a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions, in terms of carbon dioxide equivalents, that could substantially impede local, regional or statewide efforts to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions.

The Scoping Plan discusses the role of local governments in assisting with the implementation of AB 32. Local governments are encouraged to set goals to reduce community emissions by approximately 15 percent from current levels by 2020. The GHG emissions generated by the proposed project would make the state’s ability to achieve reductions targets identified in AB 32
more challenging. In the absence of local, regional or state guidelines, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Both the MST and Whispering Oaks Business Park general development plans include direction that would reduce GHG emissions, including facilitation of transit use and LEED certification for most buildings. Additional greenhouse gas reduction measures can be implemented that would reduce the operational emissions of the proposed project. However, the full GHG emissions reduction potential of the measures may not be realized due to economic and site constraints, overlapping or mutually exclusive nature of some of the measures, or other reasons. Therefore, reductions of GHG emissions to a less than significant level cannot be guaranteed, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations would be required.

**Mitigation Measure**

CC-1. The project applicant and/or succeeding developers shall prepare a greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the project site to the extent feasible. The following specific measures shall be implemented as part of the general development plan, development agreement, final map, and/or development plans as applicable:

1. MST shall analyze future bus routes and modify these routes to effectively reduce daily vehicle miles travelled. For near term, the proposed project is expected to result in an average of 1,959 miles of additional travel each day to serve existing routes that are served by the two existing transit facilities. This assessment uses a worst case analysis that this mileage would increase proportionally with new bus routes in the future. However, MST has outgrown their existing facilities, so new facilities would be necessary to serve the future transit demands. Potential reductions: 20 percent of the daily increased vehicle miles travelled. This 20 percent reduction would equate to a reduction of 392 miles when the project first becomes operational (assuming 186 daily bus trips).

2. MST and Whispering Oaks employees and visitors shall be provided opportunities for using transit that would reduce travel to the site. Potential reductions: up to 15 percent according to the URBEMIS2007 model. This reduction is based solely on the transit service at the site (e.g., frequency of buses within one-quarter mile and regional transit service within ½ mile). With future transit routes, the project could achieve a 10 percent reduction in mobile (non-bus) GHG emissions.
3. MST and Whispering Oaks employees shall be provided incentives to use transit, such as discounted transit passes. Potential reductions: five percent of employee mobile source emissions.

4. Provide local retail uses. Retail services, such as restaurants, markets, and automatic teller machines located in proximity could substantially reduce employee vehicle miles travelled during the day (lunch period). One lot within the business park shall be designated for retail services only. Potential reductions: two percent of employee mobile source emissions according to the URBEMIS2007 model.

5. Provide amenities for bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel. Sidewalks and bicycle lanes shall be provided on both sides of all streets to serve the project site (except sidewalks on the north side of Engineer’s Equipment Road where it abuts open space). In addition, secure employee bicycle facilities, along with lockers and showers shall be provided at each lot, and at least one public bicycle parking space shall be provided at each lot. Signal light sensors shall be set to respond to bicycle traffic, and an automatic walk signal shall be provided with green lights. Potential reductions: up to nine percent of employee mobile source emissions, depending on the network of bicycle lanes and sidewalks serving the project site, according to the URBEMIS2007 model. An additional two percent could be achieved with on-site amenities that would encourage employees to bike or walk to work. The total combined reductions for these measures could reach 10 percent, depending on the network of developed sidewalks and bicycle lanes in the future. Note: this measure shall not be required on interim access driveways built within street rights-of-way.

6. LEED credits shall focus to the extent feasible on approaches that directly or indirectly reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Potential reductions: 20 percent or more by meeting LEED Silver design level.

The project applicant and/or succeeding developers may elect to utilize other measures not specifically listed, including measures to reduce dependence on gas or electrical space or water heating, and additional means to encourage forms of transportation that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Use of other methods may be credited toward fulfilling this measure based on anticipated emissions reductions.

Measures to be included in the general development plan(s) or development agreement(s) shall be prepared as part of project-wide emissions reduction plan for RMA – Planning Department review and recommendation prior to Board of Supervisors approval. Measures to be included as notes on or designs within a final map, site plan, or building plans, shall be prepared as part of a site-specific emissions reduction plan for
RMA – Planning Department review and approval prior to approval of the relevant permit. The applicant/developer may elect to prepare a consolidated greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan for two or more lots.

**Monitoring Actions**

**Prior to Board of Supervisors approval of the development agreement or general development plan,** the project applicant shall prepare a project-wide greenhouse gas reduction plan for the review and recommendation of RMA – Planning Department and shall include applicable measures from the greenhouse gas reduction plan in the general development plan and development agreement.

**Prior to approval of a final map,** the applicant/developer shall include applicable measures from the project-wide greenhouse gas reduction plan on the final map, subject to the review and approval of the RMA - Planning Department.

**Prior to issuance of a building permit,** the applicant/developer shall prepare a site-specific greenhouse reduction plan for the review and approval of the RMA - Planning Department, and shall include applicable measures from the greenhouse reduction plan in site plans, improvement plans, and building plans.

**Transportation**

**Significant Unavoidable Impact – Increased Trips at State Route 1 Interchanges (Phase 1).**

The first phase of the proposed project would add new trips to the following two intersections already operating at LOS F at both the AM and PM peak hours. These intersections and the required improvements are:

- **Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway:** close the median along Imjin Parkway at this intersection; and

- **Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway:** signalize intersection; add a second westbound Imjin parkway left turn lane; and add a second southbound State Route 1 Off-ramp left turn lane.

The improvements necessary to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level would require the approval of Caltrans, and implementation of the improvements may not be feasible. Ultimately, Caltrans plans to re-design and consolidate this interchange and the Del Monte Boulevard interchange to the north. Until such time as that major improvement is undertaken, mitigation at this location is infeasible and the interchange will continue to operate at LOS F. The City of Marina traffic fee program includes signalization of this intersection and implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1 would require fair share payment to Caltrans.
towards the lane improvements. However, these fees would not reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Significant Unavoidable Impact – Increased Trips at State Route 1 Interchanges (Phases 2 and 3).** The second and third phases of the proposed project would add new trips to the following two intersections already operating at LOS F at both the AM and PM peak hours. These intersections and the required improvements are:

- **Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway:** close the median along Imjin Parkway at this intersection; and

- **Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway:** signalize intersection; add a second westbound Imjin parkway left turn lane; and add a second southbound State Route 1 Off-ramp left turn lane.

The improvements necessary to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level would require the approval of Caltrans, and implementation of the improvements may not be feasible. Ultimately, Caltrans plans to re-design and consolidate this interchange and the Del Monte Boulevard interchange to the north. Until such time as that major improvement is undertaken, mitigation at this location is infeasible and the interchange will continue to operate at LOS F.

The City of Marina traffic fee program includes signalization of this intersection and implementation of Mitigation Measure T-3 would require fair share payment to Caltrans towards the lane improvements. However, these fees would not reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Growth Inducing Effects**

The proposed project would construct local-serving infrastructure, including on-site water and sewer lines, and on-site and adjacent roads. The proposed project would also make use of existing infrastructure located adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not develop new or over-sized utilities that would allow for unplanned growth in adjacent areas. The proposed project is within an area planned for development in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. The proposed project would not be growth inducing.

**Areas of Controversy**

CEQA Guidelines section 15123(b)(2) requires an EIR summary to identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency including issues raised by agencies and the public. The following concerns have been raised regarding the proposed project:
Aesthetics

The proposed project could result in significant changes to the visual character of the project site. In particular, California State University at Monterey Bay has raised concerns regarding the effect of tree loss on the visual character of the site when viewed from adjacent CSUMB locations. The City of Marina has expressed concerns regarding the effects of tree loss on the open space character of the Inter-Garrison Road corridor.

Biological Resources

The proposed project would result in the removal of approximately 4,500 oak trees.

Land Use and Planning

The project site has a *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* designation of Mixed Use – Planned Development. The project site is also within the City of Marina planning area, and has a *Marina General Plan* land use designation of Park and Open Space.

Summary of Alternatives

Project alternatives are presented, discussed, analyzed and compared in Section 4.0 Alternatives.

Alternatives Analyzed

The following project alternatives were analyzed:

- **Alternative 1: No project.** This alternative assumes no development takes place on the project site.

- **Alternative 2: MST Facility Only.** This alternative includes development of the MST facility only on the project site, without the Whispering Oaks subdivision portion of the proposed project.

- **Alternative 3: Seventh-Gigling/Light Industrial.** This alternative includes development of the MST facility on the land located at Seventh Avenue and Gigling Road and designated in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* for the MST facility; and development of the entire project site for Light Commercial uses.

- **Alternative 4: Seventh-Gigling/Recreational.** This alternative includes development of the MST facility on the land located at Seventh Avenue and Gigling Road and designated in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* for the MST facility; and a recreational use on the entire project site.
Comparison of Alternatives

The “no project” alternative would result in the least environmental impact, since it would not involve any new development. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” alternative and the “MST Only” alternative rank similarly, and although the “MST Only” alternative appears best in the alternatives summary table, the “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” ranks better in two important categories. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” alternative is superior to the “MST Only” alternative in terms of aesthetics and biological resources. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” alternative maintains the project site in low intensity recreational uses that do not result in significant loss of trees or introduction of light or glare. This alternative avoids these two primary adverse effects associated with development on the project site. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” alternative does result in potential noise effects in the vicinity of the MST site, but the “MST Only” alternative results in greater aesthetics and biological resources effects. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Industrial” alternative involves a greater level of development and has greater environmental impacts than the proposed project and the other alternatives.
**RESOLUTION ___ - EXHIBIT 1**  
Monterey County Resource Management Agency  
Planning Department  
Condition Compliance and/or Mitigation Monitoring  
Reporting Plan  

Project Name: MST – Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR  
File No: PLN*  
APNs: 031-101-056, 031-101-041  
Approved by:  
Date: July 6, 2010 (Draft EIR)

*Monitoring or Reporting refers to projects with an EIR or adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration per Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. AQ-1.            |              | Prior to issuance of the tree removal, grading, or building permits, the applicant shall prepare a dust control plan for submittal to and approval of the Monterey County planning director. The dust control plan shall be implemented for all construction sites when total project area under grading exceeds 2.2 acres per day. The dust control plan shall limit onsite construction emissions to 82 pounds per day. As more detailed construction information becomes available, emissions from grading activities should be reassessed to determine if the area of grading could be increased. The following measures shall be included in the dust control plan:  
1. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to existing businesses should be kept damp at all times. If necessary, during windy period, watering is to occur on all days of the week regardless of onsite activities.  
2. Cover all trucks hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard. | The applicant shall prepare a dust control plan that meets the requirements of the mitigation measure.  
The contractor shall appoint a qualified site monitor to ensure that the dust control plan is implemented.  
The contractor shall submit reports on said activities to the project proponent who shall then forward a copy to the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. | Applicant/Developer/Contractor | Prior to issuance of the tree removal, grading, or building permits | Prior to commencement of construction activities  
Monthly during grading and construction activities |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.</td>
<td>The applicant shall require in construction contracts that all off-road construction vehicles comply with the specifications outlined in the mitigation measure, and shall submit a report to the Planning Department showing compliance.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer/Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to building or grading permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Sweep daily all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.</td>
<td>The project proponent shall submit a written roster of equipment anticipated to be used on the project site, including fuel use information on each.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.</td>
<td>The contractor shall keep a certified daily log of each activity performed during construction including date and photographs, as necessary. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Suspend excavation and grading activity when hourly-average winds exceed 15 mph and visible dust clouds cannot be contained within the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>AQ-2.</td>
<td>All off-road construction vehicles/equipment greater than 100 horsepower that will be used on site for more than one week shall: 1) be manufactured during or after 1996, and 2) shall meet the NOX emissions standard of 6.9 grams per brake-horsepower hour. Alternatively, the project shall implement a combination of the following emission reduction measures on some or all of the above described vehicles and equipment, subject to approval by the MBUAPCD: 1. Use alternative fuels (such as biodiesel blends); 2. Require diesel particulate matter filters on equipment; 3. Require diesel oxidation catalyst on equipment; 4. Install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g. compressors).</td>
<td>The applicant shall require in construction contracts that all off-road construction vehicles comply with the specifications outlined in the mitigation measure, and shall submit a report to the Planning Department showing compliance.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer/Contractor</td>
<td>Prior to commencement of grading</td>
<td>During grading and construction activities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforce state required idle restrictions (e.g., post signs). Diesel equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks may keep their engines running continuously as long as they were onsite and staged away from residential areas.</td>
<td>Department. Failure to submit a report, or failure to comply with the requirements of the mitigation measure, shall cause all work to be stopped until the report is received and approved by the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage large diesel-powered equipment at least 100 feet from any active land uses (e.g., residences).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limit the hours of operation for heavy-duty equipment to daytime periods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BIO-1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>For the MST project: The sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus shall be flagged for avoidance and included in the offsite maritime chaparral area fenced for avoidance, as described in Mitigation Measure BIO-13.</td>
<td>Obtain Section 2081 permit from CDFG to allow for disturbance in areas known to support sand gilia. Sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus shall be flagged for avoidance and included in the offsite maritime chaparral area fenced for avoidance. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County Department of Planning and Building Inspection.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to Ground Disturbance Lots 2-11</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BIO-2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>For Lots 2-11: The County of Monterey has consulted with the CDFG regarding the potential for take of sand gilia within the entire landfill site, including the Lots 2-11, and the agencies have agreed upon an acceptable mitigation strategy for the proposed impacts. Under this mitigation strategy, none of the project site would need to be preserved or restored, and the site could be developed in its entirety. However, the County has not</td>
<td>Within Lots 2-11, the applicant shall provide evidence of the issuance of a Section 2081 permit. Sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus shall be flagged for avoidance and included in the offsite maritime chaparral area fenced for avoidance.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to grading permit</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>BIO-3</td>
<td>Obtained a permit for incidental take of sand gilia on the landfill parcel, including the project site, at this time. Therefore, no vegetation removal, grading, or other ground-disturbing construction activities that may result in take of the sand gilia populations within Lots 2-11 shall occur prior to the issuance of a Section 2081 permit.</td>
<td>Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County Department of Planning and Building Inspection.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to Ground Disturbance resulting from the extension of Engineer’s Equipment Road, gas line relocation, or off-site drainage basins east of Eighth Avenue.</td>
<td>Weekly during grading activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For the extension of Engineer’s Equipment Road; gas line realignment; and off-site drainage basins east of Eighth Avenue: Prior to ground disturbance activities, surveys for Monterey spineflower, sand gilia, coast wallflower, and Kellogg’s horkelia will occur during the blooming period in spring. Additional surveys for Seaside bird’s beak and Yadon’s rein orchid will occur during the blooming period in the summer. If individuals of this species are found, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted to determine the appropriate course of action.</td>
<td>Surveys for Monterey spineflower, sand gilia, coast wallflower, and Kellogg’s horkelia shall occur during the blooming period in spring. Additional surveys for Seaside bird’s beak and Yadon’s rein orchid shall occur during the blooming period in the summer. If individuals of this species are found, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted to determine the appropriate course of action.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>Weekly during grading activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submit take permit and habitat restoration plan or submit evidence that take will be avoided.</td>
<td>Additional surveys for Seaside bird’s beak and Yadon’s rein orchid shall occur during the blooming period in the summer.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td>At termination of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County Department of Planning and Building Inspection.</td>
<td>Provide habitat restoration plan compliance report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.                  | BIO-4        | For Lots 12-16: Prior to the initiation of any ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal and grading, the applicant shall comply with one of the following three approaches:  
1. Conduct protocol surveys to determine the presence or absence of California tiger salamander within Lots 12-16. Protocol surveys conducted in compliance with the protocols outlined in the /Interim Guidance on Site Assessment and Field Surveys for Determining Presence or a Negative Finding of the California Tiger Salamander /(USFWS October 2003). Two consecutive years of upland drift fence studies are required. Fencing arrays shall be installed and approved by USFWS prior to October 15 of each survey year. Surveys shall continue until individuals are found or the criteria for a Negative Finding are met. If individuals are found, either approach 2 or 3 shall be implemented;  
2. If the presence of California tiger salamander is documented or the applicant chooses to assume the species is present, the project shall comply with the ESA and CESA and obtain Incidental Take Authorization from the USFWS and CDFG for the loss of California tiger salamander individuals and upland habitat associated with construction and operation of the project; or  
3. Following adoption of the Fort Ord HCP and issuance of base-wide federal and state incidental take permits, all applicable conditions of the HCP shall be followed and individual incidental take permits are not required. | Provide evidence to the RMA – Planning Department that criteria for a Negative Finding have been met, or that the requirements of the ESA or HCP will be implemented. | Applicant/Developer | Prior to Ground Disturbance within Lots 12-16 | During construction within Lots 12-16. |
For all development areas: prior to construction activities, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to monitor construction. The biological monitor shall conduct an Employee Education Program for the construction crew. The biologist shall meet with the construction crew at the project site at the onset of construction to educate the construction crew on the following:

- A review of the project boundaries;
- All special-status species that may be present, their habitat, and proper identification;
- The specific mitigation measures and success criteria that will be incorporated into the construction effort (Measures BIO-6 through BIO-9);
- The general provisions and protections afforded by the USFWS and CDFG; and
- The proper procedures if a special-status animal is encountered within the project site.

Conduct an Employee Education Program for the construction crew on the points listed in the mitigation measure. Submit evidence of training to Monterey County RMA - Planning Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>BIO-5</td>
<td>For all development areas: prior to construction activities, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to monitor construction. The biological monitor shall conduct an Employee Education Program for the construction crew. The biologist shall meet with the construction crew at the project site at the onset of construction to educate the construction crew on the following: A review of the project boundaries; All special-status species that may be present, their habitat, and proper identification; The specific mitigation measures and success criteria that will be incorporated into the construction effort (Measures BIO-6 through BIO-9); The general provisions and protections afforded by the USFWS and CDFG; and The proper procedures if a special-status animal is encountered within the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to construction activities</td>
<td>Monthly monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>BIO-6</td>
<td>For all development areas: The biological monitor shall be onsite during initial grading and vegetation removal activities to protect any special-status species encountered. The qualified biologist shall identify and explain the protection methods during the Employer Education Program as described in Mitigation Measure 5. These methods could include, but are not limited to, stopping work in the area where the animal is encountered until it has moved on its own outside of the project site or moving individuals outside of the project site to adjacent appropriate habitat.</td>
<td>The biological monitor shall conduct an Employee Education Program for the construction crew. The biological monitor shall be onsite to stop work or move individual species outside of the work area. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA - Planning Department.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer/Contractors</td>
<td>Prior to construction activities</td>
<td>During construction activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BIO-7</td>
<td>For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, project proponents shall retain a qualified, CDFG-approved biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys within three days prior to construction for woodrat nests within the project area and in a buffer zone 100 feet out from the limit of disturbance. All woodrat nests shall be flagged for avoidance of direct construction impacts, where feasible. Any active nests that will not be in areas of grading or vegetation removal will be avoided and protected during project activities with a minimum 25-foot buffer. Nests that cannot be avoided shall be manually deconstructed prior to land clearing activities to allow animals to escape harm and to reestablish territories for the next breeding season. Nests shall be dismantled during the non-breeding season, between October 1 and December 31. Dismantling shall be done by hand, allowing any animals to escape either along existing woodrat trails or toward other available habitat. If a litter of young is found or suspected, nest material shall be replaced, and the nest left alone for two to three weeks before rechecking the nest to verify that young are capable of independent survival before proceeding with nest dismantling.</td>
<td>CDFG-approved biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys within three days prior to construction for woodrat nests within the project area and in a buffer zone 100 feet out from the limit of disturbance. All woodrat nests shall be flagged for avoidance of direct construction impacts, where feasible. The biological monitor shall be onsite to stop work or move individual species outside of the work area. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA - Planning Department.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Survey/report three days prior to construction. During construction activities Monthly monitoring reports as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BIO-8</td>
<td>For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the American badger, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused pre-construction surveys for badger dens in all areas proposed for construction, ground disturbance, or staging no more than two weeks prior to construction. If no potential badger dens are present, no further mitigation is required. If potential dens are observed, the following measures are required to avoid potential significant impacts to the American badger: • If the qualified biologist determines that potential badger dens are present: The biological monitor shall be onsite to stop work or move individual species outside of the work area.</td>
<td>Retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused pre-construction survey’s for badger dens in all areas proposed for construction, ground disturbance, or staging.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Survey/report no more than two weeks prior to construction Prior to construction activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. BIO-9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the white-tailed kite and other nesting raptors, construction activities can be timed to avoid the nesting season period. Specifically, tree removal can be scheduled after September 1 and before January 31 to avoid impacts to these species. Alternatively, if avoidance of the nesting period is not feasible, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for nesting raptors within 300 feet of proposed construction activities if construction is to be initiated between February 1 and August 31. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction. If nesting raptors are identified during the pre-construction surveys, the CDFG shall be contacted and an appropriate no-disturbance buffer imposed within which no construction activities or disturbance shall take place (generally 300 feet in all directions for raptors) until the young of the year have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival, as determined by a qualified biologist and the CDFG. The applicant shall time construction activities to avoid the nesting season period. If construction cannot be timed outside of the nesting period, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for nesting raptors within 300 feet of proposed construction activities if construction. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA - Planning Department. If avoidance of the nesting period is not feasible, the applicant shall conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors within 300 feet of proposed construction activities. Establish buffers in conjunction with CDFG if necessary. Submit evidence of CDFG compliance.</td>
<td>Applicant/ Developer</td>
<td>Survey/report o more than 30 days prior to the start of construction</td>
<td>CDFG evidence prior to start of construction and monthly monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>BIO-10.</td>
<td>The applicant shall comply with the measures included in the Forest Management Plans that were prepared for the MST and Whispering Oaks Business Park sites. The Forest Management Plans include measures to avoid tree removal and/or transplant trees whenever possible as well as suitable mitigation ratios and planting areas. If off-site improvements result in disturbance to oak trees, the provisions of the MST Forest Management Plan shall apply to that off-site location. In addition, a program shall be established for the applicant to submit a special fee to FORA to fund tree replacement elsewhere within Fort Ord.</td>
<td>Construction supervisors shall review the Forest Management Plans to identify and prepare for mitigation directed at tree avoidance and tree protection during construction.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer/Contractors</td>
<td>Prior to Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>BIO-11.</td>
<td>For both projects: The appropriate strategy for compliance, as identified in the Preliminary Oak Woodland Habitat and Tree Removal Mitigation Strategy Plan for the MST Facility/Whispering Oaks Business Park (Denise Duffy &amp; Associates, Inc., 2009) for this project is as follows: • The maximum amount of native oak trees as feasible for screening and habitat purposes shall be retained in coordination with a qualified arborist. • Construction best management practices (as identified in the appropriate FMP) to protect retained trees and trees adjacent to the project site shall be implemented.</td>
<td>A qualified arborist shall be consulted as necessary regarding the best removal, protection, transplanting, planting and irrigation methods as construction proceeds.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer/Contractors</td>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>BIO-12.</td>
<td>Two, five, and eight years following mitigation plantings, the applicant shall arrange for a qualified arborist to inspect replacement tree plantings following project completion. Any trees that have died or are in poor condition in the judgment of the arborist shall be replaced and inspected on a two, five and eight year schedule beginning with the next inspection on the original schedule, and with the same replacement location requirements.</td>
<td>A qualified arborist shall inspect replacement tree plantings following project completion. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA – Planning Department.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Two, five, and eight years following mitigation plantings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>BIO-13.</td>
<td>For the MST project, gas line realignment, Lots 2-11, Engineer’s Equipment Road, and off-site drainage improvements: The maritime chaparral vegetation immediately adjacent to the construction area shall be protected during construction. This includes the use of exclusionary fencing of herbaceous and shrubby vegetation, such as hay bales and protective wood barriers for trees. Only certified weed-free straw shall be used to avoid the introduction of non-native, invasive species. A biological monitor shall supervise the installation of protective fencing. The monitor shall remain on-site during the initial grading activities and vegetation removal. After these activities are completed, the biological monitor shall check at least once per week until the construction is complete that the protective fencing remains intact and that all construction work is maintained within the limits of construction.</td>
<td>Protect the maritime chaparral vegetation immediately adjacent to the project site using an appropriate barrier. After initial grading and vegetation removal activities are completed, the biological monitor shall check that the protective fencing remains intact and that all construction work is maintained within the limits of construction at least once per week until the construction is complete. Standard erosion control techniques to minimize erosion and sedimentation to native vegetation shall be utilized in consultation with a qualified hydrologist, engineer, or erosion control specialist.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to start of construction</td>
<td>Weekly during construction activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>GEO-1.</td>
<td>All future development within the project site shall be designed using the parameters for code-based design listed in the Fugro West report and shall be designed in accordance with the requirements for Seismic Design Category “D.”</td>
<td>The applicant shall design all development using the parameters for code-based design listed in the Fugro West report and according to Seismic Design Category “D.”</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to approval of grading, improvement or building plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>GEO-2.</td>
<td>All future development within the project site shall be designed consistent with the latest edition of the California Building Code as adopted by Monterey County and its related seismic standards, as well as any additional standards required as standard conditions of approval by the County of Monterey. Future development on the MST site shall incorporate all recommendations from the geotechnical report, and if necessary, a supplemental exploration may be required depending on the final layout of the proposed structures and facilities. A geotechnical report shall be required prior to development on any lot within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.</td>
<td>Prepare a geotechnical report to inform design and engineering for development within the Whispering Oaks Business Park. Design all development within the project site to be consistent with the latest edition of the California Building Code as adopted by Monterey County and its related seismic standard, and well as any additional standards required as standard conditions of approval by the County of Monterey.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR  
S-42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oaks Business Park. Final improvement plans and building plans shall be based on recommendations in the geotechnical report, and subject to review and approval of Monterey County prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. A geotechnical report may be prepared to apply to more than one lot.</td>
<td>A qualified engineer shall prepare an erosion control plan, including but not limited to the methods outlined in the mitigation measure. The erosion control plan shall be submitted to the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department for review and approval, based on conformance with the methods outlined in the mitigation measure and consistent with the requirements of Monterey County Code Chapter 16.12.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer/Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. GEO-3. Each applicant shall prepare an erosion control plan consistent with the requirements of Monterey County Code Chapter 16.12 prior to approval of tree removal, grading, or building permits. All erosion control measures required by the approved erosion control plan shall be in place until work is completed. Grading, excavating, and other activities that involve substantial soil disturbance shall be planned and carried out in consultation with a qualified hydrologist, engineer, or erosion control specialist, and shall utilize standard erosion control techniques to minimize erosion and sedimentation to native vegetation. Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, permanent erosion control measures shall be in place and approved by the Resource Management Agency. An erosion control plan may be prepared to apply to more than one lot or for related projects at different sites.</td>
<td>The contractor shall submit a letter report and/or photographs from a qualified soils engineer to the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department documenting the ongoing maintenance and the condition of the erosion control fencing and other erosion control measures. The Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department shall review the reports for conformance with the methods outlined in the mitigation measure. Failure to submit a report showing that the proposed project is in conformance with the methods outlined in the mitigation measure shall cause all work to be stopped until conformance is confirmed and the report is received by the Monterey County Planning and Building Inspection Department. The project proponent shall be responsible for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monthly between October 15 and April 15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. H-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>As part of its Business Response Plan, MST shall develop a designated transport route for hazardous waste deliveries and removal, subject to the review and approval of the Monterey County Environmental Health Department.</td>
<td>Submit to Monterey County Building Inspection Department an approved Business Response Plan.</td>
<td>Applicant/MST</td>
<td>Prior to sign-off on a grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. H-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction supervisors and crews shall attend a U.S. Army sponsored munitions and explosives safety briefing prior to commencement of construction. This briefing shall identify the variety of munitions and explosives that are known to exist on the former Fort Ord and the actions to be taken if a suspicious item is discovered. This requirement for briefing shall be included in construction documents.</td>
<td>Construction supervisors and crews shall attend a U.S. Army sponsored munitions and explosives safety briefing. Construction supervisors shall submit an evidence letter to the Monterey County Building Inspection Department</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer/Construction Supervisors</td>
<td>Prior to the start of construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. HY-1.</td>
<td>Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permits, the developer(s) for Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8 shall provide the Water Resources Agency a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site impacts with supporting calculations and construction details. The plan shall include retention facilities to mitigate the impact of impervious surface storm-water runoff. Pond(s) shall be fenced for public safety. Oil-grease/water separators shall be installed for the pre-treatment of storm-water runoff from paved parking areas. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Water Resources Agency.</td>
<td>Prepare drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site impacts with supporting calculations and. Indicate basin locations and provide construction details on plans.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to the approval of grading or building permits for Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. HY-2.</td>
<td>Prior to filing the final map, the applicant shall provide the Water Resources Agency a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site and off-site impacts with supporting calculations and construction details. The plan shall include retention facilities to mitigate the impact of impervious surface storm-water runoff. Pond(s) shall be fenced for public safety. Oil-grease/water separators shall be installed for the pre-treatment of storm-water runoff from paved parking areas. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Water Resources Agency.</td>
<td>The developer shall submit a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site and off-site impacts with supporting calculations and construction details.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to filing the final map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. HY-3</td>
<td>Prior to filing the final map, a copy of a signed and notarized Road and Drainage Maintenance Agreement shall be provided to the Water Resources Agency for approval. The agreement shall be recorded concurrently with final map. The responsibility for care, maintenance, and repair of road and drainage improvements in the subdivision shall be the joint and separate personal obligation of each and every owner of a lot in the Subdivision. The obligation includes preparation of an annual drainage report by a</td>
<td>Submit a copy of a signed and notarized Road and Drainage Maintenance Agreement shall be provided to the Water Resources Agency for approval. Record Road and Drainage Maintenance Agreement</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to filing the final map</td>
<td>Concurrent with filing the final map</td>
<td>Annually by August 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24. T-1. | | Prior to issuance of building permits, MST shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the fees listed below (fair share costs for project-level impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).  
- FORA development impact fees.  
- City of Marina traffic impact fees.  
- County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:  
  - Davis Road/Reservation Road (1.3% of $1,825,600 = $23,389)  
  - Blanco Road/Reservation Road (2.0% of $263,400 = $5,288).  
- City of Marina fair share costs for lane improvements at the following intersection:  
  - Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway – eastbound right (17.5% of $466,888 = $81,791) Note: this fee would be reimbursable to Whispering Oaks Business Park – see Mitigation Measure T-6.  
- City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:  
  - Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road (1.3% of $222,700 = $2,788).  
- City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections: | Submit off-site improvement plans for the design and construction of the listed street improvements.  
Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.  
Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department. | Applicant/Developer | October 15 of the same year | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25. T-2 | | • General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue (0.4% of $300,000 = $1,054)  
• Caltrans fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:  
  • Northbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (1.2% of $151,428 = $1,875)  
  • Southbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (0.8% of $965,308 = $7,958) | Submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.  
Provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.  
Construct listed improvements in accordance with approved plans. | Applicant/Developers | Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase I  
Prior to acceptance of Phase I subdivision improvements  
Prior to occupancy permits | |
| 26. T-3 | | Prior to issuance of building permits, the Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor(s) shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the specific development’s pro-rata share of fees listed below (fair share costs for project-level impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).  
• FORA development impact fees.  
• City of Marina traffic impact fees (includes improvements at Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway, Third Avenue/Imjin | A pro-rata division of costs shall be assigned to each lot (lots 2-16) within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.  
The applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction and shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department. | Applicant/Developer | Prior to execution of development agreement  
Prior to issuance of building permits | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                    |               | Parkway, Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway, Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway, and signalization at the Imjin Parkway/southbound State Route 1 ramps. | • County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:  
  • Davis Road/Reservation Road (4.3% of $1,825,600 = $78,375)  
  • Blanco Road/Reservation Road (4.6% of $263,400 = $12,056).  
• City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:  
  • Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway – second westbound left (11.6% of $925,453 = $107,189) Note: this fee would be reimbursable to MST – see Mitigation Measure T-2.  
• City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:  
  • Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road (2.9% of $222,700 = $6,481).  
• City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersection:  
  • General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue (4.0% of $300,000 = $12,119)  
• Caltrans fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:  
  • Northbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (3.2% of $151,428 = $4,797)  
  • Southbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (2.6% of $965,308 = $24,759) | | |
| 27.                | T-4.          | The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvements prior to acceptance of Phase 2 (lots 2-12) improvements:  
• Signalize intersection of Imjin Road/Eighth Street | Submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval. | Applicant/Developer | Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 2 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. T-5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>and add a southbound Imjin Road left turn lane, and corresponding second eastbound Eighth Street receiving lane, or&lt;br&gt;• Construct the re-alignment of Imjin Road between Imjin Parkway and Eighth Street, realigning Imjin Road as a fourth approach to the Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road intersection.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer is responsible for 78.2% of the cost of this improvement and MST is responsible for 21.8% of the cost of this improvement (see Mitigation Measure T-9).</td>
<td>Provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;• Add a westbound right-turn lane at the Imjin Road/Eighth Street intersection, or&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;• Construct the re-alignment of Imjin Road between Imjin Parkway and Eighth Street, realigning Imjin Road as a fourth approach to the Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road intersection.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer is responsible for 78.2% of the cost of this improvement and MST is responsible for 21.8% of the cost of this improvement (see Mitigation Measure T-9).</td>
<td>Submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29.                 | T-6.          | The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 2 (lots 2-12) improvements:  
- Construct an eastbound right-turn lane at the intersection of Imjin Road and Imjin Parkway.  
The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor shall be subject to reimbursement of 17.5 percent of the cost of this improvement by MST ($81,791 based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index) – see Mitigation Measure T-1. | Submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.  
Provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department. | Applicant/Developer | Prior to approval of a final maps for Phase 2 |  
| 30.                 | T-7           | The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:  
- Signalize intersection of Whispering Oaks Drive/Engineer’s Equipment Road. The signal light shall be coordinated with the signal light at Engineer’s Equipment Road and Inter-Garrison Road.  
- construct northbound and southbound left turn lanes.  
- construct eastbound and westbound right turn lanes. | Submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements for review and approval.  
Provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements to the RMA – Planning Department. | Applicant/Developer | Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3 |  
| 31.                 | T-8           | MST shall include a policy in the General Development Plan to require out-of-service buses traveling to and from the beginning or ends of their day’s runs to use routes that avoid the following streets within the CSUMB campus core area: Inter-Garrison Road/Third Street (Sixth Avenue to General Jim Moore Boulevard) and Divarty Street (east of General Jim Moore | A policy shall be added to the GDP or condition placed upon the approval to require the policy prior to project development. | County/MSST | Prior to approval of the MST GDP |  

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR S-50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 32.                 | T-9          | Prior to issuance of building permits, MST shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the fees listed below (fair share costs for cumulative impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index). County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:  
  • Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road (1.8% of $612,100 = $11,056)  
  • Engineer’s Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Way (17.8% of $300,000 = $53,251)  
  • Engineer’s Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road (3.6% of $300,000 = $10,827)  
City of Marina fair share costs for reimbursement to Whispering Oaks Business Park at the following intersection (Note: this amount may be bonded or otherwise assured, and the cost could change if an alternate improvement is constructed:  
  • Imjin Road/Eighth Street (21.8% of $1,136,064 = $247,689) | Submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction and provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department. | Applicant/Developer | Prior to the issuance of a building permit | |
| 33.                 | T-10         | Prior to issuance of building permits, the Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor(s) shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the specific development’s pro-rata share of fees listed below (fair share costs for cumulative impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).  
A pro-rata division of costs shall be assigned to each lot (lots 2-16) within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.  
Submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction and provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department. | Applicant/Developer | Prior to execution of the development agreement | |

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Cond. Number</th>
<th>Mitig. Number</th>
<th>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</th>
<th>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</th>
<th>Responsible Party for Compliance</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road (3.3% of $612,100 = $20,468)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engineer’s Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Way (82.2% of $300,000 = $248,749)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engineer’s Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road (7.8% of $300,000 = $23,298)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• General Jim Moore Boulevard/Light Fighter Drive (1.1% of $654,185 = $7,416)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Second Avenue/Light Fighter Drive (0.9% of $18,000 = $159)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• First Avenue/Light Fighter Drive (1.1% of $102,600 = $1,141)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>T-11</td>
<td>The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvements prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:</td>
<td>Submit improvement plans for the identified improvements for review and approval.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a southbound Whispering Oaks right turn lane;</td>
<td>Provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements to the RMA – Planning Department.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a westbound Inter-Garrison Road right turn lane;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• second eastbound and second westbound Inter-Garrison Road through lanes; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a median left turn acceleration lane on Inter-Garrison Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>CC-1</td>
<td>The project applicant and/or succeeding developers shall prepare a greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the project site to the extent feasible. The following specific measures shall be implemented as part of the general development plan, development agreement, final map, and/or development plans as applicable:</td>
<td>Prepare a project-wide greenhouse gas reduction plan for the review and recommendation of RMA – Planning Department and include applicable measures from the greenhouse gas reduction plan in the general development plan and development agreement.</td>
<td>Applicant/Developer</td>
<td>Prior to Board of Supervisors approval of the development agreement or general development plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MST and Whispering Oaks employees shall be provided incentives to use transit, such as discounted transit passes. Potential reductions: five percent of employee mobile source emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide local retail uses. Retail services, such as restaurants, markets, and automatic teller machines located in proximity could substantially reduce employee vehicle miles travelled during the day (lunch period). One lot within the business park shall be designated for retail services only. Potential reductions: two percent of employee mobile source emissions according to the URBEMIS2007 model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide amenities for bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel. Sidewalks and bicycle lanes shall be provided on both sides of all streets to serve the project site (except sidewalks on the north side of Engineer’s Equipment Road where it abuts open space). In addition, secure employee bicycle facilities, along with lockers and showers shall be provided at each lot, and at least one public bicycle parking space shall be provided at each lot. Signal light sensors shall be set to respond to bicycle traffic, and an automatic walk signal shall be provided with green lights. Potential reductions: up to nine percent of employee mobile source emissions, depending on the network of bicycle lanes and sidewalks serving the project site, according to the URBEMIS2007 model. An additional two percent could be achieved with on-site amenities that would encourage employees to bike or walk to work. The total combined reductions for these measures could reach 10 percent, depending on the network of developed sidewalks and bicycle lanes in the future. Note: this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Cond. Number</td>
<td>Mitig. Number</td>
<td>Conditions of Approval and/or Mitigation Measures and Responsible Land Use Department</td>
<td>Compliance or Monitoring Actions to be performed. Where applicable, a certified professional is required for action to be accepted.</td>
<td>Responsible Party for Compliance</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Verification of Compliance (name/date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measure shall not be required on interim access driveways built within street rights-of-way. 6. LEED credits shall focus to the extent feasible on approaches that directly or indirectly reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Potential reductions: 20 percent or more by meeting LEED Silver design level. The project applicant and/or succeeding developers may elect to utilize other measures not specifically listed, including measures to reduce dependence on gas or electrical space or water heating, and additional means to encourage forms of transportation that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Use of other methods may be credited toward fulfilling this measure based on anticipated emissions reductions. Measures to be included in the general development plan(s) or development agreement(s) shall be prepared as part of project-wide emissions reduction plan for RMA – Planning Department review and recommendation prior to Board of Supervisors approval. Measures to be included as notes on or designs within a final map, site plan, or building plans, shall be prepared as part of a site-specific emissions reduction plan for RMA – Planning Department review and approval prior to approval of the relevant permit. The applicant/developer may elect to prepare a consolidated greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan for two or more lots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF CONDITIONS
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 REPORT AUTHORIZATION AND PURPOSE

Determination to Prepare an Environmental Impact Report

The County of Monterey, acting as the lead agency, has determined that the proposed Monterey Salinas Transit (MST)/Whispering Oaks industrial subdivision (hereinafter “proposed project”) may result in significant adverse environmental effects, as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines section 15064. Therefore, the Resources Management Agency, Planning Department (RMA), acting on behalf of the County, has had this environmental impact report (EIR) prepared to evaluate the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the proposed project.

Based upon the decision to prepare an EIR, the RMA prepared and distributed a notice of preparation (NOP), from December 18, 2009 to January 19, 2010 in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15082. CEQA Guidelines section 15375 defines an NOP as:

…a brief notice sent by the lead agency to notify the responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and involved federal agencies that the lead agency plans to prepare an EIR for the project. The purpose of the notice is to solicit guidance from those agencies as to the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR.

A scoping meeting was held at the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Board Room on January 6, 2010. Representatives of FORA and California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) attended the scoping meeting. Written responses to the NOP were received from the following agencies:

- City of Marina (December 14, 2009)
- Native American Heritage Commission (December 29, 2009)
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- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (January 6, 2010)
- California State University Monterey Bay (January 6, 2010 and January 20, 2010)
- California Department of Transportation (January 11, 2010)
- Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (January 15, 2010)

The initial study, NOP, and responses to the NOP received from responsible agencies are contained in Appendix A.

**Preparation Standards and Methods**

This EIR has been prepared by EMC Planning Group Inc. (Consultant) under contract to the RMA in accordance with CEQA and implementing guidelines. This EIR has been prepared using available information from private and public sources noted herein, as well as information generated by the consultant through field investigation. This EIR will be used to inform public decision-makers and their constituents of the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

This EIR describes and evaluates the existing environmental setting of the project site and surrounding areas, discusses the characteristics of the proposed project, identifies environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, and provides feasible mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce or avoid identified adverse environmental impacts. This EIR also evaluates reasonable alternatives to the proposed project.

If an EIR identifies a significant adverse impact, the lead agency may approve the project only if it finds that mitigation measures have been required to reduce the impact's significance, or that such mitigation is infeasible for specified social, economic, and/or other reasons (Public Resources Code section 21081), and a statement of overriding considerations is adopted. The lead agency may not omit from the project conditions a mitigation measure associated with a project impact identified in the EIR as significant, unless it makes specific findings regarding the omission.

This EIR is an objective public disclosure document that takes no position on the merits of the proposed project. Thus, the findings of this EIR do not advocate a position "for" or "against" the proposed project. Instead, this EIR provides information on which decisions about the proposed project can be based. The EIR has been prepared according to the professional standards and practices of the EIR participants' individual disciplines and in conformance with the legal requirements and informational expectations of CEQA and its implementing guidelines.
**Provisions for Projects on Former Military Bases**

The California legislature adopted specific provisions to address CEQA review for planning and redevelopment of former military bases. A reuse plan EIR may be based on the physical setting as it existed at the time the decision to close the base was made final, and the EIR prepared for the reuse plan is considered, with some exceptions, to provide the CEQA review for all subsequent actions in furtherance of the reuse plan. For purposes of determining whether a reuse plan, or public or private activities taken pursuant to or in furtherance of a reuse plan may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report may be prepared in the context of the physical conditions that were present at the time that the federal decision for closure or realignment of the base or reservation became final (CEQA Guidelines section 15229). The federal decision to close Fort Ord became final in 1993, and the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR* (Reuse Plan EIR) baseline conditions are those that were present in 1993. The Reuse Plan EIR (SCH #96013022) was certified by FORA on June 13, 1997.

CEQA Guidelines section 15229 (c) states:

> All public and private activities taken pursuant to, or in furtherance of, a reuse plan for which an EIR was prepared and certified pursuant to this section shall be deemed to be a single project. A subsequent or supplemental EIR shall be required only if the lead agency determines that any of the circumstances described in Section 15162 [subsequent] or 15163 [supplement] exist.

The following excerpts from CEQA Guidelines section 15229 (d), [subsection (2) omitted], clarify that although a new environmental document may not be required for projects that are in furtherance of the reuse plan, the lead agency remains responsible to ensure that any potential environmental effects are adequately addressed in accordance with current laws:

1. Nothing in this section shall in any way limit the scope or review or determination of significance of the presence of hazardous or toxic wastes, substances, and materials, including but not limited to, contaminated soils and groundwater. The regulation of hazardous or toxic wastes, substances, and materials shall not be constrained by this section...

3. All subsequent development at the military base or reservation shall be subject to all applicable federal, state or local laws, including but not limited to, those relating to air quality, water quality, traffic, threatened and endangered species, noise, and hazardous or toxic waste, substances, or materials.
Since certification of the Reuse Plan EIR, new information has become known and changes in the environmental setting potentially affecting the severity of environmental impacts have occurred. Such new information and changes include changes to the regional water and traffic settings, awareness of climate change as an environmental issue, and more detailed information on land use, biological resources, public services and utilities. Therefore, this EIR has been prepared subsequent to the Reuse Plan EIR.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

Project Site Location

The 115.53-acre project site is located on the former Fort Ord, north of Inter-Garrison Road, east of Seventh Avenue, and east of the city limits of Marina in unincorporated Monterey County. Figure 1, Regional Location, shows the project location in a regional context. Figure 2, Project Vicinity, shows the project site in relation to Fort Ord. The project site is comprised of two Assessor’s parcels, APNs 031-101-056, and 031-101-041.

Project Vicinity Existing Conditions

Existing surrounding land uses include the inactive Fort Ord landfill to the north; coast live oak woodland and mostly vacant former Fort Ord buildings to the south; a residential neighborhood to the east; and vacant land, the Eighth Street Cutoff, the California State University at Monterey Bay (CSUMB) campus, and the Golden Gate University satellite campus to the west. Figure 3, Project Vicinity Conditions, shows significant features near the project site. Figure 4, Project Vicinity Photos, shows photographs of the surrounding area.

Project Site Existing Conditions

The project site is essentially undeveloped and predominantly covered in coast live oak woodland, but also includes areas vegetated with central maritime chaparral and annual grassland. Two narrow paved roads and several gravel or dirt roads traverse the project site. Engineer’s Equipment Road enters the project site on the west, and an un-named road enters the project site on the south just east of Eighth Avenue and intersects with Engineer’s Equipment Road. A number of small graveled roads branch out from the southern road. Also in this area are a trailer, a shed, chain-link fencing, and several concrete pads where other small buildings once stood. A natural gas transmission line crosses the project site from east to west, with a branch line serving CSUMB crossing on a southwest to northeast slant. Regulating valves associated with the gas line are located in a fenced area just north of Engineer’s Equipment Road.
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Figure 2
Project Vicinity
MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR

Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Google Earth 2009
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Figure 3
Project Vicinity Existing Conditions

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR

Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Monterey County 2006, 2009,
Orthophoto: Google Earth 2007, CSUMB 2007

1 Residential
(some under construction)
2 CSUMB Staff/Faculty Housing
3 Shopping Center
4 Dis-used Military Facilities
5 UC Santa Cruz
6 Golden Gate University
7 CSUMB Campus Core
8 Storage
9 MST
10 Industrial/Dis-used Military
11 CSUMB Sports Fields
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Figure 4

Project Vicinity Photographs

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR

Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Google Earth 2007
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PG&E power transmission lines cross through the project site from the west to east sides within a 20-foot wide maintenance easement. A conservation easement has been recorded for the proposed Parcel C as habitat mitigation for the Marina Heights residential project to the north of Imjin Parkway. Project site features are illustrated in Figure 5, Project Site Existing Conditions. Photographs of the project site are shown in Figure 6, Project Site Photos.

**Project Site Planning Context**

The project site is within unincorporated Monterey County’s portion of the former Fort Ord. Development within the former Fort Ord is subject to the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, which is administered by FORA. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan land use designation for the project site is Planned Development Mixed Use District. The project site is within the 308-acre Landfill Planning Area at the former Fort Ord. Monterey County’s draft Fort Ord Master Plan will be a component of the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan and 2010 Monterey County General Plan upon adoption of the County’s general plan update, and provides additional planning guidance for the unincorporated areas of the former Fort Ord. Draft Fort Ord Master Plan land use designations for the project site are the same as those shown in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The project site has a County zoning designation of PQP-D-S. The PQP-D-S zoning includes design control (“D”) and site plan review (“S”) designations.

The project site is adjacent to the Marina city limits on the west, and within the Marina sphere-of-influence (Marina 2000, Figure 1-1). The Marina General Plan designates the project site Parks & Recreation (refer to Section 2.7 Land Use and Planning, for additional information). Because the project site is outside the Marina city limits it does not have a Marina zoning designation. The southwest corner of the project site touches the Seaside city limits. Much of the project site is adjacent to CSUMB. Figure 7, Jurisdictions, shows the Marina and Seaside city limits, and the territory of CSUMB.

The Fort Ord Reuse Plan and Draft Fort Ord Master Plan provide the following land use designations in the area surrounding the project site: Habitat Management, Golf Course Opportunity Site and Equestrian Center Opportunity Site to the north, CSUMB to the south, CSUMB medium-density residential to the east, and Planned Development Mixed Use District to the west. The Monterey County portion of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan land use map is shown in Figure 8, Fort Ord Reuse Plan Land Use Map. Note that the equestrian center identified on the map is now planned for a location to the south of the project site.

CSUMB is adjacent to the project site on the south and east sides. The CSUMB Master Plan includes faculty and staff housing to the east of the project site and near the southwest corner of the project site. The housing to the east is already existing (former military housing); the CSUMB Master Plan does not identify a development timeframe for the staff and faculty housing near the
southwest corner of the project site. Most of the land to the south of the project site is designated as open space in the CSUMB Master Plan. The CSUMB Master Plan land use framework map is presented in Figure 9, CSUMB Master Plan Land Use Map. The project site is owned by the Redevelopment Agency of the County of Monterey. The project site was conveyed to the Redevelopment Agency from the U.S. Department of the Army in 2006 as part of the base closure proceedings begun in 1993.

1.3 Project Description

Project Overview

The proposed project is a rezoning and business park subdivision, with development to be controlled by two general development plans. One general development plan would cover the entire business park and one would be specific to the Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) bus yard and maintenance facility. A total of about 58 acres would be developed, with about 695,500 square feet of building anticipated. About 58 acres would be dedicated as open space preserve.

The following specific components are included in the proposed project, and are described in greater detail in the sections that follow:

1. Amendment to the Monterey County Zoning Map to change the designation for the development portions of the project site from Public and Quasi-Public to Heavy Commercial.

2. Phased, vesting subdivision map to create 20 parcels including a lot for the MST Administrative and Maintenance Facility (24.37 acres), 15 additional business park lots (24.44 acres), two open space parcels, one parcel for a detention basin, and dedication of streets and/or a parcel for private streets.

3. Disposition and Development Agreement for conveyance of proposed Lot 1 from the Redevelopment Agency to MST.


5. General Development Plan and Use Permit for development of the MST Administrative and Maintenance Facility.

6. Use permits for the removal of coast live oak trees.

7. California Department of Fish and Game 2081 incidental take permit for sand gilia.

8. On and off-site road construction, and an amendment to the Fort Ord Circulation Plan.

Figure 5
Project Site Existing Conditions
MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR

Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Google Earth 2007

Paved Roads  Gravel Roads  Natural Gas Line

Note: Most of the site is covered by oak woodland
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Figure 6

Project Site Photographs
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Figure 8

Fort Ord Reuse Plan Land Use Map
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**Proposed Planning Approvals**

**Re-zone**

The project proposes an amendment to the Monterey County Zoning Map to change the designation for the proposed developed portions of the project site from PQP-D-S to Heavy Commercial. There is no zoning designation for the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* that precisely parallels the Heavy Commercial designation, but there are similar uses elsewhere within the former Fort Ord under the Light Industrial designation. The proposed open space areas would retain their current Public and Quasi-Public zoning designation.

**Subdivision and Phasing**

The project proposes a phased, vesting tentative subdivision map to create 20 parcels including a 24.37-acre parcel (Lot 1) for the MST Administrative and Maintenance Facility, 15 additional lots (Lots 2-16) for the Whispering Oaks Business Park (24.44 acres total), two open space parcels (57.62 acres total), one parcel for a percolation basin (1.71 acres), and dedication of streets and/or a parcel for private streets (7.39 acres). Details regarding private or public streets have not been finalized. The subdivision and proposed phasing is summarized in *Table 1, Subdivision Summary*. The vesting tentative map site plan is shown in *Figure 10, Vesting Tentative Map*.

Phase 1 would consist of the subdivision and most of the site improvements for the MST facility. Engineer's Equipment Road would be extended southward and connect to the western stub of Whispering Oaks Drive; this improvement would serve only as a driveway to the MST site during this phase. Phase I would also include the MST northern driveway at Engineer's Equipment Road and the driveways at Inter-Garrison Road. The Inter-Garrison Road improvements adjacent to the MST site would be constructed, consisting of widening, adding turn pockets, restoring the bike lanes, and landscaped frontage improvements that would include a pedestrian pathway. During Phase 1, MST would use Engineer's Equipment Road for bus travel to and from Eighth Street, Imjin Parkway, and Imjin Road, and as the site access for employees. The off-site drainage and gas line improvements would be constructed.

Phase 2 would include improvements to Engineer's Equipment Road (expanding it to a full public street and connecting it to Inter-Garrison Road), construction of the remainder of Whispering Oaks Drive, subdivision of Lots 2-11 in the Whispering Oaks business park, and development of an on-site drainage basin (Parcel B).

Phase 3 would include development of the remaining lots in the Whispering Oaks Business Park (Lots 12-16).
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## Table 1  Subdivision Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Number</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>Industrial Business Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>Private Streets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>Percolation Basin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>48.91</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Whitson Engineers Inc. 2009*

---

**Disposition and Development Agreement**

The Redevelopment Agency proposes to enter into a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) with MST for conveyance of proposed Lot 1 (a 24.37-acre parcel shown on Figure 10, Vesting Tentative Map) from the Redevelopment Agency to MST. The DDA would define the terms and conditions related to the sale and development of the parcel and would become the instrument that would legally govern the relationship between the Redevelopment Agency and MST until development of Lot 1 is complete. At minimum, the DDA would include the following components:
Project Boundary

OPEN SPACE PARCEL

ON-SITE DRAINAGE BASIN PARCEL

OFF-SITE STREET IMPROVEMENT (WHISPERING OAKS)

OPEN SPACE PARCEL

Refer to Figure 13 for circulation changes in this area

Refer to Figures 14, 15 & 16 for possible off-site basin locations

Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Whitson Engineers 2009

Figure 10
Vesting Tentative Map
MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR
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- Land Sale: The Redevelopment Agency would agree to sell the property for a specified purchase price and MST would agree to purchase the property at that price.

- Development: MST would agree to purchase the property for development of its Administrative and Maintenance Facility and not for speculation or landholding. The development would be described in accordance with the MST General Development Plan including specific uses, development standards, and proposed operations and phasing.

- Redevelopment Agency Assistance: The DDA would describe the nature and extent of any Redevelopment Agency assistance and/or cost sharing for public improvements such as infrastructure.

- Use Covenants: Any covenants running with the land and imposed on continued use of the property would be described.

- Other Elements: The DDA would also establish a procedure for architectural review of the plans. Financing provisions would be identified to ensure that the transaction between the Redevelopment Agency and MST can be financed. And finally, the rights and remedies of both parties in the event of a breach of the agreement would be described, including the conditions to the performance of both the Redevelopment Agency and MST.

**Whispering Oaks Business Park General Development Plan**

The *Whispering Oaks Business Park General Development Plan* (Whispering Oaks GDP) would guide development of the 57.91-acre business park portion of the proposed project (inclusive of the MST site). Uses allowed would be similar to those allowed by the Heavy Commercial zoning district; however, several specific uses allowed by the Heavy Commercial zoning would not be allowed by the provisions of the Whispering Oaks GDP. Uses illustrative of those not allowed include: mini-storage; vehicle sales, repair, or storage; service stations; bottling plants; hotels; kennels; and lumber yards. Table 2, *Whispering Oaks GDP Allowed and Conditional Uses*, presents the uses allowed by right and with a use permit within the Whispering Oaks GDP.

The Whispering Oaks GDP allows several uses not listed as allowed uses in the Heavy Commercial district: sales, service, and limited manufacturing of green products; food service; convenience retail; vocational education; and transit centers (with a use permit).

Based on the 50 percent coverage allowed by the proposed Heavy Commercial zoning, the total building floor area is expected to be approximately 532,300 square feet for lots 2-16.
## Table 2  Whispering Oaks GDP Allowed and Conditional Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses Allowed by Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change of commercial uses within a structure, provided the new use will not change the nature or intensity of the current use of the structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, service, and limited manufacturing of products that promote environmental sustainability (“green” products and related businesses) that do not produce undue odors, dust, smoke, noise, or other environmental hazards, including but not limited to alternative energy manufacturing (e.g. solar panels); recycled furniture manufacturing, recycled building materials manufacturing, green cleaning services, and home energy efficiency consulting services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses of a similar character, density and intensity to those listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development Uses (that do not produce undue odors, dust, smoke, noise, or other environmental hazards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office condominiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops for tradesmen and artisans (e.g. craft shops for the manufacture of art, jewelry, silverware, ceramics, leather goods, toys, bookbinding, editorial and designing, printing, lithography) provided that in all cases all equipment and materials, except vehicles, are maintained within a structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker unit for the purpose of providing on-site security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography/art studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail businesses of light commercial/light industrial character that do not produce excessive noise, odors, or environmental hazards such as: interior decorating businesses; picture framing businesses; manufacturing of clothing; carpentry (e.g. wood working or furniture or uses of a similar nature provided that in all cases that the equipment and materials are enclosed within a structure); printing or publishing, repair and maintenance (general), call centers, and warehouse and distribution centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience retail to service light commercial tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant and food service limited to food manufacturing and packaging that does not produce undue odors, dust, smoke, noise, or other environmental hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training/education facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to existing, approved wireless communications facilities, pursuant to Section 21.64.310 of the Zoning Ordinance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conditional Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public and Quasi-public uses and Public Utility Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any lot or establishment where alcoholic beverages are served, commercial place of amusement or recreation, or any place where live entertainment is provided within 200 feet of the boundary of a residential district (ZA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research laboratories, provided such use does not produce undue odor, noise, smoke, or other objectionable effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless communications facilities, pursuant to Section 21.64.310 of the Zoning Ordinance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Monterey County Inland Zoning Code (Title 21); Redevelopment Agency (2010)

**Notes:** (ZA) requires zoning administrator approval; other conditional uses require Planning Commission approval.

### MST Administrative and Maintenance Facility General Development Plan and Use Permit

**Proposed Facilities.** The MST Administrative and Maintenance Facility General Development Plan and Use Permit would guide development on the 24.37-acre MST site. Based on conceptual site plans, the main buildings would total 163,243 square feet. The facility would include the following components:

- 39,800 square-foot, three story administrative building, including Board of Directors’ board room. The administration building will have an integrally-colored concrete masonry exterior finish with a flat roof.

- 96,450 square-foot, two story bus maintenance building to include an engine and transmission rebuild shop, machine shop, brake shop (including a brake dyno testing apparatus), body shop, paint spray booth, tire shop, specialty repair shop, and steam cleaning facility. The building would include 21 service bays. The building would have three 1,000-gallon fluids storage tanks, and several waste oil tanks. The maintenance building will have a metal siding exterior finish with standing seam metal roofing. A photovoltaic system generating about 12 percent of this buildings energy demand will be mounted on the roof.

- 18,620 square-foot fuel/brake/tire repair and fuel dispensing building. The building would have three 1,000 and one 2,500 gallon storage tanks for fluids.

- 8,373 square-foot bus washing and steam-cleaning building, with water reclamation system to re-use 75 percent of water from each wash.

- Small structures including a canopy between the maintenance and washing buildings, outdoor storage building (2,763 square feet), covered smoking area (388 square feet), and HVAC housing.
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- Two 30,000 gallon diesel storage tanks, two 7,500-gallon unleaded gasoline storage tanks, one 4,000 gallon diesel storage tank, and one 20-gallon diesel storage tank. All tanks will be double-lined above ground tanks located within containment berms.

- An eight to ten foot tall masonry wall around the site perimeter.

- Two entry area monument signs and one wall sign.

- Parking lot lighting on 30-foot poles with cut-off luminaires (400 watt metal halide in the bus parking lot and 250 watt metal halide in the automobile parking lot). The average lighting intensity is expected to be about two foot-candles.

- Approximately 15 acres of concrete and/or asphalt paved parking surface (435 automobile parking spaces and 260 bus parking spaces).

These new facilities would replace two existing facilities at locations in Salinas and Monterey. The EIR will not address the potential replacement uses at these facilities. These existing locations are identified in Figure 11, Existing MST Facilities. The proposed MST site plan is presented in Figure 12, MST Site Plan.

**Development Standards.** The MST site would be developed within the following standards:

- 50 percent maximum site coverage and 10 percent minimum landscape coverage.

- Main buildings set back minimum 40 feet from streets and 20 feet from interior lot lines.

- Accessory buildings set back minimum 10 feet.

- 60-foot maximum building height for administration building; 40-foot maximum height for other main buildings, 20-foot maximum height for accessory buildings, excluding spires and aerials.

- 12-foot maximum height for site perimeter walls with no set-back requirement.

- Colors and textures chosen to blend with oak woodland.

- Lighting to prevent off site spill and glare.

- Landscape plantings to be primarily native with rain-sensor controlled drip irrigation.

- Maintenance building to meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) basic or silver certification.
Figure 11

Existing MST Administrative & Maintenance Facilities

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR

Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Google Earth 2009
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**Proposed Operations.** MST would use the project site for all of its operations and maintenance activities. MST currently has a fleet of about 75 buses, and anticipates a fleet of about 85 buses at the time the proposed project would open. Ultimate fleet size is projected to be 250 buses. Weekday bus departures would begin at about 3:15 AM, with most morning departures between 5:00 AM and 7:00 AM. On weekends most morning departures occur between 6:30 AM and 7:30 AM. Busses return between 5:00 PM and 12:30 AM. There are some mid-day arrivals and departures.

Daily bus cleaning and fueling generally would take place from 4:00 PM to 12:00 AM. Each bus would be washed twice per week. Additional scheduled maintenance is conducted each 3,000 miles of service. Repairs and major maintenance would also be handled at the MST site.

Solid waste and hazardous waste would be stored in the outside storage building. Regular standard waste would be collected weekly and hazardous waste would be collected monthly.

The MST General Development Plan estimates that at initial occupancy about 300 people would be on-site during a typical day (including bus drivers before and after shifts), and at build-out about 440 people would be on-site. Monthly Board of Directors’ meetings would draw about 25 to 45 people.

**Use Permits for Tree Removal**

Two use permits for the removal of coast live oak trees would be required. The use permits would allow removal of about 2,400 coast live oak trees on the MST site and about 2,000 coast live oak trees on the remaining business park lots.

**Incidental Take Permit**

A California Department of Fish and Game 2081 incidental take permit for sand gilia is sought in conjunction with the proposed project.

**Infrastructure**

Proposed infrastructure includes new on- and off-site street improvements, water and sewer lines, and drainage facilities. In addition, a relocated gas line and new metering station would be built. *Figure 13a, Circulation Infrastructure Improvements* and *Figure 13b, Utility Infrastructure Improvements* show the general location of these proposed improvements.
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Streets

The proposed project includes a change to the Fort Ord Circulation Plan and both on and off-site road construction. The project proposes changes to Fort Ord Circulation Plan, involving a modified alignment of roads in the Imjin Road/Eighth Street/Sixth Avenue area. The following changes would be made to the circulation plan:

- Eighth Street Cutoff would be abandoned south of Sixth Avenue.
- Eighth Street/Sixth Avenue intersection would be realigned so that Eighth Street would continue eastward into Engineer’s Equipment Road and Sixth Street would be the southern leg of the intersection.
- Imjin Road would be realigned to the east to meet Sixth Avenue at Eighth Street/Engineer’s Equipment Road.

Construction of these improvements is not a part of the proposed project. These improvements would be constructed by others. Abandonment of the Eighth Street Cut-off and re-alignment of the intersection are anticipated to occur prior to Phase 1. The Imjin Road realignment is anticipated to occur after build-out of the proposed project.

The proposed project includes frontage improvements along Inter-Garrison Road, including a sidewalk and turn lanes at the intersecting roads within the proposed project.

Engineer’s Equipment Road is currently a narrow paved road that principally provides access to the U.S. Army landfill. Engineer’s Equipment Road would be re-constructed on the same general alignment east of Sixth Avenue, but with an extension curving southward within the project site to intersect with Inter-Garrison Road about 2,000 feet east of Seventh Avenue. Engineer’s Equipment Road would be built 40 to 64 feet wide within a 72 to 84-foot wide right-of-way. Sidewalks would be constructed on both sides generally, but only at the south side of Engineer’s Equipment Road where it passes Parcel C. In Phase 1 Engineer’s Equipment Road would be utilized only as a driveway to the MST parcel, and would not connect to Inter-Garrison Road.

Whispering Oaks Drive would be built for a length of about 300 feet west and 1,700 feet east of Engineer’s Equipment Road, with a spur connection (Whispering Oaks Way) to Inter-Garrison Road near the eastern terminus. Whispering Oaks Drive would be built 40 feet wide within a 60-foot wide right-of-way. Sidewalks would be constructed on both sides.

Inter-Garrison Road would be widened to provide an east-bound left-turn pocket and a west-bound right-turn lane at the MST entrance; a west-bound left turn pocket at Eighth Street, and 24-foot landscape area with sidewalk along the MST frontage. A plan line for a future multi-modal corridor would be established on the north side of Inter-Garrison Road.
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ON-SITE DRAINAGE
BASIN PARCEL
MST DRAINAGE
BASIN
NEW GAS REGULATOR
STATION AND METER (PG&E)
WATER CONNECTIONS ALONG INTER-GARRISON ROAD

Note: Additional drainage basin(s) required on lots 2, 3, 7, and 8 to serve those lots

WHISPERING OAKS WASTEWATER PUMPED ALONG ENGINEER'S EQUIPMENT ROAD
MST WASTEWATER PUMPED TO INTER-GARRISON ROAD

See Figures 14-16 for off-site drainage alternatives

Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Whitson Engineers 2010

Figure 13b
Utility Infrastructure Improvements
MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR
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**Water and Sewer**

Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) would provide water from an existing 18-inch water line located in Inter-Garrison Road. Wastewater would be disposed of through MCWD’s existing sewer collection system. There is an existing eight-inch gravity sewer line located in Inter-Garrison Road, and an existing 15-inch gravity sewer line located west of Sixth Avenue on CSUMB property. Due to rolling topography, two sewer lift stations are proposed, one at the east and one at the west end of the business park site. The lift stations would pump effluent to a gravity line draining west along Engineer’s Equipment Road to the existing 15-inch main. At one location a siphon may be required to pass underneath an existing 27-inch storm drain main. Wastewater from the MST portion of the project site would be pumped from a lift station located at the northwest corner to the existing eight-inch line in Inter-Garrison Road. The vesting tentative map does not indicate exact connection points or internal utility routing.

**Gas Line and Metering Station**

The existing natural gas distribution line would be re-located from its present location to an alignment starting at a new junction with the main line within the northern open space parcel, and following the western boundary of the project site to the south. A new gas metering station would be constructed off site to the southwest of the project site. These improvements are proposed to be accomplished by others than the applicant, prior to the beginning of MST development.

**On and Off-site Drainage Basins**

Storm drainage conduits and basins would be constructed both on and off site. Three off-site drainage plans have been developed, although a combination of these features may be used. The off-site basins would intercept storm run-off from the south of the project site that currently flows onto the project site, and would be constructed during the first phase of the proposed project. Refer to Figure 14, Off-site Drainage Alternative 1, Figure 15, Off-site Drainage Alternative 2, and Figure 16, Off-site Drainage Alternative 3, and the discussion below.

**On-site Basins.** A basin with a capacity of three acre-feet would be constructed within Lot 1 to serve MST development within that parcel. Another basin would be constructed with initial development of the business park on all or most of Parcel B (which is subdivided for that purpose) to serve Lots 4-6 and 8-16. In-line grease and debris separators would be located within drainage lines in advance of the discharge to the basin. Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8 would not be served by any of these basins, and would be required to accommodate a drainage basin or basins within those four lots. Infiltration galleries are proposed at several locations along roadways to percolate run-off from streets.
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**Off-site Drainage Alternative 1.** Two basins would be constructed off-site at the southeast corner of Inter-Garrison Road and Seventh Avenue on land owned by CSUMB, and adjacent to the southwest corner of the project site. Existing outfalls along Inter-Garrison Road would be redirected into these basins, and the basins would discharge to the west of Lot 1.

**Off-site Drainage Alternative 2.** Existing outfalls along Inter-Garrison Road would be redirected along the west edge of proposed Lot 1, discharging to vacant land west of Lot 1 and continuing as surface drainage. Discharge from a third existing outfall would be captured in an infiltration gallery along the north side of Inter-Garrison Road.

Up-gradient water tributary to the existing storm drain system in Eighth Avenue would be directed to three existing ponds or natural depressions for percolation. Ponds 4 and 5 are existing ponds; Pond 3 would utilize an existing natural depression and require only modest modifications to contain storm water. A conduit would be constructed to divert water from along Eighth Avenue into Pond 3.

**Off-site Drainage Alternative 3.** Existing outfalls along Inter-Garrison Road would be redirected along the west edge of proposed Lot 1 for discharge. Discharge from a third existing outfall would be captured in an infiltration gallery along the north side of Inter-Garrison Road.

The flow through the Eighth Avenue outfall would be reduced by approximately 75 percent. The storm drain main in Eighth Avenue would be intercepted and redirected via a 30-inch storm drain pipe to an existing natural drainage depression to the east. The existing depression has capacity far in excess of the required storage volume necessary to store and percolate this runoff.

**Site Preparation and Project Construction**

Specific development plans have been prepared for the MST facility on Lot 1. The MST site would be graded into two levels: the higher level would be at the southeast corner of the site and be occupied by the automobile parking; all other facilities would be located on the lower level. Most on-site streets would be graded and constructed during development of Lots 2 through 16. No specific development plans have been prepared for Lots 2 through 16. Individual lots would be graded as development plans are approved for each.

Most of the existing vegetation within the development lots would be removed. Development of the MST site would require the removal of about 2,400 oak trees, and development of the remainder of the lots, the percolation basin, and the streets would require the removal of about 2,000 additional oak trees. Overall, much of the existing wooded area on the development parcels would be removed, with the exception being a 20-foot corridor/visual buffer along Inter-Garrison Road and some on-site preservation where possible.

The few existing structures and concrete pads would be removed. Concrete and asphalt are proposed to be recycled to the extent feasible.
Location of proposed off-site basins

Figure 14

Off-site Drainage Alternative 1

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR
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Figure 15

Off-site Drainage Alternative 2
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Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Whitson Engineers 2010
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Figure 16

Alternative 2 Pond Location

Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Whitson Engineers 2010

Off-site Drainage Alternative 3

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR
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Project Background and Objectives

Background

When the Fort Ord Reuse Plan was adopted in 1997 it identified a site south of Gigling Road and east and west of Seventh Avenue for the MST facility. That site consists of several parcels and comprises a total of about 42.1 acres. About 15.1 acres of the site have been transferred to MST to date. MST subsequently determined that the currently proposed site better meets its operational needs than the site originally identified in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

Project Objectives

The Redevelopment Agency and MST are the proponents of the proposed project.

The Redevelopment Agency has provided the following project objectives:

- Promote and implement a development plan that will create local jobs and assist in accelerating economic growth and recovery on the former Fort Ord Army Base.

- Encourage sustainable development and green building techniques both in building construction and by attracting businesses and industries associated with environmental sustainability and the green building trade.

- Promote a “self contained” work place, where places of business and industry are supported by a reasonable mix of support services and businesses.

- Implement the County’s recently adopted “Strategic Plan Initiatives,” including Initiative No.1 which speaks to engaging in appropriate economic development to ensure a County-wide perspective in support of a diversified economy, higher paying jobs and an expanded revenue base for local government services. One of the advantages of the Whispering Oaks/MST site is it’s proximity to several major developments including: The Dunes (a mix of commercial, office and residential uses); East Garrison (a “new urbanism” community of 140 residential units, a new town center and a historic/arts district); Marina Heights (a 1,050 unit development of mixed residential product); and adjacent campus developments at CSUMB. The proposed business park is well positioned given its advantageous location in the heart of the north-central portion of the former Fort Ord property, ease of north/south access via State Route 1, east/west access via Inter-Garrison Road and access to adjacent pending developments.
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- Maintain a high level of urban design and aesthetic appeal by showcasing the site’s native coast live oak trees as the preeminent design theme. The oak design theme will be continued through preservation and retention of oak trees where feasible and through planting and/or replanting of oaks in the development area.

- Site planning and design shall be environmentally sensitive, consistent with the ultimate business attraction strategy identified in objective #2.

MST objectives include consolidating operations to a new and convenient site at the former Fort Ord. MST desires to locate adjacent to the planned intermodal corridor, which will be constructed within the Inter-Garrison Road right-of-way.

1.4 CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL AND REGIONAL PLANS

CEQA Guidelines section 15125(d), Environmental Setting states that an EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans. The EIR includes a discussion of the proposed project’s consistency with the following plans, in the sections of the EIR noted:

2008 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Area

Fort Ord Habitat Management Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan

Fort Ord Reuse Plan

FORA Master Resolution, Chapter 8

1982 Monterey County General Plan

Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan

2010 Draft Monterey County General Plan (includes November 2007 Draft Fort Ord Master Plan)

City of Marina General Plan

Cal State University Monterey Bay Master Plan

2005 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan
1.5 EIR Uses and Approvals

As mandated by CEQA Guidelines section 15124(d), this section contains a list of agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision-making, and a list of the approvals for which the EIR will be used. These lists include information that is known to the lead agency.

Local Agencies

County of Monterey (Lead Agency)

- Zone Change
- Whispering Oaks Business Park General Development Plan
- MST General Development Plan
- Use Permit for Transit Facility
- Use Permits for Tree Removal
- Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map
- Disposition and Development Agreement
- Off-site Road Improvements

City of Marina

- Off-site Road Improvements

Regional Agencies

Fort Ord Reuse Authority (Responsible Agency)

- Project Consistency Determination
- Approval of Circulation Plan changes

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (Responsible Agency)

- Spray Paint Booth Permit
- Fuel dispensing Permit


**State Agencies**

**California State University at Monterey Bay**
- Off-site Drainage Improvements

**University of California**
- Off-site Road Improvements

**California Department of Fish and Game (Responsible and Trustee Agency)**
- 2081 Incidental Take Permit for Sand Gilia

**Regional Water Quality Control Board (Responsible Agency)**
- Clean Water Certification

**Department of Toxic Substances Control (Responsible Agency)**
- Oversight of Landfill Buffer

**Public Utilities Commission (Responsible Agency)**
- Relocation of Natural Gas Transmission Pipe

**1.6 TERMINOLOGY USED IN THE EIR**

**Characterization of Impacts**

This EIR uses the following terminology to denote the significance of environmental impacts:

- “No impact” means that no change from existing conditions is expected to occur;
- A “less than significant impact” would cause no substantial adverse change in the physical environment, and no mitigation is recommended;
- A “significant impact” or “potentially significant impact” would, or would potentially, cause a substantial adverse change in the physical environment, and mitigation is required; and
- A “significant and unavoidable impact” would cause a substantial change in the physical environment and cannot be avoided if the project is implemented; mitigation may be recommended, but will not reduce the impact to less than significant levels.
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SETTING, ANALYSIS, AND MITIGATION

2.1 AESTHETICS

This section of the EIR addresses the project’s effect on visual resources, the change in the visual character of the project site and its surroundings, and new sources of light or glare. The discussion in this section is based upon visual simulations provided by the applicant, independent site investigation and analysis by the Consultant, and information found in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan, a component of the 1982 Monterey County General Plan, the Marina General Plan, and associated EIRs.

Standards of Significance

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; and/or
- create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.
Policy and Regulatory Issues

Fort Ord Reuse Plan

Land Use Objective A. Encourage land uses that respect, preserve and enhance the natural resources of Fort Ord. The former Fort Ord is located in a diverse and scenic natural environment. From coastal strand and dune areas to maritime chaparral and oak woodlands, the area offers a broad range of natural features. Land use and design policies can encourage development that enhances the beauty of the natural environment by carefully distributing building intensity and land uses. Fort Ord jurisdictions can preserve the environment by encouraging project design that is responsive to natural features, such as plant and animal habitats.

1982 Monterey County General Plan

The following policies of the general plan and the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan (denoted “GMP”) are applicable to the proposed project.

Policy 26.1.6 Development which preserves and enhances the County's scenic qualities shall be encouraged.

Policy 26.1.2 All exterior lighting shall be unobtrusive and constructed or located so that only the intended area is illuminated, long range visibility is reduced, and offsite glare is fully controlled.

Policy 1.1.3 (GMP) The County shall take comprehensive measures to ensure protection of sensitive and highly sensitive scenic areas as shown on the Greater Monterey Peninsula Visual Sensitivity Map. Implementing policies are located in the transportation section of this plan.

Policy 26.1.6.1 (GMP) Development proposals should include compatible open space uses located between other developed areas in order to maintain a rural atmosphere and to protect scenic resources.

Policy 26.1.6.2 (GMP) Open space, low intensity educational and recreational uses should be considered to be appropriate and compatible land uses in environmentally sensitive areas and areas of high visual sensitivity.
**Regulatory Setting**

The project site is located in unincorporated Monterey County on the former Fort Ord and is subject to the policies and provisions of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan, 1982 Monterey County General Plan*, and the *Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan*.

The project site is located within the City of Marina planning areas and immediately north of the CSUMB campus. Future residence halls, faculty housing, and land reserved for campus/business partnerships research are planned for by CSUMB on parcels south of Inter-Garrison Road and east of Eighth Avenue. The *CSUMB Master Plan* includes faculty and staff housing to the east of the project site and near the southwest corner of the project site. The Frederick Park housing to the east is already existing (former military housing); the *CSUMB Master Plan* does not identify a development timeframe for the staff and faculty housing near the southwest corner of the project site. Most of the land to the south of the project site is designated for open space in the *CSUMB Master Plan*. Refer to Figure 9, CSUMB Master Plan Land Use Map, in Section 1.0 Introduction.

Comments regarding aesthetic resources were received from the City of Marina and CSUMB during the comment period on the NOP. Concerns noted by CSUMB include potential impacts to the overall natural oak atmosphere of the campus and to views of the oak woodland from the North Campus entrance on Sixth Avenue, Inter-Garrison Road, and from planned campus development on currently vacant land south and east of the project site. CSUMB also expressed concerns about proposed building and communication tower height. The City of Marina commented on impacts to open space, whether or not public use of the open space parcels would be allowed, and expressed concerns over the proposed scale of tree removal on the project site. Both agencies identified concerns over the proposed project’s potential to result in light and glare impacts to adjacent properties.

**Environmental Setting**

**Regional Setting**

The 115.53-acre project site is located on the former Fort Ord, north of Inter-Garrison Road, east of Seventh Avenue, south and east of the city limits of Marina in unincorporated Monterey County. Located on the highly scenic Monterey Peninsula, lands within the former Fort Ord contribute substantially to the region’s valued visual character and quality due to large and highly visible expanses of natural open-space. Most of the existing development on the former Fort Ord is concentrated near the Main Garrison, East Garrison, and associated residential areas. In the concentrated development areas there are mostly old, abandoned buildings with
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broken glass windows, fences, expansive paved areas, invasive plant species mixed with new development in the City of Marina, the Military enclaves, and CSUMB. The rolling hills, and mature landscaping in and around the developed areas conceal development from view from locations not immediately adjacent. The project site is not located in a sensitive viewshed according to the Monterey County General Plan DEIR (2007, March 2008), or the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

Portions of State Route 1 are designated as a scenic highway. Caltrans has designated State Route 1 south of State Route 68 as a state scenic highway. In addition, those portions of State Route 1 within the former Fort Ord are designated as a scenic corridor. The project site is not visible from either of these scenic highway sections.

Local Setting

The project site is predominantly undeveloped and covered in coast live oak woodland. Parts of the project site are vegetated with central maritime chaparral or annual grassland. Parts of the project site have been disturbed by roads, utilities, and small structures.

Immediately north of the project site is the inactive Fort Ord landfill, which has been capped and no longer accepts waste. The landfill is mostly devoid of vegetation. Farther north are the Ord Market and, north of Imjin Parkway, the Marina Heights residential development. East of the project site are a stand of oak trees and former military residences now used for CSUMB campus housing. Parcels to the southeast and south are relatively undisturbed and predominantly covered in oak woodland. CSUMB property is located immediately to the southeast, south, and southwest across Inter-Garrison Road. Future campus housing is planned by CSUMB on parcels south of Inter-Garrison Road and east of Seventh Avenue, across from the proposed MST facility. Former Fort Ord buildings are vacant and boarded up immediately to the southwest of the project site. The land to the west is presently vacant, but planned for development. Farther west are CSUMB, Golden Gate University, and University of California buildings. Refer to Figure 3, Project Vicinity Conditions and Figure 4, Project Vicinity Photos, presented in Section 1.0 Introduction

Vantage Points

The project site is visible from the following roadways: Imjin Road/Parkway, Inter-Garrison Road, Seventh Avenue, and Eighth Avenue, although the only close views of the project site are from Inter-Garrison Road. Views of the project site are not possible from Reservation Road to the north or from State Route 1 to the west (both of these are more than a mile distant from the project site). The eastern boundary of the project site is partially visible from the backyards of the residences at the end of Gettysburg Court and Petersburg Court in the Frederick Park neighborhood located approximately 150 feet east of the eastern boundary of the project site.
The western boundary of the project site may be visible from adjacent parcels owned by Golden Gate University and the University of California, which are located approximately 200-600 feet west of the western project boundary on Third Street.

Six vantage points were selected to provide representative views of the project site from public locations: Imjin Parkway (north), Eighth Avenue (west), the intersection of Seventh Avenue and Inter-Garrison Road (southwest), location of future CSUMB campus housing (south), Inter-Garrison Road (south) and from existing Frederick Park residential development to the east. The applicant for the MST project also provided visual simulations of the rooflines of the proposed MST buildings. Figure 17, Project Viewpoints, presents a map of the six vantage points with accompanying photographs. The Monterey County Code protects views from public viewing points, and does not protect views from private property.

**Vantage Point #1.** Nearly the entire project site is visible from this point off Imjin Road. Views of the project site are characterized by oak woodland vegetation on rolling topography rising from the foreground. Several CSUMB campus buildings are visible beyond the project site at higher elevations in the background. Note that for most of the length of Imjin Parkway views to the south are blocked by rising topography.

**Vantage Point #2.** The project site is obscured from view on Eighth Avenue by exiting trees and understory vegetation on the Golden Gate University property and on the University of California property.

**Vantage Point #3.** Only foreground views of the MST site are present from the intersection of Seventh Avenue and Inter-Garrison Road. These views are dominated by the heavily wooded vegetation.

**Vantage Point #4.** This viewpoint is elevated above Inter-Garrison Road and the project site at the planned location of future CSUMB housing. The wooded features of the MST site dominate the foreground. Distinguishing characteristics of views from the higher elevation are characterized by nearly contiguous woodlands (including those on the project site) in the foreground framed by distant views of former Fort Ord buildings and development within the City of Marina in the background.

**Vantage Point #5.** When viewed from this portion of Inter-Garrison Road, the visual characteristics of the remainder of the project site remain dominated by foreground vegetation features along the roadway. The topography of the project site immediately adjacent to Inter-Garrison Road rises slightly away from the roadway, obscuring most of the project site from view.

**Vantage Point #6.** Views of the project site from existing Frederick Park residential development to the east are limited by topography and existing development. Visual
characteristics of the project site from this area include grassland interspersed with oak trees and gradually sloping hillsides toward the interior of the project site.

**Project Analysis**

**Scenic Qualities**

The natural landscape of the project site contributes to the scenic quality and visual characteristics of this area of the former Fort Ord when viewed from nearby public streets. The project site is not visible from State Route 1, and is not easily discernable from other public view corridors not immediately adjacent to the project site. The project site is not located within a designated scenic vista or corridor and public views of or over the project site are not unique; therefore, development of the project site as proposed would not have an impact to a designated scenic vista or scenic highway.

**Proposed Conservation Easements**

The proposed project includes the provision of conservation easements to protect open-space resources on two parcels within the project site: 48.91 acres between the former Fort Ord landfill and the proposed MST facility and business park parcels, and 8.71 acres between the existing Frederick Park neighborhood and the proposed business park. As a result, development would occur on only about one-half of the 115.53-acre site and would be most evident when viewed from Imjin Parkway, Inter-Garrison Road, Seventh Avenue, and points south. Views of the project site from public streets within the Frederick Park neighborhood would remain unchanged. The proposed easements would preserve open space adjacent to the developed portions of the project site, and in particular, provide an open space buffer when viewed from Imjin Parkway on the north and the Frederick Park neighborhood on the east.

**Grading and Tree Removal**

Development of the project site would permanently change the wooded character of the project site and extend the existing developed character of the areas to the west of the project site. The developed portions of the project site would be cleared of most oak trees in two phases. In the first phase the oak trees on the MST site, with the exception of those within the buffer area along Inter-Garrison Road, would be removed and the site graded into two levels. In the second phase, oak trees would be removed to accommodate road development, and lots at Whispering Oaks Business Park would be individually cleared as necessary to grade the lots for development. It is anticipated that trees would be retained along the edges of each of the individual lots in addition to the trees within the Inter-Garrison Road buffer.
Figure 17

Project Viewpoints

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR

This side intentionally left blank.
Development of the MST site would require the removal of about 2,400 oak trees and development of the remainder of the lots, the percolation basin, and roadways would require the removal of about 2,000 additional oak trees. All of the trees within the open space parcels, which constitute half the project site, would be retained. Overall, the proposed project would remove somewhat less than half the trees on the project site.

Visual changes resulting from tree removal would be most evident when viewed from higher elevations, especially the CSUMB housing site (vantage point #4) and Imjin Parkway (vantage point #1). Effects on views from locations at a similar elevation to the project site, such as along Inter-Garrison Road, would be moderated by the retention of oak trees within the buffer area.

In accordance with the County’s tree ordinance, Monterey County Code Section 21.64.260, forest management plans were prepared for both the MST site and the Whispering Oaks Business Park. According to both plans, compliance with the County’s minimum replacement ratio of 1:1 for native tree removal is not possible within the project site. Project developers are subject to participation in the FORA developer fee program, a portion of which provides funding for the existing oak woodland conservation efforts on the former Fort Ord. The project site is designated for development, and the loss of oak trees within the site is anticipated in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan.

**Monterey Salinas Transit Bus Maintenance and Operations Center General Development Plan**

**Site Layout and Buildings.** The MST site would be graded to two levels, with the lower level about ten feet below the elevation of Inter-Garrison Road. Five new buildings would be constructed on the lower level, including the two-story 96,450 square foot maintenance building and a three-story, 39,800 square foot operations building. Building height limits are proposed as 60 feet for the operations building and a maximum of 40 feet for all other buildings, excluding communications equipment. Assuming a ten-foot elevation drop from Inter-Garrison Road, and an average tree height of 15 feet, the top of the operations building would extend about 35 feet above tree line, and the other buildings would extend about 15 feet above tree line. Due to viewing angles from street level, less of these buildings would actually be visible above the trees.

Proposed roofing materials include a white elastomeric coating on the operations building. The applicant has prepared a visual simulation that reflects the rooflines of the proposed MST buildings when viewed from vantage points 1-6. The visual simulation confirms that development would be most visible from Imjin Parkway, Inter-Garrison Road, Seventh Avenue, and from public areas at higher elevations within the CSUMB campus property south of Inter-Garrison Road. The visual simulations are included as Appendix B.
The proposed project includes the construction of about 15 acres of parking lots for the bus fleet, staff and visitors. The bus parking lot would be located on the lower level and the visitor parking lot would be located at the upper level, adjacent to Inter-Garrison Road. The parking lots would be most visible from higher elevations to the north.

**Perimeter Wall and Landscape Buffer.** The MST site would be surrounded by a ten-foot tall security wall. The wall would be masonry block along the western and northwestern property lines, and along the eastern and southeastern property lines. Ornamental metal fences would be located at the northeastern and southwestern property lines, where they would stand atop retaining walls. The wall locations are indicated on Figure 12, MST Site Plan, presented in Section 1.0 Introduction. The MST GDP design standards identify perimeter fencing setbacks of zero feet from right-of-way and interior lot lines, and maximum fence heights of 12 feet (page 1-9). The proposed walls would largely shield the parking lots from view from Inter-Garrison Road.

The proposed project also includes a landscape buffer area to preserve trees along Inter-Garrison Road. Along the entire MST site frontage a buffer of 24 feet would be retained within the inter-Garrison Road right-of-way, as part of an overall plan line design for the roadway. At the western end of the MST site, an additional 75 feet of on-site buffer width would be provided. New oak trees would be planted in the upper level parking lot and at a few landscaping and sloped areas within the site. A landscaped area measuring about 100-feet wide and extending along the western half of the Engineer’s Equipment Road property line would incorporate detention basins and plantings. The landscape buffers would obscure views of the security fence in those locations where a solid wall is proposed near public roadways.

**Design Standards.** Site design and architectural design standards, equipment screening standards, and landscaping standards are among the most important factors in reducing visual impacts of development. The MST GDP includes a number of design elements intended to reduce the impact of new development to the existing visual character of the project site.

**Lighting.** Proposed exterior lighting includes 30-foot pole mounted lights with one to four 400-watt cutoff fixtures per pole within the bus parking area (average lighting level of 2.0 foot-candles), 20-foot pole-mounted lights south of the maintenance building (providing an average light level of 1.5 foot-candles), and 14-foot pole mounted lights at the visitor parking lot (providing an average light level of 1.0 foot-candles). Building-mounted cut-off luminaries would be installed for security (p 5-2). All lighting would be subject to consistency with the Monterey County Zoning Ordinance, and would require approval by the County of Monterey planning director prior to the issuance of building permits.
Signage. Directional signage is proposed on all facility buildings and parking lots. Monument signage is proposed on Inter-Garrison Road for bus entries and auto entries to the project site. Project signage would be subject to compliance with the Monterey County Code Chapter 21.60.090.

Landscaping. The MST GDP calls for the use of native plants and trees to mimic existing vegetation on and adjacent to the project site (3-14). Native oak trees would be preserved in the buffer area along Inter-Garrison Road and along the south side of the proposed Maintenance and Operations Building, which is the tallest building proposed on the project site. The MST GDP calls for supplemental oak tree plantings within these areas-especially within the south parking lot to help shield buildings and parking lots from view. Additional oak trees would be planted on the slope between the two parking lots. No landscaping is proposed within the bus stalls to avoid creating circulation hazards in this area.

The MST GDP proposes a minimum of ten percent landscaping coverage on the project site and earth-tone color schemes and textures on all buildings and structures to “reflect the oak-prominent landscape” (p 1-8).

Whispering Oaks Business Park General Development Plan

Buildings. For much of the Inter-Garrison Road frontage along the Whispering Oaks Business Park the site slopes upward slightly from the road. The Whispering Oaks GDP limits buildings to no more than 35 feet tall. Assuming a lot at the same elevation as Inter-Garrison Road, a five foot up-slope, and an average 15 foot tree height, the tops of buildings would exceed the tree line by about 15 feet. Due to viewing angles from street level, less of these buildings would actually be visible above the trees. The Whispering Oaks GDP directs buildings to use subdued earth-tones and textures to complement the existing landscape, and discourages reflective materials.

Design Standards. Specific development plans for the remaining development lots has not yet been proposed. The following design standards and requirements of the Whispering Oaks GDP include the following features to reduce the effect of development to the visual characteristics of the project site.

Lighting. Lighting plans would be subject to the review and approval of the County of Monterey planning director prior to the issuance of building permits. The Whispering Oaks GDP requires the preparation of an exterior lighting plan for all new development. Design standards for exterior lighting include recessed lighting elements and down lit fixtures to reduce off-site glare. A street lighting plan would be prepared as part of the final building plans and according to the Whispering Oaks GDP, would include full cut-off fixtures that shield and direct light to intended on-site areas and prevent light spill beyond the boundary of the project site.
Signage. The Whispering Oaks GDP includes provision for signage and requires a master sign program to reduce visual clutter, and provide a common theme, hierarchy of sign types, and minimization of illumination.

Landscaping. According to the Whispering Oaks GDP, a 20-foot wide landscaped buffer will be maintained along property lines adjacent to Inter-Garrison Road, and all new development would be required to landscape a minimum of 30 percent of the total site area of each lot (Section 3.2.3). The Whispering Oaks GDP Section 3.2.6 identifies the 20-foot oak corridor and notes that trees within 30 feet of the property line would be retained initially, and future tree removal would be subject to the provisions of the County Tree Ordinance, Monterey County Code Section 21.64.260. The Whispering Oaks GDP calls for the use of native plants in all landscaping plans with an emphasis on Coast live oak trees and plants associated with oak woodland habitat (page 6).

Light and Glare

The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site and vicinity, in particular the MST site, which could interfere adversely with views of the night sky or intrude onto adjacent properties. Proposed lighting for the MST facility parking lots (approximately 15 acres) consists of 30-foot poles with cut-off luminaries (400 watt metal halide in the bus parking lot) and 14 to 20-foot poles (in the automobile parking lot and south of the maintenance building). According to the project description, weekday bus departures would begin at about 3:15 AM, with most morning departures between 5:00 AM and 7:00 AM. On weekends most morning departures occur between 6:30 AM and 7:30 AM. Busses return between 5:00 PM and 12:30 AM. It is assumed that the bus parking lots would be illuminated for the entire night. Therefore, the proposed project has the potential to illuminate the night sky at all hours of the night.

The immediate vicinity of the project site (the project site itself, the landfill, small undeveloped parcels to the west, and vacant land to the south) is absent of light sources. However, many nearby locations provide sources of nighttime lighting. Existing sources of night lighting in the vicinity of the project site include the residential uses to the east and north, the CSUMB campus core to the west, and other existing development in Marina, Salinas, and Seaside.

The proposed MST facility would create a new source of illumination including continuous night time illumination of 15 acres of parking lots, in an area where little to no lighting currently exists. These effects would be most visible from Imjin Parkway to the north and Inter-Garrison Road to the south.
Impacts and Mitigation Measures

No Impact – Substantial Adverse Effect on Scenic Vista or Scenic Highways. The project is not located within a scenic vista designated by the 1982 Monterey County General Plan or the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. Views of and through the project site are not unique to the vicinity or region. Consequently, development of the project site would not have an impact on a scenic vista. The project site is not visible from State Route 1, a FORA-designated scenic corridor, and there are no state-designated scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic resources within a state designated scenic highway.

Less than Significant Impact – Degrade Visual Quality of the Inter-Garrison Road Corridor. Development of the MST site would include placing a ten foot tall masonry wall along a portion of the south property line adjacent to the Inter-Garrison Road right-of-way. Buildings between 40 and 60 feet tall would be constructed on the MST site, and buildings up to 35 feet tall would be constructed within the Whispering Oaks Business Park. The proposed project would retain an oak tree landscape area of 20 to 24 feet within the road right-of-way and up to 75 feet of additional buffer width at some locations within the MST site that would provide a visual buffer between Inter-Garrison Road and the proposed development. The MST GDP and Whispering Oaks GDP require exterior building materials that would blend with the oak trees. The MST site will be depressed at least ten feet below the level of Inter-Garrison Road. Due to a combination of gradient differences, existing trees, and general development plan limitations on exterior building materials, very little of the wall or buildings would be visible from Inter-Garrison Road. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on the visual qualities of Inter-Garrison Road.

Less than Significant Impact – Glare from Reflective Surfaces and Nighttime Lighting. Development of the MST site has the potential to create new sources of glare from architectural and paved surfaces. The proposed project includes 15 acres of paved areas, buildings and roadways, and a white elastomeric roofing material is proposed for the Maintenance and Operations building. Sources of glare include building rooftops and sun reflections off vehicles in the parking lots. Most building materials would be non-reflective, although the white elastomer roof could reflect considerable light. Glare effects would be most visible from Imjin Road, but the views from Imjin Road are distant and brief. Some of the MST development, and much Whispering Oaks Business Park development would be obscured by trees and variations in grade when viewed from Imjin Road. Views from Inter-Garrison Road would be obscured by gradient differences and existing trees. The impact from daytime reflection and glare would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

The proposed project would create a substantial new source of light and glare during all hours of the night. The proposed project would contribute incrementally to the degradation of
atmospheric “night sky” conditions. The MST GDP requires full cut-off lighting to reduce light spill onto adjacent properties. The light poles at the parking areas nearest to Inter-Garrison Road have been reduced in height from original proposals to 14 to 20 feet tall, which would not exceed the average tree line height. The MST bus parking area would have 30-foot tall light poles and very high levels of lighting. The bus parking lot would be about ten below the level of Inter-Garrison Road, and the poles would extend about five feet above the average height of the tree line. The Whispering Oaks GDP does not specifically address pole height, but does require full cut-off fixtures and encourages the use of down-lighting. Due to the number of smaller lots, lighting would be less concentrated at the Whispering Oaks Business Park compared to the MST facility. The design standards proposed by the MST GDP and Whispering Oaks Business Park GDP would reduce the impacts of light and glare to a less than significant level.

2.2 AIR QUALITY

Information in this section is drawn primarily from the 2008 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Region and the CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (2008) prepared by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), as well as the Whispering Oaks Business Park General Development Plan/Monterey-Salinas Transit Center Project Environmental Air Quality Assessment Monterey County, California, prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. (2009). A copy of the air quality assessment can be found in Appendix C.

Standards of Significance

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
- Cause a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.
Policies and Regulations

Federal

The federal Clean Air Act, adopted in 1970 and amended in 1990, provides the basis for federal air quality standards. The Clean Air Act is implemented by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). The Clean Air Act established two types of national air standards: primary and secondary. Primary standards set limits to protect public health, including the health of sensitive persons such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly. Secondary standards set limits to protect public welfare, including protection against decreased visibility, damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings.

State

The Lewis-Presley Air Quality Management Act, adopted in 1976 and amended in 1987, and the California Clean Air Act, adopted in 1988 and amended in 1992, provide the basis for air quality regulation in the state, particularly maintaining ambient air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter, collectively referred to as “criteria pollutants.” The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is responsible for coordinating air quality attainment efforts, setting standards, conducting research, and creating solutions to air pollution.

Standards for Criteria Air Pollutants. In general, criteria pollutants are pervasive constituents, such as those emitted in vast quantities by the combustion of fossil fuels. Both the State of California and the federal government have developed ambient air quality standards for the identified criteria pollutants, which include ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and suspended particulate matter 10 microns or less (PM₁₀), and 2.5 microns or less (PM₂.₅). Table 3, Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards, lists state and federal ambient air quality standards for criteria air pollutants. The state standards generally have lower thresholds than the federal standards, yet both are applicable to the proposed project. When thresholds are exceeded at regional monitoring stations, an “attainment plan” must be prepared that outlines how an air quality district will achieve compliance. Generally, these plans must provide for district-wide emission reductions of five percent per year averaged over consecutive three-year periods.

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District

The Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) exercises its jurisdiction within the North Central Coast Air Basin (air basin), which includes Monterey, Santa Cruz, and
Table 3  Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>California Standards(^1)</th>
<th>Federal Standards(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration(^3)</td>
<td>Primary(^3,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>(\mu g/m^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone ((O_3))</td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Hour</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(^{10})</td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM(^{2.5})</td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide ((CO))</td>
<td>8 Hour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide ((NO_2))*</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide ((SO_2))</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Hour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead(^7)</td>
<td>30 Day Average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rolling 3-month</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calendar Quarter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles</td>
<td>8 Hour Extinction coefficient of 0.23 per km. - visibility of 10 miles or more due to particles when relative humidity is less than 70 percent. Method: beta attenuation and transmittance through filter tape.</td>
<td>No Federal Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates</td>
<td>24 Hour 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide</td>
<td>1 Hour 0.03 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride6</td>
<td>24 Hour 0.01 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** California Air Resources Board, February 16, 2010.

**Note:**

1. California standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (except Lake Tahoe), sulfur dioxide (1 and 24 hour), nitrogen dioxide, suspended particulate matter—PM10, PM2.5, and visibility reducing particles, are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. California ambient air quality standards are listed in the Table of Standards in Section 70200 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations.

2. National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual averages or annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth highest eight hour concentration in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM10, the 24 hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 μg/m3 is equal to or less than one. For PM2.5, the 24 hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over three years, are equal to or less than the standard. Contact U.S. EPA for further clarification and current federal policies.

3. Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr. Most measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.

4. National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.

5. National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.

6. To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average at each monitor within an area must not exceed 0.100 ppm.

7. The CARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as 'toxic air contaminants' with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.
San Benito counties. The MBUAPCD is charged with regulatory authority over stationary sources of air emissions, monitoring air quality within the air basin, providing guidelines for analysis of air quality impacts pursuant to CEQA, and preparing an air quality management plan or clean air plan. CARB also grants air districts explicit statutory authority to adopt indirect source regulations and transportation control measures, including measures to encourage the use of ridesharing, flexible work hours, or other measures that reduce the number or length of vehicle trips.

**Attainment Status of the Air Basin.** CARB is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified with regard to its compliance with state standards for criteria air pollutants. An “attainment” designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations do not violate the standard for that pollutant in that area. A “nonattainment” designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the standard at least once, excluding an “unclassified” designation which signifies that available data does not support either an attainment or nonattainment status. The California Clean Air Act divides districts into moderate, serious, and severe air pollution attainment categories, with increasingly stringent control requirements mandated for each category.

Ambient air quality in the air basin is monitored at several monitoring stations. On several occasions in recent years, the ozone and PM$_{10}$ standards have been exceeded at ambient air quality monitoring stations in the air basin. The air basin does not meet the state ambient air quality standards for ozone or PM$_{10}$. The ozone attainment status is currently “nonattainment” and the PM$_{10}$ attainment status is currently “nonattainment.” Nonattainment infers that the air basin has had less than three exceedences at any one monitoring station. All other pollutants are considered to have an attainment status relative to established state and federal thresholds. Table 4, North Central Coast Air Basin Attainment Status, identifies the current status within the air basin for each criteria pollutant.

**Air Quality Management Plan.** The MBUAPCD is delegated with local responsibility to implement both federal and state mandates for improving air quality in the air basin through implementation of an air quality plan. The MBUAPCD adopted the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District Air Quality Management Plan (Air Quality Management Plan) in 1991 and several updates in subsequent years. The Air Quality Management Plan presents measures to control emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from stationary and mobile sources in order to meet the ozone standard mandated by the California Clean Air Act. In 2006 CARB made the ambient air quality standards more stringent by adding an 8-hour ozone average to the standard.
### Table 4  North Central Coast Air Basin Attainment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>Non-attainment (moderate)</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalable Particulates (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>Nonattainment</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulates (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>Monterey Co. – Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Benito Co. – Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Co. – Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Unclassified/Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** California Air Resources Board, March 2010

Although the air basin achieved the 1-hour ozone standard in 2006, it failed to meet the new 8-hour standard and CARB designated the air basin a nonattainment area for the state ambient air quality standards for ozone. In August 2008 the MBUAPCD updated the Air Quality Management Plan to focus on achieving the new 8-hour ozone standard. Five control measures from the 2004 Air Quality Management Plan, whose development was suspended because the 1-hour standard had been met, have been re-introduced in the 2008 Air Quality Management Plan. These five measures are:

- **A1 - Solvent Cleaning Operations**;
- **A2 - Degreasing Operations**;
- **A3 - Spray Booths - Miscellaneous Coatings and Cleanup Solvents**;
- **A4 - Adhesives and Sealants**; and
- **A5 - Natural Gas-Fired Fan-Type Central Furnaces and Residential Water Heaters**.

For 2010, the combined emission reductions from these measures are estimated to be 1.65 tons per day of VOC and 0.17 tons per day of NOₓ. The 2008 Air Quality Management Plan also updates the description of the area’s Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), as well as grant activity under AB 2766 and the Moyer mobile source emission reduction programs. The Air Quality Management Plan further proposes to evaluate any co-pollutant benefits in terms of reducing ozone precursors achieved under AB 32.

**MBUAPCD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines (2008).** The MBUAPCD prepared its CEQA air quality guidelines to assist lead agencies in the preparation of CEQA document air quality analysis. When comparing a proposed project to an adopted plan or policy, the analysis should...
examine the existing physical conditions at the time the NOP is published as well as potential future conditions discussed (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(e)). The EIR should focus on the project's cumulative air quality impact on regional ozone and its localized impact on carbon monoxide levels. A proposed project cumulative impact should be analyzed by determining its consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan (MBUAPCD CEQA Guidelines Section 5.5). Its localized impact should be assessed by identifying whether build-out would create or substantially contribute to carbon monoxide hot spots where federal or state ambient air quality standards are exceeded (MBUAPCD CEQA Guidelines Section 5.4).

The air district thresholds for PM$_{10}$ emissions are based on maximum daily emissions. According to the guidelines, construction sites with earthmoving activities larger than 2.2 acres in size could lead to emissions of 82 pounds per day or greater, which would be considered a significant impact.

The MBUAPCD guidelines include a threshold for how many cases of cancer per million a project would produce due to emissions such as diesel particulate matter. The guidelines identify a significant cancer risk from a proposed project as greater than 10 in one million.

**Monterey County General Plan**

**Policy 20.2.1** The County shall condition approval of all new industrial and commercial development, including major modifications as defined by the Uniform Building Code, on meeting, as a minimum, federal and state ambient air quality standards and the rules and regulations of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.

**Policy 20.2.6** The County shall require that any particulate fallout problem created by the establishment or expansion of industrial facilities be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Monterey County Board of Supervisors or its designee, and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District as a condition of a use permit for any further upgrading, expansion, or modification that may degrade the quality of emissions from these facilities.

**Fort Ord Reuse Plan**

**Objective A.** Protect and improve air quality.
**Environmental Setting**

**Regional Climate and Topography**

The air basin lies along the central coast of California covering an area of approximately 5,159 square miles. The air basin is comprised of several interconnected valleys: a portion of the Santa Clara Valley; San Benito Valley; Salinas Valley, and Carmel Valley. The project site is within an area of low hills considered to be within the Salinas Valley. The semi-permanent high-pressure cell in the eastern Pacific Ocean is the basic controlling factor in the climate of the air basin. In the summer, the high pressure cell is dominant and causes persistent west and northwest winds over the entire California coast. Air descends in the Pacific high-pressure cell forming a stable temperature inversion of hot air over a cool coastal layer of air. The onshore air currents pass over cool ocean waters to bring fog and relatively cool air into the coastal valleys. The warmer air aloft acts as a lid to inhibit vertical air movement.

The generally northwest-southeast orientation of mountain ridges restricts and channels the summer on-shore air currents. Surface heating in the interior portion of the Salinas and San Benito valleys creates a weak low pressure, which intensifies the on-shore airflow during the afternoon and evening.

In the fall, the surface winds become weak, and the marine layer grows shallow, dissipating altogether on some days. The airflow is occasionally reversed in a weak offshore movement, and the relatively stationary air mass is held in place by the Pacific high-pressure cell, which allows pollutants to build up over a period of a few days. It is most often during this season that the north or east winds develop to transport pollutants from either the San Francisco Bay Area or the Central Valley into the air basin.

During the winter, the Pacific high-pressure cell migrates southward and has less influence on the air basin. Air frequently flows in a southeasterly direction out of the Salinas and San Benito valleys, especially during night and morning hours. Northwest winds are nevertheless still dominant in winter, but easterly flow is more frequent. The general absence of deep, persistent inversions and the occasional storm systems usually result in good air quality for the basin as a whole in winter and early spring.

**Air Pollutants and Their Effects on Human Health**

The primary air quality problems in the air basin are ozone and PM$_{10}$. The health effects of the most prevalent pollutants are discussed below. Table 5, Common Air Pollutants, presents the sources and effects of common criteria air pollutants.
### Table 5  Common Air Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Major Sources</th>
<th>Related Health &amp; Environmental Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>Created by the chemical reaction between oxides of nitrogen and volatile organic compounds (VOC) in the presence of heat and sunlight. Ground level ozone is the principal component of smog.</td>
<td>▪ Motor vehicle exhaust; ▪ Industrial emissions; ▪ Gasoline vapors; ▪ Chemical solvents.</td>
<td>▪ Reduced lung capacity; Irritation of lung airways and inflammation; ▪ Aggravated asthma; ▪ Increased susceptibility to respiratory illnesses (i.e. bronchitis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)</td>
<td>Precursor of ground-level ozone.</td>
<td>▪ Petroleum transfer and storage, ▪ Mobile sources; ▪ Organic solvents.</td>
<td>▪ Potential carcinogen (e.g. benzene); ▪ Toxic to plants and animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxides (SOₓ)</td>
<td>Sulfur oxide gases are formed when fuel containing sulfur such as coal and oil is burned and when gasoline is extracted from oil, or metals are extracted from ore.</td>
<td>▪ Electric utilities (especially coal-burning); ▪ Industrial facilities that derive their products from raw materials to produce process heat.</td>
<td>▪ Respiratory illness, particularly in children and the elderly; ▪ Aggravates existing heart and lung diseases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides (NOₓ)</td>
<td>Generic form for a group of highly organic gases, all of which contain nitrogen in varying amounts. Many of the nitrogen oxides are odorless and colorless.</td>
<td>▪ Motor vehicles; ▪ Electric utilities; ▪ Industrial, commercial, and residential sources that burn fuel.</td>
<td>▪ Toxic to plants; ▪ Reduced visibility; ▪ Respiratory irritant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>Describes particles in the air, including dust, soot, smoke, and liquid droplets. Others are so small that they can only be detected with an electron microscope.</td>
<td>▪ Motor vehicles, ▪ Factories, ▪ Construction sites, ▪ Tilled farm fields, ▪ Unpaved roads; ▪ Wood burning.</td>
<td>▪ Aggravated asthma; ▪ Increases in respiratory symptoms; ▪ Decreased lung function; ▪ Premature death; ▪ Reduced visibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carbon Monoxide (CO) | Colorless, odorless gas that is formed when carbon in fuel is not burned completely. | • Fuel combustion; • Industrial processes; • Highly congested traffic. | • Chest pain for those with heart disease; • Vision problems; • Reduced mental alertness; • Death (at high levels)

Lead (Pb) | Metal, can become airborne | • Factories (smelters, lead acid batteries) | • Neurological, kidney reproductive, and immunity disorders • Reduced blood oxygen capacity

**Ozone and Related Compounds.** Ozone is produced by chemical reactions, which are triggered by sunlight, involving nitrogen oxides (NO\textsubscript{x}) and reactive organic gases (ROG) or volatile organic compounds (VOC). NO\textsubscript{x} are created during combustion of fuels, while reactive organic gases are emitted during combustion and evaporation of organic solvents. Since ozone is not directly emitted to the atmosphere, but is formed because of photochemical reactions, it is considered a secondary pollutant. Ozone is a seasonal problem, occurring roughly from April through October.

Ozone is a strong irritant that attacks the respiratory system, leading to the damage of lung tissue. Asthma, bronchitis, and other respiratory ailments, as well as cardiovascular diseases, are aggravated by exposure to ozone. A healthy person exposed to high concentrations may become nauseated or dizzy, may develop a headache or cough, or may experience a burning sensation in the chest. Research has shown that exposure to ozone damages the alveoli (the individual air sacs in the lung where the exchange of oxygen and carbon dioxide between the air and blood takes place). Research has shown that ozone also damages vegetation.

Calculating VOC and NO\textsubscript{x} emissions from typical construction equipment is not necessary because temporary emissions of these ozone precursors have been accommodated in State- and federally-required air plans.

**Sulfur Oxides.** SO\textsubscript{x} gases are formed when fuel containing sulfur, such as coal and oil, is burned, when gasoline is extracted from oil, or metals are extracted from ore. SO\textsubscript{2} dissolves in water vapor to form acid, and interacts with other gases and particles in the air to form sulfates and other products that can be harmful to people and their environment.

**Nitrogen Dioxide.** NO\textsubscript{2} is a reddish-brown gas that can irritate the lungs and can cause breathing difficulties at high concentrations. Like O\textsubscript{3}, NO\textsubscript{2} is not directly emitted, but is formed
through a reaction between nitric oxide (NO\textsubscript{x}) and atmospheric oxygen. NO\textsubscript{x} is a major contributor to O\textsubscript{3} formation. NO\textsubscript{2} also contributes to the formation of PM\textsubscript{10} (see discussion of PM\textsubscript{10} below). NO\textsubscript{2} concentrations in the air basin have been well below ambient air quality standards; therefore, NO\textsubscript{2} concentrations from land use projects are not a concern.

**Suspended Particulate Matter.** PM\textsubscript{10} is comprised of small, suspended particulate matter, 10 microns or less in diameter. The major components of PM\textsubscript{10} are dust particles, nitrates, and sulfates. PM\textsubscript{10} is directly emitted to the atmosphere as a byproduct of fuel combustion, wind erosion of soil and unpaved roads, and from construction or agricultural operations. Small particles are also created in the atmosphere through chemical reactions. Approximately 64 percent of fugitive dust is PM\textsubscript{10}. Minimal grading typically generates about 10 pounds per day per acre on average while excavation and earthmoving activities typically generate about 38 pounds per day per acre.

Although particles greater than 10 microns in diameter can cause irritation in the nose, throat, and bronchial tubes, natural mechanisms remove much of these particles. Particles less than 10 microns in diameter are able to pass through the body's natural defenses and the mucous membranes of the upper respiratory tract and enter into the lungs. The particles can damage the alveoli. The particles may also carry carcinogens and other toxic compounds, which can adhere to the particle surfaces and enter the lungs.

The MBUAPCD CEQA Guidelines consider emissions of 82 pounds per day or greater of PM\textsubscript{10} from construction activity to be significant; this typically equates to general construction activity over an area of at least 8.1 acres per day, or grading/excavation over an area of at least 2.2 acres per day.

**Carbon Monoxide.** Carbon monoxide (CO) is a component of motor vehicle exhaust, which contributes about 56 percent of all CO emissions nationwide. Other non-road engines and vehicles (such as construction equipment and boats) contribute about 22 percent of all CO emissions nationwide. Higher levels of CO generally occur in areas with heavy traffic congestion. In cities, 85 to 95 percent of all CO emissions may come from motor vehicle exhaust. Carbon monoxide can cause harmful health effects by reducing oxygen delivery to the body's organs (like the heart and brain) and tissues. Carbon monoxide contributes to the formation of ground-level ozone.

Emissions thresholds established for carbon monoxide apply to direct or stationary sources. Emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) emitted from traffic generated by the project are first evaluated by assessing the impacts of general development plan-generated traffic on existing and future traffic conditions. Congested intersections with high volumes of traffic could cause CO “hot spots”, where localized high concentrations of CO occur. The MBUAPCD guidelines require CO hot spot analysis under the following project conditions:
• Intersections where the Level of Service (LOS) would degrade below D
• Volume to capacity ratio increases by 0.05 at LOS E or F intersections
• The delay at LOS E or F intersections increases by 10 seconds or more
• Reserve capacity at unsignalized LOS E or F intersections decrease by 50 or more

**Lead.** Lead was formerly a major air pollutant of concern. Levels of lead in the air decreased 94 percent between 1980 and 1999, following the removal of lead from gasoline. Today, the highest levels of lead in air are usually found near lead smelters and a few other industrial and utility plants.

**Toxic Air Contaminants.** Toxic air contaminants (TACs) are pollutants that may be expected to result in an increase in mortality or serious illness or may pose a present or potential health hazard. Health effects include cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, damage to the body's natural defense system, and diseases that lead to death. TACs can be classified as either carcinogens or non-carcinogens. An incremental risk of ten excess cancer cases per million at the Maximally Exposed Individual (or MEI) would result in a significant impact. The ten-in-one-million risk level is used by the Air Toxics “Hot Spots” (AB 2588) program and California’s Proposition 65 as the public notification level for air toxic emissions from existing sources.

**Diesel Emissions.** Diesel exhaust is the predominant TAC in urban air and is estimated to represent about two-thirds of the cancer risk from TACs. Diesel engines emit a complex mix of pollutants including NO\textsubscript{X}, particulate matter, and TACs. The most visible constituents of diesel exhaust are very small carbon particles or "soot," known as diesel particulate matter. Diesel exhaust also contains over 40 cancer-causing substances, most of which are readily adsorbed on the soot particles. Among the TACs contained in diesel exhaust are dioxin, lead, polycyclic organic matter, and acrolein.

Short-term exposure to diesel particulate matter is associated with variable irritation and inflammatory symptoms. Diesel engine emissions are responsible for a majority of California's estimated cancer risk attributable to air pollution. In 2000, ARB identified an average potential cancer risk of 540 excess cases per million people, statewide, from diesel particulate matter. In addition, diesel particulate matter is a significant fraction of California’s particulate pollution. Assessments by ARB and U.S. EPA estimate that diesel particulate matter contributes to approximately 3,500 premature respiratory and cardiovascular deaths and thousands of hospital admissions annually in California. Diesel exhaust contains several chemicals detrimental to visibility and vegetation (OEHHA 2001).

Diesel exhaust is especially common during the grading stage of construction (when most of the heavy equipment is used), and adjacent to heavily trafficked roadways where diesel trucks are
common. EPA regulates diesel engine design and fuel composition at the federal level, and has implemented a series of measures since 1994 to reduce NO\textsubscript{x} and particulate emissions from off-road diesel equipment. EPA Tier 2 diesel engine standards were implemented from 2001 and 2006, Tier 3 standards from 2006-2008, and Tier 4 standards are being phased in through 2014. Ultralow sulfur off-road diesel fuel, 15 parts per million (ppm) will become standard in 2010, replacing the current 500 ppm fuel. The Tier 4 engines and ultralow sulfur fuels will reduce emissions by up to 65 percent compared to older engines and fuel (EPA 2004). CARB's Regulation for In-use Off-road Diesel Vehicles establishes a state program to reduce emissions from older construction equipment. Although the implementation phasing for this regulation has been delayed by budget legislation in early 2009, the regulation is in effect and will reduce construction equipment emissions over time.

**Sensitive Receptors**

Although air pollution can affect all segments of the population, certain groups are more susceptible to its adverse effects than others. Children, the elderly, and the chronically or acutely ill are the most sensitive population groups. These sensitive receptors are commonly associated with specific land uses such as residential areas, schools, parks, retirement homes, and hospitals.

The nearest existing sensitive receptors include student housing southwest of the Inter-Garrison Road and Seventh Avenue intersection and staff/faculty housing located approximately 900 feet to the east. CSUMB owns properties to the east and south of the project site, and the University of California has development parcels to the west. The City of Marina and CSUMB are attempting to acquire these parcels from the University of California for possible mixed use and educational developments. CSUMB is also attempting to acquire the Golden Gate University parcel for educational facilities.

**Project Analysis**

Build out of the proposed project is envisioned to occur in three phases, with the first phase (MST operation at the site) in 2013, the second phase would add build out of the Whispering Oaks Business Park in 2016, and the third phase would include expanded operation of MST in 2030, although no physical improvements are anticipated in this phase.

**Construction Emissions**

**Construction Dust.** Construction phase emissions are generated over the short-term as a result of construction activities. Construction emissions are generated from heavy-duty construction equipment, asphalt for roadways, and dust from earthmoving activities (e.g., grading, trenching). Construction-generated PM\textsubscript{10} emissions vary substantially from day to day depending on the
level of activity, the specific construction equipment used, and weather conditions. Construction emissions can substantially increase localized concentrations of PM$_{10}$, for which the MBUAPCD is currently in nonattainment. Fugitive dust emissions would occur during each of the construction stages. The initial stages of construction generate the highest emissions of PM$_{10}$ from fugitive dust because initial site preparation activities typically involve the most intense grading. The other construction stages would generate dust emissions, but to a lesser degree than grading since the intensity of soil disturbance activities would be reduced. The first and second phases of the proposed project would generate most of the construction emissions. During these phases, additional materials would be imported to the site including base rock, select soil/gravel for trenches and building pads, and asphalt for paving. Without controls, dust from construction would be transported off-site via wind erosion of unpaved surfaces or through soils tracked-out onto paved roads where PM$_{10}$ enters the air through the motion of passing cars and trucks. The third phase of the proposed project would generate minimal construction dust, as most facilities would already exist.

The MBUAPCD guidelines suggest that construction sites with earthmoving activities larger than 2.2 acres in size could lead to emissions of 82 pounds per day or greater, which would be a significant impact. This estimate assumes some level of dust control. General construction sites of 8.1 acres or larger could lead to significant PM$_{10}$ emissions. MBUAPCD considers these emissions to potentially result in potential exceedances of the state PM$_{10}$ standard. Detailed construction information would be necessary to conduct modeling to determine if such an exceedance were predicted. Since detailed construction plans are not known and given the size of the construction area, daily grading activities could exceed 2.2 acres, which would exceed air district thresholds. This is a potentially significant air quality impact.

Emissions from PM$_{10}$ would also occur as a result of wind erosion over disturbed areas during dry windy conditions and from vehicle track out. These emissions are not accounted for in the emission factors applied to grading and construction activities. Ordinarily, these emissions would be considerably small in comparison with grading activities. Emissions from wind erosion are difficult to predict depending on the location and area subject to wind disturbance and wind speeds. Wind erosion emissions would vary considerably, but could be controlled through active watering of the site throughout the construction period, including days that construction is not occurring, but soils are left disturbed.

**Construction Exhaust Emissions.** Diesel exhaust includes air contaminants that can cause health effects. Development of the project site would utilize diesel-fueled heavy equipment. Diesel-powered trucks and equipment would emit substantial amounts of NO$_X$, acrolein, diesel particulate matter during the construction phase.

Construction equipment can emit substantial amounts of NO$_X$ that could have a small, but cumulative effect on ozone concentrations. The MBUAPCD CEQA guidelines do not have
thresholds that apply to these emissions. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant if reasonable and feasible measures to reduce emissions are employed.

Short-term exposure to acrolein is suspected to result in eye and upper respiratory tract irritation. This type of impact is typically addressed by predicting maximum one-hour concentrations of acrolein and comparing those to a reference exposure level (REL). The REL is a level at which the onset of these adverse impacts could occur. Due to the ongoing delay by the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment in adopting a REL for acrolein, the MBUAPCD has suspended evaluations of acute exposures to diesel exhaust for air quality assessments. In other words, there is no general agreement for the onset of health effects associated with acute exposure to this contaminant and therefore, health effects cannot be determined and are not assessed in this document.

Diesel exhaust is a complex mixture of gases, vapors, and fine particulate matter. The particulate matter component of diesel exhaust, diesel particulate matter, has been classified as a TAC by the CARB based on its potential to cause cancer and other adverse health effects. While there are a number of other cancer causing compounds in diesel exhaust, CARB has identified diesel particulate matter as the surrogate compound to be used in evaluating potential long-term cancer-related health risks from diesel exhaust.

Truck travel and other construction equipment exhaust would result in elevated levels of diesel particulate matter for short time periods. Clearing and grading within the project site would produce the highest emissions of diesel particulate matter. Other phases of construction use smaller sized equipment (e.g., loaders, forklifts, etc.), but include numerous heavy-duty truck deliveries for cement, asphalt, building materials, and landscape materials. Grading and infrastructure construction could begin at the western end of the project site as soon as late 2010 and extend to other parcels as development of individual projects on those parcels is undertaken over the following years. Although these activities would not occur close to residences or other sensitive receptors, they would result in a cumulative contribution to emissions of diesel particulate matter in the region (page 20). This is a potentially significant impact. Reasonable controls to reduce these emissions should be incorporated into the project.

**Operational Emissions**

Increases in mobile source emissions associated with the future development would be primarily associated with bus trips and employee commute trips. The URBEMIS2007 air quality modeling program was used to predict direct and indirect daily emissions of each phase of the proposed project and build-out. The model predicts daily or annual emissions associated with land use developments. The model combines predicted daily traffic activity associated with the different land use types, with emission factors from the state’s mobile emission factor model (i.e.,
EMFAC 2007). The project size and estimated traffic generation were input to the URBEMIS2007 model to predict daily emissions of ROG, NO\textsubscript{X}, PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5}. The model also computes area source emissions from the different land uses, such as natural gas combustion associated with the heating of water and space, along with the emissions from use of gas-powered landscape equipment. Changes in bus travel due to the relocation of MST’s facilities were also computed using the EMFAC2007 emission factor model developed by CARB.

**URBEMIS2007 and EMFA2007 Emission Factors.** Emission rates of ROG and NO\textsubscript{X} are sensitive to the year of analysis. Vehicular emissions rates are sharply decreasing as vehicles with more effective emission controls dominate the fleet mix. This will continue to be the case in the future. Build-out years for the analysis were 2013 for Phase I, 2016 for Phase I & II, and 2030 for Phase I, II, and III. The emission factors in 2030 are considerably lower than those in 2013.

The model also predicts area source emissions, which are minor compared to emissions associated with traffic. Area source emissions include natural gas combustion associated with the heating of water and space, along with emissions from use of gas-powered landscape equipment. The default URBEMIS2007 value for natural gas usage was used, which assumes 100 percent natural gas usage for water and space heating.

**MST Facility.** The proposed MST facility would include bus storage and maintenance facilities. Primary emission sources include bus idling for start-up and maintenance, fugitive emissions from maintenance activities, emissions from travel associated with workers, and changes in bus travel. URBEMIS2007 does not include land uses representative of bus service facilities. A light industrial land use with similar acreage and trip generation predicted in the traffic report was used. All trips except bus trips were considered new. For bus trips, emissions associated with the difference in travel between the current sites and the proposed project site were computed.

Emissions from changes in bus routing were assumed to reflect the differences in travel to the various bus routes from the project site. Currently, buses that serve Salinas and the Salinas Valley are located in Salinas. The proposed project would add about five miles of travel to each bus trip serving these routes. Currently buses serving the Monterey Peninsula area are located in Monterey. About five miles of travel would also be added to buses serving the Monterey/Carmel areas. The differences in additional bus travel were computed based on bus schedules, number of buses serving each route and locations of buses that serve these routes. EMFAC2007 emission factors were applied to the additional mileage that the project would add to daily bus travel. The emission factors represent the current age and mix of bus vehicles reported by MST.

**Whispering Oaks Business Park.** The size of the proposed business park and daily predicted trip generation provided in the traffic report were input to the URBEMIS2007 model. The proposed business park was assumed to be fully operational in 2016.
**URBEMIS2007 Results.** Daily emissions from the build out of the proposed project are reported in Table 6, *Estimated Project-Related Operational Emissions*. The table shows air quality emissions associated with future build-out of the project site as determined by URBEMIS2007 NO\textsubscript{X} and ROG emissions associated with build out of the proposed project are predicted to be below the MBUAPCD significance thresholds. The majority of NO\textsubscript{X} emissions (over 90 percent) would come from traffic. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact to regional air quality with respect to emissions of ozone precursors. The MBUAPCD thresholds for PM\textsubscript{10} only apply to onsite emissions of PM\textsubscript{40}. The emissions reported above include both on-site and off-site emissions for summer conditions. Wintertime wood smoke emissions are not included, because the project does not include residences or land uses that would routinely burn wood. Operational PM\textsubscript{10} emissions would result in a less than significant impact. The MBUAPCD does not have thresholds for PM\textsubscript{2.5}, however the state currently has a standards for PM\textsubscript{2.5}, which is set at 12 micrograms per cubic meter.

The complete URBEMIS emissions report is presented in *Appendix D of the air quality report (EIR Appendix C)*. The URBEMIS analysis indicates that unmitigated build out of the proposed project would not exceed the MBUAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO\textsubscript{X}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} and the impact would be less than significant.

**Stationary Sources.** The URBEMIS2007 model does not predict emissions from stationary air pollutant sources, other than general natural gas usage (i.e., area sources such as water and space heaters). Stationary equipment that could emit air pollution in substantial amounts has not been identified. These types of emissions are usually only identified at the project-level analysis.

Stationary sources constructed as part of both the MST facility and Whispering Oaks Business Park facilities may require permits from MBUAPCD. The proposed MST facility would include spray paint operations that are part of the proposed maintenance facilities. Paint spraying operations would be subject to MBUAPCD rules and regulations that require spray booths and controls on emissions. The MST project would also include a fueling station that may require permitting, although on site maintenance and fueling operations would be buffered from Inter-Garrison Road and the sensitive receptors opposite the roadway by landscaped areas and parking facilities.

The Whispering Oaks Business Park may also include stationary sources that may require permits from MBUAPCD. Such sources would include paint spray booths, combustion emissions from large boilers used for heating and cooling, or standby emergency generators (rated 50 horsepower or greater). These sources would normally result in minor emissions, compared to those from traffic generation reported above. Sources of air pollutant emissions complying with all applicable MBUAPCD regulations generally will not be considered to have a significant air quality impact. Stationary sources that are exempt from these permit requirements due to low emission thresholds would not be considered to have a significant air quality impact.
### Table 6  Daily Project Emissions based on URBEMIS2007 Modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)</th>
<th>Nitrogen Oxides (NOX)</th>
<th>Respirable Particulates (PM₁₀)</th>
<th>Fine Particulates (PM₂.₅)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1 – 2013 – Initial MST Facility Occupancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed MST Facility</td>
<td>6.5 lbs</td>
<td>9.1 lbs</td>
<td>5.1 lbs</td>
<td>1.1 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Bus Travel</td>
<td>0.4 lbs</td>
<td>9.1 lbs</td>
<td>0.1 lbs</td>
<td>0.1 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase 1</td>
<td>6.9 lbs</td>
<td>18.2 lbs</td>
<td>5.1 lbs</td>
<td>1.2 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 – 2016 – Whispering Oaks Business Park Build-out</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 MST 2016 Emissions</td>
<td>5.4 lbs</td>
<td>9.0 lbs</td>
<td>5.1 lbs</td>
<td>1.2 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whispering Oaks</td>
<td>52.9 lbs</td>
<td>74.8 lbs</td>
<td>56.5 lbs</td>
<td>12.6 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Phase 1– 2</td>
<td>58.3 lbs</td>
<td>83.8 lbs</td>
<td>61.6 lbs</td>
<td>13.9 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1 – 3 – 2030 – MST Facility Full Occupancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded MST</td>
<td>5.2 lbs</td>
<td>13.8 lbs</td>
<td>8.3 lbs</td>
<td>2.0 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whispering Oaks</td>
<td>30.9 lbs</td>
<td>31.1 lbs</td>
<td>56.1 lbs</td>
<td>12.2 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – Phase 1– 3</td>
<td>36.1 lbs</td>
<td>44.9 lbs</td>
<td>64.3 lbs</td>
<td>14.2 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MBUAPCD Significance Thresholds</strong></td>
<td>137 lbs</td>
<td>137 lbs</td>
<td>82 lbs*</td>
<td>No threshold**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. 2009, EMC Planning Group Inc. 2010

**Note:**
- * Applies only to onsite emissions
- ** Current State threshold for PM₂.₅ is 12 micrograms per cubic meter

Emission rates of ROG and NOX are sensitive to the year of analysis. Vehicular emissions rates are sharply decreasing as vehicles with more effective emission controls dominate the fleet mix. This will continue to be the case in the future. Build-out years for the analysis were 2013 for Phase I, 2016 for Phase I & II, and 2030 for Phase I, II, and III. The emission factors in 2030 are considerably lower than those in 2013

### Bus Emissions. The proposed MST facility would generate new bus trips that would travel near student housing located south and west of the project site. Most of the buses are diesel powered and generate emissions of diesel particulate matter. Buses would elevate diesel particulate matter concentrations along roadways serving the project site.

MST must meet the Fleet Rule for Transit Agencies (Title 13, California Code of Regulations, sections 1956.1, 2020, 2023, 2023.1 & 2023.4). As a result, the mix of buses in the MST fleet is increasingly moving away from diesel-powered. MST reported in 2004 that about 20 percent of the fleet was fueled by compressed natural gas (CNG) and the rest were diesel powered. Busses are typically replaced at between 10 and 15 years of age, and typically advances in technology and more stringent regulation result in decreases in emissions for new busses.
A screening cancer risk assessment was performed to identify the potential for significant health risks due to bus travel near student housing along Inter-Garrison Road. A screening assessment uses simplified conservative assumptions that are meant to overstate the impact. If results of a screening assessment show results that would lead to a significant impact, then refinement of the modeling is conducted to more accurately predict the effect or impact.

Inter-Garrison Road is fairly narrow with potential student housing about 50 feet from the edge of the roadway. While most of the traffic generated by the MST project would either travel east or use the Eighth Street Cut Off, about 50 percent of the buses were assumed to pass by student housing. A receptor distance of 50 feet from the edge of the roadway was modeled. The EMFAC2007 model was used to develop diesel emission rates for urban buses. Bus volumes and emission factors were input to the Caline4 model to predict diesel particulate matter concentrations. Since the diesel modeling was conducted to predict an annual concentration, the Caline4 modeling included meteorological conditions of one meter per second wind speed, Class 6 or “F” atmospheric stability and a search for the worst wind angle direction. The peak hourly bus traffic volumes were used in the modeling. The modeling assumed that 70 percent of the buses passed this sensitive receptor and all of them were diesel powered. The model predicts a one-hour concentration based on these conditions. A U.S. EPA recommended persistence factor of 0.8 was applied to the modeled concentration to predict the incremental annual increase in the diesel particulate matter concentration due to the proposed project.

The annual diesel particulate matter concentration due to the proposed project was used to calculate the incremental cancer risk due to the proposed project. A unit cancer risk factor of 318, representative of adult exposures, was used along with a four-year continuous exposure to predict cancer risk. In 2013 and 2016, the annual diesel particulate matter concentration resulting from the proposed project would be 0.05 to 0.06 micrograms per cubic meter. Students residing almost continuously at 50 feet from the road would experience an increase in cancer risk of one in one million. By 2030, MST anticipates a substantial increase in bus traffic. To provide a worst-case analysis the air quality report assumed MST’s increased bus fleet would be diesel powered in 2030, and based on this assumption, the resulting cancer was predicted to be two excess cancer cases per million. Calculations can be found in Attachment 3 of the air quality report.

The screening health risk assessment indicates the worst-case cancer risk from the proposed project would be one to two increased cancer cases per million people. The MBUAPCD guidelines identify a significant cancer risk from a proposed project as greater than 10 in one million. The project would have a less than significant impact with respect to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations or increased cancer risk due to bus trips.

The proposed project would allow MST to expand transit services regionally. The air quality benefits, in terms of overall lower emissions from the expanded services were not calculated,
since those services have not been identified. Expanded transit service would be expected to result in overall lower emissions of air pollutants that affect the region (i.e., pollutants that are precursors to ozone formation).

**Localized Concentrations of Carbon Monoxide.** Congested intersections with high volumes of traffic could cause CO hot spots, where localized high concentrations of CO occur. The highest CO level measured in the air basin is one ppm for 8-hour exposures. This is well below the state standard.

The traffic study for the proposed project identified several intersections with stop sign controls that would experience LOS E or F conditions in the future. However, these intersections would not have large enough volumes in congested movements to result in a CO hot spot. Signalized intersections affected by project traffic along Imjin Parkway and General Jim Moore Boulevard would have a combination of the highest traffic volumes and the most congestion. Dispersion modeling was conducted at the three busiest intersections to predict roadside CO concentrations.

The Caline4 model along with EMFAC2007 emission factors and project traffic projections were used to predict increases in CO levels caused by the proposed project. Background CO levels were added to the project impact to predict future hot spot CO concentrations and compare them to air quality standards.

Emission factors were calculated using the EMFAC2007 model, with default assumptions for Monterey County during winter that include a temperature of 40 degrees Fahrenheit, and slow traffic speeds of five miles per hour for all traffic movements. The high emission rate for the slow traffic speed was used regardless of the congestion to ensure a worst case scenario. Air quality models such as the one used in this analysis include the assumption that per-mile emission rates will continue to be reduced in future scenarios due to anticipated improvements in the automobile fleet; attrition of older, high-polluting vehicles; and improved fuel mixtures. As a result, emission rates in 2016 when the project is operational will be almost 50 percent lower than existing emission rates.

Peak-hour traffic and emissions factors along with screening worst-case meteorological conditions were input to the Caline4 model. The model predicted one-hour roadside CO concentrations. A persistence factor of 0.7 was used to calculate 8-hour increases to CO levels. The contribution of project-generated traffic to carbon monoxide levels was added to background level of one ppm to predict the resulting concentrations. The results of this modeling can be found in Table 7, Predicted 8-hour Worst Case Carbon Monoxide Levels.

There are 1- and 8-hour standards for carbon monoxide. The 8-hour standard is the most stringent and is always exceeded if the 1-hour standard is exceeded. Therefore, this analysis evaluated impacts against the 8-hour standard.
Table 7  \textbf{Predicted 8-hour Worst Case Carbon Monoxide Levels}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imjin Parkway/Imjin Road</td>
<td>3.4 ppm</td>
<td>3.0 ppm</td>
<td>3.0 ppm</td>
<td>2.3 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imjin Parkway/ Second Avenue</td>
<td>3.0 ppm</td>
<td>3.0 ppm</td>
<td>3.0 ppm</td>
<td>2.2 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Jim Moore Blvd./Light Fighter Drive</td>
<td>2.5 ppm</td>
<td>2.3 ppm</td>
<td>2.3 ppm</td>
<td>1.9 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0 ppm for 8-hour CAAQS and 9.0 ppm for 8-hour NAAQS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Source:} Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. 2009, EMC Planning Group Inc. 2010

The modeling indicates that existing 8-hour CO levels are currently below National and California Ambient Air Quality Standards. The 8-hour CO levels with the project in place under future conditions are predicted to remain below ambient air quality standards. The impact on local air quality resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant.

\section*{Odors}

During construction, the various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment in use onsite would create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and not likely to be noticeable for extended periods of time much beyond the project site boundaries. The potential for diesel odor impacts is therefore less than significant.

The MST project may result in localized odors as a result of maintenance activities performed at the facility. These odors are not expected to be noticeable much beyond the site boundaries. Most of the maintenance activities that would occur at MST’s facility would be located several hundred feet from the nearest active land uses. Residences are located far enough away that the odor impacts are less than significant. The Whispering Oaks Business Park is not expected to generate odors that would cause odor complaints at existing or planned land uses. Certain uses that are not specifically listed as allowed uses within the Whispering Oaks GDP may be allowable if they comply with certain restrictions, including that they do not produce undue odors. Examples of these conditionally allowed uses are sales, service and limited manufacturing of products that promote environmental sustainability, research and development uses, and businesses of light commercial/light industrial character such as carpentry and clothing manufacturing. The proposed project has a low potential to cause odor complaints. This would be a less than significant impact.
Monterey Bay Area Air Quality Management Plan

The 2008 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Area was adopted by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District in August 2008. Consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan is determined based on a project’s consistency with other regional development and transportation plans upon which the assumptions in the Air Quality Management Plan is based. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) considered the proposed project and determined that it was consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AMBAG 2010).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Significant Impact – Construction PM$_{10}$ Generation from Fugitive Dust. Construction activities, such as demolition, clearing, excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic on unpaved ground, and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate dust and particulate matter. Development of the project site would involve grading in excess of the MBUAPCD thresholds of 2.2 acres daily. This is a significant impact. The implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1. Prior to issuance of the tree removal, grading, or building permits, the applicant shall prepare a dust control plan for submittal to and approval of the Monterey County planning director.

The dust control plan shall be implemented for all construction sites when total project area under grading exceeds 2.2 acres per day. The dust control plan shall limit onsite construction emissions to 82 pounds per day. As more detailed construction information becomes available, emissions from grading activities should be reassessed to determine if the area of grading could be increased.

The following measures shall be included in the dust control plan:

1. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods. Active areas adjacent to existing businesses should be kept damp at all times. If necessary, during windy periods, watering is to occur on all days of the week regardless of onsite activities.

2. Cover all trucks hauling trucks or maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

3. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
4. Sweep daily all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

5. Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is deposited onto the adjacent roads.

6. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more).

7. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles.

8. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.

9. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

10. Suspend excavation and grading activity when hourly-average winds exceed 15 mph and visible dust clouds cannot be contained within the site.

**Monitoring Actions**

**Prior to issuance of a grading permit,** the applicant shall prepare a dust control plan in conformance with the mitigation measure, subject to the review and approval of the RMA - Planning Department.

**Prior to commencement of construction activities,** the contractor shall appoint a qualified site monitor to ensure that the dust control plan is implemented. Evidence of implementation shall be submitted to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department within three days of commencement of grading, and monthly thereafter as long as grading occurs.

**Monthly during grading and construction activities,** the contractor shall submit reports on said activities to the project proponent who shall then forward a copy to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department. Failure to submit a report shall cause all work to be stopped until the report is received by the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department.

**Potentially Significant Impact – Construction Exhaust Emission.** Construction activities would involve use of the heavy-duty off-road equipment and large trucks that use diesel fuel resulting in a cumulative contribution to emissions of diesel particulate matter in the region. This is a potentially significant impact. The implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.
Mitigation Measure

AQ-2. All off-road construction vehicles/equipment greater than 100 horsepower that will be used on site for more than one week shall: 1) be manufactured during or after 1996, and 2) shall meet the NO\textsubscript{X} emissions standard of 6.9 grams per brake-horsepower hour. Alternatively, the project shall implement a combination of the following emission reduction measures on some or all of the above described vehicles and equipment, subject to approval by the MBUAPCD:

1. Use alternative fuels (such as biodiesel blends);
2. Require diesel particulate matter filters on equipment;
3. Require diesel oxidation catalyst on equipment;
4. Install temporary electrical service whenever possible to avoid the need for independently powered equipment (e.g. compressors).
5. Enforce state required idle restrictions (e.g., post signs). Diesel equipment standing idle for more than five minutes shall be turned off. This would include trucks waiting to deliver or receive soil, aggregate or other bulk materials. Rotating drum concrete trucks may keep their engines running continuously as long as they were onsite and staged away from residential areas.
6. Properly tune and maintain equipment for low emissions.
7. Stage large diesel-powered equipment at least 100 feet from any active land uses (e.g., residences).
8. Limit the hours of operation for heavy-duty equipment to daytime periods.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall require in construction contracts that all off-road construction vehicles comply with the specifications outlined in the mitigation measure, and shall submit a report to the Planning Department showing compliance.

Prior to commencement of grading, the project proponent shall submit a written roster of equipment anticipated to be used on the project site, including fuel use information on each.

During grading and construction activities, the contractor shall keep a certified daily log of each activity performed during construction including date and photographs, as
necessary. Monthly reports shall be submitted to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department. Failure to submit a report, or failure to comply with the requirements of the mitigation measure, shall cause all work to be stopped until the report is received and approved by the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department.

**Less than Significant Impact – Operational Emissions.** According to the URBEMIS2007 analysis, the unmitigated build out of the proposed project would not exceed the MBUAPCD thresholds for ROG, NO\textsubscript{X}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5}. The air quality impacts of the proposed project in its operational phase would be less than significant.

**Less than Significant Impact – Bus Emissions on Sensitive Receptors.** The proposed project would generate new diesel bus trips that would travel along roadways serving the project site. A screening cancer risk assessment was performed to identify the potential for significant health risks due to bus travel near housing along Inter-Garrison Road. The screening health risk assessment indicates the worst-case cancer risk from the proposed project would be one to two increased cancer cases per million people. This was based on a screening assessment, so the risks are overstated. The MBUAPCD guidelines identify a significant cancer risk from a proposed project as greater than 10 in one million. As a result, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with respect to exposing sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.

**Less than Significant Impact – Carbon Monoxide Concentrations.** Modeling indicates that existing 8-hour CO levels are currently below standards. The 8-hour CO levels with the proposed project in place under future conditions are predicted to remain below ambient air quality standards and the proposed project would not result in CO hot spots. The impact on local air quality would be less than significant.

## 2.3 Biological Resources

The biological resources section is based on a review of the following reports:

- *Forest Management Plan for Monterey Salinas Transit Bus Maintenance and Operations Facility, Fort Ord, Monterey County* (“Forest Management Plan” Bill Ruskin, August 2009);

- *Forest Resource Evaluation Whispering Oaks Business Park Monterey, California* (Bill Ruskin, August 2009);

- *Preliminary Oak Woodland Habitat and Tree Removal Mitigation Strategy Plan for the MST Facility/Whispering Oaks Business Park Site* (Denise Duffy and Associates 2009);
• MST Facility/Whispering Oaks Business Park Biological Assessment (“Biological Assessment” Denise Duffy and Associates 2009);

• Memorandum to Leanne Humble, Senior Planner from Jami Davis, Assistant Environmental Scientist. (Denise Duffy and Associates December 22, 2009).

• Memorandum from Leanne Humble, Senior Planner and Jami Davis, Assistant Environmental Scientist to Henry Liang, AECOM. (Denise Duffy and Associates, April 20, 2010).

• Memorandum from Leanne Humble, Senior Planner and Jami Davis, Assistant Environmental Scientist to Henry Liang, AECOM. (Denise Duffy and Associates, June 18, 2010).

These reports are included as Appendix D.

One applicable comment letter was received in response to the Notice of Preparation. The letter submitted by CSUMB expressed a request for a vegetated buffer that maintains the native oak atmosphere of the Central and East open space portions of the school campus.

**Standards of Significance**

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project, either individually or cumulatively when viewed in connection with other projects, may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

• have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;

• have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;

• have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means;

• interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites;
conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; and/or

- conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.

**Policy and Regulatory Issues**

**Habitat Management Plan**

The Department of the Army developed the *Installation-Wide Multispecies Habitat Management Plan for Former Fort Ord, California* (HMP) (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1997), in compliance with Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), to provide for incidental take of federally-listed species as will occur with implementation of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* (Fort Ord Reuse Authority 1997).

A primary goal of the HMP is to promote preservation, enhancement and restoration of special-status plant and animal species and their habitats at former Fort Ord, while allowing economic recovery through reuse and development of the base. To achieve this goal, some parcels at former Fort Ord are designated for “Development,” with no restrictions, others are designated as “Development – with Restrictions” and have certain management guidelines or prescribed set-asides, and others are designated as habitat preserves with little or no development allowed.

The project site is located within an area designated “Development – with Restrictions” in the HMP (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1997, Figure 4-1 and page 4-46). Lands designated as “Development – with Restrictions” have management restrictions placed upon them as a result of the HMP. According to the HMP, 227 acres within the 308-acre landfill parcel must be managed as habitat area, and the remaining 81 areas are available for development with no specific restrictions provided (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1997, page 4-46). Impacts to biological resources associated with development of these areas are mitigated in the HMP through the set-aside of habitat reserve areas within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord. The Biological Opinion issued on the HMP by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS October 19, 1993) acknowledged development of these parcels, and addressed the impacts to species covered in the HMP. The USFWS Biological Opinion allows for development of these parcels with no additional mitigation required, but it also recommends identification of sensitive biological resources within these parcels that may be salvaged for use in restoration activities within reserve areas.

A Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and Implementing Agreement (IA) tiered from the HMP are currently being finalized and will be signed by the USFWS and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), respectively. Once the HCP and IA are executed, the need for further
consultation with the USFWS and CDFG and mitigation requirements for impacts to HMP resources in HMP-designated development areas, such as those affected by the proposed project, will be eliminated. However, until the HCP and IA are finalized, impacts to federal- and state-listed endangered or threatened species must be separately addressed. At the federal level, prior to approval of the HCP, under the federal ESA, an entity that authorizes or carries out an action that could affect a federally-listed species must consult or confer with USFWS to ensure that the action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of such species. Although the USFWS has signed the HMP and would not require further mitigation for projects that are in conformance with the HMP, entities without incidental take authorization would be in violation of the ESA if any of their actions result in the take of a listed species. At the state level, prior to approval of the IA, under Section 2081 of the California ESA, parties are directed to obtain authorization for “incidental-take” from the CDFG for actions that could affect state-listed species. Adoption of the HCP is not anticipated until at least mid 2011 (Jonathan Garcia, FORA, January 6, 2010).

It is important to note that the HMP includes species that are listed as “threatened” or “endangered” under the state and/or federal ESA, and also includes several species that are not listed but are considered “species of special concern” by USFWS and/or CDFG. All species addressed in the HMP are collectively known as “HMP species.” However, there are also some species that are considered “species of special concern” by USFWS and/or CDFG or that are otherwise considered sensitive, such as plant species included on California Native Plant Society special plant lists, that are not addressed in the HMP. Although these species are not protected by the state or federal ESA, they are sensitive species that need to be considered during environmental review of proposed projects. Sensitive species that are not addressed in the HMP are collectively known as “non-HMP species.”

**Fort Ord Reuse Plan**

**Program A-2.3:** The County shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a management plan that addresses; special-status species monitoring, development and maintenance of fire breaks, controlled burning as appropriate, vehicle access controls, erosion control, and regular patrol to assure that passive public use and/or unauthorized actions are not adversely affecting natural habitats. The management plan shall be submitted to the USFWS and CDFG, through the CRMP [California Resource Management and Planning] program.

**Program A-2.4:** The County shall monitor, or cause to be monitored the remaining natural areas within the parcel in accordance with the HMP Implementing/Management Agreement and submit annual monitoring reports to CRMP.
**Biological Resources Policy A-9:** The County shall encourage the preservation of small pockets of habitat and populations of HMP species within and around developed areas.

**Program A-9.1:** The County shall require project applicants who propose development in undeveloped natural lands to conduct reconnaissance-level surveys to verify the general description of resources for the parcel provided in the biological resource documents prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The information gathered through these reconnaissance-level surveys shall be submitted as a component of the project application package.

**Program A-9.2:** The County shall encourage project applicants to incorporate small pockets of habitat containing HMP species and/or habitats amidst the development, where feasible.

**Program A-9.3:** Where development will replace existing habitat which supports sensitive biological resources, the County encourage attempts to salvage some of those resources by collecting seed or cuttings of plants, transplanting vegetation, or capturing and relocating wildlife species.

**Biological Resources Policy B-2:** As site-specific planning proceeds for Polygons 8a, 16, 17a, 19a, 21a and 21b, the County shall coordinate with the Cities of Seaside and Marina, California State University, FORA and other interested entities in the designation of an oak woodland conservation area connecting the open space lands of the habitat management lands NRMA on the south, the oak woodland corridor in Polygons 17b and 11a on the east and the oak woodlands surrounding the former Fort Ord landfill in Polygon 8a on the north.

**Program B-2.1:** For lands within the jurisdictional limits of the County that are components of the designated oak woodland conservation area, the County shall ensure that those areas are managed to maintain or enhance habitat values existing at the time of base closure so that suitable habitat is available for the range of sensitive species known or expected to use those oak woodland environments. Management measures shall include, but not be limited to maintenance of a large, contiguous block of oak woodland habitat, access control, erosion control and non-native species eradication. Specific management measures should be coordinated through the CRMP.
Program B-2.2: For lands within the jurisdictional limits of the County that are components of the designated oak woodland conservation area, the County shall monitor, or cause to be monitored, those areas in conformance with the habitat management compliance monitoring protocol specified in the HMP Implementing/Management Agreement and shall submit annual monitoring reports to the CRMP.

Biological Resources Policy C-2: The County shall preserve and encourage the preservation and enhancement of oak woodland elements in the natural and built environments.

Program C-2.1: The County shall encourage clustering of development wherever possible so that contiguous stands of oak trees can be maintained in the non-developed natural land areas.

Program C-2.2: The County shall apply certain restriction for the preservation of oak and other protected trees in accordance with Chapter 16.60 of Title 16 of the Monterey County Code (Ordinance 3420).

Program C-2.3: The County shall require the use of oaks and other native plant species for project landscaping. To that end, the County shall require collection and propagation of acorns and other plant material from former Fort Ord oak woodlands to be used for restoration areas or as landscape plants material.

Program C-2.4: The County shall provide the following standards for plantings that may occur under oak trees; 1) plantings may occur within the dripline of mature trees, but only at a distance of five feet from the trunk and 2) plantings under and around oaks should be selected from the list of approved species compiled by the California Oak Foundation (see Compatible Plants Under and Around Oaks).

Program C-2.5: The County shall require that paving within the dripline of preserved oak trees be avoided wherever possible. To minimize paving impacts, the surfaces around tree trunks shall be mulched, paving materials should be used that are permeable to water, aeration vents should be installed in impervious pavement, and root zone excavation should be avoided.

Biological Resources Policy D-1. The applicant shall implement a contractor education program that instructs construction workers on the sensitivity of biological resources in the vicinity and provides specifics for certain species that may be recovered and relocated from particular development areas.
Biological Resources Policy D-2. The City shall encourage and participate in the preparation of educational materials through various media sources which describe the biological resources on the former Fort Ord, discuss the importance of the HMP and emphasize the need to maintain and manage the biological resources to maintain the uniqueness and biodiversity of the former Fort Ord.

1982 Monterey County General Plan

Goal: To preserve the diversity and conserve the extent of the County's native vegetation

Objective 7.1: Inventory, as feasible, the extent and acreages of the County's most threatened or limited plant communities, including coastal strand, wetland, riparian, and maritime chaparral; and promote conservation of these communities.

Policy 7.1.1: Development shall be carefully planned in, or adjacent to, areas containing limited or threatened plant communities, and shall provide for the conservation and maintenance of the plant communities.

Policy 7.1.2: The County shall encourage the protection of limited or threatened plant communities through dedications of permanent conservation easements and other appropriate means.

Objective 7.2: Encourage the use of drought-resistant plants for landscaping, particularly in water deficient areas.

Policy 7.2.1: Landowners and developers shall be encouraged to preserve the integrity of existing terrain and natural vegetation in visually sensitive areas such as hillsides and ridges.

Policy 7.2.2: Native and native compatible species, especially drought resistant species, shall be utilized to the extent possible in fulfilling landscaping requirements imposed as conditions of discretionary permits.

Goal: To conserve the abundance and diversity of the County's wildlife.

Objective 9.1: Promote the conservation of large, continuous expanses of native vegetation as the most suitable habitat for maintaining abundant and diverse wildlife.
Policy 9.1.1: Development shall be carefully planned in areas known to have particular value for wildlife and, where allowed, shall be located so that the reasonable value of the habitat for wildlife is maintained.

Policy 9.1.2: Development shall be carefully planned in areas having high value for fish and wildlife reproduction.

Goal: To conserve natural habitats for native plant and animal species and to promote preservation of rare and endangered plant and animal species.

Objective 11.1: Establish protective measures for areas of particular environmental sensitivity or concern.

Policy 11.1.2: The California Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted and appropriate measures shall be taken to protect Areas of Special Biological Importance.

Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan

7.2.3 (GMP): Plant materials shall be used to integrate the manmade and natural environments, to screen or soften the visual impact of new development, and to provide diversity in developed areas.

9.1.1.1 (GMP): Open space areas should include a diversity of habitats with special protection given to ecologically important zones such as areas where one habitat grades into another and areas used by wildlife for access routes to water or feeding grounds.

Monterey County Zoning Ordinance

Guidelines and permit requirements for the preservation of oak and other protected trees are outlined in Monterey County Zoning Ordinance Section 21.64.260. The tree ordinance states that no oak tree six inches or more in diameter, two feet above ground level may be removed (with a few exceptions) without approval of a permit. Additionally, no landmark oak tree shall be removed in any area except as may be approved by the planning director pursuant to Section 21.64.260D.

Section 21.64.260D.3 states:

(a) Removal of more than three protected trees on a lot in a one-year period shall require a Forest Management Plan and approval of a Use Permit by the Monterey County Planning Commission.
(b) The Forest Management Plan shall be prepared by a qualified professional forester, as selected from the County's list of Consulting Foresters. Plan preparation shall be at the applicant's expense.

(c) The Director of Planning and Building Inspection shall prescribe the format and content requirements for the Forest Management Plan and maintain a list of qualified and acceptable foresters to prepare the Forest Management Plan.

(d) All tree removal requests coming under this subsection shall be subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Tree replacement or re-location is required by Section 21.64.260.D.4:

As a consideration of the granting of a permit pursuant to subsections 2 or 3, the applicant shall be required to relocate or replace each removed protected tree on a one-to-one ratio. This requirement may be varied upon a showing that such a requirement will create a special hardship in the use of the site or such replacement would be detrimental to the long-term health and maintenance of the remaining habitat.

Granting of a Use Permit under this section requires the findings outlined in Section 21.64.260.D.5:

a. The tree removal is the minimum required under the circumstances of the case; and

b. The removal will not involve a risk of adverse environmental impacts such as:

1. Soil erosion;

2. Water Quality: The removal of the trees will not substantially lessen the ability for the natural assimilation of nutrients, chemical pollutants, heavy metals, silt and other noxious substances from ground and surface waters;

3. Ecological Impacts: The removal will not have a substantial adverse impact upon existing biological and ecological systems, climatic conditions which affect these systems, or such removal will not create conditions which may adversely affect the dynamic equilibrium of associated systems;
4. Noise Pollution: The removal will not significantly increase ambient noise levels to the degree that a nuisance is anticipated to occur;

5. Air Movement: The removal will not significantly reduce the ability of the existing vegetation to reduce wind velocities to the degree that a nuisance is anticipated to occur;

6. Wildlife Habitat: The removal will not significantly reduce available habitat for wildlife existence and reproduction or result in the immigration of wildlife from adjacent or associated ecosystems; or

c. The tree is diseased, injured, in danger of falling too close to existing or proposed structures, creates unsafe vision clearance, or is likely to promote the spread of insects of disease.

State and Federal Protective Policies for Plants, Animals and Habitats

**Threatened and Endangered Species.** Several species of plants and animals within the state of California have low populations, limited distributions, or both. Such species may be considered rare, and are vulnerable to extinction as the state's human population grows and the habitats these species occupy are converted to urban uses. State and federal laws have provided the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the United States Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) with a mechanism for conserving and protecting the diversity of plant and animal species native to California. A sizable number of native plants and animals have been formally designated as threatened or endangered under state and federal endangered species legislation. Others have been designated as candidates for such listing. Still others have been designated as species of special concern by the CDFG. The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) has developed its own lists of native plants considered rare, threatened, or endangered (CNPS 2001).

Species listed as threatened or endangered under provisions of the state and federal endangered species acts, candidate species for such listing, state species of special concern, and some plants listed as endangered by CNPS are collectively referred to as special-status species. Permits may be required from both the CDFG and USFWS if activities associated with a proposed project will result in the “take” of a listed species or their habitat. Under the federal Endangered Species Act, the definition of “take” is to “harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.” USFWS has also interpreted the definition of “harm” to include significant habitat modification that could result in take. Pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and Section 2081 of the Fish and Game Code, an incidental take permit from the CDFG is required for projects that could result
in the take of a state-listed Threatened or Endangered species. Under CESA, “take” is defined as an activity that would directly or indirectly kill an individual of a species, but the definition does not include “harm” or “harass,” as the federal act does. As a result, the threshold for a take under the CESA is higher than that under the federal Endangered Species Act. Both agencies review CEQA documents for adequacy regarding endangered species issues and to make project-specific recommendations for the conservation of special status species.

In addition to the state and federal endangered species acts, CEQA limits activities that may have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife USFWS. For additional CEQA Guidelines, please see the Standards of Significance section, above.

Migratory Birds. State and federal law also protect most birds. The Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (FMBTA: 16 U.S.C., sec. 703, Supp. I, 1989) prohibit killing, possessing, or trading in migratory birds, except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. This act encompasses whole birds, parts of birds, bird nests, and eggs.

Birds of Prey. Birds of prey are protected in California under provisions of the State Fish and Game Code, Section 3503.5, 1992. This section states that it is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the order Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds of prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto. Disturbance that causes nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort, such as construction during the breeding season, is considered a take by the CDFG.

Senate Bill 1334 – Oak Woodlands Conservation Act. Effective January 1, 2005, County governments statewide must comply with Senate Bill 1334 (SB 1334), which requires mitigation for projects with significant oak woodland impacts. A project must conform to both the state’s mandated program that established habitat mitigation standards, as well as local conservation measures adopted by Monterey County.

Existing Conditions

Project Site Vegetation Communities

The project site is located adjacent to a developed portion of the former Fort Ord, with the former landfill to the north, Inter-Garrison Road to the south, CSUMB housing to the east, and limited vegetation to the west. The site is contiguous to significant natural vegetation only on the
south, to the south of Inter-Garrison Road (Refer to Figure 3 Project Vicinity Existing Conditions, presented in Section 1.0 Introduction). Development on the project site includes small abandoned buildings, gravel roads and dirt trails, and gas and electrical transmission lines. The majority of the project site (approximately 37.45 acres) is covered with coast live oak trees. Four habitat types were identified within the area proposed for development: annual grassland, coast live oak woodland, maritime chaparral, and ruderal areas. There are no wetlands or water courses located on or adjacent to the project site. Figure 18, Habitat Map, presents the various habitats within the project site. The acreage of each habitat type is shown in Table 8, Acreages of Habitat Types by Development Area.

Table 8  Acreages of Habitat Types by Development Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat Type</th>
<th>MST Parcel (acres)</th>
<th>Lots 2-11 (acres)</th>
<th>Lots 12-16 (acres)</th>
<th>Road Corridor (acres)</th>
<th>Gas Line (acres)</th>
<th>Totals (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coast Live Oak Woodland</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Grassland</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruderal</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Maritime Chaparral</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:  Denise Duffy and Associates, Inc. 2009 and 2010

Note: Additional habitat would be disturbed in association with off-site drainage improvements.

In addition to areas within the project boundary, an off-site extension from the project site westward along Engineer’s Equipment Road has been included as part of the project. This area encompasses approximately 1,000 feet of the linear roadway with a total right-of-way width of 72 feet. Engineer’s Equipment Road is a paved roadway with central maritime chaparral and oak woodland habitats bordering both sides.

Of the habitat types identified above, one habitat type, central maritime chaparral, is identified as a sensitive habitat on the California Natural Diversity Database’s working list of high priority and rare natural communities. On the MST parcel, the maritime chaparral habitat is very dense and approximately four to six feet high. The maritime chaparral habitat within the area of Lots 2-11 is somewhat shorter, approximately two to five feet high, and less dense with large sandy patches between the shrubs.
Off-site Vegetative Communities

The proposed project includes potential drainage or street improvements at several off-site locations.

**Engineer’s Equipment Road and Gas Line Realignment.** This is an existing paved road, approximately 20 feet wide, extending off the project site to the west. At Phase 2 of project development, this road is proposed to be widened to accommodate increased traffic volumes. The area surrounding the road, including the area of the proposed gas line realignment, is primarily central maritime chaparral. Central maritime chaparral is identified as a sensitive habitat on the California Natural Diversity Database’s working list of high priority and rare natural communities.

**Off-site Drainage Alternative 1.** This alternative includes two ponds located at the southeast corner of Inter-Garrison Road and Seventh Avenue and related conduit along the edge of Inter-Garrison Road. The pond site is currently a parking lot and has no biological value.

**Off-site Drainage Alternative 2.** Three existing ponds or depressions south of Inter-Garrison Road and near Eighth Avenue would be used for storm water detention. Short connecting conduits for additional diversion may be required. The southern and middle ponds are in an area predominated by oak woodland, although a considerable amount of ice plant is also growing in these areas. The northern pond is located between Eighth Avenue and existing development and covered in ice plant.

**Off-site Drainage Alternative 3.** This proposed pond would be developed south of the project site and Inter-Garrison Road in an open grassy meadow within an area of oak woodland. The connecting pipe would run through an area of oak woodland.

**Special-Status Species within the Project Area**

Data from the USFWS, CDFG, and CNPS were reviewed to determine the potential for any special-status species to occur within the project vicinity. Special-status species include species listed by the USFWS as threatened or endangered, USFWS candidates for listing as threatened or endangered, species designated as “Species of Concern” by USFWS, species listed by the CDFG as threatened, endangered, or designated as “Species of Special Concern,” and species included on California Native Plant Society Lists 1A, 1B, 2, 3, or 4. The project site and adjacent areas were evaluated for the presence or potential presence of a variety of special-status plant species (refer to Appendix A of the Biological Assessment).
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Plants. Special status plants generally occur in relatively undisturbed areas and are largely found within unique vegetation communities and/or habitats. Surveys were conducted in April, June, and July of 2009 during the typical blooming periods of special status plant species known to occur in the project vicinity. Follow up surveys of Engineer's Equipment Road and vicinity were conducted in December 2009 and June 2010. Monterey spineflower and sand gilia, both federally listed species, and sandmat manzanita and Monterey ceanothus, both state listed species, were identified within the development area and adjacent areas along and near Engineer's Equipment Road.

Wildlife. Potential habitat for the California tiger salamander was identified during the site surveys. This species is federally listed and is also proposed for state listing. In addition, habitat for the following state listed species was identified within the development area: Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, American badger, Monterey ornate shrew, white-tailed kite, nesting raptors, California legless lizard, and coast horned lizard. These species are discussed in more detail in the Biological Assessment.

Protected Trees

Coast live oak woodland is the dominant habitat type, composing approximately 67 percent of the project site (approximately 37.4 acres). The oak woodland on the project site is comprised primarily of coast live oak trees with an understory of ice plant, poison oak, and non-native grasses, and varies between dense, closed canopy to fairly open, almost oak-savannah habitat. Guidelines and permit requirements for the preservation of oak and other protected trees are outlined in Monterey County Zoning Ordinance Title 21, Section 21.64.260 and Chapter 16.60 of Title 16 of the Monterey County Code (Ordinance 3420). Removal of more than three protected trees on a lot in a one-year period requires preparation of a forest management plan and approval of a Use Permit by the Monterey County Planning Commission. A forest management plan has been prepared for the proposed MST facility project (Bill Ruskin 2009). A forest resources evaluation has been prepared for the Whispering Oaks Business Park (Bill Ruskin 2009).

Existing Project Site Habitat Conservation Areas

A portion of the area that comprises proposed Parcel C was set aside in a memorandum of agreement between the County, FORA, and Cypress Marina Heights LP to mitigate loss of sand gilia at the Marina Heights residential project to the north of Imjin Road. This area is part of the 227 acres within the landfill parcel that are required to be set aside for habitat conservation in the HMP.
**Project Analysis**

The proposed project would convert existing undeveloped land to commercial and industrial uses. The proposed project would result in the removal and/or disturbance of vegetation and wildlife habitat.

**Conservation Easements**

The proposed project would establish conservation easements on the 48.91-acre Parcel C and on the 8.71-acre Parcel D at the eastern end of the project site, adjacent to open space at the former landfill. Preservation of this habitat area is consistent with *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* Biological Resources Policy B-2, the HCP, and the Marina Height memorandum of agreement.

**Special-Status Plant Species**

The proposed project would result in the removal or disturbance to Monterey spineflower, sand gilia, sandmat manzanita, and Monterey ceanothus.

**Monterey Spineflower.** Monterey spineflower typically occurs on open sandy or gravelly soils on relic dunes in coastal dune, coastal scrub, and maritime chaparral habitats, though it can also be associated with cismontane woodlands and valley and foothill grasslands, within a range of 3-450 meters in elevation. There are 20 recorded observations of this species within the project vicinity, including an occurrence that covers the entire project site. This species was identified throughout the project site during the focused special-status plant survey and adjacent to the northwest corner of the MST Parcel where the gas line realignment would occur as shown in *Figure 19, Rare Plant Map* and described in the biological resources reports in Appendix D.

**Sand Gilia.** Sand gilia is typically found in sandy openings of maritime chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal dune and coastal scrub habitats within the range of 0-45 meters in elevation. There are 28 recorded observations of this species within the project vicinity. This species has been identified within the area of Lots 2-11 and immediately adjacent to the northwest corner of the MST Parcel where the gas line realignment would occur as shown in *Figure 19, Rare Plant Map* and described in the biological resources reports in Appendix D.

**Sandmat Manzanita.** Sandmat manzanita is typically found associated with openings in chaparral, coastal scrub, closed cone coniferous forest, coastal dunes, and cismontane woodland habitats on sandy soils at elevations up to 205 meters above sea level. There are 12 recorded observations of this species in the project vicinity quadrangles reviewed, including an occurrence that is shown as covering the entire project site. This species was identified throughout the project site during the focused special-status plant surveys conducted for the Biological Assessment, as presented in *Figure 19, Rare Plant Map*. 
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**Monterey Ceanothus.** Monterey ceanothus is typically associated with closed cone coniferous forests, chaparral, and coastal scrub on sandy soils at elevations between 3-550 meters. There were no recorded observations of this species documented in the database search; however it is known to occur throughout Fort Ord. Monterey ceanothus was identified immediately adjacent to the northwest corner of the MST Parcel, outside of the project boundaries, during the focused special-status plant surveys conducted for the Biological Assessment, as presented in Figure 19, Rare Plant Map.

**Special-Status Wildlife Species and Protected Habitat**

The proposed project would potentially result in the loss or disturbance of habitat for California tiger salamander, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, American badger, Monterey ornate shrew, white-tailed kite, nesting raptors, California legless lizard, and coast horned lizard.

**Central Maritime Chaparral.** Grading and construction activities associated with the project would require the removal of central maritime chaparral, a sensitive habitat designated by the CDFG.

**California Tiger Salamander.** California tiger salamander typically utilizes annual grassland habitat, but can also occur in the grassy understory of valley-foothill hardwood and chaparral habitats and uncommonly along stream courses in valley-foothill riparian habitats. Breeding habitat primarily consists of vernal pools and other temporary rainwater ponds. There are 39 recorded observations of California tiger salamander within the project vicinity, the nearest of which is approximately one mile north of the project site. The nearest documented breeding location is also approximately one mile away. The area proposed for Lots 12-16 lies within two kilometers (1.24 miles) of the breeding site, which is the current accepted dispersal range for this species. Therefore, California tiger salamander only has the potential to occur within proposed Lots 12-16, but is not expected to occur within the remainder of the project site or road corridor.

**Monterey Dusky-footed Woodrat.** Monterey dusky-footed woodrat relies on duff accumulated within oak woodlands to build nests and native understory plants for cover. Woodrat abundance is limited by the availability of duff. Disturbance and/or removal of coast live oak woodland on the project site, including trimming or removal of oak trees, disturbance or removal of understory plants associated with the oak woodland, and removal of accumulating duff, could result in the loss of habitat for Monterey dusky-footed woodrat.

**Monterey Ornate Shrew.** Monterey shrew is typically found utilizing moist or riparian habitat with a thick duff layer. The project site does not support any riparian habitat suitable for Monterey shrew, however moist areas found on the site does provide some marginal habitat. There is a low potential for the Monterey ornate shrew to occur with the chaparral, grassland, and oak woodland habitats on the project site.
American Badger. There are eight recorded observations of American badger within the project vicinity, the nearest of which is located approximately 0.25 mile from the project site and annual grassland habitat on the project site provides suitable habitat for this species.

White-tailed Kite and Nesting Raptors. Trees in and adjacent to the project site contain potential nesting habitat for raptors. Disturbance and/or removal of trees on the project site could result in the loss of nest sites, if active nests are present during construction.

California Legless Lizard and Coast Horned Lizard. There are 36 recorded observations of California legless lizard within the project vicinity; one is located approximately two miles north of the project site and a second occurrence is located approximately two miles northeast of the project site. This species may use any of the habitats present within the project boundary. There are five recorded observations of coast horned lizard within the project vicinity, the nearest of which is approximately 0.5 mile north of the project site, and this species is known to occur throughout the former Fort Ord. Appropriate habitat for this species is present in the annual grassland, maritime chaparral, and ruderal habitats within the project boundary.

Protected Trees

The project site is heavily forested with the dominant species being coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*). Forest Management Plans were prepared for the MST and Whispering Oaks Business Park sites to assess the health of the trees proposed for retention and removal, and to estimate the size class and number of trees to be removed. Table 9, MST Site Tree Removal and Retention Estimates, shows the number of trees to be retained or removed by size class.

### Table 9 Tree Removal and Retention Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coast Live Oak Tree Diameter (inches)</th>
<th>6-11”</th>
<th>12-23”</th>
<th>24+”</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bill Ruskin 2009

Oak Woodlands. The proposed project includes the removal of approximately 37.4 acres of oak woodland. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR estimated that about 1,584 acres of oak woodland would be lost within the former Fort Ord, out of a total of about 5,000 acres (FORA 1997b, page 4-175). The Fort Ord Reuse Plan and the Fort Ord HMP set aside about 17,000 acres of habitat area, about 1,800 acres of which is oak woodland, in recognition that oak woodland and other habitat would be lost on some of the parcels designated by the Fort Ord Reuse Plan for development.
SB 1334 requires mitigation for projects with significant oak woodland impacts. The proposed project must conform to both the state’s mandated program that established habitat mitigation standards, as well as local conservation measures adopted by Monterey County. To determine an appropriate mitigation strategy, MST has prepared the following document: *Preliminary Oak Woodland Habitat and Tree Removal Mitigation Strategy Plan for the MST Facility/Whispering Oaks Business Park Site* (Denise Duffy & Associates, Inc. 2009).

**Invasive Species**

The proposed project could result in establishment of additional invasive, non-native plant species, which often appear after grading and construction activities, thereby displacing native species and precluding them from becoming established. At least three invasive species, including ice plant (*Carpobrotus edulis*), kikuyu grass (*Pennisetum clandestinum*), and one species listed as ‘high” risk, pampas grass (*Cortaderia jubata*), currently occur on the project site.

**Wildlife Movement**

Wildlife corridors provide connectivity between habitat areas, enhancing species richness and diversity. Impacts from development, such as habitat fragmentation and/or isolation, as well as the creation of impassable barriers can cause a significant impact to wildlife corridors. The proposed project is within the allowable development acreage for the landfill parcel, and impacts to HMP species and habitats occurring within the project site were anticipated and mitigated through the establishment of habitat reserves and corridors, and assignment of management requirements for other parcels on former Fort Ord. This parcel has not been identified as a wildlife corridor and impacts to wildlife movement are expected to be minimal.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Potentially Significant Impact: Sand Gilia and Monterey Ceanothus.** Sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus occur immediately adjacent to the northwest corner of the MST parcel outside of project boundaries where road improvements and gas line realignment would occur. These species are both CNPS List 1B and HMP species. Sand gilia is also a federal endangered and state threatened species. Impacts to the sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus outside of the proposed development area may occur as a result of construction activities. Sand gilia also occurs within the area of Lots 2-11. Impacts could include elimination of the entire population during vegetation removal, grading, and other ground-disturbing construction activities. Other protected plant species may occur along Engineer’s Equipment Road and at off-site basin locations. These are considered potentially significant impacts. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
Mitigation Measures

BIO-1. For the MST project: The sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus shall be flagged for avoidance and included in the offsite maritime chaparral area fenced for avoidance, as described in Mitigation Measure BIO-13.

BIO-2. For Lots 2-11: The County of Monterey has consulted with the CDFG regarding the potential for take of sand gilia within the entire landfill site, including the Lots 2-11, and the agencies have agreed upon an acceptable mitigation strategy for the proposed impacts. Under this mitigation strategy, none of the project site would need to be preserved or restored, and the site could be developed in its entirety. However, the County has not obtained a permit for incidental take of sand gilia on the landfill parcel, including the project site, at this time. Therefore, no vegetation removal, grading, or other ground-disturbing construction activities that may result in take of the sand gilia populations within Lots 2-11 shall occur prior to the issuance of a Section 2081 permit.

BIO-3. For the extension of Engineer’s Equipment Road; gas line realignment; and off-site drainage basins east of Eighth Avenue: Prior to ground disturbance activities, surveys for Monterey spineflower, sand gilia, coast wallflower, and Kellogg’s horkelia will occur during the blooming period in spring. Additional surveys for Seaside bird’s beak and Yadon’s rein orchid will occur during the blooming period in the summer. If individuals of this species are found, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted to determine the appropriate course of action. If removal of the species cannot be avoided, authorization for take will be obtained and any loss will be mitigated in habitat replacement and enhancement areas at a minimum of a 3:1 replacement ratio. A habitat restoration plan shall be prepared to identify the exact amount and location of impacted habitat, identify the appropriate location for replacement or restoration habitat, and provide specifications for installation, maintenance, and monitoring of the replacement habitat. The use of locally-obtained native species shall be specified in the habitat restoration plan, as appropriate.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to Ground Disturbance at Lots 2-11, a Section 2081 permit shall be obtained from the CDFG to allow for disturbance in areas known to support sand gilia.

Prior to Ground Disturbance resulting from the extension of Engineer’s Equipment Road or gas line realignment, surveys for Monterey spineflower, sand gilia, coast wallflower, and Kellogg’s horkelia shall occur during the blooming period in spring. Additional surveys for Seaside bird’s beak and Yadon’s rein orchid shall occur during the blooming period in the summer. If individuals of this species are found, the United States
Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game shall be consulted to determine the appropriate course of action. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA Planning Department.

Prior to Construction of Lots 2-11, the extension of Engineer’s Equipment Road, or gas line realignment, sand gilia and Monterey ceanothus shall be flagged for avoidance and included in the offsite maritime chaparral area fenced for avoidance. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA Planning Department.

**Potentially Significant Impact: California Tiger Salamander.** This species only has a high potential to occur within the habitat types located in the proposed Lots 12-16. This is because Lots 12-16 are located within 1.24 miles of a breeding population, which is considered to be a distance that California tiger salamander could cover to breed and/or forage for resources. The other areas of the project site are deemed too geographically distance from the breeding population to be suitable habitat. This species is listed as federally threatened, a state candidate species and a state species of special concern. Impacts to this species may include loss of habitat and direct mortality of individuals as a result of vegetation removal, grading, and other ground-disturbing activities. This would be considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

BIO-4. For Lots 12-16: Prior to the initiation of any ground-disturbing activities, including vegetation removal and grading, the applicant shall comply with one of the following three approaches:

1. Conduct protocol surveys to determine the presence or absence of California tiger salamander within Lots 12-16. Protocol surveys conducted in compliance with the protocols outlined in the /Interim Guidance on Site Assessment and Field Surveys for Determining Presence or a Negative Finding of the California Tiger Salamander /(USFWS October 2003). Two consecutive years of upland drift fence studies are required. Fencing arrays shall be installed and approved by USFWS prior to October 15 of each survey year. Surveys shall continue until individuals are found or the criteria for a Negative Finding are met. If individuals are found, either approach 2 or 3 shall be implemented;

2. If the presence of California tiger salamander is documented or the applicant chooses to assume the species is present, the project shall comply with the ESA and CESA and obtain Incidental Take Authorization from the USFWS and
CDFG for the loss of California tiger salamander individuals and upland habitat associated with construction and operation of the project; or

3. Following adoption of the Fort Ord HCP and issuance of base-wide federal and state incidental take permits, all applicable conditions of the HCP shall be followed and individual incidental take permits are not required.

**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to Ground Disturbance within Lots 12-16, the applicant shall provide evidence to the RMA – Planning Department that criteria for a Negative Finding have been met, or that the requirements of the ESA or HCP will be implemented.

During construction within Lots 12-16, the applicant shall contract with a qualified biologist to provide reports for submittal to the RMA – Planning Department as may be required by conditions of the Incidental Take Permit or Fort Ord HCP.

**Potentially Significant Impact: Monterey Dusky-footed Woodrat, American Badger, White-tailed Kite, Nesting Raptors, and Coast Horned Lizard.** Construction activities within the project site may result in impacts to special status wildlife species, including the Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, American badger, white-tailed kite and other nesting raptors, and coast horned lizard. Impacts to these species may include direct mortality of individuals, destruction of nests or dens, and loss of habitat as a result of vegetation removal and grading. These are considered significant impacts. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

BIO-5. For all development areas: prior to construction activities, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to monitor construction. The biological monitor shall conduct an Employee Education Program for the construction crew. The biologist shall meet with the construction crew at the project site at the onset of construction to educate the construction crew on the following:

- A review of the project boundaries;
- All special-status species that may be present, their habitat, and proper identification;
- The specific mitigation measures and success criteria that will be incorporated into the construction effort (Measures BIO-6 through BIO-9);
- The general provisions and protections afforded by the USFWS and CDFG; and
- The proper procedures if a special-status animal is encountered within the project site.

**BIO-6.** For all development areas: The biological monitor shall be onsite during initial grading and vegetation removal activities to protect any special-status species encountered. The qualified biologist shall identify and explain the protection methods during the Employer Education Program as described in Mitigation Measure 5. These methods could include, but are not limited to, stopping work in the area where the animal is encountered until it has moved on its own outside of the project site or moving individuals outside of the project site to adjacent appropriate habitat.

**BIO-7.** For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, project proponents shall retain a qualified, CDFG-approved biologist to conduct pre-construction surveys within three days prior to construction for woodrat nests within the project area and in a buffer zone 100 feet out from the limit of disturbance. All woodrat nests shall be flagged for avoidance of direct construction impacts, where feasible. Any active nests that will not be in areas of grading or vegetation removal will be avoided and protected during project activities with a minimum 25-foot buffer. Nests that cannot be avoided shall be manually deconstructed prior to land clearing activities to allow animals to escape harm and to reestablish territories for the next breeding season. Nests shall be dismantled during the non-breeding season, between October 1 and December 31. Dismantling shall be done by hand, allowing any animals to escape either along existing woodrat trails or toward other available habitat. If a litter of young is found or suspected, nest material shall be replaced, and the nest left alone for two to three weeks before rechecking the nest to verify that young are capable of independent survival before proceeding with nest dismantling.

**BIO-8.** For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the American badger, project proponents shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct focused pre-construction surveys for badger dens in all areas proposed for construction, ground disturbance, or staging no more than two weeks prior to construction. If no potential badger dens are present, no further mitigation is required. If potential dens are observed, the following measures are required to avoid potential significant impacts to the American badger:

- If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens are inactive, the biologist shall excavate these dens by hand with a shovel to prevent badgers from re-using them during construction.
If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens may be active, the entrances of the dens shall be blocked with soil, sticks, and debris for three to five days to discourage the use of these dens prior to project disturbance. The den entrances shall be blocked to an incrementally greater degree over the three to five day period. After the qualified biologist determines that badgers have stopped using active dens within the project boundary, the dens shall be hand-excavated with a shovel to prevent re-use during construction.

BIO-9. For all development areas: To avoid and reduce impacts to the white-tailed kite and other nesting raptors, construction activities can be timed to avoid the nesting season period. Specifically, tree removal can be scheduled after September 1 and before January 31 to avoid impacts to these species. Alternatively, if avoidance of the nesting period is not feasible, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for nesting raptors within 300 feet of proposed construction activities if construction is to be initiated between February 1 and August 31. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to the start of construction. If nesting raptors are identified during the pre-construction surveys, the CDFG shall be contacted and an appropriate no-disturbance buffer imposed within which no construction activities or disturbance shall take place (generally 300 feet in all directions for raptors) until the young of the year have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival, as determined by a qualified biologist and the CDFG.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to Construction, a CDFG-approved biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys within three days prior to construction for woodrat nests within the project area and in a buffer zone 100 feet out from the limit of disturbance. All woodrat nests shall be flagged for avoidance of direct construction impacts, where feasible. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA Planning Department.

Prior to Construction, if construction cannot be timed outside of the nesting period, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for nesting raptors within 300 feet of proposed construction activities if construction. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA Planning Department.

Prior to Construction, the biological monitor shall conduct an Employee Education Program for the construction crew. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA Planning Department.
During initial grading and vegetation removal activities, the biological monitor shall be onsite to stop work or move individual species outside of the work area. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA Planning Department.

**Significant Impact: Coast Live Oak Woodland.** Coast live oak trees and oak woodland habitat are protected under Monterey County Zoning Ordinance Title 21, Chapter 16.60 of Title 16 of the Monterey County Code (Ordinance 3420), Section 21.64.60, PRC 21083.4, and the Oak Woodland Management Act. Approximately 37.4 acres of coast live oak woodland would be removed as a result of construction activities. This is considered a significant impact. Additionally, off-site drainage improvements could occur in locations with oak trees, and construction of these improvements could result in the loss or disturbance of oak trees. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

The Reuse Plan EIR determined the impacts to oak woodland as a result of redevelopment of the former Fort Ord are less than significant due to the establishment of the base-wide conservation area and the habitat preservation and management of these spaces in perpetuity as required by the HMP. The project site is within a parcel designated as “development with reserve areas or restrictions” in the HMP, which allows for development of approximately 81 acres of the 309 acre landfill parcel. The project site is within the allowable development area, and therefore the project is consistent with the HMP and the associated impact analysis of the Base Reuse Plan EIR. These base-wide conservation easements combined with the proposed on-site easements also satisfy Alternative 1 of PRC 21083.4 with the required payment of FORA development fees, a portion of which goes to management of the open space.

In addition, establishment of an on-site conservation easement on the 8.71-acre Parcel D has been proposed by the project applicant, and implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level in coordination with the conditions set forth in the tree removal permit.

**Mitigation Measures**

BIO-10. The applicant shall comply with the measures included in the Forest Management Plans that were prepared for the MST and Whispering Oaks Business Park sites. The Forest Management Plans include measures to avoid tree removal and/or transplant trees whenever possible as well as suitable mitigation ratios and planting areas. If off-site improvements result in disturbance to oak trees, the provisions of the MST Forest Management Plan shall apply to that off-site location. In addition, a program shall be established for the applicant to submit a special fee to FORA to fund tree replacement elsewhere within Fort Ord.
BIO-11. For both projects: The appropriate strategy for compliance, as identified in the Preliminary Oak Woodland Habitat and Tree Removal Mitigation Strategy Plan for the MST Facility/Whispering Oaks Business Park (Denise Duffy & Associates, Inc., 2009) for this project is as follows:

- The maximum amount of native oak trees as feasible for screening and habitat purposes shall be retained in coordination with a qualified arborist.
- Construction best management practices (as identified in the appropriate FMP) to protect retained trees and trees adjacent to the project site shall be implemented.

BIO-12. Two, five, and eight years following mitigation plantings, the applicant shall arrange for a qualified arborist to inspect replacement tree plantings following project completion. Any trees that have died or are in poor condition in the judgment of the arborist shall be replaced and inspected on a two, five and eight year schedule beginning with the next inspection on the original schedule, and with the same replacement location requirements.

**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to Construction, construction supervisors shall review the Forest Management Plans to identify and prepare for mitigation directed at tree avoidance and tree protection during construction.

During Construction, a qualified arborist shall be consulted as necessary regarding the best removal, protection, transplanting, planting and irrigation methods as construction proceeds.

Two, five, and eight years following mitigation plantings, the applicant shall arrange for a qualified arborist to inspect replacement tree plantings following project completion. Reports documenting compliance with mitigation requirements shall be submitted to Monterey County RMA Planning Department.

**Potentially Significant Impact: Central Maritime Chaparral.** Central maritime chaparral occurs immediately adjacent to the MST Parcel where the gas line realignment would be constructed, within proposed Lots 2-11, along the off-site section of Engineer’s Equipment Road, and may occur within the area of the alternative drainage improvements. Central maritime chaparral is designated as a sensitive habitat on the California Natural Diversity Database’s working list of high priority and rare natural communities. Impacts to central maritime chaparral habitat outside of the proposed development area may occur as a result of construction activities. This is considered a potentially significant impact. Habitat set-aside completed throughout the former Fort Ord in accordance with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and the
Fort Ord HMP, establishment of on-site conservation easements over half the project site as proposed by the project applicant, implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-3, and implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

BIO-13. For the MST project, gas line realignment, Lots 2-11, Engineer’s Equipment Road, and off-site drainage improvements: The maritime chaparral vegetation immediately adjacent to the construction area shall be protected during construction. This includes the use of exclusionary fencing of herbaceous and shrubby vegetation, such as hay bales and protective wood barriers for trees. Only certified weed-free straw shall be used to avoid the introduction of non-native, invasive species. A biological monitor shall supervise the installation of protective fencing. The monitor shall remain on-site during the initial grading activities and vegetation removal. After these activities are completed, the biological monitor shall check at least once per week until the construction is complete that the protective fencing remains intact and that all construction work is maintained within the limits of construction.

**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to Construction, maritime chaparral vegetation shall be protected using a suitable barrier.

During Construction, after initial grading and vegetation removal activities are completed, the biological monitor shall check that the protective fencing remains intact and that all construction work is maintained within the limits of construction at least once per week until the construction is complete.

During Construction, standard erosion control techniques to minimize erosion and sedimentation to native vegetation shall be utilized in consultation with a qualified hydrologist, engineer, or erosion control specialist.

### 2.4 Geology and Soils

The information contained within this section is based on data from the 1982 *Monterey County General Plan*, the *Soil Survey of Monterey County* (United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service 1978), and the *Geotechnical Report Monterey-Salinas Transit Bus Maintenance*
Standards of Significance

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving
  - rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault;
  - strong seismic ground shaking;
  - seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction; or
  - landslides;
- Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;
- Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse;
- Be located on an expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the current Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.

Policy and Regulatory Issues

1982 Monterey County General Plan

Goal: To minimize loss of life, injury, damage to property, and economic and social dislocations resulting from seismic and other geologic hazards.

Objective 15.1. Reduce the risks resulting from earthquakes to an acceptable level by regulating the type, density, location, and/or design and construction of development in seismic hazard areas.
Policy 15.1.6 Prior to the construction of a new public facility or critical structure within a high hazard zone, the County shall require a full geological investigation by a registered geologist.

Policy 15.1.10 All structures and private utility lines shall be designed and constructed to conform to the standards of the latest adopted Uniform Building Code.

Policy 15.1.12 The County shall require grading permits to have an approved site plan which minimizes grading and conforms to the recommendations of a detailed soils or geology investigation where required.

Policy 15.1.13 The County shall require septic leachfields and drainage plans to direct runoff and drainage away from unstable slopes.

Fort Ord Reuse Plan

Objective A: Prevent the loss and transport of soil resulting from wind and water erosion and promote construction practices that recognize soils with development limitations.

Soils and Geology Policy A-2: The County shall require developers to prepare and implement erosion control and landscape plans for projects that involve high erosion risk. Each plan shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer or certified professional in the field of erosion and sediment control and shall be subject to the approval of the public works director for the County of Monterey. The erosion component of the plan must at least meet the requirements of Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) required by the California State Water Resources Control Board.

Soils and Geology Policy A-4: The County shall continue to enforce the Uniform Building Code to minimize erosion and slope instability problems.

Soils and Geology Policy A-5: Before issuing a grading permit, the County shall require that geotechnical reports be prepared for developments proposed on soils that have limitations as substrates for construction or engineering purposes, including limitations concerning slope and soils that have piping, low-strength, and shrink-swell potential.
The County shall require that engineering and design techniques be recommended and implemented to address these limitations.

**Environmental Setting**

**Regional Geology and Faulting**

The project site is situated within the Salinian block of the California Coast Ranges. This tectonic area is characterized by a northwest-trending basement of granitic and high-grade metamorphic rocks, and is overlain by Tertiary- and Quaternary-age sedimentary rocks. The landward portion of the Salinian block is bounded on the northeast by the San Andreas fault and on the southwest by the Sur-Nacimiento fault, which separates the Cretaceous-aged granite-metamorphic rocks from the older Jurassic-Cretaceous Franciscan rocks outside the block. Offshore, the Salinian block is bounded by the north-northwest trending San Gregorio-Hosgri fault zone.

Within the Salinian block the project site is located in the Salinas Valley, which is bound on the southwest by the northwest trending Rinconada/Reliz/King City fault system. Those faults generally have a steep, southwest to near vertical dip and a right-lateral oblique sense of movement. The mapped fault splay is concealed by alluvial sediments.

The San Gregorio and Monterey Bay fault zones, both seismically active, trend southeastward. The San Gregorio fault zone is at least 130 kilometers (km) long and may extend northwestward from Big Sur for about 190 km to join the San Andreas fault at Bolinas. The Monterey Bay fault zone abuts the San Gregorio fault zone in the northwestern portion of Monterey Bay and consists of a discontinuous series of en echelon faults. Individual faults of that zone continue onshore into the Monterey/Seaside area. Those faults generally are thought to have a right-lateral sense of movement.

The Salinas Valley contains several thousand feet of Tertiary sediments in the faulted southwestern margin. The sediments rise and thin to the northeast, where basement granite is exposed in the Gabilan Range. Surficial sediments in the vicinity of the project area consist of older, stabilized dune and drift sand (Qos). The late Pleistocene coastal dunes consist of weakly consolidated fine- to medium-grained sand ranging in thickness from two to 25 meters (m) (Fugro West, page 5).

**Field Exploration**

The field exploration of the MST site was conducted by Fugro West on March 11 and 12, 2009. The exploration consisted of 11 cone penetrometer test (CPT) soundings to depths of
approximately 50 to 75 feet below ground surface (bgs); 16 hollow-stem-auger drill holes to depths ranging from approximately 10 to 50 feet bgs; and eight exploratory backhoe test pits to a maximum depth of about 13.5 feet bgs.

At the time the field exploration was performed, locations of the proposed structures and facilities were preliminary and access to the western portion of the MST site for exploration equipment was significantly limited because of existing dense brush and vegetation. Explorations within the eastern portions of the MST site were located in a general grid-type layout. Exploration locations in that area were generally limited to the existing roads. Supplemental exploration of the MST site may be required depending on the final layout of the proposed structures and facilities, as well as site specific exploration at the lots within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.

The approximate locations of the subsurface explorations are shown on Plate 3 of the geotechnical report. Laboratory testing was performed on selected samples obtained from the field exploration (Fugro West, page 3). The CPT, drill hole, and test pit logs summarizing the soil conditions encountered in the field explorations are provided in Appendix A of the geotechnical report, and the results of laboratory tests performed on selected soil samples are provided in Appendix B of the report.

The soils encountered at the site included artificial fill, which consists of aggregate base overlying about two feet of granular fill, and older stabilized dune and drift sand (Qos), which consists of silty sand (SM) to fine- to medium-grained sand (SP) with minor amounts of silt (SP-SM).

Based on the subsurface conditions encountered, seismic hazard analyses were performed as a basis for estimating ground motion parameters for the design of the structures, and to assess the potential for liquefaction or seismic settlement to impact the MST site (Fugro West, page 9).

Percolation tests were performed on March 9, 2009 in two of the test pits created during the field exploration. The result are generally typical of well-drained, sandy soil, with the recorded percolation rates ranging from about one- and one-half to three minutes per inch (Fugro West, page 7). Groundwater was encountered in one drill hole, DH-11, at a depth of approximately 46 feet bgs. Groundwater was not encountered in any of the other holes drilled for the field exploration. The groundwater level in this area of the Salinas Basin is reportedly generally below sea level (Fugro West, page 9). The project site is approximately 205 to 250 feet above mean sea level (Fugro West, page 1).
Soil Characteristics

Soils constraints are summarized in the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan (Monterey County, 1982). Soil constraints considered in determining suitability include slope, depth to bedrock, soil strength, shrink-swell potential, and the presence of groundwater. Categories of soil constraints are rated as low, moderate, and high. Soils in areas with a low constraint rating are favorable for most land uses and any limitations can be easily overcome. Soils with moderate constraints have properties which render them unfavorable for specified uses, but in such cases limitations can usually be overcome by special planning and design. Areas with soils given a high constraint rating have soil properties which are so unfavorable or difficult to overcome that a major increase in construction effort, special design, or intensive maintenance is required. The project site is identified as having low constraints (Monterey County 1982, page 6).

The project site topography is characterized by irregular terrain. The site slightly descends gently to the northwest, with surface elevations ranging by about 50 feet across the project site. According to the Soil Survey of Monterey County, the project site a majority of the project site is located on Oceano loamy sand, two to 15 percent slopes (OaD), with small part of the northern portion of the site located on Baywood sand, two to 15 percent slopes (Bbc). Runoff rate in these areas is medium, the erosion hazard is slight to moderate, and the shrink-swell potential is low.

Seismicity

The project site lies within a region with active seismic faults, and is therefore subject to risk of hazards associated with earthquakes. Seismic activity poses two primary and secondary types of hazards. Primary hazards include ground rupture, ground shaking, ground displacement, and subsidence and uplift from earth movement. Primary hazards can induce secondary hazards including ground failure (lurch cracking, lateral spreading, and slope failure), liquefaction, water waves (tsunamis and seiches), and movement on nearby faults (sympathetic fault movement), dam failure, and fires (Monterey County 1982, page S-20). Most loss of life and injuries that occur during an earthquake are related to the collapse of buildings and structures due to ground shaking. According to the Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR, the project site is in a moderately high seismic hazard zone (Figure 4.6-3).

No known active faults are located within the project boundary and no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning has been established by the State of California in the project vicinity. Consequently, the potential for primary surface rupture due to faulting on the project site is considered to be low (Fugro West, page 12). Significant faults within a 62-miles radius of the site include 17 active and potentially active mapped faults and fault segments. The closest fault to the site is the Rincondad fault located approximately two miles north of the project site from the site. The Monterey Bay - Turlarcitos fault is approximately six miles from the project site.
Mapping by the California Department of Mining and Geology shows an inferred splay or trace of the King City fault, which is considered a part of the Rinconada system, about 4,000 feet north-northeast of the project site (Fugro West, page 6). Both the Rinconada and Monterey Bay–Turlacitos faults are considered by the California Geologic Survey fault model as Type B seismic sources. After a review of the subsurface conditions encountered in the field exploration, the Fugro West report concluded that the soil profile type for the MST site (and likely the entire project site) could be classified as a Site Class D, “SD”, or stiff soil (Fugro West, page 9).

**Ground Failure**

Ground-surface disturbance or ground failure is a phenomenon associated with seismic shaking. Ground failure can occur as subsidence, liquefaction, lateral ground spreading, or dynamic compaction. Ground oscillation can be observed as buckled pavements, curbs, broken pipelines, etc.

**Subsidence.** Subsidence is the gradual lowering of the ground surface with little or no horizontal motion. Subsidence results from settlement over small or large areas as the consequence of compaction or loss of subsurface materials. The exception is tectonic subsidence, which occurs suddenly and is the compaction of soils due to ground shaking during earthquakes. Subsidence is usually the result of groundwater, gas, or oil extraction, and hydro-compaction or the oxidation of organic soils. Hydroconsolidation, or collapse, is a geologic hazard where soil materials undergo a decrease in volume (settlement) when the materials become saturated either through environmental changes, irrigation, pipe breaks or leaks, or other factors. Hydroconsolidation potential at the project site is considered low (Fugro West, page 13).

**Liquefaction.** Liquefaction occurs primarily in areas of recently deposited sands and silts and in areas of high groundwater levels. Liquefaction involves a sudden loss in strength of a saturated, cohesionless soil caused by shock or strain, such as an earthquake, and resulting in the temporary transformation of the soil into a fluid mass. If the liquefying layer is near the surface, the effects are much like that of quicksand. If the liquefying layer is in the subsurface, it may provide a sliding surface for the material above it. Liquefaction typically occurs in areas where groundwater is less than 30 feet bgs, and where the soils are composed predominantly of poorly consolidated fine sand. Groundwater was encountered in only one drill hole at a depth of approximately 46 feet bgs The potential for liquefaction at the project site is very low (Fugro West, page 12).

**Lateral Spreading.** Lateral spreading movement may occur when a soil mass slides laterally on liquefied soil layers, moving downslope or toward a free face. The magnitude of lateral spreading movements has been correlated with earthquake magnitude, distance between the site and the seismic event, thickness of the liquefied layer, ground slope or ratio of free-face height to
distance between the free-face and structure, fines content, and average particle size of the material comprising the liquefied layer. The potential for lateral spreading at the project site is considered to be very low and does not represent a geologic hazard (Fugro West, page 12).

**Seismic Settlement Dry Sands.** Seismically-induced settlement can occur during earthquake shaking in sandy soils that are loose to medium dense and above the water table. Seismically induced settlement differs from settlement resulting from liquefaction of saturated granular materials. The materials encountered in the field explorations ranged from loose to very dense sand, sand with silt, and silty sand. The loose to medium-dense granular materials on the project site may be susceptible to seismic settlement. The potential magnitude of seismically induced settlement at the project site is estimated to be about one- to one-and-one-half inches (Fugro West, page 13).

**Landslides.** The project site lacks high or steep slopes and the risk of landslides is low.

**Erosion Hazard and Unstable Soils**

Erosion is a natural process caused by wind, water, or gravitational forces, which can result in soil removal or erosion of soil from a site. The primary geological effects of erosion are loss of topsoil, rut formation, and potential destabilization of slopes. Subsequent deposition to another site is sedimentation. According to the geotechnical report, project site slopes composed of cohesionless dune sand materials may be subject to erosion and surficial instability (Fugro West, page 13).

**Expansive Soils**

Expansive soils are susceptible to expansion or contraction as moisture content changes. Expansive soils swell when wet and shrink when dry, which can damage buildings that are not designed properly. Clay soils are especially prone to shrink or swell due to their high water holding capacity and elastic qualities. The soils encountered in the field explorations generally consisted of poorly graded sand, poorly graded sand with silt, and silty sand. The Oceano and Baywood soils under the project site have a low shrink-swell potential. On the basis of visual classification and laboratory test data, the on-site soils are considered to have a very low expansion potential (Fugro West, page 26).

**Project Analysis**

Only geology and soils issues that may result in significant impacts are discussed in this section.
Seismic Ground Shaking

The project site is located in a seismically-active region. A major earthquake along either the Rinconada or King City fault has the greatest potential to generate major ground shaking and could result in structural damage to future development within the project site. Because the project site is not located within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Zone, and because no known active or potentially active faults are believed to exist on or trend toward the project site, the potential for primary ground surface rupture due to faulting is considered to be low (Fugro West, page 12).

Based on the seismic design parameters calculated by the United State Geologic Survey Hazard Calculations and per the 2007 California Building Code Section 16.13A.5.6, structures of Occupancy Category I, II, III, and IV should be designed according to Seismic Design Category “D”. The Fugro West report concludes that the known seismicity of the project site, along with the Soil Profile Type of Site Class D, “Sd”, or stiff soil, could result in seismically induced hazards for the proposed project.

Seismic Settlement Dry Sands

During the field exploration, the material encountered in the project site ranged from loose to very dense sand, sand with silt, and silty sand. The loose to medium dense granular materials may be susceptible to seismic settlement. The potential magnitude of seismically induced settlement at the project site is estimated to be about one- to –one and one-half inches (Fugro West, page 13). Future development on the project site may be at risk due to the seismically-induced settlement of the soil.

Erosion Hazard and Unstable Soils

The project site is located on cohesionless dune sand materials and may be subject to erosion and surficial instability (Fugro West, page 13). During grading and construction activities, when soils are loosened and bare of vegetation, the risk of erosion could be increased over normal circumstances. Future development on the project site may be at risk due to the instability of the soil.

The proposed project would alter drainage patterns, including the potential consolidation or redirection of existing storm water flows. Water flowing out of these outfalls could result in erosion.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potentially Significant Impact – Seismic Ground Shaking. The known seismicity of the project site, coupled with the project site soils profile type described in the Fugro West report, may
result in seismically-induced hazards for the proposed project. This is a potentially significant impact. The implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

GEO-1. All future development within the project site shall be designed using the parameters for code-based design listed in the Fugro West report and shall be designed in accordance with the requirements for Seismic Design Category “D.”

**Monitoring Action**

Prior to approval of grading, improvement or building plans, the applicant shall design all development using the parameters for code-based design listed in the Fugro West report and according to Seismic Design Category “D”.

**Potentially Significant Impact – Soil Instability and Seismic Settlement.** The project site is located on cohesionless dune sand materials and may be subject to surficial instability and seismically-induced settlement. Future development on the project site may be at risk due to the instability of the soil. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

GEO-2. All future development within the project site shall be designed consistent with the latest edition of the California Building Code as adopted by Monterey County and its related seismic standards, as well as any additional standards required as standard conditions of approval by the County of Monterey. Future development on the MST site shall incorporate all recommendations from the geotechnical report, and if necessary, a supplemental exploration may be required depending on the final layout of the proposed structures and facilities. A geotechnical report shall be required prior to development on any lot within the Whispering Oaks Business Park. Final improvement plans and building plans shall be based on recommendations in the geotechnical report, and subject to review and approval of Monterey County prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. A geotechnical report may be prepared to apply to more than one lot.
Monitoring Actions

Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, prepare a geotechnical report to inform design and engineering for development within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.

Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, design all development within the project site to be consistent with the latest edition of the California Building Code as adopted by Monterey County and its related seismic standard, and well as any additional standards required as standard conditions of approval by the County of Monterey.

Potentially Significant Impact – Soil Erosion. Although the project site soils have a moderate erosion risk, during construction, when soils are disturbed or bare, the erosion hazard would increase. New storm drainage outfalls could result in increased or concentrated storm water flows that could cause erosion. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

GEO-3. Each applicant shall prepare an erosion control plan consistent with the requirements of Monterey County Code Chapter 16.12 prior to approval of tree removal, grading, or building permits. All erosion control measures required by the approved erosion control plan shall be in place until work is completed. Grading, excavating, and other activities that involve substantial soil disturbance shall be planned and carried out in consultation with a qualified hydrologist, engineer, or erosion control specialist, and shall utilize standard erosion control techniques to minimize erosion and sedimentation to native vegetation. Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, permanent erosion control measures shall be in place and approved by the Resource Management Agency. An erosion control plan may be prepared to apply to more than one lot or for related projects at different sites.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of permits for tree removal, grading, or other on-site or off-site improvements, a qualified engineer shall prepare an erosion control plan, including but not limited to the methods outlined in the mitigation measure. The erosion control plan shall be submitted to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department for review and approval, based on conformance with the methods outlined in the mitigation measure.

Monthly between October 15 and April 15, the contractor shall submit a letter report and/or photographs from a qualified soils engineer to the Monterey County RMA -
Planning Department documenting the ongoing maintenance and the condition of the erosion control fencing and other erosion control measures. The Monterey County RMA - Planning Department shall review the reports for conformance with the methods outlined in the mitigation measure. Failure to submit a report showing that the proposed project is in conformance with the methods outlined in the mitigation measure shall cause all work to be stopped until conformance is confirmed and the report is received by the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department. The project proponent shall be responsible for correcting any violations immediately. Frequency of the reporting may be decreased at the discretion of the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department if there is no active grading.

Prior to sign-off on a grading permit, the project proponent shall demonstrate to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department that the applicable provisions of the approved landscape, re-vegetation, and erosion control plans have been implemented. The report shall briefly explain why measures not employed are not necessary or applicable.

Prior to issuance of each occupancy permit, the project proponent shall submit to Monterey County Building Inspection Department a certified report from a qualified soils engineer regarding how each post-construction erosion control measure has been implemented at the subject lot.

2.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The information contained within this section is based on data from the 1982 Monterey County General Plan and the Fort Ord Reuse Plan (1992). The 2005 Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) was also prepared to assess the suitability of transfer for parcels at the former Fort Ord, as well as documents relating to the remediation of the former landfill. An abridged copy of the FOST is presented in Appendix F.

Standards of Significance

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;

- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;

- For a project located within an airport land-use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public-use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;

- Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; or

- Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including wildlands area adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

**Policy and Regulatory Issues**

**Federal Legislation**


**California Legislation**

The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) works in conjunction with United States Environmental Protection Agency to enforce and implement specific legislation and regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes. California legislation for which the DTSC has primary enforcement authority includes the Hazardous Waste Control Act and the Hazardous Substance Account Act. Most state hazardous waste regulations are contained in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. The DTSC generally acts as the lead agency for soil and groundwater
cleanup projects, and establishes cleanup and action levels for subsurface contamination that are equal to, or more restrictive than, federal levels.

The California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA) is responsible for promulgating a range of state and federal regulations relating to environmental protection and hazardous materials.

**Monterey County Department of Environmental Health – Local Regulatory Agency**

The Monterey County Department of Environmental Health is designated by the Cal EPA as a Certified Unified Program Agency. As a Certified Unified Program Agency, the Monterey County Department of Environmental Health is responsible, at the local level, for the administrative requirements, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities of six state level environmental and emergency response programs, including those that relate specifically to public safety and hazardous materials. These activities are codified in Title 19 - Public Safety and Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations, and in Chapter 6.95, Article 1 of the California Health and Safety Code. In its role as a Certified Unified Program Agency, the Monterey County Department of Environmental Health administers several programs designed to implement these regulations. The programs include the following:

- Hazardous Material Business Plan and Inventory Program;
- Hazardous Waste Generator Program;
- Hazardous Waste Onsite Treatment: Tiered Permitting Program;
- Underground Storage Tank Program;
- California Accidental Release Prevention Program (Cal-ARP); and
- Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Program.

As a fundamental component of several of these programs, facilities which generate any quantity of hazardous waste or which handle hazardous materials in amounts greater than 55 gallons for liquids, 500 pounds for solids, and/or 200 cubic feet for compressed gases must prepare a Business Response Plan. Business Response Plans must include specific information on hazardous materials handled (inventory), emergency contacts, notification procedures, evacuation plans, training procedures and a site map. Facilities which handle extremely hazardous (regulated materials) may also be required to prepare a Risk Management Plan. A Risk Management Plan must addresses several issues including types of substances handled, accidental release and chemical-specific prevention, accident history, emergency response
program, etc. Business Response Plan’s and Risk Management Plans are among the fundamental reporting tools used by the Monterey County Department of Environmental Health to track and monitor the activities of facilities which are subject to the regulations noted previously.

**Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority**

In 1997, the Salinas Valley Solid Waste Authority (SVSWA) was formed as a joint powers authority with a membership comprised of Monterey County and the cities of Salinas, Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, and King City. Section 18 of the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), entitled “Land Use Restrictions,” requires member agencies that have jurisdiction over land within 2,500 feet of active and closed landfills located within the boundaries of SVSWA to adopt an ordinance establishing land use restrictions on properties within 2,500 feet of the landfills. Under the JPA requirements, the ordinance must, among other requirements, prohibit the issuance of a building permit for a residential structure within, specifically, 2,500 feet of an active landfill and require a conditional use permit for any residential, commercial office or industrial use within, specifically, 2,500 feet of a closed landfill. The purpose of the ordinance required by Section 18 would be to minimize incompatible land uses and conflicts that may arise between a landfill facility and surrounding land uses. Section 18 further requires that, if a member agency does not adopt the required ordinance, it must indemnify the SVSWA and hold it harmless from any claim or lawsuit initiated by an owner or occupant of property located within 2,500 feet of a landfill for damages related to the operation of the landfill.

In April 2007, pursuant to Section 18 of the JPA, the County released and circulated for public review a draft ordinance and associated initial study and proposed mitigated negative declaration. During public workshops, the overwhelming public viewpoint was that the required 2,500 foot buffer zone of land use restrictions was excessive. Offsite migration of landfill gas and waterborne contaminants from landfills has been well-documented in waste management literature up to 1,000 feet. State and local regulations are commonly based on an assumption that landfill gas may migrate up to 1,000 feet from a landfill facility. The County did not adopt the landfill buffer ordinance.

On October 16, 2008, the Board of Directors of the SVSWA adopted a resolution to amend the JPA to delete Section 18 (SVSWA Resolution No. 2008-49). On April 6, 2010 the Monterey County Board of Supervisors approved a resolution giving its approval for the elimination of Section 18.
Hazardous Materials Oversight

Waste regulated by the federal government under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act is known as "RCRA waste;" waste regulated by California law alone is known as "non-RCRA" or "California-only" waste. All hazardous waste in California is regulated under state statutes and regulations. A business generating more than one kilogram of RCRA acutely hazardous waste per month or more than 100 kilograms of other RCRA waste per month must have a federal ID number.

The Monterey County Environmental Health Division is designated as the local Certified Unified Program Agency, and administers state and federal hazardous waste laws locally. Facilities that generate any amount of a hazardous waste, including waste oil and solvents that are recycled, must complete and submit a Business Response Plan and an inventory of their hazardous wastes. Business Response Plans must include specific information on hazardous wastes generated (inventory), emergency contacts, notification procedures, evacuation plans, training procedures and a site map. Entities that generate, transport or offer for transport, treat, store, or dispose of non-RCRA hazardous waste generally must have an identification number, issued by the Department of Toxic Substances Control, which is used to identify the hazardous waste handler and to track the waste from its point of origin to its final disposal ("from cradle to grave").

Propane and fuel transport is also regulated by the U.S. Department of Transportation. Storage and handling of significant quantities of hazardous materials is also regulated by the Occupational Safety and Hazards Administration.

1982 Monterey County General Plan

**Goal.** To minimize the risks from fire.

**Policy 17.2.3.** The County shall develop a procedure to inform potential developers of the requirements for development in high and very high fire hazard areas. This information should be made available through the County Building Inspector.

**Policy 17.3.1.** In no case shall a roadway be less than 12-feet wide. Determination of the width of an all-weather surface shall be made at the time of subdivision approval. Further, the County shall revise its subdivision ordinance to address road standards including minimum width, height clearance, gradient and materials; these standards shall pertain to all new development. Minimum road widths of all new driveways, roads and streets shall be designed, constructed and maintained according to adopted County Standards (Appendix D: Standard Detail, 1977).
**Policy 17.3.3** The County shall encourage all new development to be located within the response time of 15 minutes from the fire station responsible for serving the parcel. If this is not possible, on-site fire protection systems (such as fire breaks, fire-retardant building materials, and/or water storage tanks) approved by the fire jurisdiction must be installed or development may only take place at the lowest density allowed for the parcel by the General Plan.

**Policy 17.3.4** The County shall require all new development to have adequate water available for fire suppression. Water availability can be provided from a conventional water system; from an approved alternative water system if within 300 feet of a habitable structure; by the fire fighting equipment of the fire district within which the property is located; or by an individual water storage facility--water tank, swimming pool, etc.--on the property itself. The fire and planning departments shall determine the adequacy and location of individual water storage to be provided.

**Policy 17.3.5** Water systems constructed, extended or modified to serve a new land use or a change in land use or an intensification of land use shall be designed to meet, in addition to the average daily demand, the standards shown in Table 2 [fire suppression storage], subject only to changes authorized pursuant to Policy Number 17.4.2.

**Policy 17.4.1** All residential, commercial, and industrial structural development (not including accessory uses) in high and very high fire hazard areas shall incorporate recommendations by the local fire district before a building permit can be issued.

**Policy 17.4.2** Every building, structure and/or development shall be constructed to meet, at minimum, the requirements specified in Volume I of the current edition of the Uniform Building Code [now the California Building Code], Fire Hazards Policy 17.3.5, and Table 2 of this general plan. The chief of the fire agency having jurisdiction may recommend to the appropriate decision-making authority a variation of the general plan fire hazard policies and Table 2 (but not U.B.C. [CBC] standards) for such development where, in his opinion, the fire safety of the County and adjoining and nearby properties and improvements is not materially impaired by such variation.

**Policy 17.4.7** The County shall require all subdivisions, multi-unit residential complexes, and commercial and industrial complexes to
obtain, prior to permit approval, a statement from the fire department that adequate structural fire protection is available within minimum response time established by this Plan.

**Objective 18.1** Reduce the level of risk from hazardous chemicals to an acceptable level by regulating the storage of hazardous chemicals.

**Fort Ord Reuse Plan**

**Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Policy A-1:** The County shall monitor and report to the public all progress made on the RA-ROD [remedial action record of decision].

**Program A-1.3:** All construction plans for projects in the City/County shall be reviewed by the Presidio of Monterey, Directorate of Environmental and Natural Resources Management (DENR), to determine if construction is planned within known or potential OE areas unless an alternative mechanism is approved by the City/County and DENR.

**Program A-1.4:** Before construction activities commence on any element of the proposed project, all supervisors and crews shall attend an Army sponsored OE safety briefing. This briefing will identify the variety of OE that are expected to exist on the installation and the actions to be taken if a suspicious item is discovered.

**Objective B:** Protect and ensure public safety during the remediation of hazardous and toxic materials sites on Fort Ord including clearance, treatment, transport, disposal, and/or closure of such sites containing ordnance and explosives, landfill, above and below ground storage facilities, and buildings with asbestos and/or lead base paint.

**Hazardous and Toxic Materials Safety Policy B-2:** The County shall monitor implementation procedures of the RA-ROD and work cooperatively with the U. S. Army and all contractors and future users/operators of landfill or hazardous materials storage sites at the former Fort Ord.

**Program B-2.2:** The County shall review and make public its review of administrative covenants on remediation of landfills or hazardous materials storage to ensure that remediation activities related to landfill
closure and hazardous materials storage are complete and in compliance with all applicable regulations, that liability responsibilities are identified to entities intending to use these landfills, and that such uses are consistent with the administrative covenants and all post closure activities.

**Recreation Program E-1.3:** The County of Monterey shall work with and support the Army to investigate clean-up of the Recreation/HMP District in the CSUMB/Recreation Planning Area (Polygon 8a). This area is proposed to be used for remediation and reuse research, habitat management, open space/recreation (including an equestrian center, a golf course opportunity site, and an amphitheater), and a convenience center. This proposed use is subject to capping of the landfill and remediation of groundwater beneath it. A minimum of 120 acres will require mitigation by the Army. The polygon is considered for an annexation request by the City of Marina. Drainage, slumping, toxic fumes or gases associated with old landfill need to be considered.

**Environmental Setting**

**Hazards Associated with Past Land Uses**

**Landfill Superfund Site.** According to the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*, Fort Ord was added to the “Superfund” National Priorities List of Hazardous Waste Sites in 1990, and the identification, remediation, and disposal of hazardous waste associated with Superfund cleanup process of Fort Ord takes place under the General Facilities Agreement. The Army has been responsible for conducting the Superfund cleanup process, and the U.S. EPA is the lead agency for regulatory enforcement and oversight of Superfund activities. The Army is also responsible for characterizing and removing unexploded ordnance on the former Fort Ord (FORA 1997a, page 441). Hazardous and toxic waste materials and sites at the former Fort Ord consist of a wide variety of materials including: industrial chemicals, petrochemicals, domestic and industrial wastes (landfills), asbestos and lead paint in buildings, above- and underground storage units, and ordnance and explosives, including unexploded ordnance.

*Fort Ord Reuse Plan* Figure 4.6-3 shows the locations of hazardous and toxic waste sites. Although it is adjacent to (and was a part of) the landfill parcel, the project site is not identified as a hazardous or toxic waste site, and the project site does not contain any known hazardous materials sites as reported on any of the reviewed federal or state databases.
The now closed landfill, located directly to the northeast of the project site, is identified in *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* Figure 4.6-3 as a hazardous and/or toxic waste site (FORA 1997a, page 443). In 1988, the landfill was identified as a former disposal area and was noted as a source of groundwater contamination. The landfill was operated from 1960 until 1987 and may have received a small amount of chemical waste along with household and commercial refuse. A second smaller landfill was located north of Imjin Parkway and was in use from 1956 to 1965 (U.S. EPA 1994).

In July 2005, the Army prepared a FOST to document the environmental suitability of certain parcels at the former Fort Ord for transfer to other agencies. A copy of the FOST can be found in Appendix F. The Army made a determination of the environmental condition of the parcels by reviewing existing environmental and military munitions response-related documents and by conducting visual site inspections. Based on this review and site inspections parcels were placed in one of seven categories, and only parcels in categories 1 through 4 are deemed suitable for transfer. The project site (Parcel E8a.1.1.2) is classified as a Category 4 Parcel (U.S. Army 2005, page 3). The FOST states that hazardous substances were released on portions of the former Fort Ord in excess of reportable quantities and the release of these hazardous substances affected the project site (U.S. Army 2005, page 11).

At this time, all hazardous substances storage operations have been terminated on the former Fort Ord, and the impacted sites have been remediated as part of the Installation Restoration Program in compliance with CERCLA (U.S. Army 2005, page 11). Remediation included reburying of some landfill materials, placement of an impermeable cap, and extraction and treatment of contaminated groundwater. A screening risk evaluation concluded that adverse health effects are unlikely to occur and that no further action is required (U.S. Army 2005, page 11). A buffer zone with a minimum width of 1,000 feet has been established around the actual former disposal area and no portion of the project site is located over former disposal areas. *Figure 20, Landfill Buffer Location*, shows the location of the landfill and the landfill buffer in relation to the project site. Uses such as residential and day cares, with which frequent or long-term exposure to soils or off-gassing may occur, are not permitted within the buffer area. The proposed project uses are allowed within the buffer. An extraction, treatment, and monitoring system for methane off-gassing is in place (U.S. Army 2005, 2006).

**Munitions and Explosives.** According to Reuse Plan FEIR Figure 4.6-4 the project site is not located within a known area of unexploded ordnances or in an area that has the potential for unexploded ordnances. Four incidental pieces of ordnance or other explosives, not associated with training activities, have been found within the larger landfill area (U.S. Army 2006).
Landfill Buffer Locations
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Airport and School Land Use Compatibility

The project site is not located within an airport land-use plan area. The Marina Municipal Airport, formerly known as the Fritzsche Army Airfield is located approximately two miles to the northeast of the project site, outside the area of influence. No other private or public airfields are located within two miles of the project site.

The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of a planned or existing elementary or secondary school. The project site is adjacent to land owned by CSUMB and University of California and Golden Gate University is within 300 feet of the project site.

Fire Hazards

According to Fort Ord Reuse Plan Figure 4.6-2 of the, portions of the project site are located in a fire hazard zone. The project site is largely surrounded by oak woodland and chaparral, which could be subject to wildlands fires.

Project Analysis

Use of Hazardous Materials

Many of the uses proposed as part of the project are not sensitive in nature and would not result in a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, the proposed MST facility would use and transport hazardous materials, and several of the allowable uses within the Whispering Oaks Business Park could also involve the transport or use of hazardous materials. Manufacturers, tradesmen, printers, and other similar uses would likely use inks and paints, resins, adhesives, solvents, lubricants, and other potentially hazardous materials. Some of these materials involve elevated fire or explosive risks. In addition, manufacturing processes could result in potentially hazardous dust, vapors, or fumes. A propane distributor could be located on the project site and would transport and store propane cylinders. The MST facility would require the transport and use of fuel for the bus fueling station, and would also involve the transport and use of various vehicle maintenance fluids.

The transport and use of these materials is carefully regulated by several government agencies. The MST site plan is designed to place the fueling station and hazardous waste storage areas at the opposite side of the project site from the proposed residences at CSUMB, about 800 feet distant. Most of the openings in the maintenance building face away from these proposed residences. The site arrangement minimizes the potential that escaping fumes or other chemical hazards, or an explosion involving any of these materials would adversely affect the nearest sensitive receptors.
The nearest lot at the Whispering Oaks Business Park is about 1,000 feet distant from the CSUMB housing to the east of the project site. In conjunction with government regulation of the use and transport of hazardous materials, this separation would provide an adequate level of safety for residents.

**Effects of Existing Hazardous Materials**

The project site is located on the former Fort Ord and is adjacent to an inactive landfill. In the past, hazardous materials were released on portions of the project site, including the contamination of groundwater from the adjacent landfill. According to the 2005 FOST prepared for several parcels at the former Fort Ord, all hazardous substances storage operations have been terminated on the former Fort Ord, and the impacted sites have been remediated as part of the Installation Restoration Program in compliance with CERCLA (U.S. Army 2005, page 11). Remedial actions have been undertaken at the abandoned landfill and a screening risk evaluation concluded that adverse health effects are unlikely to occur due to the landfill and that no further action is required (U.S. Army 2005, page 11).

Although the project site was never used for munitions or explosives training, the past discovery of isolated munitions and explosives confirms that munitions and explosives could potentially be discovered during construction work on the project site.

**Airport and School Land Use Compatibility**

The Whispering Oaks GDP limits buildings heights to a maximum of 35 feet and the MST GDP limits buildings heights to 60 feet for the administrative building, 40 feet for all other main buildings, and 30 feet for accessory buildings. The project site is not subject to height restrictions related to air operations. Therefore, the proposed buildings would not interfere with air traffic in the area and would not result in a safety hazard for air traffic or people working in the project vicinity.

Hazardous materials would be used at the MST site, within one-quarter mile of the CSUMB, University of California, and Golden Gate University campuses. Hazardous materials supplies, including gasoline, diesel, and volatile fluids could be transported through or past these facilities.

**Fire Hazards**

The proposed project would be located in areas of high fire hazard according to the 1982 Monterey County General Plan. Several factors would reduce the risk of wildfire upon construction of the proposed project. The proposed project includes the removal of many of the trees that currently contribute to fire hazard conditions at the project site. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan
anticipates the development of some areas adjacent to the project site (primarily to the west), which would reduce the risk of wildfires adjacent to the project site. Engineer’s Equipment Road would be widened and would provide a fire break to the north of the project site. Inter-Garrison Road provides a fire break to the south. The proposed project would be constructed to comply with the California Building Code and Wildlands Intermix Fire Code and would comply with all County policies pertaining to fire safety, including setbacks to natural vegetation. The Wildlands Intermix Fire Code establishes requirements for fire resistive construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Potentially Significant Impact – Hazardous Materials Transport and Use.** The proposed project would involve the transport and handling of a variety of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials, including solvents, propane, and vehicle fuel. The transport and use of these materials is carefully regulated by several government agencies. The MST site plan places the fueling station and hazardous waste storage areas at the opposite side of the project site from the proposed residences at CSUMB minimizes the potential for adverse effects at the nearest sensitive receptors. Transport of hazardous materials could occur adjacent to or through the CSUMB, University of California, or Golden Gate University campuses, and could expose students at these facilities to risks resulting from a spill or accident. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

H-1. As part of its Business Response Plan, MST shall develop a designated transport route for hazardous waste deliveries and removal, subject to the review and approval of the Monterey County Environmental Health Department.

**Monitoring Action**

Prior to occupancy of the MST facility, the applicant shall submit to Monterey County Building Inspection Department an approved Business Response Plan.

**Less than Significant Impact – Hazards Associated with the Adjacent Landfill.** The proposed project is located adjacent to an abandoned landfill, and a portion of the project site is within the 1,000-foot landfill buffer. In the past, hazardous materials were released on portions of the project site from the landfill, including groundwater contamination, however remedial actions have been undertaken and it has been concluded that no adverse health effects are likely to occur.
due to the adjacent landfill. Methane off-gasses from the landfill, but this is monitored and maintained within acceptable levels. The uses proposed are acceptable within the landfill buffer. The impact would be less than significant.

**Potentially Significant Impact – Munitions and Explosives.** Although the project site was not used for military training exercises, the potential exists to discover isolated munitions or explosives during tree removal and grading operations. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

H-2. Construction supervisors and crews shall attend a U.S. Army sponsored munitions and explosives safety briefing prior to commencement of construction. This briefing shall identify the variety of munitions and explosives that are known to exist on the former Fort Ord and the actions to be taken if a suspicious item is discovered. This requirement for briefing shall be included in construction documents.

**Monitoring Actions**

**Prior to the start of construction,** construction supervisors and crews shall attend a U.S. Army sponsored munitions and explosives safety briefing.

**Prior to the start of construction,** construction supervisors shall submit an evidence letter to the Monterey County RMA - Planning Department.

**Less than Significant Impact – Risk from Wildfire Hazard.** The project site is located in an area of high fire hazard. Many of the trees that comprise the existing on-site fire hazard would be removed as part of the proposed project, which would reduce the fire risk. Future adjacent development, and compliance with fire code requirements, including the Wildlands Intermix Fire Code, would also reduce the potential for wildlands fires to affect the proposed project. The impact would be less than significant.

### 2.6 Hydrology and Water Quality

and the *Water Supply Assessment Provisions of SB 610 Monterey-Salinas Transit – Whispering Oaks Business Park Project* that was prepared by Carollo Engineers in January 2010.

**Standards of Significance**

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements;
- substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of a stream or river;
- substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-site or off-site;
- create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;
- place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows; or
- substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level.

In accordance with Monterey County General Plan policies, a project may have a significant effect, either individually or cumulatively when viewed in connection with other projects, if it would:

- increase the net deficit of a groundwater aquifer; or
- generate a water demand exceeding or adversely impacting the safe, long-term yield of the local aquifer per Monterey County Code section 20.144.070.E.11.

**Policy and Regulatory Issues**

**Federal Clean Water Act and State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act**

Water quality objectives for all waters in the State of California are established under applicable provisions of Section 303 of the Federal Clean Water Act and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Central
Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) are responsible for assuring implementation and compliance with the provisions of Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

**National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System**

The EPA has published regulations establishing storm water permit application requirements under the Clean Water Act. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program controls and reduces pollutants to water bodies from point and non-point discharges. Projects that disturb more than one acre of land during construction are required to file a notice of intent to be covered under the State NPDES General Construction Permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activities. The NPDES construction permit requires implementing both construction and post construction phase storm water pollution best management practices. The State NPDES General Construction Permit requires development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that uses storm water “Best Management Practices” to control runoff, erosion, and sedimentation from the site both during and after construction. The SWPPP has two major objectives: (1) to help identify the sources of sediments and other pollutants that affect the quality of storm water discharges; and (2) to describe and ensure the implementation of practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in storm water discharges.

**Fort Ord Reuse Plan**

**Hydrology and Water Quality Objective A:** Protect and preserve watersheds and recharge areas, particularly those critical for the replenishment of aquifers.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Policy A-1:** At the project approval stage, the County shall require new development to demonstrate that all measures will be taken to ensure that runoff is minimized and infiltration maximized in groundwater recharge areas.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Program A-1.1:** The County shall develop and make available a description of feasible and effective best management practices and site drainage designs that shall be implemented in new development to ensure adequate storm water infiltration.
**Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-2:** At the project approval stage, the County shall require new development to demonstrate that all measures will be taken to ensure that on-site drainage systems are designed to capture and filter out urban pollution.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Program C-2.1:** The County shall develop and make available a description of feasible and effective measures and site drainage designs that will be implemented in new development to minimize water quality impacts.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-3:** The MCWRA and the County shall cooperate with MCWRA and MPWMD to mitigate further seawater intrusion based on Salinas Valley Basin Management Plan.

**Hydrology and Water Quality Program C-3.1:** The County shall continue to work with the MCWRA and the MPWMD to estimate the current safe yield within the context of the Salinas Valley Basin Management Plan for those portions of the former Fort Ord overlying the Salinas Valley and Seaside groundwater basins to determine available water supplies.

**1982 Monterey County General Plan**

**Policy 6.1.1:** Increased uses of groundwater shall be carefully managed, especially in areas known to have ground water overdrafting.

**Policy 6.1.2:** Water conservation measures for all types of land uses shall be encouraged.

**Policy 21.2.1:** The County shall require all new and existing development to meet federal, state, and County water quality regulations.

**Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan**

**26.1.4.3 (GMP):** A standard tentative subdivision map and/or vesting tentative and/or Preliminary Project Review Subdivision map application for either a standard or minor subdivision shall not be approved until:

1) an applicant provides evidence of an assured long term water supply in terms of yield and quality for all lots which are to be created through subdivision. A recommendation on the water supply shall be made to the
decision making body by the County’s Health Officer and the General Manager of the Water Resources Agency, or their respective designees.

2) The applicant provides proof that the water supply to serve the lots meets both the water quality and quantity standards as set forth in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, and Chapters 15.04 and 15.08 of the Monterey County Code subject to the review and recommendation by the County’s Health Officer to the decision making body.

**Environmental Setting**

**Drainage**

The project site is located in an area of uneven topography, which due to the rapidly-draining soils does not feature discernable drainages. Rather, much of the storm water percolates into the soil before forming significant channels (FORA 1997a, page 344). There is a south to north downward slope in the vicinity of the project site which results in the drainage of storm water through the project site from an up-gradient contributing area of about 85 acres. Some of this water is captured in conduits or channels and discharged at three locations along the north side of Inter-Garrison Road adjacent to the project site: Seventh Avenue, mid-block between Seventh and Eighth avenues, and Eighth Avenue.

**Soils**

Project site soils are in the Oceano loamy sands series and have a very high percolation rate, measured at between 20 and 35 inches per minute on Lot 1. Measured percolation rates exceed the 6 to 20 inch rate published for this soil series in the National Resource Conservation Service soil survey (Whitson Engineers 2009).

Oceano loamy sands are considered to have a moderate erosion potential.

**Groundwater**

The northwestern section of the former Fort Ord overlies a small part of the Salinas Valley groundwater basin (FORA 1997a, page 344). The Salinas Valley aquifer system is divisible into upper and lower groundwater basins, with the lower basin extending from San Ardo to Monterey Bay. The lower basin can be further divided into the East Side subarea (to the east of Gonzales and Salinas), and the Pressure subarea. The project site is within the Pressure subarea (Kennedy/Jenks Consultants 2004, page 17). Groundwater in the lower basin is mostly under
water-table conditions, meaning it is not confined. Groundwater movement in most of the valley is in the direction of surface water flow and follows the gradient of the land surface seaward. Nearly all the discharge in the lower basin is by withdrawals from wells. Principal recharge is from percolation of river water near the Salinas River. Applied surface water (including rainfall and irrigation) do not contribute to recharge due to clay layers overlying the 180-foot aquifer (Department of Water Resources 2004).

The Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) provides water to the project vicinity. The MCWD has three wells principally serving the former Fort Ord; these draw from the lower 180-foot and 400-foot aquifers. These wells are located about one to two miles north and northeast of the project site. A fourth well is proposed to replace an inactive well farther to the east (Denise Duffy & Associates 2007). The MCWD has three other active wells, principally serving areas outside the former Fort Ord, which draw from the 900-foot aquifer. The wells and distribution systems are interconnected, so some water from either set of wells may be distributed to any part of the MCWD system. MCWD’s groundwater withdrawals, including the Ord Community lands, are about 4,670 acre-feet per year (as of 2005), or less than one percent of total annual basin withdrawals of about 500,000 acre-feet per year (MCWD 2005, page 2-1).

Potable water for the project site vicinity comes primarily from wells developed in the Salinas Valley groundwater basin. The groundwater basin underlies the Salinas Valley from San Ardo to the coast of the Monterey Bay and is divided into five hydrologically linked subareas: Pressure, East Side, Forebay, Arroyo Seco, and Upper Valley. The basin is further divided in the Pressure subarea by distinct aquifers, commonly referred to as the 180-foot, 400-foot and deep aquifer. Historically, the deep aquifer was thought to be geologically confined in the Marina area, meaning that groundwater did not move between the deep aquifer and the 400-foot and 180-foot aquifers. However, recent stratigraphic analyses have indicated that these aquifers are connected hydraulically, with water from the 180-foot and 400-foot aquifers recharging the deep aquifer. Additionally, the deep, or 900-foot, aquifer is in reality a series of aquifers, not all of which are hydraulically connected.

**Basin Overdraft and Seawater Intrusion**

As a result of basin-wide pumping, levels in some basin subareas (Pressure and East Side) have declined over time. The other three basin subareas tend to recharge rapidly and recover historic groundwater levels each year. In a healthy condition, Salinas Valley basin groundwater would move through the basin and into the Monterey Bay through subsurface freshwater outcrops. Cumulative reductions of groundwater basin storage have contributed to a decrease in the amount of groundwater moving toward and into Monterey Bay. This imbalance is generally part of a definition of groundwater overdraft. The result has been a reversal of the seaward gradient. In its place the basin experiences a landward gradient of seawater (intrusion), where the seawater
has contaminated coastal aquifers and wells. While historic groundwater pumping throughout the basin contributed the overdraft, only the basin’s coastal areas adjacent or near to the bay suffer from seawater intrusion (Carollo Engineers 2010, page 18).

Due to withdrawals of groundwater from the Salinas Valley basin that have exceeded the recharge rate, groundwater elevations have declined and seawater has intruded the portions of the basin nearest Monterey Bay. The extent of seawater intrusion is not even in terms of depth of aquifer or distance from the coast, but generally affects the shallower aquifers at a greater distance from the coast. Seawater intrusion extends as much as seven miles inland in some areas. Seawater intrusion extends to within one half mile north of the project site, and beyond Blanco Road just north of Reservation Road (Monterey County Water Resources Agency 2009).

Annual Salinas Valley groundwater basin overdraft is estimated at between 9,000 and 19,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) (Byron Buck and Associates 2005, page 2-1; Carollo Engineers 2010, page 17; United States Army Corps of Engineers and Monterey County Water Resources Agency 2001, Section 5.3). The MCWD’s groundwater withdrawals are about 4,670 AFY, or less than 1.0 percent of total annual basin withdrawals of about 500,000 AFY. Other than MCWD, only a small number of wells tap the deep aquifer, some of which also draw from the middle aquifer (Carollo Engineers 2010, page 17).

The MCWRA is responsible for regulation and supply of water from the Salinas Valley groundwater basin. Where groundwater basins are in or are projected to be in overdraft, the state Water Code requires urban water management plans to provide detailed descriptions of efforts undertaken to eliminate the long-term overdraft condition. MCWD is working cooperatively with MCWRA and is taking actions to protect and preserve its ability and right to access groundwater, and to augment groundwater supplies with new sources of supply. MCWRA is leading two efforts in the Salinas Valley groundwater basin: the Salinas Valley Water Project (SVWP) and the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP).

The SVWP was approved in 2003 and is intended to address critical issues facing the management and longevity of the Salinas Valley groundwater basin’s water resources by meeting the following objectives:

a. Stopping seawater intrusion.
b. Providing adequate water supplies to meet current and future (year 2030) needs.
c. Improving the hydrological balance of the groundwater basin in the Salinas Valley.

The two major components of the SVWP are re-construction of the Nacimiento Dam spillway (completed) and construction of a removable diversion dam on the lower Salinas River (scheduled for completion at the beginning of 2010 according to a telephone communication
Coupled with the CSIP, implemented in 1998, the SVWP is intended to increase recharge to bring the Salinas Valley groundwater basin into balance, and halt seawater intrusion. The SVWP will increase summer flows and recharge along the Salinas River, and the diverted water will be blended with the recycled water for the CSIP. The present seawater intrusion will be reversed to an outflow of 900 acre-feet of fresh water (Monterey County Water Resources Agency 2003, page 3-6). The modeling developed for the SVWP predicts a rise in Pressure subarea groundwater levels for at least 35 years following SVWP implementation (United States Army Corps of Engineers and Monterey County Water Resources Agency 2001, Figures 5.3-13 through 5.3-17).

The proposed project is within the SVWP assessment area known as Zone 2C. Therefore, the proposed project would be required to pay an annual property tax assessment to fund its share of the cost of developing the SVWP.

**Groundwater Contamination**

The project site is adjacent to an inactive landfill. In the past, hazardous materials were leached from the landfill resulting in the contamination of groundwater. The impacted sites have been remediated as part of the Installation Restoration Program in compliance with CERCLA (U.S. Army 2006, page 11). Remediation included extraction of upper aquifer groundwater that contained volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and subsequent treatment, and recharge. An impermeable cap has been placed over the landfill to prevent further penetration of rainfall (U.S. EPA 1994, 1997; U.S. Army 2006). Refer to Section 2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials for further discussion.

**Project Analysis**

**Project Construction**

Construction of the proposed project would involve removal of most of the development parcels vegetation, and grading of building pads, parking areas, driveways, and roads. The soils on the project site have a moderate potential for erosion; however, standard erosion control procedures will be necessary when soils have been disturbed to prevent down-gradient siltation. Water quality procedures required by NPDES would also minimize the potential for siltation or other water pollution by eroded soil.

Project construction would utilize water primarily for dust control and cleaning. The amount of water used for these activities would be minimal compared to annual consumption after the proposed project is completed.
Aquifer Withdrawals and Recharge

The proposed project would use water withdrawn from MCWD wells in the Salinas Valley basin. Water used inside buildings (and potentially some water used outdoors; e.g. at the bus wash rack) would be collected and discharged into the wastewater system for treatment at the wastewater treatment plant north of Marina. Note that the bus wash water would be reclaimed for additional washing use, and may be collected ultimately for irrigation. A portion of the wastewater delivered to the wastewater treatment plant would be recycled and used primarily for agricultural irrigation. The recycling plant has a capacity of 91 acre-feet per day, and the distribution system reaches 12,000 acres of farmland. Water applied to landscaping on the project site would either percolate into the soil, or evaporate or transpire into the atmosphere.

The proposed project is within the former Fort Ord and has potential water entitlements from the former Fort Ord’s annual 6,600 acre-foot Salinas Valley basin allotment. Monterey County’s share of the allotment is 710 acre-feet (plus 144 acre-feet from other sources), of which 326 acre-feet remains available for allocation to new development. The proposed project is estimated to require 80 acre-feet of water each year.

The Salinas Valley basin is estimated to have a groundwater recharge deficit of about 9,000 acre-feet per year. Over-withdrawal of groundwater has led to seawater intrusion, which was first identified in the 1940s. The MCWD’s 2005 Urban Water Management Plan states that there are longstanding concerns that localized groundwater withdrawals could, over the long term, exceed the localized capacity of the groundwater basin and lead to further sea water intrusion and loss of potable supply at the district’s wells. The district and all jurisdictions represented under FORA have recognized the need to invest in the district’s water supply system and the need to respond to seawater intrusion. Accordingly, the district’s Capital Improvement Program includes development of new water supply wells located away from the seawater intrusion front. The SVWP will be in operation by early 2010 and result in adequate groundwater recharge to off-set groundwater withdrawals from wells within the Salinas Valley basin, thus ensuring a long-term supply for the proposed project. Water demand is discussed in greater detail in Section 2.11, Water Demand and Supply. The proposed project would result in a net increase in withdrawals from the aquifer. However, these withdrawals are anticipated in the calculations for the SVWP, and the proposed project would fund a share of the SVWP through the payment of property tax assessments.

Drainage Overview

The proposed project includes both on-site and off-site drainage improvements. The on-site improvements would capture run-off originating on the project site. The off-site drainage
improvements would capture off-site run-off that currently flows across the project site. Three alternative off-site drainage plans have been developed.

**On-site Drainage**

Most of the proposed project drainage would be directed toward one of two on-site percolation basins. In addition, four infiltration galleries are proposed alongside Engineer’s Equipment Road. Four lots would provide percolation within each lot.

Drainage from Lot 1 (the MST site) would be directed to a series of basins on Lot 1 with a capacity of 1.75 acre-feet. This basin complex would also accept drainage from a small portion of Engineer’s Equipment Road and Whispering Oaks Drive in the area where these roads intersect. Lots 4 through 6 and 9 through 16 would drain to the Parcel B basin. Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8 do not drain to any of the basins, and individual or shared on-site percolation provisions will need to be developed for each of these lots. The remaining road areas would drain to infiltration galleries along the sides of the roads.

The drainage reports determined that the proposed on-site basins would be adequate to retain storm flows expected during 100-year storms (Whitson Engineers 2009; AECOM 2010). Conduits would be sized for 25-year storm flows, with storm flows from higher precipitation events potentially flowing above-ground. Because storms exceeding the 25-year event are rare, sizing conduits larger than for a 25-year flow is considered unnecessary. Storm flows in excess of the 25-year level could cause localized flooding which is considered acceptable. Acceptability of localized flooding from 25-year and greater storms is premised on locating structures outside of the 100-year flood zone, and cost considerations associated with larger facilities that are infrequently required. Depending on the particular lag times and flow characteristics, a 25-year design conduit may be capable of handling a larger than 25-year storm flow (Rich Weber, personal communication, January 28, 2010).

In general pre-treatment of storm water is required for soils where the groundwater is within 10 feet of the surface or the percolation rate exceeds 2.4 inches per hour. Treatment is typically accomplished through use of best management practices approaches such as vegetated swales. The MST storm drainage basins would include filtering devices. The Whispering Oaks GDP does not indicate if storm water treatment will be provided prior to storm water entry to the basins or galleries.

**Off-site Drainage**

The proposed project includes the construction of off-site drainage basins and connecting conduits to intercept storm water run-off from south of the project site that currently drains through the project site. Refer to Figure 14, Off-site Drainage Alternative 1; Figure 15, Off-site
Drainage Alternative 2; and Figure 16, Off-site Drainage Alternative 3, presented in Section 1.0

Introduction. MST will select one of the three off-site drainage plans (or a combination of features from these plans) based on cost, CSUMB’s preferences, and environmental constraints.

**Off-site Drainage Alternative 1.** This off-site drainage plan includes the construction of two ponds at the southeast corner of Inter-Garrison Road and Seventh Avenue. Water currently discharging to the mid block and Eighth Street locations would be diverted into the basins. These drainage features are similar to those identified in the *CSUMB Storm Drain Master Plan*. The improvements would be constructed by MST as part of their initial phase of development. The proposed location of the basins is currently a paved parking lot. Drainage currently discharging Seventh Avenue outfall, as well as discharge from the new ponds, would be directed to the west of Lot 1.

The two off-site basins would have a combined capacity of 3.72 acre-feet. The basins would be sized to retain flows from a 100-year storm and the conduits would be sized for 25-year storm conditions. Based on the CSUMB Master Plan implementation program, impervious surface area within the watershed for the basins may decrease as un-used buildings and parking lots are removed. At this time the ponds are considered to be for interim use; however, ultimately, CSUMB may determine that the ponds are adequate for long-term use. Storm water discharging at Inter-Garrison Road and Seventh Street would be routed to the western edge of Lot 1, and continue as surface drainage on a course similar to existing conditions.

The preliminary drainage calculations determined that each pond would be adequately sized to retain 100-year storm flows from their respective drainage areas (Whitson Engineers 2009). Although conduit sizing is based on 25-year storm flows, conduit capacity could potentially be adequate even during a 100-year storm; this is dependent on a number of variables and unpredictable. In the event that storm flows exceed the capacity of the conduits, overflow may flow or pond on the surface, potentially on or near Inter-Garrison Road. It is possible, but not likely, that surface flows would enter the project site, although if that did occur, storm waters are expected to either infiltrate within the open space area or be captured in the Lot 1 drainage system (Rich Weber, personal communication, January 28, 2010).

**Off-site Drainage Alternative 2.** With this off-site drainage alternative the mid block and Seventh Avenue outfalls along Inter-Garrison Road would be redirected along the west edge of proposed Lot 1, discharging to vacant land west of Lot 1 and continuing as surface drainage on a course similar to existing conditions. Discharge from the Eighth Avenue outfall would be captured in an infiltration gallery along the north side of Inter-Garrison Road.

Up-gradient water tributary to the existing storm drain system in Eighth Avenue would be directed to three existing ponds or natural depressions for percolation. Ponds 4 and 5 are existing ponds; Pond 3 would utilize an existing natural depression and require only modest modifications to contain storm water. An 18-inch conduit would be constructed to divert water
from along Eighth Avenue into Pond 3. An existing storm drain line crosses through the Pond 3 location.

**Off-site Drainage Alternative 3.** With this off-site drainage alternative the Seventh Avenue and mid-block outfalls would be redirected in a 24-inch conduit along the north edge of proposed Lot 1, eventually discharging to vacant land west of Lot 1 and continuing as surface drainage on a course similar to existing conditions. Discharge from the Eighth Avenue outfall would be captured in an infiltration gallery (smaller than Alternative 2) along the north side of Inter-Garrison Road

The flow through the Eighth Avenue outfall would be reduced by approximately 75 percent. The storm drain main in Eighth Avenue would be intercepted approximately 300 feet south of Inter-Garrison Road and redirected via a 30-inch storm drain pipe to an existing natural drainage depression to the east. The conduit would mostly follow an existing dirt road that was recently cleared of ordnance. The existing depression has capacity far in excess of the required storage volume necessary to store and percolate this runoff. The diversion from Eighth Avenue would capture most of the up-gradient tributary drainage.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Potentially Significant Impact – Soil Erosion during Construction.** The proposed project would expose large areas of soil through tree removal and grading during construction. The project site soils have a moderate potential for erosion, and this erosion risk would be significantly elevated when the soils are disturbed. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-3 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Less Than Significant Impact – Groundwater Aquifer Overdraft.** The proposed project would result in additional withdrawals of water from the Salinas Valley groundwater basin. The groundwater basin is in a state of overdraft; however, the Monterey County Water Resources Agency has implemented the SVWP and the CSIP to attain a positive freshwater outflow and prevent further seawater intrusion. Property owners within Zone 2C are assessed a special tax to fund the SVWP. The project site is located within Zone 2C; therefore, the proposed project is considered to have a long-term sustainable water supply and this would reduce the proposed project’s impact to a less than significant level.

**Potentially Significant Impact – On-site Storm Drainage Basin Capacity.** The proposed project includes on-site basins and galleries for infiltration of on-site storm water run-off. The basins and galleries that are specifically proposed are sized adequately to accept flows during the 100-year storm event. However, no specific basins or basin capacities have been proposed for Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8. Therefore, it cannot be determined if these lots would be able to adequately
retain storm water and prevent flooding. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

HY-1. Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permits, the developer(s) for Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8 shall provide the Water Resources Agency a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site impacts with supporting calculations and construction details. The plan shall include retention facilities to mitigate the impact of impervious surface storm-water runoff. Pond(s) shall be fenced for public safety. Oil-grease/water separators shall be installed for the pre-treatment of storm-water runoff from paved parking areas. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Water Resources Agency.

**Monitoring Action**

Prior to the approval of grading or improvement plans for Lots 2, 3, 7, and 8 submit a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site impacts with supporting calculations and indicate basin locations and provide construction details on plans.

**Less Than Significant Impact – Off-site Storm Drainage Basin Capacity.** The proposed project includes off-site basins for interception and infiltration of storm water run-off flowing from the south of the project site that is currently directed onto the project site. The off-site basins are sized adequately to accept flows during the 100-year storm event and would prevent flooding. This is a less than significant impact.

**Less than Significant Impact – Storm Drainage Conduit Capacity.** Conduits are sized for 25-year storms in accordance with standard engineering practice. In the event that the conduits exceed capacity, surface flooding may occur for a period of time. Overflow of conduits could result in localized flooding or overflow into open space areas or other storm drainage systems, but this is considered acceptable owing to its infrequency and the standard precautions taken to protect structures. This is a less than significant impact.

**Potentially Significant Impact – Water Quality at Percolation Basins.** The high percolation rate of the soil necessitates the inclusion of passive water quality pre-treatment measures for storm water, generally categorized as storm water best management practices. The general development plans do not specify pre-treatment of storm water. Storm water that percolates into the groundwater without pre-treatment is considered a significant environmental impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
Mitigation Measures

HY-2. Prior to filing the final map, the applicant shall provide the Water Resources Agency a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site and off-site impacts with supporting calculations and construction details. The plan shall include retention facilities to mitigate the impact of impervious surface storm-water runoff. Pond(s) shall be fenced for public safety. Oil-grease/water separators shall be installed for the pre-treatment of storm-water runoff from paved parking areas. Drainage improvements shall be constructed in accordance with plans approved by the Water Resources Agency.

HY-3. Prior to filing the final map, a copy of a signed and notarized Road and Drainage Maintenance Agreement shall be provided to the Water Resources Agency for approval. The agreement shall be recorded concurrently with final map. The responsibility for care, maintenance, and repair of road and drainage improvements in the subdivision shall be the joint and several personal obligation of each and every owner of a lot in the Subdivision. The obligation includes preparation of an annual drainage report by a registered civil engineer which shall include analysis of the subdivision drainage facilities and recommendation of any maintenance. The report shall be submitted to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency for review and approval by the 15th day of August, and any recommended maintenance activities shall be completed by the 15th day of October of the same year.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to filing the final map, the developer shall submit a drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer addressing on-site and off-site impacts with supporting calculations and construction details.

Prior to filing the final map, the developer shall submit a copy of a signed and notarized Road and Drainage Maintenance Agreement shall be provided to the Water Resources Agency for approval.

Concurrent with filing the final map, the developer shall record a Road and Drainage Maintenance Agreement.

Annually by August 15th, the developer or successor shall submit an annual drainage report by a registered civil engineer which shall include analysis of the subdivision drainage facilities and recommendation of any maintenance.
Annually by October 15th, the developer or successor shall complete any recommended maintenance activities identified in annual drainage report.

### 2.7 Land Use and Planning

This section of the EIR addresses the proposed project’s consistency with the 1982 Monterey County General Plan, Monterey County Title 21 (Inland Zoning), the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, the FORA Maser Resolution, the Marina General Plan, and the California State University Monterey Bay Master Plan.

#### Standards of Significance

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Physically divide an established community; or
- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

#### Policy and Regulatory Issues

The plans and regulations listed below are analyzed in this section. For ease of cross-reference between the policy text and the associated analysis, these are presented together in the Project Analysis section, which follows.

- **Fort Ord Reuse Plan**
- FORA Master Resolution, Chapter 8
- 1982 Monterey County General Plan and Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan
- **City of Marina General Plan**
- **Cal State University Monterey Bay Master Plan**

Neither the City of Marina nor CSUMB have jurisdiction over the proposed project; however, because their jurisdiction is immediately adjacent to the project site, a discussion of their general plan (Marina) and master plan (CSUMB) are provided herein.
Environmental Setting

The project site is designated Mixed Use-Planned Development in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan and the Draft Fort Ord Master Plan, a part of the Draft 2010 Monterey County General Plan, which the County anticipates will be adopted in the summer of 2010. The project site is included in the planning area for the City of Marina and is therefore, included in the land use plan for the Marina General Plan and is designated Recreation. Because the project site is within the City of Marina planning area, the city is an interested agency, and the County is required to submit the project to the city for comment. The project site is outside the Marina city limits, so it does not have a city zoning designation. The County's zoning designation for the project site is PQP-D-S.

The project site is within the “landfill parcel” at the former Fort Ord. Although the project site itself has never been used as a landfill, portions of the project site are within a 1,000-foot buffer from the edge of the landfill.

A more detailed land use and planning context for the proposed project is presented in Section 1.2 Project Location and Setting.

Project Analysis

Fort Ord Reuse Plan

The Fort Ord Reuse Plan was adopted in June 1997, and is the guidance document for redevelopment of the former Fort Ord military base. Several Fort Ord Reuse Plan land use objectives and policies that are applicable to the proposed project, and discussion of the proposed project’s consistency, are presented below.

Commercial Land Use Objective C. Ensure that various types of commercial land use categories are balanced, and that business and industry enhance employment opportunities in and self-sufficiency of Fort Ord communities.

Planning for reuse of the former military base allows local jurisdictions to create a community that is largely self-contained, a place where residents can live, work, do business, shop, and enjoy recreational facilities. The commercial activities should be allocated across the Fort Ord area to bring about and maintain this balance.

The economic objectives for Fort Ord base reuse address the need for balanced growth and call for creating a setting which is conducive to long-term balanced economic and employment growth and the self-sufficiency of local communities.
Commercial Land Use Policy C-1. The County of Monterey shall encourage a strong and stable source of county revenues by providing a balance of commercial land use types on its former Fort Ord land, while preserving the area’s community character.

Commercial Land Use Objective D. Encourage commercial development in close proximity to major residential areas and transportation routes.

Allowing for mixed-use development at the former Fort Ord by combining compatible land uses, such as shops, offices and housing, to locate closer together, will help decrease travel distances, increase transit ridership, walking and biking, and ultimately reduce the vehicle emissions associated with various types of land uses.

The commercial land use strategy for Fort Ord base reuse locates commercial activity near residential areas. It encourages convenience retail and services in a dispersed pattern to support the residential development pattern. The Convenience and Specialty Retail designation allows the distribution of commercial uses, establishing small scale centers that can meet the needs of residential districts. Uses allowed within this category, in addition to convenience and specialty retail, include restaurants and personal services, promoting additional linkage between residential and commercial development. This strategy will help reduce local vehicular trips and trip lengths, which in turn will lead to fewer air quality impacts from Fort Ord development.

A mix of commercial and residential uses is further encouraged by designating mixed-use districts that will allow people to both live and work in the Fort Ord area and therefore to depend less on their cars. The land use concept provides for Planned Development Mixed Use in each of the three land use jurisdictions. This designation is intended to encourage the development of pedestrian-oriented community centers that support a wide variety of commercial, residential, retail, professional services, and cultural and entertainment activities. Generally, this mixed use will be located near future transit facilities or along transit corridors, and near commercial and employment centers.

Commercial Land Use Policy D-1. The County of Monterey shall allow a mix of residential and commercial uses to decrease travel distances, encourage walking and biking and help increase transit ridership.
Land uses that are considered acceptable within the Planned Development Mixed Use designation are listed in Table 3.4-1 of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan (Volume 1, page 100). These uses include: convenience, neighborhood, and regional retail; office/research and development; entertainment; public buildings and facilities; day care centers; business parks; light industrial development; and several other types of uses. Development intensity up to a gross floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.35 is allowed. Given that about half the site is set aside for open space preservation, development up to a net FAR of 0.7 may be allowed on the developed portion of the project site. The Whispering Oaks GDP establishes a maximum FAR of 0.6, which is within the density allowed on the developable portion of the project site.

**Commercial Land Use Objective E.** Provide for adequate access to commercial developments.

**Commercial Land Use Policy E-2.** In areas of commercial development, the County of Monterey shall provide for designation of access routes, street and road rights-of-way, off-street and on-street parking, bike paths and pedestrian walkways.

**Commercial Land Use Objective F.** Provide for Community Design principles and guidelines to ensure quality of life for employees and residents of Fort Ord and the surrounding communities.

Ensuring high-quality design for Fort Ord commercial development will help to establish the form and appearance for the area and ensure that the commercial features will contribute to community identity, livability, and quality of life for residents of the Fort Ord area and surrounding jurisdictions.

**Commercial Land Use Program F-1.2.** The County of Monterey shall review each commercial development proposal for consistency with the regional urban design guidelines and the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework.

**Commercial Land Use Policy F-2.** The County of Monterey shall adhere to the General Development Character and Design Objectives of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan Framework for commercial development at the former Fort Ord.

The project site is adjacent on two sides to CSUMB, and to University of California lands on a third side. Several of the institutional policies are applicable to non-educational types of development located adjacent to institutional uses.
Institutional Land Use Objective A. Encourage proper planning of public lands so that uses on these lands are compatible with existing and planned uses on adjacent privately-owned lands.

The land use design concept for the former Fort Ord stresses cohesiveness of institutional lands with adjacent uses. Incompatible uses can disrupt the development process of public facilities and cause the creation of barriers, while coordination with planning of neighboring areas will enhance the quality of life and encourage interaction among all planning areas.

Institutional Land Use Policy A-1. The County of Monterey shall review and coordinate with the universities, colleges and other school districts or entities in the planning of both public lands designated for university-related uses and adjacent lands.

Institutional Land Use Program A-1.1. The County of Monterey shall be included in the master planning efforts undertaken by the University of California and California State University and jointly with those agencies ensure compatible land uses in the transition between university and non-university lands.

Institutional Land Use Program A-1.2. The County of Monterey shall review, and if necessary, revise its zoning ordinance regulations on the types of uses allowed in areas adjacent to the UCMBEST Center Cooperative Planning District and the CSUMB Planning Area District, so as to ensure compatibility of uses; the County will adopt zoning standards to ensure a suitable transition of land use types, density, design, circulation and roadways to the areas designated for university-related uses.

Institutional Land Use Program A-1.3. The County of Monterey shall designate the land surrounding the UC MBEST Center Cooperative Planning District and CSUMB planning areas for compatible use, such as Business Park/Light Industrial/Office/R&D and Planned Development Mixed Use, 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.

Institutional Land Use Objective B. Consider special needs of schools in developing land and infrastructure.
The broad range of educational activities that already exist at or are planned for the former Fort Ord provide the nucleus for redevelopment of the former base. In addition to the universities which represent two major activity nodes at the former Fort Ord, the area will be home to a number of other educational uses, including five existing elementary and middle schools and several planned locations for community college extension programs and private higher education institutions. Consideration of the special school-related planning and safety needs will contribute toward the goal of educational excellence at the former Fort Ord.

**Institutional Land Use Policy B-1:** The County of Monterey shall provide a safe environment for schools serving Fort Ord areas when planning land use and infrastructure improvements.

**Institutional Land Use Program B-1.1:** The County of Monterey shall review all planning and design for Fort Ord land use and infrastructure improvements in the vicinity of schools and ensure appropriate compatibility, including all applicable safety standards for development near schools, as a condition of project approval.

Consistency of the proposed project is considered in light of all of these policies taken together. Commercial Land Use Objective C establishes the need for balanced land use within the commercially designated areas at the former Fort Ord. The *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* designates the project site as Planned Development – Mixed Use. Commercial Land Use Objective D sets forth the intention for development of lands with this designation. The focus of the designation is to provide a mix of uses and “to encourage the development of pedestrian-oriented community centers that support a wide variety of commercial, residential, retail, professional services, and cultural and entertainment activities.” Specific types of land uses are listed as consistent with the Planned Development Mixed Use designation. Commercial Land Use Objective E directs jurisdictions to provide suitable access to the commercial sites, including transportation modes other than automobiles. Commercial Land Use Objective F is concerned with the aesthetics of the built development.

Institutional Objective A and its related policies focus on compatibility of uses adjacent to educational uses, and appropriate transitions between educational and private development, to be carried out by both the educational and private entities. Institutional Objective B requires assurance of the safety of educational uses when adjacent private uses are developed.
The proposed project meets the use requirements of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. The proposed land uses (e.g. business park, convenience retail, day care, etc.) are consistent with the types of land uses that are allowed within the Planned Development Mixed Use designation (Table 3.4-1). The proposed project uses are also potentially supportive of accessory university uses such as research.

The project site is located on the fringe of existing and planned development in the area, and for the most part is adjacent to open space on the north and south. The project site is not especially amenable to a pedestrian focus that interfaces with adjacent development as envisioned in *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* policy. Planned CSUMB development adjacent to the project site is limited to staff or faculty housing south of the southwest corner of the project site. Future CSUMB development near the project site will be focused westward toward the campus core, and not toward the project site. The University of California owns most of the land adjacent to the west of the project site, but no development plans are currently proposed. Existing residential areas to the east are adjacent on the eastern end of the project site, but these residential areas are very low density, and not directly connected to the project site or Inter-Garrison Road. Although integration of the proposed project with existing and future adjacent development would be desirable, the characteristics of the site and adjacent development combine to make realization of this goal problematic. The proposed project does provide internal pedestrian connections, and several connections to adjacent streets, and the sidewalk along Inter-Garrison Road would help to create a pedestrian connection between the CSUMB housing area east of the project site with the CSUMB campus core.

Although the proposed project fails to achieve the pedestrian-oriented mixed use design direction provided by the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*, it does meet other major *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* goals for development of the site, including compatibility of uses and the potential to provide uses that could be symbiotic with the educational and research goals of the adjacent educational uses. In balance, the proposed project would be consistent with the land use policies of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*.

**Fort Ord Reuse Authority Master Resolution Chapter 8**

FORA must determine consistency with the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* for local jurisdiction’s land use plans and development projects within the former Fort Ord. Because the proposed project includes a zone change, a full consistency determination, approved by the FORA Board of Directors, will be required. Consistency determinations are made based on the provisions of FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8. Key points of consideration in that consistency determination are discussed below.
8.02.020 (a) (1): Each land use agency shall review each application for a development entitlement for compatibility with adjacent open space land uses and require suitable open space buffers to be incorporated into the development plans of any potentially incompatible land uses as a condition of project approval.

The portions of the project site proposed for development are designated for Planned Development Mixed Use on the Fort Ord Reuse Plan land use map. Approximately half the project site would be dedicated as permanent open space, and a buffer area along Inter-Garrison Road would preserve oak trees adjacent to the road and the CSUMB open space area to the south.

8.02.020 (k) (1): Preparation, adoption, and enforcement of a storm water detention plan that identifies potential storm water detention design and implementation measures to be considered in all new development, in order to increase groundwater recharge and thereby reduce potential for further seawater intrusion and provide for an augmentation of future water supplies.

The proposed project includes two storm water retention and percolation basins. One of the basins would collect up-gradient storm water that currently flows onto the project site from the south, and the other would collect storm water run-off from new impervious surfaces constructed by the proposed project.

8.02.020 (l): Each land use agency shall adopt policies and programs that ensure that all proposed land uses on the Fort Ord Territory are consistent with the hazardous and toxic materials clean-up levels as specified by state and federal regulation.

The project site is adjacent to the inactive U.S. Army landfill, and most of the project site is within the 1,000-foot buffer from the landfill. The majority of the project site area that is within the landfill buffer is proposed for open space. The remaining land within the landfill buffer would be used for business park development. Commercial and open space uses are acceptable within the buffer area.

8.02.020 (n) (1): Establishment and provision of a dedicated funding mechanism to pay for the “fair share” of the impact on the regional transportation system caused or contributed by development on territory within the jurisdiction of the Authority.
The proposed project would pay the applicable FORA development impact fees to cover traffic improvements, cumulative demolition costs, habitat maintenance and other uses approved by FORA.

**8.02.020 (s):** Each land use agency shall include policies and programs in their respective applicable general, area, and specific plans that will ensure that native plants from on-site stock will be used in all landscaping except for turf areas, where practical and appropriate. In areas of native plant restoration, all cultivars, including, but not limited to, manzanita and ceanothus, shall be obtained from stock originating on Fort Ord Territory.

The proposed project includes landscape direction in the general development plans. The Whispering Oaks GDP requires native landscape materials generally, although it calls for “formal” landscaping at entrances. This would be generally consistent with the requirements of FORA Master Resolution Chapter 8. The MST GDP calls for primarily native plantings.

**8.02.030 (a):** In the review, evaluation, and determination of consistency regarding any development entitlement presented to the Authority Board pursuant to Section 8.01.030 of this Resolution, the Authority Board shall withhold a finding of consistency for any development entitlement that:

(1): Provides an intensity of land uses, which is more intense than that provided for in the applicable legislative land use decisions, which the Authority Board has found consistent with the Reuse Plan;

(2): Is more dense than the density of development permitted in the applicable legislative land use decisions which the Authority Board has found consistent with the Reuse Plan;

The proposed project would be developed at densities that are consistent with the Planned Development Mixed Use land use designation.

**8.02.030 (a) (3):** Is not conditioned upon providing, performing, funding, or making an agreement guaranteeing the provision, performance, or funding of all programs applicable to the development entitlement as specified in the Reuse Plan and in Section 8.02.020 of this Master Resolution and consistent with local determinations made pursuant to Section 8.02.040 of this Resolution.
The proposed project would pay the applicable FORA development impact fees to cover traffic improvements, cumulative demolition costs, habitat maintenance and other uses for the fees as determined and approved by FORA.

8.02.030 (a) (4): Provides uses which conflict or are incompatible with uses permitted or allowed in the Reuse Plan for the affected property or which conflict or are incompatible with open space, recreational, or habitat management areas within the jurisdiction of the Authority.

The proposed land uses are consistent with the Planned Development Mixed Use land use designation and the proposed project includes approximately half the project site in permanent open space, which provides a buffer to areas designated in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan for open space.

8.02.030 (a) (5): Does not require or otherwise provide for the financing and installation, construction, and maintenance of all infrastructure necessary to provide adequate public services to the property covered by the applicable legislative land use decision.

The proposed project would construct infrastructure directly related to the proposed project and would pay the applicable FORA development impact fees to cover its share of regional infrastructure.

8.02.030 (a) (6): Does not require or otherwise provide for implementation of the Fort Ord Habitat Management Plan.

The portions of the project site proposed for development are planned for development in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The proposed project sets aside approximately half the project site for permanent open space.

8.02.030 (a) (8): Is not consistent with the jobs/housing balance requirements developed and approved by the Authority Board as provided in Section 8.02.020(t) of this Master Resolution.

The proposed project would provide an unknown number of jobs; the number of jobs would be dependent on the type of uses that occupy the business park. The MST portion of the proposed project is expected to provide 280 jobs initially and about 415 jobs at build-out. No housing is proposed. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan projected over 18,000 jobs and 10,300 housing units within the former Fort Ord by 2015, and approximately 45,000 jobs and over 22,000 housing units at build-out. The proposed project would provide jobs that fit within the overall job-housing balance at the former Fort Ord.
1982 Monterey County General Plan and Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan

The project site is within the area covered by the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan, which is a part of the 1982 Monterey County General Plan. The Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan pre-dates conversion of the former Fort Ord to civilian uses and the land use map identifies the project site, as the rest of the former Fort Ord, as public/quasi-public land use. The Draft Fort Ord Master Plan, which is part of the Draft 2010 Monterey County General Plan, designates the project site as Planned Development Mixed use, consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The following land use policies from the 1982 Monterey County General Plan are discussed here. Policies relevant to specific environmental topics are discussed in the applicable section of the EIR.

**Land Use Policy 26.1.2:** The County shall discourage premature and scattered development.

**Land Use Policy 26.1.11:** The County shall encourage clustering in all development projects, where appropriate.

**Land Use Policy 26.1.12:** In order to preserve its open space and rural character, the County shall encourage the voluntary restriction of development through dedication of scenic or conservation easements, transfer of development rights and other appropriate techniques.

**Land Use Policy 29.1.2:** The County shall require that industrial areas be as compact as possible and, where feasible, designate planned industrial park areas.

**Land Use Policy 34.1.1:** The County shall encourage clustering of all types of development, where appropriate, in order to allow for a portion of each project site to be dedicated as permanent open space.

**Land Use Policy 34.1.3:** Wherever possible, open space lands provided as part of a development project should be integrated into an areawide open space network.

**Land Use Policy 34.1.5:** Open space areas shall be designated, wherever possible, on the perimeter of all development under taken by the County.

These policies concern compact development intended to preserve open space areas. The proposed project is clustered, with about half the project site, along the north and east sides of the project site, remaining in open space. The open space parcel on the north is adjacent to the former landfill, a disturbed site that is planned to remain in open space. The eastern open space preserves a corridor between the northern parcel/landfill open space, and the much larger open
space areas to the south of Inter-Garrison Road. A vegetated area will also be preserved between the southern edge of the project site and Inter-Garrison Road, to preserve the wooded characteristic of the Inter-Garrison Road corridor as it transitions from the CSUMB campus to the west to the open space areas to the east. The proposed project is consistent with these policies.

Land Use Policy 26.1.5: The County shall designate future land uses in a manner which will achieve compatibility with adjacent uses.

Land Use Policy 27.3.1: The County shall discourage those new land use activities which are potential nuisances and/or hazards within and in close proximity to residential areas.

Land Use Policy 29.1.4: The County shall work to minimize nuisances in industrial areas.

Land Use Policy 29.3.1: Industrially designated areas shall be compatible with surrounding land uses.

Land Use Policy 29.3.4: In designating industrial areas, the County shall consider the proximity of other compatible land uses which have similar levels of utility and service requirements.

Land Use Policy 34.1.4: Open space areas should be used as a buffer between land uses of different types and/or intensities.

This set of policies addresses concerns of compatibility between different nearby land uses. When all areas near the project site are built out, the proposed project would be adjacent to open space on the north, residential land to the east, open space and residential land on the south, and institutional or business uses on the west. The proposed project includes an on-site buffer of 700 feet between the proposed project’s industrial uses and the housing area to the east. To the south, the proposed project would include a 20-foot wide landscape/native vegetation buffer, and the additional width of Inter-Garrison Road would further separate it from planned residential uses to the south of the MST site. The proposed uses are similar to those planned to the west. According to the noise and air quality studies conducted for the proposed project, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant nuisance to adjacent residential properties.

Land Use Policy 26.1.14: The County shall encourage that development be annexed to existing cities where annexation will facilitate the logical and economical provision of services, if annexation is feasible.
The project site is located adjacent to the City of Marina and is located within the city’s sphere of influence. Services to the proposed project would be provided by regional agencies, including the Marina Coast Water District and Monterey County Regional Fire District, which are able to serve the proposed project efficiently. The project site is owned by the Monterey County Redevelopment Agency, which is sponsoring the proposed project in order to increase economic development within the County’s redevelopment district and influence a positive transition at the former landfill site. The Redevelopment Agency intends that the proposed project would remain within the unincorporated County at this time, rather than be annexed to Marina, so that Monterey County can realize the tax increment benefits. Therefore, at this time, annexation to the City of Marina is not economically feasible for the County.

Land Use Policy 29.1.3: In order to maintain a healthy environment, the County shall allow only those industries which do not violate the County's environmental quality standards.

The proposed project includes an industrial business park, but with the exception of MST, the specific industries that would be developed are not known. However, the Whispering Oaks GDP does include a list of allowed, conditionally allowed, and prohibited uses. The list eliminates some types of industry that could result in significant effects on environmental quality due to the nature of the work. Some potential uses that are allowed, and could have potential for effects on environmental quality would require special permits from resource agencies. In general, those industries that are allowed within the proposed project and which could result in adverse effects on environmental quality are regulated and the regulation process would ensure adequate safeguards to protect the environment.

Marina General Plan

The Marina General Plan was adopted by the city in October 2000, and a consistency determination was approved by FORA on March 22, 2001. The project site is within the Marina sphere of influence and has a Marina General Plan designation of Parks and Recreation. This designation differs from the Fort Ord Reuse Plan designation of Planned Development Mixed Use.

Compared to the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, the Marina General Plan includes additional visitor accommodation units and less commercial area (including elimination of the project site as a commercial area). The Marina General Plan expands the open space designation of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan from the adjacent areas into the project site. FORA Board minutes from the FORA consistency hearing acknowledge discrepancies between the Marina General Plan and the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, but the minutes indicate that the FORA staff and the FORA Board of Directors determined that the two plans were substantially consistent and that absolute parcel-by-parcel consistency was not necessary for making an affirmative consistency finding. The proposed
project is being developed by Monterey County under the land use designations of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* and the Draft *Fort Ord Master Plan*; therefore, the *Marina General Plan* land use designation is not relevant.

**Community Design and Development 4.10:** Along the City’s southern border the major areas reserved for habitat protection encircle the Frederick-Schoonover Park area and extend inward as far as Imjin Road to provide a well-defined edge to the City…

**Community Design and Development 4.33:** …the Intergarrison Road segment is designated as a two-lane arterial. The entire corridor is also designated a Class I bikeway. The Intergarrison portion of the corridor passes through permanently protected open space…

*Marina General Plan* policies addressing the character of the Inter-Garrison Road area call for protection of a habitat buffer surrounding the residential areas east of the project site, and preservation of open space along Inter-Garrison Road. The proposed project would be consistent with Policy 4.10 by maintaining an open space area adjacent to the CSUMB housing area east of the project site. Consistency with Policy 4.33 is less clear, as the preservation of open space is not directly addressed in the policy. In context with the land use map it is clear that Policy 4.33 refers to an intent to preserve the entire area north of Inter-Garrison Road as open space, rather than the 20-foot buffer of oak trees proposed to be preserved along Inter-Garrison Road. However, the inconsistency appears to be with the land use map itself rather than this policy. The proposed project would be consistent with these *Marina General Plan* policies.

**California State University Monterey Bay Master Plan**

The *CSUMB Master Plan* does not include the project site, but does encompass the land adjacent to the south and east of the project site. Most of the land to the south of the project site is designated to remain open space. An area south of the southwest corner of the project site is planned for staff and faculty housing. An existing university housing area is located to the east of the project site.

The proposed project would not preclude development of the planned housing. Potential environmental issues relating to the proposed project uses and the proposed CSUMB housing are addressed in relevant sections of the EIR, and in particular Section 2.1 Aesthetics and Section 2.9 Noise.
Zoning

The project site would be re-zoned to Heavy Commercial, although land uses and development standards would be controlled more precisely through the general development plans than through provisions of Monterey County Code Title 21 (Inland Zoning). Refer to Section 1.3 Project Description for a list of proposed allowed uses and development standards. The *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* does not have a land use category that corresponds to Heavy Commercial, however, the land uses allowed under the general development plans are consistent with uses allowed in business and light industrial parks under the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*.

Landfill Buffer

Certain land uses are prohibited within the 1,000-foot buffer that surrounds the inactive Army landfill north of the project site. The types of uses that are prohibited include residential, schools, and other uses where persons may have an elevated potential to be exposed to hazardous materials from the landfill, or persons may have a higher sensitivity to exposure to hazardous materials. The commercial and industrial uses proposed are acceptable within the buffer.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

No Impact – Division of a Community. The proposed project would not divide an existing community. The project site is mostly undeveloped land at the edge of existing development, and the proposed uses are consistent with the applicable land use plan.

No Impact – Inconsistency with 1982 Monterey County General Plan/Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan Land Use Designation. The Whispering Oaks Business Park portion of the proposed project is not consistent with Public/Quasi-Public land use designation of the 1982 Monterey County General Plan as shown on the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan land use map. However, the land use map in the Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan pre-dates conversion of the former Fort Ord to civilian uses. The Draft *Fort Ord Master Plan*, a part of the Draft 2010 Monterey County General Plan shows a land use designation of Planned Development Mixed Use for the project site, consistent with the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. These plans are expected to be adopted by the County in the summer of 2010. The proposed uses are consistent with the land use designations in the Draft County plans and the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. The proposed project includes a zone change from the existing PQP district (a hold-over from military use) to Heavy Commercial, a zoning designation that is consistent with the Planned Development Mixed Use land use designation. The MST GDP and Whispering Oaks GDP further define the allowable uses for the proposed project, all of which are consistent with the Planned Development Mixed Use land use designation.
No Impact – Inconsistency with the Air Quality Management Plan. The 2008 Air Quality Management Plan for the Monterey Bay Area was adopted by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District in August 2008. Consistency with the Air Quality Management Plan is determined based on a project’s consistency with other regional development and transportation plans upon which the assumptions in the Air Quality Management Plan is based. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments considered the proposed project and determined that it was consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan.

No Impact – Inconsistency with Habitat Management Plan. The Department of the Army developed the Fort Ord HMP in compliance with Section 7 of the federal Endangered Species Act to provide for incidental take of federally-listed species as will occur with implementation of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The HMP protects habitat within a significant portion of the former Fort Ord while allowing development to occur in other areas with minimal restrictions. The HMP designates the project site “Development – with Reserve Areas or with Restrictions.” The HMP places management restrictions on areas with this designation. According to the HMP, 227 acres within the 308-acre landfill parcel must be managed as habitat area, and the remaining 81 areas (which includes the proposed development areas of the project site) are available for development with no specific restrictions provided. Impacts to biological resources associated with development of these areas are mitigated in the HMP through the set-aside of habitat reserve areas within the boundaries of the former Fort Ord.

Less than Significant Impact – Consistency with Regional Transportation Plan. The proposed project would add trips to each of the nearby regional transportation facilities identified in the Regional Transportation Plan, including some locations with unacceptable levels of service. Within the former Fort Ord, the Regional Transportation Plan defers to the FORA transportation programs. The proposed project would pay the FORA development impact fee to offset the fair share costs of roads improvements identified in the FORA capital improvement plan. The proposed project’s traffic generation is consistent with that of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan land use assumptions, and is therefore accurately accounted for in the Regional Transportation Plan. The proposed MST operations and administrative facility is identified in the Regional Transportation Plan. The payment of traffic impact fees would reduce cumulative impacts to regional transportation facilities to a less than significant level.

2.8 Noise

The information contained within this section is based on data from the 1982 Monterey County General Plan and the Whispering Oaks Business Park General Development Plan/Monterey-Salinas Transit FJL Center Project Environmental Noise Assessment Monterey County, California, prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin, Inc. (2010). A copy of the noise report can be found in Appendix G.
Standards of Significance

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;
- Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or groundborne noise levels;
- Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; and/or
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Policy and Regulatory Issues

1982 Monterey County General Plan

Policy 22.2: Ensure, through land use planning, a quiet acoustic environment in portions of the County to be developed.

Policy 22.2.3: The County shall require environmental review of all proposed new development, expansion of industrial facilities, and quarry excavation and processing activities which may increase the noise level in surrounding areas or generate noise levels greater than those specified in the Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise chart.

Policy 22.2.4: The County shall specify working hours as part of the use permit for industries where on- and off-site noise is a concern to adjacent land uses.
Policy 22.2.5: The County, in accordance with Table 6, should require ambient sound levels to be less at night (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) than during the day.

Policy 22.3.1: The County shall develop cooperative working relationships between those uses that produce noise and those that are sensitive to noise to mitigate existing noise problems.

Monterey County Ordinance

The Monterey County Municipal Code Ordinance (MCC 10.60.030) restricts the operation of noise producing devices as follows:

No person shall, within the unincorporated limits of the County of Monterey, operate any machine, mechanism, device, or contrivance which produces a noise level exceeding 85 dBA measured fifty feet therefrom. The prohibition in this section shall not apply to aircraft nor to any such machine, mechanism, device or contrivance which is operated in excess of two thousand five hundred feet from any occupied dwelling unit. (Ord. 2450 Section 3, 1978.)

Fort Ord Reuse Plan

Monterey County Objective B: Ensure through land use planning that noise environments are appropriate for and compatible with existing and proposed land uses based on noise guidelines provided in the noise element.

Monterey County Noise Policy B-1: The County shall ensure that the noise environments for existing residences and other existing noise-sensitive uses do not exceed the noise guidelines presented in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4, where feasible and practicable.

Monterey County Program B-1.2: Wherever practical and feasible, the County shall segregate sensitive receptors, such as residential land uses, from noise generators through land use.

Monterey County Noise Policy B-2: By complying with the noise guidelines presented in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4, the County shall ensure that new development does not adversely affect existing or proposed uses.
Monterey County Noise Policy B-3: The County shall require that acoustical studies be prepared by qualified acoustical engineers for all new development that could result in noise environments above noise range I (normally acceptable environment), as defined in Table 4.5-3. The studies shall identify the mitigation measures that would be required to comply with the noise guidelines, specified in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4, to ensure that existing or proposed uses will not be adversely affected. The studies should be submitted prior to accepting development applications as complete.

Monterey County Noise Policy B-4: The County shall enforce the State Noise Insulation Standards (California Administrative Code, Title 24) which require that interior sound levels of 45 dB-Ldn be achieved for new multi-family dwelling, condominium, hotel, and motel uses.

Monterey County Noise Policy B-5: If, through site planning or the architectural layout of buildings, it is not feasible or practicable to comply with the noise guidelines presented in Tables 4.5-3 and 4.5-4, the County shall require the following, as conditions to approval: that noise barriers be provided for new development to ensure that the noise guidelines are met; or that acoustical treatments be provided for new buildings to ensure that interior noise levels would be reduced to less than 45 dB-Ldn.

Monterey County Noise Policy B-6: If the ambient day-night average sound level (DNL) exceeds the normally acceptable noise range for residential uses (low density single family, duplex, and mobile homes; multi-family; and transient lodging), as identified in Table 4.5-3, new development shall not increase ambient DNL in residential areas by more than 3 dBA measured at the property line. If the ambient DNL is within the normally acceptable noise range for residential uses, new development shall not increase the ambient DNL by more than 5 dBA measured at the property line.

Monterey County Noise Policy B-7: If the ambient DNL exceeds the normally acceptable noise range for commercial (office buildings and business, commercial, and professional uses) or industrial (industrial, manufacturing, utilities, and agriculture) uses, as identified in Table 4.5-3, new development in commercial or industrial areas shall not increase the ambient DNL by more than 5 dBA measured at the property line.
Monterey County Noise Policy B-8: If the ambient DNL exceeds the normally acceptable noise range for public or institutional uses (passively and actively used open spaces; auditoriums, concert halls, and amphitheaters; schools, libraries, churches, hospitals and nursing homes; golf courses, riding stables, water recreation areas, and cemeteries), as identified in Table 4.5-3, new development shall not increase ambient Ldn by more than 3 dBA measured at the property line.

Monterey County Noise Policy B-9: The County shall require construction contractors to employ noise-reducing construction practices.

**Environmental Setting**

**Measurements of Noise**

Noise may be defined as unwanted sound. Noise is usually objectionable because it is disturbing or annoying. There are several noise measurements scales which are used to describe noise in a particular location. A decibel (dB) is a unit of measurement which indicates the relative amplitude of a sound. The zero on the decibel scale is based on the lowest sound level that the healthy, unimpaired human ear can detect. Sound levels in decibels are calculated on a logarithmic basis. An increase of ten decibels represents a ten-fold increase in acoustic energy, while 20 decibels is 100 times more intense, 30 decibels is 1,000 times more intense, etc. There is a relationship between the subjective noisiness or loudness of a sound and its intensity. Each ten decibel increase in sound level is perceived as approximately a doubling of loudness over a fairly wide range of intensities.

There are several methods of characterizing sound. The most common in California is the A-weighted sound level or dBA. This scale gives greater weight to the frequencies of sound to which the human ear is most sensitive. Because sound levels can vary markedly over a short period of time, a method for describing either the average character of the sound or the statistical behavior of the variations must be utilized. Most commonly, environmental sounds are described in terms of an average level that has the same acoustical energy as the summation of all the time-varying events. This energy-equivalent sound/noise descriptor is called L_{eq}. The most common averaging period is hourly, but L_{eq} can describe any series of noise events of arbitrary duration.

The scientific instrument used to measure noise is the sound level meter. Sound level meters can accurately measure environmental noise levels to within about plus or minus one dBA. Various computer models are used to predict environmental noise levels from sources, such as roadways and airports. The accuracy of the predicted models depends upon the distance the receptor is from the noise source. Close to the noise source, the models are accurate to within about plus or minus one to two dBA.
Since the sensitivity to noise increases during the evening and at night -- because excessive noise interferes with the ability to sleep -- 24-hour descriptors have been developed that incorporate artificial noise penalties added to quiet-time noise events. The Community Noise Equivalent Level, CNEL, is a measure of the cumulative noise exposure in a community, with a five dB penalty added to evening (7:00 PM - 10:00 PM) and a 10 dB addition to nocturnal (10:00 PM - 7:00 AM) noise levels.

**Existing Conditions**

Land uses bordering the project site include CSUMB properties to the east and south and vacant University of California development parcels to the west. The City of Marina and CSUMB are attempting to acquire these parcels from the University of California for possible mixed use and educational developments. CSUMB is also attempting to acquire the Golden Gate University parcel west of the project site for educational facilities.

The nearest existing sensitive receptors include student housing about 300 feet southwest of the Inter-Garrison Road/Seventh Avenue intersection and staff/faculty housing located approximately 900 feet to the east of the nearest part of the project site proposed for development. The nearest proposed (not existing) sensitive land uses are assumed to be located approximately 75 feet from the center of Inter-Garrison Road, southeast of the Inter-Garrison Road/Eighth Avenue intersection, and 200 feet or more from the primary construction areas. Refer to Figure 3 Project Vicinity Existing Conditions for an aerial photograph of the vicinity.

The existing ambient noise environment at the project site and in the vicinity is primarily the vehicular traffic along local roadways within the former Fort Ord. Ambient noise levels were monitored on August 19, 2009 and August 20, 2009 in concurrent ten-minute intervals. Noise measurements were taken at six locations. The first location, LT-1, was approximately 100 feet from the center line of Inter-Garrison Road northeast of Eighth Avenue. Ambient noise levels, resulting primarily from vehicular traffic along Inter-Garrison Road, were monitored at this site. Hourly average noise levels typically ranged from 51 to 61 dBA $L_{eq}$ during the day and from 40 to 55 dBA $L_{eq}$ at night. The Community Noise Equivalent Level was 59 dBA CNEL. A second noise measurement position, LT-2, was approximately 95 feet from the center of Imjin Parkway west of 4th Avenue. Hourly average noise levels at LT-2 typically ranged from 64 to 70 dBA $L_{eq}$ during the day and from 55 to 68 dBA Leq at night. The Community Noise Equivalent Level was 71 dBA CNEL. Four additional locations were selected in the vicinity for short-term daytime noise measurements. There was a large variation in measured noise levels based on the proximity of the measurement location to local roadway noise sources and due to the volume and speed of traffic along the adjacent roadway. Summaries of the noise measurements are presented in Table 10, Noise Measurements.
Table 10 Noise Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>$L_{eq}$</th>
<th>$L_1$</th>
<th>$L_{10}$</th>
<th>$L_{50}$</th>
<th>$L_{90}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST-1 – 100 feet west of the center of 8th Avenue at Butler Street.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-2 – 75 feet from the center of Inter-Garrison Road at Frederick Park housing.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-3 – 100 feet east of the center of the 8th Street Cut-Off south of Imjin Road.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST-4 – Staff/faculty housing along Gettysburg Court east of the project site.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Illingworth and Rodkin 2010

Note: $L_{eq}$ is the average A-weighted noise level during the measurement period.

$L_1$, $L_{10}$, $L_{50}$, $L_{90}$ are the A-weighted noise levels that are exceeded one percent, 10 percent, 50 percent, and 90 percent of the time during the measurement period.

Noise monitoring surveys of MST activities at the Thomas D. Albert (TDA) Monterey facility were also conducted. These surveys serve to quantify source noise levels from activities at the TDA Monterey facility that would be expected to also occur during the operational phase of the proposed project. The noisiest hours at the Thomas D. Albert Monterey facility are typically at the beginning of the day (5:00 AM to 7:00 AM). The majority of employees arrive, conduct safety inspections of the buses prior to departure, and then drive busses toward their designated routes during these hours.

The project site is located just over two miles from Marina Municipal Airport and is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**Project Analysis**

**Noise Exposure and Vibration – Short-Term Construction Effects**

The construction of the proposed project would generate noise and would temporarily increase noise levels at nearby residential receivers. The nearest proposed (not existing) sensitive land uses are located near the MST site, and it is assumed construction on that site would be complete prior to construction of these residences. Noise impacts resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise sensitive receptors.
Construction activities generate considerable amounts of noise, especially during the construction of project infrastructure when heavy equipment is used. The highest maximum instantaneous noise levels generated by project construction would typically range from about 90 to 95 dBA $L_{\text{max}}$ at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Hourly average construction generated noise levels would be about 81 dBA to 88 dBA $L_{\text{eq}}$ measured at a distance of 50 feet from the center of the site during busy construction periods (e.g., earth moving equipment, impact tools, etc.) depending on the amount of equipment and type of construction occurring at the site at a particular time. Construction generated noise levels drop off at a rate of about six dBA per doubling of distance between the source and receptor. Shielding by buildings or terrain often results in lower construction noise levels at distant receptors, such as the housing to the southwest of the project site. Typical un-shielded construction period noise levels are presented in Table 11, Construction Noise.

### Table 11  Construction Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Approximate Noise Level Range $L_{\text{eq}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>81 dBA to 88 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>75 dBA to 82 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 feet</td>
<td>69 dBA to 76 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 feet</td>
<td>63 dBA to 70 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 feet</td>
<td>57 dBA to 63 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 feet</td>
<td>51 dBA to 58 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Illingworth and Rodkin 2010 and EMC Planning Group*

The vast majority of the proposed construction activities associated with the Whispering Oaks Business Park and MST facility would occur at distances of 900 feet or more from the nearest residential receivers and would not be expected to interfere with normal residential activities. Construction noise impacts primarily result when construction activities occur during noise sensitive times of the day, the construction occurs in areas immediately adjoining noise sensitive land uses, or when construction durations last over extended periods of time. Construction activities associated with the project would not be expected to result in noise levels that would exceed 60 dBA $L_{\text{eq}}$ for a period of more than one year at a particular receiver or group of receivers. The construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant temporary noise impacts on receptors within the project vicinity; however some construction related noise may occur. Pile driving, the most common source of construction causing elevated vibration levels, is not proposed with the project.
MST Facility Operational Noise

MST proposes a new facility on approximately 24 acres located near the corner of Seventh Avenue and Inter-Garrison Road to provide for fleet expansion and upgraded maintenance, operations, and administrative facilities. At full build-out, the facility will support 205 buses, 50 paratransit vehicles, 60 support vehicles, and 550 employees. Project components include a fueling island, body shop, paint facilities, central warehousing, a dispatching office, driver training facilities, a customer service center, taxi vehicle inspection area, and parking.

The primary noise sources associated with proposed operations at the MST facility would be circulation, idling, and safely inspection of buses conducted prior to departure. Employee and visitor parking lots and bus maintenance activities would also generate noise, but would not measurably contribute to hourly average or daily average noise levels noise levels emanating from the site. A 10-foot security barrier that provides sound attenuation in locations where a solid wall is used is planned along the west, south, and east property lines of the project site. At two locations (atop retaining walls at the southwest and northeast) an open iron fence that does not attenuate noise will be used; however, in these locations the retain walls will provide some attenuation. The site plan also incorporates large buffers between the primary bus parking areas and existing/proposed sensitive land uses in the vicinity to provide additional noise attenuation with distance.

The noise report includes a credible worst-case scenario to calculate noise levels expected as a result of build-out operations at the MST facility. The worst-case scenario analysis did not include the noise attenuation that would be provided by the 10-foot solid security barrier proposed along much of the project site periphery, or intervening terrain, because future sensitive land uses may consist of multi-story buildings in which sensitive building facades may overlook these barriers. The nearest proposed sensitive land uses were assumed to be located 75 feet from the center of Inter-Garrison Road, southeast of the Inter-Garrison Road/Eighth Avenue intersection. The nearest receptors would be located approximately 490 to 730 feet from the primary bus parking areas planned north of the employee and visitor parking lot.

Worst-case hourly average noise levels from operations associated with the MST facility are calculated to reach 56 dBA $L_{eq}$ at the nearest planned receptors located south of Inter-Garrison Road. Maximum instantaneous noise levels would typically range from 51 to 54 dBA $L_{max}$. The Community Noise Equivalent Level resulting from operations at the MST facility is calculated to be 54 dBA CNEL. Noise levels generated by operations at the MST facility would not exceed “normally acceptable” noise level standards at planned housing south of the project site and would not substantially increase ambient noise levels on a permanent basis.

The nearest existing student housing is located over 900 feet from the four primary bus parking areas. Worst-case hourly average noise levels at these receivers are calculated to reach 50 dBA
Leq and maximum instantaneous noise levels would typically range from 45 to 49 dBA L\(_{\text{max}}\). Community Noise Equivalent Levels at the proposed student housing southwest of the project site would be 48 dBA.

Worst-case hourly average noise levels at the nearest staff/faculty housing, approximately 3,000 feet east of the MST site, are calculated to reach 42 dBA L\(_{\text{eq}}\). Maximum instantaneous noise levels would typically range from 38 to 39 dBA L\(_{\text{max}}\) at a distance of 3,000 feet. The Community Noise Equivalent Level resulting from operations at the MST facility is calculated to be 40 dBA CNEL at the nearest existing receivers east of the project site. Noise levels generated by the operation of the MST facility would not substantially increase ambient noise levels at the nearest existing receptors east of the project site.

Certain maintenance activities, such as use of impact wrenches, could result in minor vibration; however, there are no operational sources of groundborne vibration that would be perceptible beyond the project site boundaries.

**Noise Exposure – Operational Noise – Whispering Oaks Business Park**

The Whispering Oaks GDP calls for a commercial/light industrial center on approximately 58 acres located generally north of Inter-Garrison Road near Eighth Avenue. Specific uses within the business park are not known, but are generally outlined as commercial and light industrial. Examples of allowed uses include professional offices and services, retail businesses of light commercial/light industrial character, and convenience retail to service light commercial tenants. The uses allowed would be similar to current CSUMB and commercial/industrial uses located in the project vicinity. On-site noise resulting from such uses would primarily be limited to on-site vehicle circulation, loading and unloading activities, and the operation of heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) equipment.

Some uses, such as research and development uses, trades or artisan shops, or light industrial/manufacturing uses may generate higher noise levels. Typically, these types of uses require more and larger HVAC equipment, result in infrequent, loud events if building doors are open during activities, or result in more loading and unloading events. Research and development uses would not be allowed if they produce excessive noise and shops for tradesmen and artisans would only be allowed provided that all equipment and materials, except vehicles, are maintained within a structure. Similar restrictions would be assumed for light industrial and manufacturing uses. Therefore the uses with the potential to generate the highest noise levels would not be expected to result in a substantial noise increase at the nearest existing student housing areas to the west, planned staff/faculty housing land uses south of Inter-Garrison Road, or at the existing staff/faculty housing areas east of the project site. Similarly, noise would not be expected to pose development constraints on adjacent properties.
According to the Whispering Oaks GDP, several uses may be allowed within the business park, but may require additional review and discretionary permitting due to specific size, environmental, safety, infrastructure, storage and other concerns. During this review careful consideration should be given to the location and orientation of major noise sources expected within the business park such as loading dock areas, mechanical equipment, and large building doors that lead to noisy work areas. Major noise sources should be located internal to the site where feasible, minimized in areas within direct line of sight to sensitive land uses, and/or shielded by noise barriers. This review and permitting process would control noise emanating from the business park and would minimize noise received at sensitive off-site locations. It is assumed that noise generation would be limited to the levels allowed under the 1982 Monterey County General Plan and Monterey County Code, and noise generation would not be allowed to result in a substantial increase in noise at sensitive uses in the project vicinity. Assuming these issues are individually addressed with the implementation of project-level review and the use permit process, noise resulting from development facilitated by the Whispering Oaks GDP would not be expected to be significant at the nearest existing student housing areas to the west, planned staff/faculty housing land uses south of Inter-Garrison Road, or at the existing staff/faculty housing areas east of the site. Noise resulting from uses allowed by the Whispering Oaks GDP would not be expected to pose development constraints on the adjacent properties.

**Noise Exposure – Project-Generated Traffic Noise**

Traffic data provided by Hatch Mott MacDonald was reviewed to calculate potential project-related traffic noise level increases anticipated along roadways in the project vicinity. Traffic noise levels were calculated with $L_{eq}V2$ Release 1.203, Caltrans’ version of the Federal Highway Administration’s Stamina/Optima Traffic Noise Model. The results of the traffic noise modeling efforts are summarized in Table 4 of the noise report.

Roadway segments were selected to establish baseline conditions in the project vicinity. These roadways are the major thoroughfares in and around the project site, and would potentially experience the highest project-related traffic noise level increase. Intersections further from the project site would be expected to experience less project-related traffic and less project-related noise.

Calculated CNEL values are “worst-case” estimates because they do not take acoustical shielding from existing buildings or terrain into account. Noise levels were calculated at a reference distance of 100 feet from the centerline of each roadway. The 60 dBA CNEL, 65 dBA CNEL, and 70 dBA CNEL noise contour distances are shown for each of the five traffic scenarios. Noise contours located within 50 feet from the roadway centerline are not included in the table as these locations are generally within the roadway right-of-way.
Traffic noise levels throughout the former Fort Ord are projected to increase substantially over existing conditions as a result of already approved projects. For the purposes of this assessment, a significant noise impact would occur if traffic noise levels resulting from the project would increase noise levels by three dBA CNEL. Proposed project contributions to traffic noise increases are projected to range from zero to two dBA CNEL along studied roadways (Illingworth and Rodkin 2010, Table 4). The addition of project traffic would not increase traffic noise levels at sensitive receivers along affected roadway segments by more than two dBA CNEL as compared to background traffic noise levels expected without the project. Project-generated noise level increases would not exceed the three dBA CNEL threshold and would not be readily noticeable. As such, the noise impact resulting from the proposed project traffic would be less than significant.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Less than Significant Impact – Construction-related Noise at Sensitive Receptors.** Construction-related noise is not anticipated to result in a significant temporary noise impact on sensitive receptors in the project vicinity, although some construction-related noise would be audible outside the project site. Sensitive receptors are far enough away that noise would not occur at significant levels.

**Less than Significant Impact – Operational Noise – Whispering Oaks Business Park.** The potential for operational noise is limited by the types of uses allowed on the project site by the Whispering Oaks GDP. Allowed uses are either quiet by their nature (such as retail and offices) or are restricted to specifically exclude those that result in significant noise (such as manufacturing) or that are interior to shield noise (printing). Other uses that could result in significant noise would require the additional review that accompanies the discretionary use permitting. This use permit process would allow conditions to ensure that noise emanating from the business park and would be minimized to the extent that noise received at sensitive off-site locations would be minimal. Assuming these issues are individually addressed with the implementation of project-level review and the use permit process, noise resulting from development facilitated by the Whispering Oaks GDP would not be expected to be significant at the nearby sensitive receptors and would not constrain development of adjacent parcels.

**Less than Significant Impact – Operational Noise – MST Facility.** The primary bus parking areas are located several hundred feet from existing/proposed sensitive land uses in the vicinity, so noise from bus movement would be minimized. Noise levels generated by operations at the MST facility would not exceed “normally acceptable” noise level standards at proposed staff/faculty housing south of the project site and would not substantially increase ambient noise levels on a permanent basis. MST operations would not substantially increase ambient noise levels at the nearest existing receptors southwest or east of the project site. A 10-foot high
security barrier that provides sound attenuation in locations where a solid wall is used is planned along much of the project site periphery. The solid barrier would attenuate noise produced on the project site, although the noise report concluded noise impacts would be less than significant even when attenuating effects of the wall were not taken into consideration.

**Less than Significant Impact – Project Generated Traffic Noise.** Traffic data was reviewed to calculate potential project-related traffic noise level increase anticipated along roadways in the project vicinity. According to the review, project-generated noise level increases would not exceed the three dBA CNEL threshold and would not be readily noticeable. Therefore, the noise impact resulting from the project traffic would be less than significant.

**No Impact – Groundborne Vibration.** The proposed project would not involve pile-driving during construction. No operations activities would result in groundborne vibration noticeable off the project site.

### 2.9 Traffic and Circulation

This section is based on information in a traffic impact analysis prepared by Hatch Mott McDonald in June 2010. The November 2009 draft report was peer-reviewed by Hexagon Transportation Consultants and revisions made to subsequent drafts respond to the peer review comments. The traffic impact analysis and peer review are included in Appendix I.

**Standards of Significance**

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit;

- conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;

- substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
• result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks;
• result in inadequate emergency access; or
• conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

The County of Monterey Department of Public Works indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if, for intersections under the jurisdiction of Monterey County, it would:
• decrease the level of service at a signalized intersection to LOS D, E, or F from a better level of service;
• add 0.010 or more to the critical movements volume to capacity ratio of a signalized intersection already operating at an unacceptable LOS D and E during the peak hour;
• add any traffic to an intersection operating at LOS F;
• cause an un-signalized intersection to meet or exceed traffic signal warrants;
• decrease the level of service on any roadway segment from LOS A, B, or C to LOS D, E, or F; from LOS D to LOS E or F; or from LOS E to LOS F;
• add any traffic during the peak hour to a roadway segment operating at LOS F; or
• severely impact traffic operations due to either the creation of or exacerbation of vehicle queues at an otherwise acceptably-operating intersection.

The proposed project would have a significant effect in the City of Marina if it would:
• cause pre-project operations at a signalized intersection to deteriorate from an acceptable level (LOS A, B, C, or D) to an unacceptable level (LOS E or F);
• increase the pre-project average delay at a signalized intersection by more than 1.0 second at intersections operating at LOS E or F;
• cause side-street operations (“worst approach”) at any un-signalized intersection to deteriorate from an acceptable level (LOS A, B, C, D, or E on side street) to an unacceptable level (LOS F on side street); or
• add traffic to any un-signalized intersection movement that results in an increase to the delay for any approach operating at LOS F pre-project;
- meet the Caltrans peak-hour volume signal warrant at any un-signalized intersection.
- cause pre-project operations to deteriorate at an all-way stop controlled intersection from an acceptable level (LOS A, B, C, or D) to an unacceptable level (LOS E or F); or
- add traffic to an all-way stop controlled intersection operating at LOS E or F that results in an increase to the overall intersection delay, or
- cause a roadway segment operating at an acceptable level (LOS A, B, C, or D) to deteriorate to an unacceptable level (LOS E or F); or
- cause a roadway segment operating at LOS E to deteriorate one service level; or
- add one trip to a segment operating at LOS F.
- severely impact traffic operations due to either the creation of or exacerbation of vehicle queues at an otherwise acceptably-operating intersection.

The proposed project would have a significant effect in the City of Seaside if it would:
- cause operations at signalized intersections to deteriorate from an acceptable level (LOS A, B, or C) to an unacceptable level (LOS D, E, or F); or
- increase the average delay by more than 2.0 seconds at signalized intersections operating at LOS D; or
- increase the average delay by more than 1.0 seconds at signalized intersections operating at LOS E or F.
- cause operations to deteriorate at any un-signalized intersection from an acceptable level (LOS A, B, or C) to an unacceptable level (LOS D, E, or F); or
- add any traffic to an un-signalized intersection operating at LOS F and the Caltrans peak hour signal warrant is met.
- severely impact traffic operations due to either the creation of or exacerbation of vehicle queues at an otherwise acceptably-operating intersection.

The proposed project would have a significant effect within the jurisdiction of Caltrans if it would:
- result in a level of service lower than the transition between LOS C and LOS D; or
- add new trips to an intersection that is already operating at LOS F.
The level of service standards for each jurisdiction are: City of Marina (LOS D); City of Seaside (LOS C); and Caltrans (transition between LOS C and LOS D). Typically, LOS E is considered acceptable for side street (“worst approach”) operations at un-signalized intersections.

**Policy and Regulatory Issues**

**2005 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan**

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) adopts a regional transportation plan to provide a basis for the planning and programming of local, state, and federal transportation funds to transportation projects in Monterey County. The 2005 Regional Transportation Plan identifies existing and future transportation related needs, considers all modes of travel, and identifies what can be completed with anticipated available funding for projects and programs. Roads nearest the project site included within the Regional Transportation Plan’s programs are Imjin Parkway, Reservation Road, and State Route 1. The Regional Transportation Plan was prepared in consultation with FORA, and it reflects FORA’s programs and transportation priorities within the former Fort Ord.

**1982 Monterey County General Plan**

*Policy 37.5.2:* Public facilities shall be located and designed to allow for convenient access and efficient transport of all intended users.

*Policy 39.1.4:* New development shall be located where there is existing road and highway capacity or where adequate road and highway capacity will be provided.

**Fort Ord Reuse Plan**

The *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* was adopted in June 1997. The following transportation policies are applicable to the proposed project.

*Transportation Demand Management Policy A-1.1:* TDM programs shall be encouraged.

Programs A-1.1 and A-1.2 under this policy suggest the implementation of compressed work weeks, flexible work hours, telecommuting, ridesharing, transit subsidies, guaranteed rides home, bicycle parking, and parking pricing strategies. Program A-1.3 requires new developments to incorporate design features that would strengthen transportation demand management (TDM) programs.
Streets and Roads Policy C-1: Each jurisdiction shall identify the functional purpose of all roadways and design the street system in conformance with Reuse Plan design standards.

Pedestrian and Bicycles Policy A-1: Each jurisdiction shall provide and maintain an attractive, safe and comprehensive pedestrian system.

Pedestrian and Bicycles Policy B-1: Each jurisdiction shall provide and maintain an attractive, safe and comprehensive bicycle system.

Program B-1.2: Each jurisdiction shall review new development to provide bicycle system facilities consistent with the Reuse Plan and the Bicycle System Plan concurrently with development approval.

Transit Policy A-1: Each jurisdiction with lands at former Fort Ord shall coordinate with MST to provide regional bus service and facilities to serve the key activity centers and key corridors within former Fort Ord.

Level of Service Standards and Policies

To help maintain acceptable traffic flows along roadways, public agencies adopt minimum level of service criteria for roads and highways in their jurisdiction. The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) classifies levels of service by the acronym “LOS” and a letter designation of A–F, with LOS A having traffic operations with easy movement and very low delay, and LOS F having traffic operations that are very difficult or impossible and very long delays.

In addition, Fort Ord Reuse Plan Streets and Roads Program C-1.2 requires jurisdictions to assign an appropriate threshold performance standard for its roadway system, in order to measure the impacts of future growth on the system.

Caltrans’ standards are applicable on state highways. Caltrans’ minimum acceptable level of service is the transition between LOS C and LOS D. The TAMC standard for urban roadway performance is LOS D; in some places LOS E is considered acceptable if that was the existing level of service at the time the standard was adopted. TAMC is responsible for the Congestion Management Program (CMP) in Monterey County, and for preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The traffic report prepared by Hatch Mott McDonald analyzes potential impacts at intersections within the jurisdictions of Caltrans, Monterey County, City of Marina and City of Seaside. Refer also to the Thresholds of Significance, presented earlier. Existing levels of service on specific roadways and at specific intersections are discussed later in this section.
Mitigation Fee Programs

FORA. FORA assesses development impact fees on projects built within the former Fort Ord. The fees provide funding for various traffic infrastructure improvements, both on the former army base and regionally. Payment of the impact fees would mitigate the proposed project’s share of impacts on regional roadways within the former Fort Ord. Examples of former Fort Ord roadways that would have improvements funded by the FORA fee include General Jim Moore Boulevard and South Boundary Road. Payment of the fees would also mitigate the project’s cumulative impacts towards regional improvements, such as State Route 1, State Route 68, and State Route 156. The FORA project list and fee schedule were updated based on a 2005 nexus study. The following current FORA capital improvement program projects are located near the project site:

- Widening of Davis Road from two to four lanes between Reservation Road and Blanco Road, including reconstruction of the existing bridge over the Salinas River;
- Widening of Reservation Road from two to four lanes between the East Garrison development and Davis Road;
- Widen Inter-Garrison Road from two to four lanes between the future Eastside Parkway and Reservation Road;
- Construct Eastside Parkway between Eucalyptus Road and Inter-Garrison Road; and
- Upgrading and reconstruction of General Jim Moore Boulevard as four-lane arterial from Coe Avenue to South Boundary Road. Construction of this improvement is underway on the segment between Coe Avenue and just south of Broadway Avenue and will be completed by November 2010.

It should be recognized that the FORA capital improvement program focuses on improvements to the higher order access and mobility routes as listed above. The specific local network improvements will be identified with each of the FORA project developments. The FORA capital improvement program also contributes some money towards, but does not fully fund, other regional improvements, specifically the following:

- Widening of State Route 1 to three lanes in each direction between Fremont Boulevard and Del Monte Avenue in Seaside/Sand City;
- Construction of the State Route 1/Monterey Road interchange, to be located between the Light Fighter Drive and Fremont Boulevard interchanges;
- State Route 68 improvements at the intersections of Laureles Grade, San Benancio Road, and Corral De Tierra Road, including left turn lanes and signal timing improvements; and
- State Route 156 widening to a four-lane freeway and construction of new interchanges.
TAMC/Monterey County. TAMC established a development impact fee in August 2008. Through agreement between TAMC and FORA, development projects that are subject to the FORA transportation fee are exempt from the TAMC development impact fee because the FORA fee covers regional impacts outside Fort Ord (TAMC 2009). Monterey County does not have a separate traffic impact fee.

City of Marina. The City of Marina has established a traffic capital improvement program and development impact fee that funds roadway and intersection improvements. Improvements funded include the widening of Imjin Parkway to four lanes between Imjin Road and Reservation Road and signalization of the Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway intersection. The proposed project would be responsible for payment of its applicable City of Marina traffic impact fees if it would impact operations at locations where the fee funds improvements.

City of Seaside. The City of Seaside does not have a traffic impact fee. Any necessary monetary contributions towards impacts in Seaside would likely involve fair-share payments towards the implementation of necessary improvements.

Caltrans. Caltrans does not have a traffic impact fee. Any necessary monetary contributions towards impacts to the state highway system would need to go through another jurisdiction, such as FORA.

Impacted roadway facilities not covered by any fee program may be subject to a fair-share contribution towards needed improvements.

Environmental Setting

Roads and Highways

The project site is accessed from several local and regional roads that connect the project site to the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas, and to State Route 1 and U.S. Highway 101. Existing roads near the project site are shown in Figure 2 Project Vicinity and Figure 3, Project Vicinity Conditions presented in Section 1.0 Introduction. The primary existing access to the project site is off Inter-Garrison Road, a two lane roadway connecting General Jim Moore Boulevard (within CSUMB) at the west with East Garrison at the east. Secondary access to the project site is off Engineer's Equipment Road, a narrow dead-end road, which will become the primary access when the project is built. Access to/from State Route 1 is by way of General Jim Moore Boulevard, Light Fighter Drive, or Eighth Street Cut-off, Engineer's Equipment Road, and Eighth Street. Imjin Parkway provides access to and from the east since the Inter-Garrison Road connection to Reservation Road is not yet built.
The street network within the former Fort Ord has been, and continues to be, in the process of upgrades and modifications as redevelopment activities progress. Note that Sixth Avenue north of Eighth Street and Engineer’s Equipment Road is currently abandoned. Due to the lack of development at East Garrison, the planned connection from Inter-Garrison Road to Reservation Road is not expected to be in place until cumulative conditions.

**Transit, Bicycles, Pedestrians**

MST route 16 passes the project site on Inter-Garrison Road. There are no existing pedestrian facilities adjacent to the project site, although there are sidewalks west of the project site within the CSUMB main campus and east of the project site within the CSUMB housing areas. Bicycle lanes are striped on Inter-Garrison Road adjacent to the project site, and extending west and east of the project site. Inter-Garrison Road provides the only direct connection between the CSUMB main campus and the housing areas to the east, and is used by bicyclists, pedestrians, and skateboarders traveling between the two points.

Inter-Garrison Road is proposed as part of a realigned multi-modal corridor envisioned in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* to follow Imjin Parkway and Blanco Road. FORA is currently considering a new route alignment that would follow Eighth Street, Inter-Garrison Road, and Davis Road. The corridor is planned to ultimately include rail transit and a bicycle/pedestrian path.

**Traffic Impact Assessment**

The traffic impact assessment studied traffic operations at 29 intersections and four freeway segments, during typical weekday AM and PM peak hours. The following intersections and freeway segments were studied. The jurisdiction for each is listed in brackets: Monterey County [MC], Caltrans [C], Marina [M], and Seaside [S].

**Intersections**

1. Davis Road/Reservation Road [MC];
2. Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road (future) [MC];
3. Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway [M];
4. Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway [M];
5. Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway [M];
6. Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway [M];
7. Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway [C];
8. Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway [C];
9.  Imjin Road/Eighth Street [M];
10. General Jim Moore Boulevard /Inter-Garrison Road [M];
11. General Jim Moore Boulevard/Divarty Street [M];
12. General Jim Moore Boulevard/Light Fighter Drive [S];
13. Second Avenue/Light Fighter Drive [S];
14. First Avenue/Light Fighter Drive [S];
15. General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue [S];
16. Seventh Avenue – Eighth Street/Inter-Garrison Road [M];
17. MST North Bus Driveway/Engineer’s Equipment Road (future) [MC];
18. Whispering Oaks Drive/Engineer’s Equipment Road (future) [MC];
19. Whispering Oaks Way/Inter-Garrison Road (future) [MC];
20. Engineer’s Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road (future) [MC];
21. Eighth Avenue/Inter-Garrison Road [MC];
22. Project Driveway #6/Inter-Garrison Road (future) [MC];
23. Sixth Avenue-Engineer’s Equipment Road/Eighth Street [M];
24. Eastside Parkway/Gigling Road (future) [MC];
25. Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway [M];
26. Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road [M];
27. Blanco Road/Reservation Road [MC];
28. General Jim Moore Boulevard/Gigling Road [S]; and
29. Eighth Avenue/Gigling Road [MC].

Freeway Segments

1.  State Route 1, Del Monte Boulevard/Imjin Parkway [C];
2.  State Route 1, Imjin Parkway/Light Fighter Drive [C];
3.  State Route 1, Light Fighter Drive/Monterey Road (future interchange) [C]; and
4.  State Route 1, between Monterey Road (future interchange) and Fremont Boulevard [C].
Note that the above list includes analysis of six access points into the study project site, including a project driveway forming a fourth leg of the Eighth Avenue/Inter-Garrison Road intersection. The locations of these intersections and freeway segments are identified in Figure 21, Studied Intersections and Freeway Segments.

**Existing Levels of Service**

Under existing conditions, two of the studied intersections operate at an unacceptable overall level of service and two operate at unacceptable level of service for the worst approach (a side street at an un-signalized intersection). The intersection of General Jim Moore Boulevard and Broadway Avenue operates at LOS F during the AM peak period. The southbound Davis Road approach at the Davis Road/Reservation Road intersection currently operates at an overall unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour. The intersection of Imjin Parkway and the State Route 1 southbound ramps operates at LOS F during both the AM and PM peak periods and the intersection of Imjin Parkway and the State Route 1 northbound ramps operates at LOS F during the AM peak period. Existing level of service deficiencies are summarized in Table 12, Existing Congested Intersections.

**Table 12 Existing Congested Intersections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Road/Reservation Road</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Hatch Mott McDonald 2010

*Notes:* LOS = Level of Service. Standard for the City of Seaside and County of Monterey is LOS C. Standard for the City of Marina is LOS D. Standard for Caltrans is the transition between LOS C and LOS D. Standard at un-signalized worst approach is typically LOS E. Study intersections not listed operate at acceptable LOS for AM and PM peak periods. LOS in excess of standard for the intersection is highlighted by bold type.
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During existing conditions all of State Route 1 between Del Monte Boulevard and Fremont Boulevard operates at a deficient LOS D during the AM peak hour. Only the segment between the Imjin Parkway and Del Monte Boulevard interchanges operates deficiently (LOS D) during the PM peak hour.

**Background Levels of Service**

Background conditions traffic volumes are the sum of existing volumes and trips associated with approved projects within the study area. The approved projects would generate a total of 122,941 daily trips, with 7,562 trips (3,845 in, 3,717 out) during the AM peak hour, and 11,353 trips (5,695 in, 5,658 out) during the PM peak hour. Two of the larger approved projects are assumed to be only partly built-out under background conditions. Exhibit 6A in the traffic report lists the approved projects assumed constructed under the background condition. The background analysis assumes two changes to the roadway network in the vicinity of the project site: the closure of Eighth Street Cut-off between Sixth Avenue and Inter-Garrison Road, and the reconfiguration of the intersection such that Eighth Street continues straight onto Engineer’s Equipment Road at Sixth Avenue. The future alignment is shown in Figure 13a, Circulation Infrastructure Improvements, presented in Section 1.0 Introduction.

Under background conditions the intersections listed under existing conditions worsen and additional intersections operate at an unacceptable level of service. Background level of service deficiencies are summarized below and in Table 13, Background Congested Intersections.

**Davis Road/Reservation Road.** The Davis Road/Reservation Road intersection would operate at an overall unacceptable LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours, with the southbound Davis Road approach also operating at LOS F.

**Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway.** This intersection would operate at an overall unacceptable LOS F during the AM peak hours.

**Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway.** This intersection would operate at a deficient overall LOS F, with side-street delay of LOS F, during both the AM and PM peak hours.

**Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway.** This intersection would operate at an overall LOS F during the PM peak hour.

**Northbound State Route 1 Ramps/Imjin Parkway.** Operations at this intersection would be at an overall LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours.

**Southbound State Route 1 Ramps/Imjin Parkway.** Both overall operations and operations of the southbound approach to this intersection would at an unacceptable LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours.
### Table 13  Background Congested Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Background LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Road/Reservation Road</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach) <em>Deficient under Existing</em></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach) <em>Deficient under Existing</em></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection) <em>Deficient under Existing</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach) <em>Deficient under Existing</em></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard/Inter-Garrison Road</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard/Divarty Street</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Deficient under Existing</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanco Road/Reservation Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Hatch Mott McDonald 2010

*Notes:* LOS = Level of Service. Standard for the City of Seaside and County of Monterey is LOS C. Standard for the City of Marina is LOS D. Standard for Caltrans is the transition between LOS C and LOS D. Standard at un-signalized worst approach is typically LOS E. Study intersections not listed operate at acceptable LOS for AM and PM peak periods. LOS in excess of standard for the intersection is highlighted by bold type.

**General Jim Moore Boulevard/Inter-Garrison Road.** This intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours.

**General Jim Moore Boulevard/Divarty Street.** Operations at this intersection would be at a deficient LOS F during the PM peak hour.
General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue. Operations at the General Jim Moore/Broadway intersection under Background conditions are at an unacceptable LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours.

Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway. This intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during both the AM and PM peak hours.

Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road. Operations at this intersection would be at a deficient LOS F during the PM peak hour.

Blanco Road/Reservation Road. During the PM peak hour, this intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS E.

Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway. The Imjin Parkway left turn movement at the Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway intersection is projected to be deficient under background conditions. The required storage capacity for the vehicles making this traffic movement during the AM peak hour would exceed the currently available storage and spill out into the adjacent through lane on Imjin Parkway.

State Route 1 Segments. All four freeway study segments of State Route 1 experience operational deficiencies in both directions during at least one peak period during background conditions.

Project Analysis

Project Phases

The traffic impact analysis presents project traffic effects for three scenarios that align with the proposed project phasing: Phase 1, MST development; Phase 2 additional development within lots 2-12 of the Whispering Oaks Business Park, and Phase 3 build-out of the Whispering Oaks Business Park. The traffic impact analysis assigns the full level of traffic generation for each of these phases in 2013, 2016, and 2030 respectively. The level of traffic activity would actually be achieved over time, starting with the initial relocation of existing MST buses and employees from current facilities, and increase gradually as required by increases in transit ridership. Likewise, traffic generated by the business park development would gradually increase over time as individual lots are developed and occupied.

Proposed Street Network Changes

The circulation system in the vicinity of the project site would change with time. Likewise, new streets would be developed within the project site during the several phases of project
development. These changes are summarized below by phase, as assumed in the traffic impact analysis. Refer to the earlier section for changes expected to occur during background conditions. Also refer to Section 3.0 Cumulative for changes anticipated to occur under the cumulative traffic condition.

**Phase 1.** Project-constructed Phase 1 street improvements would be limited to Inter-Garrison Road right and left turn lanes (at project driveways), frontage improvements along the MST site, and preliminary improvements to Engineer's Equipment Road to facilitate bus and employee access from Imjin Road via Eighth Street or Sixth Avenue. The proposed project would extend Engineer's Equipment Road (as a private driveway connecting via the western spur of Whispering Oaks Drive) to provide the primary access point to the employee parking lot. Engineer's Equipment Road would not connect to Inter-Garrison Road in Phase 1.

**Phase 2.** With Phase 2 the proposed project would construct final improvements to the existing section of Engineer's Equipment Road, an extension of Engineer's Equipment Road southward to intersect with Inter-Garrison Road (opening Engineer's Equipment Road as a public street connecting between Eighth Street/Sixth Avenue and Inter-Garrison Road). Phase 2 would also include construction of Whispering Oaks Drive, and Inter-Garrison Road frontage improvements along the Whispering Oaks Business Park.

**Build-out.** No significant on-site or off-site road improvements would occur. If the cul-de-sac at the eastern end of Whispering Oaks Drive has not already been constructed, it would be constructed during this phase.

**Trip Generation**

The proposed project would generate additional automobile and bus trips in the vicinity of the project site. The initial bus trips already emanate from the two existing MST facilities; those trips would be transferred to the project site and increase trips at the project site and vicinity, but would have no effect on regional trip numbers. MST facility trip generation is based upon information on the existing facilities and assumptions made by Hatch Mott McDonald regarding employee mid-day trips and vehicle occupancy. MST currently employs 224 employees, including general administration, operations administration, fleet maintenance, facility maintenance, and bus drivers. MST has 62 buses and six relief vans in its active fleet. The transit agency also has additional buses that are not in its active fleet, but would be stored on the project site, and used as temporary replacement buses when necessary. The Whispering Oaks Business Park trip generation is based on the ITE rate for Industrial Park, and assumes 600,000 square feet of buildings. Project trip generation is summarized by phase in Table 14, Trip Generation.
Table 14  Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
<th>AM Peak (total/in/out)</th>
<th>PM Peak (total/in/out)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>163 108 55</td>
<td>157 37 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,083</td>
<td>458 385 73</td>
<td>414 95 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>300 252 48</td>
<td>271 63 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total</td>
<td>8,695</td>
<td>921 745 176</td>
<td>842 195 647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hatch Mott McDonald, Inc. 2010

Trip Distribution

The traffic impact assessment determined trip distribution patterns separately for both the MST busses, MST employees, and the Whispering Oaks Business Park components. Distribution assumptions varied based on type of trip (employee commute or bus route) and phase. Table 15, Trip Distribution shows anticipated destinations for project trips.

Table 15  Trip Distribution (Percent of Trips)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination/Origination</th>
<th>MST Busses</th>
<th>MST Employees</th>
<th>Whispering Oaks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 1 North of Marina</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina via California Avenue</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 1 South of Marina</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Seaside via General Jim Moore</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Avenue to Seaside</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas via Davis Road</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas via Blanco Road</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation Road south of Davis Road</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Garrison Road east of project site (local)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Ord/CSUMB west of the project site (local)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hatch Mott McDonald, Inc. 2010

Employee and bus trips along State Route 1 would utilize different routes to and from the project site. All trips have been routed to avoid passing through the CSUMB campus core; the CSUMB Master Plan proposes that the core area of campus will ultimately be closed to non-CSUMB vehicle traffic.
Trips to State Route 1 would be split between Imjin Parkway and Light-Fighter Drive: all northbound trips would use Imjin Parkway, but southbound Route 1 trips would use both Imjin Parkway (17 percent of trips) and Light Fighter Drive (8 percent of trips). The traffic report assigned bus trips to use either Eighth Street (en route to Imjin Parkway) or Seventh Avenue (en route to Light Fighter Drive), in order to avoid traveling through the CSUMB campus core on Inter-Garrison Road and/or General Jim Moore Boulevard. MST and Whispering Oaks project trips to and from Salinas are anticipated to use a number of routes, including Reservation Road, Davis Road, and Blanco Road. The Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road connector is assumed to not yet be built during these scenarios (it is assumed to be opened under the cumulative scenario). Distribution assumptions were changed slightly for MST bus and employee trips for Phase 2 and later, as some trips would shift onto the newly opened extension of Engineer’s Equipment Road.

**Project Level of Service Analysis**

The traffic impact report analyzes project-level effects for three phases of the proposed project. This approach provides a better understanding of when project effects occur and at what point mitigation would be required, and also helps understand which component of the proposed project results in significant traffic effects.

**Phase 1 Level of Service (2013 Conditions)**

This scenario assumes construction and occupancy of the MST facility and no development of the Whispering Oaks Business Park. Note that traffic volumes assumed under this scenario would build gradually as the MST fleet and operations expand over time. Trips currently generated from the two existing MST facilities would be transferred to the project site and vicinity. Direct access to the project site would be provided via two driveways on Inter-Garrison Road and two driveways off of Engineer’s Equipment Road. The westernmost driveways on Inter-Garrison Road and Engineers Equipment Road (bus driveways) would provide access to only the bus storage and maintenance yard. Principal bus access to the MST site would be at the northern driveway on Engineer’s Equipment Road; only busses immediately entering service on Inter-Garrison Road would use the southern driveway. Access into the employee and visitor parking lot would be from the other Inter-Garrison Road driveway (located opposite the Eighth Avenue/Inter-Garrison Road intersection) and from the western end of Whispering Oaks Drive off Engineer’s Equipment Road.

Phase 1 of the proposed project would add trips to 12 intersections that are currently operating at unacceptable levels of service, and would increase delays, but would not result in any the levels of service degrading compared to background conditions. Phase 1 of the proposed project would result in significant impacts at nine of these intersections. Phase 1 of the proposed project would
also result in an impact to the Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway intersection by adding traffic to the westbound left turn movement that would exceed storage capacity.

Intersections with Phase 1 traffic impacts are summarized in Table 16, Intersections with Phase 1 Significant Impacts. Necessary improvements for Phase 1 conditions are listed in the Impacts and Mitigations section.

Table 16  Intersections with Phase 1 Significant Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS and Additional Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Road/Reservation Road</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall Intersection)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanco Road/Reservation Road</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hatch Mott McDonald, Inc. 2010

Note: LOS = Level of Service. Standard for the City of Seaside and County of Monterey is LOS C. Standard for the City of Marina is LOS D. Standard for Caltrans is the transition between LOS C and LOS D. Standard at un-signalized worst approach is typically LOS E. Study intersections not listed operate at acceptable LOS for AM and PM peak periods. LOS in excess of standard for the intersection is highlighted by bold type. * indicates delay that exceeds 300 seconds under background and project scenario.
All of the study freeway segments would operate at unacceptable levels of service under Phase 1 conditions. Phase 1 of the proposed project would not cause a change in the level of service along the study freeway segments, nor would it add trips to a study freeway segment operating at LOS F.

**Phase 2 Level of Service (2016 Conditions)**

Phase 2 includes build-out of lots 2-12 of the Whispering Oaks Business Park and the construction of the internal streets. Engineer’s Equipment Road would be upgraded to a public street and connected to Inter-Garrison Road. For this scenario, Phase 1 and Phase 2 traffic volumes are added to background conditions. The addition of Phase 2 of the proposed project results in additional trips at intersections that already operate at LOS F, and in unacceptable levels of service at a total of 13 intersections. Necessary improvements for Phase 2 conditions are listed in the Impacts and Mitigations section. Combined Phase 1 and 2 traffic levels of service are summarized in Table 17, Intersections with Phase 2 Significant Impacts.

All of the study freeway segments would operate at unacceptable levels of service under Phase 2 conditions. Phase 2 of the proposed project would not cause a change in the level of service along the studied freeway segments.

**Project Build-out Level of Service (2030 Conditions)**

The Phase 3 traffic analysis adds build-out of the Whispering Oaks Business Park (development of lots 13-16) to the first two phases. At build-out the proposed project would result in significant impacts at 14 intersections. Build-out traffic levels of service are summarized in Table 18, Intersections with Build-out Significant Impacts.

All of the study freeway segments would operate at unacceptable levels of service under build-out conditions. The proposed project would not cause a change in the level of service along the study segments, nor would it add trips to a study segment operating at LOS F.

**Transit, Bicycles, Pedestrians**

**Phase 1.** No new transit service is proposed during Phase 1; however, a new transit stop would be provided in front of the MST facility on Inter-Garrison Road. A pedestrian walkway would be constructed to connect the MST operations building and Inter-Garrison Road, and other sidewalks would be provided within the MST site. A sidewalk would be constructed along the MST frontage of Inter-Garrison Road. No new bicycle facilities are proposed to be constructed during this phase.
Table 17  Intersections with Phase 2 Significant Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS and Additional Delay</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis Road/Reservation Road (Overall Intersection)</td>
<td>F +27 sec</td>
<td>F +132 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Road/Reservation Road (Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F +54 sec</td>
<td>E +22 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway (Overall Intersection)</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway (Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway (Overall Intersection)</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway (Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway (Overall Intersection)</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway (Worst Approach)</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td>F *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imjin Parkway/Eighth Street Cut-off</td>
<td>F +95 sec</td>
<td>D +12 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard /Inter-Garrison Road</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard /Divarty Street</td>
<td>D 0</td>
<td>F 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue</td>
<td>F +6 sec</td>
<td>F +7 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F +29 sec</td>
<td>F +27 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road</td>
<td>D +7 sec</td>
<td>F +25 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanco Road/Reservation Road</td>
<td>D +15 sec</td>
<td>E +8 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hatch Mott McDonald, Inc. 2010

Note: LOS = Level of Service. Standard for the City of Seaside and County of Monterey is LOS C. Standard for the City of Marina is LOS D. Standard for Caltrans is the transition between LOS C and LOS D. Standard at un-signalized worst approach is typically LOS E. Study intersections not listed operate at acceptable LOS for AM and PM peak periods. LOS in excess of standard for the intersection is highlighted by bold type. Underline/box indicates decrease in LOS from prior scenario. Seconds of delay is compared to background conditions. * indicates delay that exceeds 300 seconds under background and project scenario.
### Table 18  Intersections with Build-out Significant Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>LOS and Additional Delay</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Davis Road/Reservation Road  
(Overall Intersection)          | F  | >194 sec  | F  | >130sec |
| (Worst Approach)               | F  |       | F  |       |
| Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway | F  |  +89 sec  | F  | +37 sec  |
| Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway     | F  |      | F  |      |
| (Overall Intersection)          | F  |      | F  |      |
| (Worst Approach)               | F  |      | F  |      |
| Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway  
(Overall Intersection)          | F  |      | F  |      |
| (Worst Approach)               | F  |      | F  |      |
| Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/ Imjin Parkway  
(Overall Intersection)          | F  |      | F  |      |
| (Worst Approach)               | F  |      | F  |      |
| Imjin Road/Eighth Street Cut-off | F  |  +213 sec  | F  | +56 sec  |
| General Jim Moore Boulevard/Inter-Garrison Road | F  |  0  | F  | 0  |
| General Jim Moore Boulevard/Divarty Street | D  | 0  | F  | 0  |
| General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue  
(Overall Intersection)          | F  |      | F  |      |
| (Worst Approach)               | F  |      | F  |      |
| Engineer's Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Drive  
(Overall Intersection)          | A  | n/a  | B  | n/a  |
| (Worst Approach)               | F  | n/a  | D  | n/a  |
| Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway      | F  |  +41 sec  | F  | +38 sec  |
| Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road  | D  |  +11 sec  | F  | +34 sec  |
| Blanco Road/Reservation Road    | D  |  +23 sec  | E  |  +9 sec  |

**Source:** Hatch Mott McDonald, Inc. 2010

**Note:** LOS = Level of Service. Standard for the City of Seaside and County of Monterey is LOS C. Standard for the City of Marina is LOS D. Standard for Caltrans is the transition between LOS C and LOS D. Standard at un-signalized worst approach is typically LOS E. Study intersections not listed operate at acceptable LOS for AM and PM peak periods. LOS in excess of standard for the intersection is highlighted by bold type. Underline/box indicates decrease in LOS from prior scenario. Seconds of delay is compared to background conditions. * indicates delay that exceeds 300 seconds under background and project scenario.
Phase 2. Although no new transit service is specifically proposed during Phase 2, transit demand would increase and a new transit stop would be constructed at the Inter-Garrison Road/Whispering Oaks Drive intersection. The Whispering Oaks GDP directs circulation designs that prevent conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians, but does not specifically address pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

Build-out. No new transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities are proposed. Ultimately, the project site would benefit from the construction of the multimodal corridor, consisting of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities along the south side of Inter-Garrison Road. The multimodal improvements are not part of the proposed project, although the MST facility would be the initiation point for transit operating along the corridor.

Project Consistency with Regional Transportation Plan

The proposed project would add trips to each of the nearby regional transportation facilities identified in the Regional Transportation Plan. Within the former Fort Ord, the Regional Transportation Plan defers to the FORA transportation programs. The proposed project would pay the FORA development impact fee to offset the fair share costs of roads improvements identified in the FORA capital improvement plan. The proposed project’s traffic generation is consistent with that of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan land use assumptions, and is therefore accurately accounted for in the Regional Transportation Plan. The proposed MST operations and administrative facility is identified in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

A combination of fee payments and construction of specific improvements have been determined to be appropriate mitigation for the identified traffic impacts. In this section, all Phase 1 traffic impacts are presented first, followed by all Phase 1 mitigation measures. Then all Phase 2 and 3 impacts are presented, followed by the Phase 2 and 3 mitigation measures. Generally-applicable impacts and mitigation measures are presented at the end of this section. Also refer to Section 3.0 Cumulative Impacts for additional mitigation measures that are applicable during each project phase.

Phase 1 Impacts.

Significant Impact – Unacceptable LOS (Phase 1). The first phase of the proposed project would result in additional trips and increased delays at intersections already operating at LOS E or F. although it would not result in a reduced level of service at any of these already deficient intersections. The affected intersections and the improvements necessary to achieve acceptable levels of service would be:
**Davis Road/Reservation Road**: signalize intersection; add second eastbound left-turn lane; re-channelize the southbound right turn as a formal right;

**Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway**: add a southbound California Avenue right turn lane;

**Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway**: signalize intersection;

**General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue**: add a northbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second northbound through lane; add a southbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second southbound through lane; add an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane;

**Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway**: add a second eastbound Imjin Parkway through lane; and add a second westbound Imjin Parkway through lane;

**Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road**: add a third northbound Imjin Parkway right turn lane;

**Blanco Road/Reservation Road**: add a second westbound Reservation through lane.

Phase 1 contributions to these impacts would be a significant impact. Implementation of the Mitigation Measure T-1 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Potentially Significant Impact – Vehicle Queues (Phase 1)**. The first phase of the proposed project would result in left-turn queues extending into traffic and a potential safety impact at the following intersection:

**Imjin Parkway/Imjin Road**. Movements at the westbound Imjin Parkway left turn onto Imjin Road that would exceed the left-turn pocket storage capacity.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-2 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Significant Unavoidable Impact – Increased Trips at State Route 1 Interchanges (Phase 1)**. The first phase of the proposed project would add new trips to the following two intersections already operating at LOS F at both the AM and PM peak hours. These intersections and the required improvements are:

**Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway**: close the median along Imjin Parkway at this intersection; and

**Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway**: signalize intersection; add a second westbound Imjin parkway left turn lane; and add a second southbound State Route 1 Off-ramp left turn lane.
The improvements necessary to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level would require the approval of Caltrans, and implementation of the improvements may not be feasible. Ultimately, Caltrans plans to re-design and consolidate this interchange and the Del Monte Boulevard interchange to the north. Until such time as that major improvement is undertaken, mitigation at this location is infeasible and the interchange will continue to operate at LOS F. The City of Marina traffic fee program includes signalization of this intersection and implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1 would require fair share payment to Caltrans towards the lane improvements. However, these fees would not reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-1. Prior to issuance of building permits, MST shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the fees listed below (fair share costs for project-level impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).

FORA development impact fees.

City of Marina traffic impact fees.

County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Davis Road/Reservation Road (1.3% of $1,825,600 = $23,389)
- Blanco Road/Reservation Road (2.0% of $263,400 = $5,288).

City of Marina fair share costs for lane improvements at the following intersection:

- Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway – eastbound right (17.5% of $466,888 = $81,791)
  Note: this fee would be reimbursable to Whispering Oaks Business Park – see Mitigation Measure T-6.

City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:

- Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road (1.3% of $222,700 = $2,788).

City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue (0.4% of $300,000 = $1,054)

Caltrans fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Northbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (1.2% of $151,428 = $1,875)
- Southbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (0.8% of $965,308 = $7,958)
Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department.

Mitigation Measure

T-2. MST shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 1 (lot 1) improvements:

- Construct a second westbound left-turn lane at the intersection of Imjin Road and Imjin Parkway.

MST shall be owed reimbursement of 11.6 percent of the cost of this improvement by the Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor ($107,189 based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index) – see Mitigation Measure T-3.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 1 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 1, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.

Phase 2 and Phase 3 Impacts.

Significant Impact – Unacceptable LOS (Phases 2 and 3). The second and third phases of the proposed project would result in additional trips and increased delays at intersections already operating at LOS E or F although they would not result in a reduced level of service at any of these already deficient intersections. The affected intersections and the improvements necessary to achieve acceptable levels of service would be:

- *Davis Road/Reservation Road*: signalize intersection; add second eastbound left-turn lane; re-channelize the southbound right turn as a formal right;
- *Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway:* add a southbound California Avenue right turn lane;

- *Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway:* signalize intersection;

- *Imjin Road/8th Street:* signalize intersection; and add a second southbound Imjin Road left turn lane, and corresponding second eastbound Eighth Street receiving lane, or alternatively, realign Imjin Road as a fourth approach to the Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road intersection;

- *General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue:* signalize intersection; add a northbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second northbound through lane; add a southbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second southbound through lane; add an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane;

- *Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway:* add a second eastbound Imjin Parkway through lane; and add a second westbound Imjin Parkway through lane;

- *Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road:* add a third northbound Imjin Parkway right turn lane;

- *Blanco Road/Reservation Road:* add a second westbound Reservation through lane.

Phase 2 and 3 contributions to these impacts would be a significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measures T-3, T-4, and T-5 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Significant Impact – Vehicle Queues (Phases 2 and 3).** The second and third phases of the proposed project would result in left-turn and right-turn queues extending into traffic and a potential safety impact at the following intersection:

- *Imjin Parkway/Imjin Road.* Although overall operations would be within acceptable levels, Phase 2 and 3 of the proposed project would add sufficient traffic to the westbound Imjin Parkway left turn movement at this intersection to cause the westbound left turn lane to overflow into the adjacent through lane. In addition, the high traffic volume for the eastbound Imjin Parkway right turn movement would also contribute to the long vehicle queues for the eastbound Imjin Parkway outer through lane, especially during the AM peak hour.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-3 and T-6 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Significant Unavoidable Impact – Increased Trips at State Route 1 Interchanges (Phases 2 and 3).** The second and third phases of the proposed project would add new trips to the
following two intersections already operating at LOS F at both the AM and PM peak hours. These intersections and the required improvements are:

- **Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway:** close the median along Imjin Parkway at this intersection; and

- **Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway:** signalize intersection; add a second westbound Imjin parkway left turn lane; and add a second southbound State Route 1 Off-ramp left turn lane.

The improvements necessary to mitigate this impact to a less than significant level would require the approval of Caltrans, and implementation of the improvements may not be feasible. Ultimately, Caltrans plans to re-design and consolidate this interchange and the Del Monte Boulevard interchange to the north. Until such time as that major improvement is undertaken, mitigation at this location is infeasible and the interchange will continue to operate at LOS F. The City of Marina traffic fee program includes signalization of this intersection and implementation of Mitigation Measure T-3 would require fair share payment to Caltrans towards the lane improvements. However, these fees would not reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Significant Impact – LOS at Engineer’s Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Drive (Phase 3).** Worst movement level of service at this intersection would drop to LOS F at project build-out during the AM peak hour. This would be a significant impact. Implementation Mitigation Measure T-7 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-3. Prior to issuance of building permits, the Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor(s) shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the specific development’s pro-rata share of fees listed below (fair share costs for project-level impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).

FORA development impact fees.

City of Marina traffic impact fees (includes improvements at Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway, Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway, Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway, Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway, and signalization at the Imjin Parkway/southbound State Route 1 ramps).
County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Davis Road/Reservation Road (4.3% of $1,825,600 = $78,375)
- Blanco Road/Reservation Road (4.6% of $263,400 = $12,056).

City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:

- Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway – second westbound left (11.6% of $925,453 = $107,189)
  Note: this fee would be reimbursable to MST – see Mitigation Measure T-2.

City of Marina fair share costs for two lane improvements at the following intersection:

- Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road (2.9% of $222,700 = $6,481).

City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersection:

- General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue (4.0% of $300,000 = $12,119)

Caltrans fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Northbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (3.2% of $151,428 = $4,797)
- Southbound State Route 1/Imjin Parkway (2.6% of $965,308 = $24,759)

**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to execution of the development agreement, a pro-rata division of costs shall be assigned to each lot (lots 2-16) within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.

Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-4. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvements prior to acceptance of Phase 2 (lots 2-12) improvements:

- Signalize intersection of Imjin Road/Eighth Street and add a southbound Imjin Road left turn lane, and corresponding second eastbound Eighth Street receiving lane, or
2.0 Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation

- Construct the re-alignment of Imjin Road between Imjin Parkway and Eighth Street, realigning Imjin Road as a fourth approach to the Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road intersection.

The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer is responsible for 78.2% of the cost of this improvement and MST is responsible for 21.8% of the cost of this improvement (see Mitigation Measure T-9).

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 2 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 2, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.

Mitigation Measure

T-5. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:

- add a westbound right-turn lane at the Imjin Road/Eighth Street intersection, or
- Construct the re-alignment of Imjin Road between Imjin Parkway and Eighth Street, realigning Imjin Road as a fourth approach to the Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road intersection.

The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer is responsible for 78.2% of the cost of this improvement and MST is responsible for 21.8% of the cost of this improvement (see Mitigation Measure T-9).

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 3, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.
Mitigation Measure

T-6. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 2 (lots 2-12) improvements:

- Construct an eastbound right-turn lane at the intersection of Imjin Road and Imjin Parkway.

The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor shall be subject to reimbursement of 17.5 percent of the cost of this improvement by MST ($81,791 based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index) – see Mitigation Measure T-1.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 2 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements to the City of Marina public works department for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 2, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements by the City of Marina public works department to the RMA – Planning Department.

Mitigation Measure

T-7. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvement prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:

- Signalize intersection of Whispering Oaks Drive/Engineer’s Equipment Road. The signal light shall be coordinated with the signal light at Engineer’s Equipment Road and Inter-Garrison Road.

- construct northbound and southbound left turn lanes.

- construct eastbound and westbound right turn lanes.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified off-site improvements for review and approval.
Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 3, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements to the RMA – Planning Department.

**Less than Significant Impact – Need for Transit and Pedestrian Facilities.** *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* policies require adequate pedestrian, bicycle, and transit provisions for all new development. The proposed project indicates the provision of pedestrian facilities within and adjacent to the MST facility (including reservation of land for the multi-modal corridor), new bus stops at both the MST and Whispering Oaks locations, and sidewalks within the business park. This would be a less than significant impact.

**Potentially Significant Impact – Non-service Bus Traffic within Campus Core.** Bus traffic heading to/from route initiation/termination points west of the CSUMB campus core could increase out-of-service bus traffic through the CSUMB campus core area on Inter-Garrison Road and other campus roads. This would increase the potential for traffic congestion and conflict with pedestrians and bicyclists. This is a potentially significant impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-8. MST shall include a policy in the General Development Plan to require out-of-service buses traveling to and from the beginning or ends of their day's runs to use routes that avoid the following streets within the CSUMB campus core area: Inter-Garrison Road/Third Street (Sixth Avenue to General Jim Moore Boulevard) and Divarty Street (east of General Jim Moore Boulevard). The restriction shall not apply to routes serving CSUMB.

**Monitoring Action**

Prior to approval of the MST GDP, a policy shall be added to the GDP or condition placed upon the approval to require the policy prior to project development.

**2.10 WATER DEMAND AND SUPPLY**

The information contained within this section is based on data from the 1982 *Monterey County General Plan* and *Water Supply Assessment Provisions of SB 610 Monterey-Salinas Transit – Whispering Oaks Business Park Project* (2010) that was prepared by Carollo Engineers for the proposed project. A copy of the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) can be found in Appendix J. This section focuses on proposed project water demands, water supply infrastructure, capability of the
Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) to deliver water to the proposed project, and consistency with water supply policies. Refer to Section 2.6 Hydrology and Water Quality for discussion of the groundwater aquifer and the proposed project’s potential for effects on the aquifer.

**Standards of Significance**

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or storm water drainage facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or

- result in a demand that could not be met by the water service provider for the project.

**Policy and Regulatory Issues**

**Fort Ord Reuse Plan**

Hydrology and Water Quality Policy B-2: The County shall condition approval of development plans on verification of an assured long-term water supply for the projects.

**1982 Monterey County General Plan**

Policy 6.1.1: Increased uses of groundwater shall be carefully managed, especially in areas known to have ground water overdrafting.

Policy 6.1.2: Water conservation measures for all types of land uses shall be encouraged.

Policy 53.1.3: The County shall not allow water consuming development in areas which do not have proven adequate water supplies.

Policy 53.1.4: New development shall be required to connect to existing water service providers which are public utilities, where feasible.
Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan

**Water Resources Policy 5.1.3:** Monterey County will encourage development projects to be served by water from public utilities or mutual water companies…

**Water Management Plans**

The MCWD prepared the *2005 Urban Water Management Plan* (UWMP) after the adoption of SB 610. The UWMP includes information required by SB 610, such as the water district groundwater, recycled water and desalination supplies. The UWMP includes the following elements: existing and future water demand projections, existing and future water supply facilities, existing and future demand versus supply comparison, groundwater basin conditions, water supply reliability, water demand management measures, water recycling, and water shortage contingency plan.

The MCWD prepared the *Water System Master Plan* in November 2006. The *Water System Master Plan* presents existing water demands, summarizes the criteria developed in the City’s UWMP for projecting water demands through the year 2025, identifies existing and future water system capacity deficiencies, recommends projects to correct these deficiencies, and identifies major water facilities for servicing future developments. The *Water System Master Plan* also addresses the supply facilities, water augmentation projects, and includes a capital improvement program (Carollo, page 4).

**Water Supply Assessment**

In response to its concern about the approval of large new developments without proof that water supply is available to serve them, in 2002 the State of California passed Senate Bill 610 (SB 610). SB 610 amended Section 10910 of the California Water Code. It requires that a water supply assessment be prepared and incorporated into the CEQA process for new development projects that meet certain size and development intensity criteria. The size criterion for industrial projects is as follows:

- A proposed commercial office building employing more than 1,000 people or having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space.

- A proposed industrial, manufacturing, or processing plant, or industrial park planned to house more than 1,000 persons, occupying more than 40 acres of land, or having more than 650,000 square feet of floor area.
The proposed project exceeds the size and development intensity variables noted above and therefore, it is subject to the requirements of SB 610. A water supply assessment must include analysis of the estimated water demands and proposed water sources for a new project. In order for a proposed project to be approved, the water supply assessment must conclude that the supply of domestic water available to the development is adequate, and will continue to be adequate over the next 20 years during normal, dry, and multiple-dry years. The water supply assessment must be included in the CEQA document for the proposed project.

The legislation describes how responsibility for preparing a water supply assessment is to be assigned. Typically, the water purveyor which would serve a proposed project must prepare the water supply assessment. The MCWD would provide water to the project site and is therefore required to prepare a water supply assessment for the project. The WSA was prepared to assist the County of Monterey and the water district in satisfying the requirements of SB 610. The water supply assessment is specific to the proposed project and addresses the potential impact of the project's water demands on the district-wide water supply conditions. The WSA includes information on the water district's water supplies, information on current water demands and projected water demands, a comparison of water supplies and water demands for normal, single dry, and multiple dry years, and information to make the sufficiency findings required by CEQA.

**Environmental Setting**

**Demand Coefficients**

The project site is located within the MCWD service area. The projected water demands in the UWMP were calculated by multiplying water demand coefficients, expressed in acre-feet per year (AFY), and land area expressed in acres. The project site has a proposed zoning classification of Heavy Commercial. The WSA assumed that the UWMP’s closest equivalent to the Heavy Commercial land use would be the Other Commercial designation, which has an average year water demand coefficient of 0.0003 AFY per square foot. The demand coefficients for the open space and other land use designations are zero AFY. To calculate a high water demand, the WSA used a total building area of 686,459 square feet and the water demand coefficient of 0.0003 AFY/square foot to yield a water demand of 205.9 AFY, which is equivalent to 127.7 gallons per minute (gpm) or 18,400 gallons per day (gpd).

To develop a land use coefficient range for commercial land uses, the WSA examined similar local water planning documents. For example, the 2005 Soledad Water Master Plan uses a water demand coefficient of 0.94 gpm/acre or 1,354 gpd/acre for commercial land uses. A demand coefficient range of 800 – 2,000 gallons per day per acre (gpd/acre) was determined to be typical for commercial land uses. Based on study of the various demand coefficients, the WSA
recommended using a demand coefficient of 1,500 gpd/acre for the proposed project, which is
25 percent lower than the high value in the range. Table 19, Low, High, and Recommended
Demands, shows the demands for the proposed project site utilizing the low, high, and the
recommended water demand coefficient values (Carollo, page 12).

Table 19  Low, High, and Recommended Demands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Low Coefficient 800 gpd/acre (AFY)</th>
<th>High Coefficient 2,000 gpd/acre (AFY)</th>
<th>WSA Recommended Coefficient 1,500 gpd/acre (AFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Commercial</td>
<td>48.82</td>
<td>42.77</td>
<td>106.92</td>
<td>80.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>57.62</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (roads, percolation facility)</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>115.54</td>
<td>42.77</td>
<td>106.92</td>
<td>80.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMC Planning Group Inc. 2010, Carollo Engineers 2010

As shown in Table 19, the calculated demand using the WSA recommended demand coefficient
of 1,500 gpd/acre is 80.19 AFY. This is a significantly lower demand estimate compared to the
205.94 AFY calculated previously using the UWMP water demand coefficient of 0.0003
AFY/square foot. Table 20, Water Demands Comparison, presents a comparison of water
demand projections for the project (Carollo, page 13).

Table 20  Water Demands Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>UWMP Demand (AFY)</th>
<th>WSA Recommended Demand (AFY)</th>
<th>Low Demand (AFY)</th>
<th>High Demand (AFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Commercial</td>
<td>205.94</td>
<td>80.19</td>
<td>42.77</td>
<td>106.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMC Planning Group Inc. 2010, Carollo Engineers 2010
The UWMP provides water demand projections to the year 2025. However, the proposed project demands were not accounted for in the UWMP. The WSA adjusted the UWMP demands to include the recommended average water demand for the project (Carollo, page 14).

**Distribution System**

The MCWD provides potable water service to its residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional customers within its service area, which includes the City of Marina and the former Fort Ord (Ord Community).

The MCWD’s municipal water system extracts water from the underground aquifers via a series of groundwater wells distributed along the valley floor and supplies five major pressure zones. Water is then pumped up to service the higher pressure zones via booster stations. The MCWD's water system facilities include six groundwater wells, eight potable water storage tanks, five booster stations, and over 280 miles of pressured pipes ranging from 2 to 24-inches in diameter. Gates and pressure reducing valves are used to isolate or regulate flow between pressure zones.

Historically, the MCWD has operated their distribution and supply facilities as two independent systems. One system served users in central Marina. The second system served the Ord Community. In 2005, the MCWD completed a project that connected the two systems, providing the ability to preserve a zero net balance of flows between the two systems through Supervisory Control and Automated Data Acquisition controls (Carollo, page 15).

**Groundwater Supply**

The MCWD draws water from the Salinas Valley groundwater basin through wells to supply water to its customers. The water from the wells is pumped directly into the district distribution system with no treatment except for disinfection by chlorination. Some wells are experiencing deteriorating water quality due to seawater intrusion, the presence of trichloroethylene (TCE), manganese, and elevated water temperatures. Seawater intrusion is due to the overdraft condition that currently exists in the Salinas Valley groundwater basin and has been steadily increasing inland.

MCWD performs wellhead sampling to detect the presence of potential contaminants in the groundwater. In addition, monitoring wells are maintained at strategic locations and sampling is performed to provide early warning of water quality issues that could jeopardize the district’s wells. In order to prepare for the possible loss of one or more of the wells, the district is studying the feasibility of installing new wells. Possible options for new wells include establishing a new well field located east of the district’s current service area and constructing new wells that would reach the deep aquifer. A detailed discussion of the water quality issues facing the district can be found in the UWMP (Carollo, page 17).
Groundwater Basin

The Salinas Valley groundwater basin is managed by the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA). As a result of basin-wide pumping, groundwater levels in some basin subareas (Pressure and East Side) have declined over time and seawater has contaminated coastal aquifers and wells. While historic groundwater pumping throughout the basin created the overdraft, only the basin’s coastal areas adjacent or near to the bay suffer from seawater intrusion (WSA, page 18). MCWRA implemented the Salinas Valley Water Project (SVWP) and the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project (CSIP) to eliminate overdraft and intrusion. The Castroville project has operated successfully for eight years, reducing basin overdraft and seawater intrusion (Carollo, page 18). Refer to Section 2.6 Hydrology and Water Quality for more in-depth discussion of groundwater.

Groundwater Supply Available to the District

Both the Army and the MCWD have agreements with MCWRA, which allows MCWD to participate in and benefit from MCWRA’s regional basin management planning process. The Army’s agreement allows for a combined annual withdrawal of up to 1,400 AF from the deep aquifer, totaling 6,600 AFY, or about equal to the historical demand from Army uses at Fort Ord. This groundwater supply is allocated by FORA among the land use or land owning jurisdictions on the former Fort Ord, as seen in Table 21, Available Water Supplies. This table also indicates available groundwater supply to the district via its own agreement with MCWRA, which provides for a maximum withdrawal of 3,020 AFY, currently limited to uses in the City of Marina, outside the Ord Community. Additionally, two adjacent major private properties within the MCWD’s LAFCO sphere of influence, the Armstrong Ranch and the Lonestar property, have groundwater available for use on those properties as noted in the table. Recycled water is a component of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan assumptions and is essential to completing planned developments on the former installation. Allocations determined through a series of working group meeting are shown on the table. These allocations were prioritized to accommodate individual jurisdiction needs under resource restraints, which were capped at 1,427 AFY of recycled water (Carollo, page 20).

Other Water Supplies

The MCWD desalination treatment plant supplements and diversifies the district’s water supply sources. The plant was constructed in 1996 and placed in operation in January 1997. At full capacity it can produce 300,000 gallons per day of potable water. In 1997-1998, the MCWD completed a one-year study comparing water quality of the ocean water and intake well groundwater, seasonal groundwater flow and time of travel for microbial contaminants. The California Department of Public Health evaluated the results and concluded the desalination
Table 21  Available Water Supplies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORA Allocation</th>
<th>Annual Acre-feet Allotment or Supply</th>
<th>Allocation of Recycled Water (AFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Marina</td>
<td>1,325.0</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seaside</td>
<td>1,012.0</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUMB</td>
<td>1,035.0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCMBEST</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>242.5</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Monterey</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td>710.0</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army</td>
<td>1,577.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/State Parks</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/City of Marina (Sphere)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORA Strategic Reserve</td>
<td>348.5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,600.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,427</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCWD by Agreement with</td>
<td>3,020.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCWRA (groundwater)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Ranch (groundwater)</td>
<td>920.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonestar Property (groundwater)</td>
<td>500.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,040</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:*  EMC Planning Group Inc. 2010, Carollo Engineers 2010

The plant seawater intake well located at Marina State Beach is groundwater not under the direct influence of surface water. With the recent rise in energy costs and the fact that the additional water supply is currently not needed, the desalination plant is not being operated. However, the MCWD maintains state and federal water quality monitoring requirements for the seawater intake well (Carollo, page 21).

**Project Analysis**

**Water Supply**

According to the WSA, Monterey County currently has a FORA allocation of 710 AFY and a recycled water allocation of 134 AFY, for a combined allocation of 854 AFY. The January 12,
2007 FORA Board Report lists existing Monterey County uses and assignments at 527.5 AFY. This leaves an allocation availability of 326.5 AFY. Based on total project demands estimated at 80.19 AFY, the MCWD would be able to provide adequate supply to meet the demands associated with the proposed project under existing conditions and existing FORA water allocations. Table 22, FORA Water Allocation and Project Demands Summary, compares available supplies and project demand.

Table 22  FORA Water Allocation and Project Demands Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Category</th>
<th>Allocation (AFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County FORA Allocation</td>
<td>710.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water Allocation</td>
<td>134.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/Marina Sphere Allocation</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allocations</strong></td>
<td><strong>854.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Monterey County Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Garrison</td>
<td>470.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula College</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ord Market Lease</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST-Whispering Oaks Business Park</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Demand</strong></td>
<td><strong>607.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining County Availability</td>
<td><strong>246.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMC Planning Group Inc. 2010, Carollo Engineers 2010

The MCWD’s current groundwater wells have sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in demand associated with the proposed project. To meet full build-out within the district as described in the UWMP, the MCWD is currently investigating additional water supply sources. Such facilities are described in the MCWD’s water management plan. The project’s demands are consistent as a component of the County and Marina Sphere/County FORA demands within an overall water balance prescribed for the Salinas Basin, and FORA jurisdiction allocation criteria can be met for this project.

The UWMP states that there are longstanding concerns that localized groundwater withdrawals could, over the long term, exceed the localized capacity of the groundwater basin and lead to further sea water intrusion and loss of potable supply at the district’s wells. The MCWD and all jurisdictions represented under the FORA have recognized the need to invest in MCWD’s water
supply system and the need to respond to seawater intrusion. Accordingly, the MCWD’s Capital Improvement Program includes development of new water supply wells located away from the seawater intrusion front (Carollo, page 23). In addition, the SVWP and Castroville recycled water projects are intended to allow for at least 35 years of withdrawals from the Salinas Valley groundwater basin without exasperating seawater intrusion. Refer to Section 2.6 Hydrology and Water Quality for additional discussion of the proposed project’s potential effects on groundwater.

**Water Infrastructure**

The MCWD would provide water to the proposed project from an existing 18-inch water line located in Inter-Garrison Road. The proposed project would connect to the existing line.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**No Impact – Construction of New Water Facilities.** The existing water district facilities are adequate to supply sufficient water to the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in the construction of significant new off-site water facilities, or significant expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The impact is less than significant.

**Less than Significant Impact – Water Supply Adequacy.** As stipulated in the WSA the MCWD's current groundwater wells have sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in demand associated with the proposed project. Implementation of the SVWP and the CSIP is anticipated to hold seawater intrusion in abeyance for at least 35 years. Therefore, the impact of the project on MCWD supplies and Salinas Valley Basin water supplies would be less than significant.

**2.11 Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment**

The information contained within this section is based on conversations with staff of FORA and the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD), and data from the 1982 Monterey County General Plan, the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, and the Monterey – Salinas Transit Maintenance & Operations Center General Development Plan & Preliminary Design Report (2009) that was prepared by AECOM for the proposed project. This section focuses on the wastewater generated from the proposed project and the capability of the applicable agencies to collect and treat the wastewater.
Standards of Significance

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments;
- Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- Fail to meet wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Policy and Regulatory Issues

1982 Monterey County General Plan

Objective 21.3: Ensure that sewage and industrial waste disposal from new and existing development will not contaminate surface or groundwater.

Policy 21.3.3: No division of land or use permit for residential, commercial, or industrial uses shall be approved without proof that an adequate waste disposal system can be developed.

Fort Ord Reuse Plan

Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-5: The County shall support all actions necessary to ensure that sewage treatment facilities operate in compliance with waste discharge requirements adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Hydrology and Water Quality Policy C-7: The County shall condition all development plans on verification of adequate wastewater treatment capacity.
Environmental Setting

Wastewater conveyance and disposal on the former Fort Ord was and currently is provided by the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD). The MCWD has an agreement with the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA) to have the district’s wastewater treated at the regional treatment plant. The MCWD is a publically-owned water and wastewater district servicing central Marina and the Ord Community. The existing wastewater infrastructure in the vicinity of the project site includes an existing eight-inch gravity sewer line located in Inter-Garrison Road, and an existing 15-inch gravity sewer line located west of Sixth Avenue on CSUMB property.

The regional treatment plant has a permitted capacity of 29.6 mgd. The MRWPCA collects both connection fees and capacity fees from new users to off-set the cost of providing for their additional demands. The regional treatment plant is expected to have capacity through 2020-2028 to serve development within the boundaries of its member agencies (local cities and the County) without implementation of a water conservation program, and until 2030 if a water conservation program is fully implemented. Two capacity expansions were pre-designed when the wastewater treatment plant was initially designed and constructed, and these could expand the plant to an ultimate capacity of 37 mgd.

Project Analysis

Wastewater generated by both the Whispering Oaks Business Park and the MST facilities would be collected and disposed of through the existing MCWD sewer collection system. The MST facility includes a bus washing and steam-cleaning building, which would include a water reclamation system that would re-use 75 percent of the water from each wash, however the water used in these processes would eventually be discharged into the sewer system and require treatment.

Wastewater generation rates for both the Whispering Oaks Business Park and the MST facilities can be estimated using the water demand rates from the Water Supply Assessment (WSA), since it can be assumed that all of the domestic water used on the project site would be discharged into the sanitary sewer system. Therefore, the amount of wastewater generated and discharged by the proposed project into the sanitary sewer system is assumed to be equal to the amount of water used by the proposed project. As some of the water would be applied to landscaping, the actual wastewater generation would be somewhat lower than total water use.

The WSA provides an estimated water demand for the proposed project based on estimates in the Marina Coast Water District’s 2005 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The WSA also shows a range of estimated water demands for the proposed project. The range included a low
and high water demand, as well as a recommended water demand based on the experience of Carollo Engineers with projects of this type. The recommended demand is the amount of water expected to be used by the proposed project. Table 20, Water Demands Comparison, shows the range of water demands estimated for the proposed project as well as the water demand estimated for the project site in the UWMP.

The WSA recommends a land use water demand coefficient of 1,500 gallons per day per acre (gpd/acre) for a use similar to the proposed project (Carollo Engineers 2010, page 15). According to the demand coefficient outlined for commercial uses in the WSA, the 57.91-acre project site would have a water demand of 86,865 gpd, which is equal to 97.30 acre feet per year (AFY). Therefore, using this methodology, the proposed project would generate 86,865 gpd of wastewater.

The Monterey –Salinas Transit Maintenance & Operations Center General Development Plan & Preliminary Design Report prepared by AECOM dated June 9, 2009 includes wastewater projections for the MST facilities that are more conservative than the Carollo estimates. According to the design report, average daily flows for the MST facilities are estimated to be approximately 40,000 gallons per day (gpd). Taking into account the similar uses and comparable acreages for both the MST facilities and the Whispering Oaks Business Park it can be assumed that both project components would demand an equal amount of water. This would result in the business park also having a water demand of 40,000 gpd. Therefore, the proposed project would have a total water demand of 80,000 gpd, which is equal to 89.61 AFY. Therefore, using this methodology, the proposed project would generate 80,000 gpd of wastewater.

Although the AECOM estimate is slightly higher than the amount estimated by Carollo in the WSA, the amount of wastewater generated by a project cannot typically exceed the amount of water used. For purposes of this analysis the Carollo estimate has been used, and therefore, the proposed project is expected to generate about 80 AFY, or 72,000 gpd, of wastewater, which is equal to the water demand of the proposed project.

**Whispering Oaks Business Park Wastewater Infrastructure.** Due to the rolling topography of the project site, two sewer lift stations are proposed, one at the east and one at the west end of the business park site. The lift stations would pump effluent to a gravity line draining west along Engineer’s Equipment Road to the existing 15-inch main located west of Sixth Avenue on CSUMB property.

**MST Wastewater Infrastructure.** The wastewater flows generated by the MST facility would be pumped from the on-site lift station to the adjacent eight-inch sewer main via a six-inch force main. The lift station would be a duplex submersible pump station with a wet well sized for operational storage. The duplex pump system has two pumps for redundancy and for handling wastewater flows exceeding the design on-site peaked flows. Oil-water separators have been
included in the design to treat portions of the wastewater generated at the building that would house the maintenance, bus washing/steam cleaning, and fuel/brake/tire repairs operations. This portion of the separated wastewater would be treated before it discharges to the on-site wastewater collection system.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Less than Significant Impact - Wastewater Facility Capacity.** Wastewater generated by the proposed project would be collected and conveyed by the MCWD. Wastewater treatment would be provided by the MRWPCA. The proposed project is estimated to generate approximately 71,562 gpd of wastewater, a conservative estimate based on 100 percent of water used by the proposed project. The MCWD has adequate capacity in their conduits, and the MRWPCA has adequate capacity in their treatment facility, to serve the proposed project.

**2.12 Emergency Services**

The information contained within this section is based on conversations with staff of FORA, the 1982 Monterey County General Plan, the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, and the Monterey –Salinas Transit Maintenance & Operations Center General Development Plan & Preliminary Design Report (2009) that was prepared by AECOM for the proposed project. This section focuses on the demand created by the proposed project for law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical services and the ability for the local jurisdictions to provide this service with their existing facilities.

**Standards of Significance**

CEQA Guidelines Appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts or significant environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, in order to maintain acceptable services ratios, response times or other performance objectives for:
  - Fire protection;
  - Police protection; and
  - Emergency Services.
**Policy and Regulatory Issues**

**1982 Monterey County General Plan**

**Policy 17.3.3:** The County shall encourage all new development to be located within the response time of 15 minutes from the fire station responsible for serving the parcel. If this is not possible, on-site fire protection systems (such as fire breaks, fire-retardant building materials, and/or water storage tanks) approved by the fire jurisdiction must be installed or development may only take place at the lowest density allowed for the parcel by the General Plan.

**Policy 17.3.4:** The County shall require all new development to have adequate water available for fire suppression. Water availability can be provided from a conventional water system; from an approved alternative water system if within 300 feet of a habitable structure; by the fire fighting equipment of the fire district within which the property is located; or by an individual water storage facility--water tank, swimming pool, etc.--on the property itself. The fire and planning departments shall determine the adequacy and location of individual water storage to be provided.

**Policy 17.3.5:** Water systems constructed, extended or modified to serve a new land use or a change in land use or an intensification of land use shall be designed to meet, in addition to the average daily demand, the standards shown in Table 2, subject only to changes authorized pursuant to Policy Number 17.4.2.

**Policy 17.4.1:** All residential, commercial, and industrial structural development (not including accessory uses) in high and very high fire hazard areas shall incorporate recommendations by the local fire district before a building permit can be issued.

**Policy 17.4.2:** Every building, structure and/or development shall be constructed to meet, at minimum, the requirements specified in Volume I of the current edition of the Uniform Building Code, Fire Hazards Policy 17.3.5, and Table 2 of this general plan. The chief of the fire agency having jurisdiction may recommend to the appropriate decision-making authority a variation of the general plan fire hazard policies and Table 2 (but not U.B.C. standards) for such development where, in his opinion,
the fire safety of the County and adjoining and nearby properties and improvements is not materially impaired by such variation.

**Policy 17.4.7:** The County shall require all subdivisions, multi-unit residential complexes, and commercial and industrial complexes to obtain, prior to permit approval, a statement from the fire department that adequate structural fire protection is available within minimum response time established by this Plan.

**Objective 46.1.1:** The County, in cooperation with LAFCO and other appropriate special districts, shall study and encourage the most cost-effective alternative of providing fire protection services while maintaining or improving fire protection service levels in the County.

**Objective 46.3:** Consider adequate levels of police protection and crime investigations for the protection of life and property in reviewing new development proposals.

**Fort Ord Reuse Plan**

**Program A-1.1:** The County shall incorporate the recommendations of the Salinas Rural Protection Fire District for all residential, commercial, industrial, and public works projects to be constructed at the former Fort Ord, in high fire hazard areas before a building permit can be issued. Such recommendations shall be in conformity with the current applicable Uniform Building Code Fire Hazards Policies. These recommendations should include standards of road widths, road access, building materials, distances around structures, and other standards for compliance with the UCB Fire Hazards Policies.

**Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy A-2:** The County shall provide fire suppression water system guidelines and implementation plans for existing and acquired former Fort Ord lands equal to or greater than those recommended in the Fort Ord Infrastructure Study (FORIS Section Table 4.1.8) for fire protection water volumes, system distribution upgrades, and emergency water storage.

**Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy A-3:** The County shall develop in cooperation with other Fort Ord jurisdictions and the surrounding communities' fire protection agencies, a fire management plan to ensure adequate staff levels, response time, and fire suppression
operations in high fire hazard areas of the former Fort Ord. The fire management plan shall also include a fire “fuel management program” in conjunction with the Bureau of Land Management.

**Program A-3.1:** The County shall develop, with appropriate fire protection agencies, a mutual and/or automatic fire aid agreement to assure the most effective response.

**Fire, Flood, and Emergency Management Policy A-4:** The County shall evaluate the need for additional fire station and fire suppression facilities and manpower within areas of the former Fort Ord which the County plans to develop in order to provide acceptable fire/emergency response time.

### Environmental Setting

#### Law Enforcement Services

Law enforcement is provided to the project site by the Monterey County Sheriff’s Department. The Sheriff’s Department has three stations: the Salinas Station, the King City Station, and the Monterey Courthouse Station. The Salinas Station, which is staffed with 43 deputies, is the station that reports to incidences that occur at the project site. The project site falls into a “beat” that stretches from former Fort Ord to the City of Gonzales. This beat is currently patrolled by one officer. At this time, the Sheriff’s Department does not have a formal Memorandum of Understanding to exchange aid with police departments in the area; however they do have an informal agreement with other local police departments for assistance with incidents until a Sheriff’s Department officer can arrive on the scene (telephone conversation, Sergeant Ron Willis, February 25, 2010). Other nearby police departments include the Presidio Police, CSUMB campus police, and the City of Marina Police.

#### Fire Protection Services

Fire protection services at the project site are provided by the Monterey County Regional Fire District (formerly Salinas Valley Rural Fire District). The fire district has a full-time staff of 30 employees and is supported by 20 volunteer firefighters. The fire district has three stations: the Toro Station, the Chualar Station, and the Laureles Station. A fourth fire station, the East Garrison Fire Station, is planned at the Inter-Garrison Road and West Camp Road intersection. According to Chief Michael Urquides, construction of this forth fire station is contingent on the construction of the residential units within the East Garrison area. At this time, the department
anticipates the construction of the East Garrison Station to begin sometime in 2011 or 2012, but this may change depending on economic factors and the pace of development within the East Garrison area. The closest fire district station to the project site is the Toro Station, located at 19900 Portola Drive, near State Route 68 and Reservation Road, in the City of Salinas. The Toro Station includes an engine company staffed with a captain, a lieutenant, and a minimum of one firefighter on duty each day. Upon completion, the East Garrison Station would become the closest station to the project site. The fire district has mutual aid agreements with both the City of Marina Fire Department, located at 211 Hillcrest Avenue in the City of Marina, and the Presidio Fire Department located on General Jim Moore Boulevard south of Light Fighter Drive (telephone conversation, Chief Urquides, February 25, 2010).

Emergency Medical Services

Emergency medical services are provided by hospitals in neighboring communities. These include Natividad Medical Center and Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital located in Salinas, and the Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula located in Monterey. Ambulance service is provided by private companies.

Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula is planning to develop a 12,000-square-foot facility in Marina near the southeast corner of Imjin Parkway and 2nd Avenue, across from the Dunes of Monterey Bay shopping center that will include urgent care, in addition to primary care, a satellite lab, and some imaging services (http://www.chomp.org/news/2009news/peninsula-primary-care-opens.aspx).

Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital is also planning a medical center at the southwest corner of Imjin Parkway and Third Avenue in Marina. Salinas Valley Memorial envisions it will be home for a Doctors on Duty urgent medical center (currently on Del Monte Boulevard), as well as general practice and specialist physicians, primary-care medical groups and medical labs http://www.montereyherald.com/growth/ci, February 2, 2010.

Project Analysis

Police Protection

According to Sergeant Ron Willis, the Sheriff’s Department would be able to provide adequate police protection to the project site with the existing facilities (telephone conversation, February 25, 2010). The proposed project would not necessitate the construction of further police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
Fire Protection

Monterey County Regional Fire District Service. According to Chief Urquides, the Monterey County Regional Fire District would be able to provide adequate fire protection to the proposed project with the existing facilities (telephone conversation, February 25, 2010). Until the proposed East Garrison Station is completed, the district may need to demand on other fire districts for first response. The proposed project would not necessitate the construction of further fire facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Fire Protection Infrastructure. The MST general development plan indicates that a proposed fire protection water distribution system consisting of ten-inch waterlines looped throughout the MST site would serve the fire hydrants and the building sprinkler system connections within the MST facilities. The pipes would be sized based on the design criteria outlined in the general development plan and would have the capacity to handle an instantaneous hydrant flow of 3,250 gallons per minute in combination with any of the building fire sprinkler flows listed in the report. Each of the MST buildings would have one or more firewater service consisting of a PVC pipeline with a shutoff valve at the water main connection. The fire hydrant laterals and building fire sprinkler system laterals would be six inches in diameter.

The fire sprinkler system would be installed within each of the buildings in the MST facility, but not within the smokers’ canopy and HVAC enclosure. Fire hydrants would be installed at various locations on the water distribution system for fire protection as required by the Fire Marshal. The Monterey County Regional Fire District requires, per the 2007 California Fire Code, that fire hydrants be placed around the project site so that all points on the various building perimeters are within 150 feet of a hydrant. The hydrant spacing would also be no greater than 300 feet throughout the project site. The fire hydrants would be equipped with one four-inch-diameter pumper nozzle and two 2.5-inch-diameter hose connections, and would be of the west barrel type. Each hydrant run would be equipped with a buried shutoff valve at the main with a valve box and lid, similar to the distribution system isolation valves. The hydrants would be capable of delivering 1,000 gallons per minute at the pumper nozzle with a pressure loss of less than five pound per square inch.

Detailed fire water and hydrant information is not available for the Whispering Oaks Business Park, since no site planning or building design has been completed.

Emergency Medical Services

The proposed project includes the development of the Whispering Oaks Business Park and the new MST facility. The proposed project is not population-generating and would not result in an increase in demand for ambulance services regionally, although it would increase demand at the project site. Ambulance services would be provided by private providers and the proposed project would not result in the need to construct new medical emergency facilities.
Impacts and Mitigation Measures

No Impact - Police Protection Facilities. Police protection for the project site is currently provided by the Monterey County Sheriff’s Department. According to Sergeant Ron Willis, the Sheriff’s Department would be able to provide adequate police protection to the project site with the existing facilities. The proposed project would not necessitate the construction of further police facilities and would not result in a significant impact. No mitigation is required.

No Impact - Fire Protection Facilities. Fire protection for the project site currently provided by the Monterey County Regional Fire District. According to Chief Urquides, the fire district would be able to provide adequate fire protection to the proposed project with the existing facilities. The proposed project would not necessitate the construction of further fire facilities and the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

No Impact – Emergency Medical Facilities. The proposed project is not population generating and would not result in an increase in regional demand for medical treatment facilities or ambulance services, although the demand for these would increase at the project site. Ambulance services would be provided by private providers and the proposed project would not result in the need to construct new emergency medical facilities.

2.13 Other Environmental Topics

Several possible effects of developing the project site are considered to be less than potentially significant. Each of these effects and the reasons why they are considered less than potentially significant are described below.

Agricultural Resources

The project site is currently undeveloped and predominantly covered in coast live oak woodland, with some areas vegetated with central maritime chaparral and annual grassland. The project site has never been used for agricultural purposes and is planned for development. No agricultural lands are located in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would have no effect on agricultural resources either on or off the project site.

Cultural Resources

A survey of archaeological sensitivity was completed for the former Fort Ord when the Fort Ord Reuse Plan was developed. The Reuse Plan EIR (page 4-194) states the following:

The areas of greatest archaeological sensitivity at former Fort Ord include all terraces and benches adjacent to the Salinas River and El Toro
Creek, the peripheries of the wet cycle lakes, and areas adjacent to streams in the BLM lands and the coastal beaches. All other lands in the area have low to medium potential for possessing archaeological resources. The areas of high archaeological sensitivity are illustrated in Figure 4.12-1. A cultural resource survey was carried out in high and low probability areas, which found that there was little potential for cultural deposits or information at three identified sites and four isolated find localities (Waite, 1995).

According to *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* Figure 4.4-2, Archaeological Resource Sensitivity, the project site is not located within an area of archaeological resource sensitivity. However, the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* states that there is archaeological evidence of human occupation of the coastal areas of Monterey County as far back as 5,000 BC (FORA 1997a, page 394). Therefore, there is the potential for the discovery of unknown archaeological resources as a result of the project. The *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* includes the following programs in the event that unknown archaeological resources are discovered during the construction phase of a project:

**Program A-1.1:** The City/County shall conduct a records search and a preliminary archaeological surface reconnaissance as a part of environmental review for any development project(s) proposed in a high archaeological resource sensitivity zone.

**Program A-1.2:** The City/County shall require that all known and discovered sites on the former Fort Ord with resources likely to be disturbed by a proposed project be analyzed by a qualified archaeologist with local expertise, recommendations made to protect and preserve resources and, as necessary, restrictive covenants imposed as a condition of project action or land sale.

**Program A-1.3:** As a contractor work specification for all new construction projects, the City/County shall include that during construction, upon the first discovery of any archaeological resource or potential find, development activity shall be halted within 50 meters of the find until the potential resources can be evaluated by a qualified professional archaeologist and recommendations made.

**Program A-2.2:** If traditional cultural properties are found to exist on the jurisdiction’s lands at former Fort Ord, the city/county shall ensure that deeds transferring Native American traditional properties include covenants that protect and allow Native Americans access to these properties. These covenants will be developed in consultation with
interested Native American groups, the State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Leases will contain clauses that require compatible use and protection as a condition of the lease.

For areas of the former Fort Ord that are considered low sensitivity, including the project site, implementation of these programs ensures that the impact to cultural resources would be less than significant.

There are no historic structures on the project site. The only structures are small trailers and sheds associated with closure activities at the adjacent landfill.

**Mineral Resources**

The project site is not included in a mineral resource zone where known or inferred mineral resources are likely to occur. According to the Reuse Plan EIR, the former Fort Ord lands do not contain significant mineral resources which would potentially be used for extraction, and proposed reuse activities are not expected to substantially alter landforms containing mineral resources (FORA 1997b, page 1-8). The proposed project would not affect mineral resources.

**Population and Housing**

The proposed project includes the development of commercial and industrial uses and does not include the development of any new housing. Development of the proposed project would not result in an increase in population and would not result in the displacement of any people or existing housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Development of the project site will require utility extensions and infrastructure construction; however, on their own, the improvements are not expected to remove an impediment to growth that indirectly would create a substantial increase in population growth. The project site is planned for mixed use development in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*, and as such, could potentially have been developed with a mix of uses that included new housing. A significant amount of development to date at the former Fort Ord has been residential, and there is not a significant lack of housing opportunity within the former Fort Ord. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on population and housing.

**Schools**

The proposed project does not include new housing and therefore, would not result in an increase in population or students. The proposed project would have no impact on schools.
Parks and Recreation

Fort Ord Reuse Plan Recreation Policy D-2 requires the County to develop parkland within the former Fort Ord that reflects the County subdivision standard of .003 acres of neighborhood parkland per person within the development areas. The proposed project does not include new housing and the development of the project site is not expected to create any increase in population. The potential impact of industrial development on park and recreation resources is considered negligible and it would not result in the need to construct new park or recreation facilities whose construction could create adverse environmental effects.

Solid Waste

The Reuse Plan EIR states that solid waste generated on former Ford Ord is deposited in the Monterey Regional Waste Management District’s landfill in Marina. The landfill has a design capacity of 46,942,284 tons and currently has a remaining capacity of 39,042,635 tons, with 100 years of estimated disposal site life still available (telephone conversation, Jeff Lindenthal, February 2, 2010).

The proposed project includes 532,300 square feet of commercial/industrial uses, 36,000 square feet of administrative office uses, and 117,938 square feet of industrial bus maintenance, repair, and cleaning facilities. To estimate the amount of solid waste that may be generated by the proposed project, waste generation rates complied by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) were used. The CIWMB website compiled a list from past environmental documents of solid waste generation rates that have been used for different uses. Using generation rates for uses that are closest to the ones proposed for the project, the CIWMB shows a solid waste generation rate of 13.0 pounds per 1,000 square feet per day for commercial uses, 1.0 pound per 100 square feet for administrative office uses, and 1.4 pounds per 100 square feet per day for industrial transportation/communication/utilities uses. Using the CIWMB rates, at build out, the proposed project would generate approximately 6,920 pounds for commercial uses, 360 pounds for administrative office uses, and 1,651 pounds per day for industrial uses, for a total of 8,931 pounds per day.

The Marina landfill has adequate capacity for the amount of solid waste estimated to be generated by the proposed project. The impact from solid waste generated by the project would be less than significant.
3.0  CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

3.1  CEQA REQUIREMENTS

CEQA Guidelines section 15130 requires a discussion of cumulative impacts when the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in section 15065(a)(3), which states, “The project has possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulative considerable. Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.”

Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not “cumulatively considerable,” a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulative considerable. A cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts that do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR. When the combined cumulative impacts associated with the project’s incremental effect and the effects of other projects is not significant, the EIR shall briefly indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant and is not discussed in further detail in the EIR. A lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting its conclusion that the cumulative impact is less than significant.

A lead agency may determine that a project’s contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and therefore, is not significant. A project’s contribution is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. The lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting its conclusion that the contribution will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable.
The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the other identified projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact.

CEQA requires a cumulative development scenario to consist of either a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or, a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.

### 3.2 Cumulative Project Scenario - Fort Ord Reuse Plan

Build-out of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* is considered the cumulative scenario, except where otherwise noted. The Reuse Plan EIR was certified by FORA as adequate prior to adoption of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. The Reuse Plan EIR includes the cumulative projects’ impact analysis and is used in the cumulative projects’ analysis in this section of the EIR. The *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* anticipates a build-out of about 22,000 housing units and approximately 45,000 jobs within the former Fort Ord. About five percent of the land area within the former Fort Ord, or about 1,350 acres, is planned for commercial/industrial development similar to that of the proposed project.

### 3.3 Cumulative Impacts and the Proposed Project’s Contribution

**Aesthetics**

Development of the project site would change the overall scenic value of the project site’s visual contribution to the natural landscape, and would contribute to a gradual change from undeveloped natural vistas to developed vistas as other areas of the former Fort Ord are developed. The proposed project would also introduce new sources of light and glare to the project site, in particular the MST site. The Reuse Plan EIR found that build-out of the former Fort Ord would result in less than significant impacts from changes to the visual quality,
including changes associated with lighting. Sites without existing development, such as the project site, would have greater effects, but the visual protection policies in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* would reduce these to a less than significant level. The proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on aesthetics.

**Air Quality**

The cumulative scenario for ozone is based on the consistency of the proposed project with the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) *2008 Air Quality Management Plan* (AQMP) for the North Central Coast Air Basin. Because the region is in nonattainment for ozone, projects and plans are evaluated for cumulative impacts by determining the consistency of the proposed project with the applicable regional air quality plan. The AQMP addresses attainment of the State ozone standard. The air district has included emissions related to population and economic growth (that leads to traffic activity) in the AQMP using projections adopted by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). Consistency with the AQMP is normally determined by AMBAG. AMBAG analyzed the proposed project and determined it was consistent with the 2008 regional forecasts, and therefore, the AQMP.

For all other pollutants the cumulative scenario is build-out of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. The Reuse Plan EIR determined that the build-out of the former Fort Ord would result in a less than significant impact on air quality. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable air quality impact.

**Climate Change**

**Cumulative Scenario**

The cumulative scenario for climate change is based on whether the proposed project would result in emissions of greenhouse gases that could cumulatively contribute to global warming or climate change. According to the GHG emissions assessment prepared for the proposed project, carbon dioxide, the primary man-made greenhouse gas of concern, would be generated by the proposed project primarily from mobile sources and energy uses. Currently neither the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the MBUAPCD, nor Monterey County have established regulations, guidance, methodologies, or other means that would require the implementation of measures to reduce GHG emissions from projects. Although there are feasible measures that may be implemented to reduce the impact of the proposed project on climate change, at this time it is unknown if these measures would reduce the impact of the proposed project to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed project would have a
significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on climate change. The following sections present a detailed analysis of the proposed project's climate change impacts.

The information contained within this section is based on data from the 1982 Monterey County General Plan and the Whispering Oaks Business Park General Development Plan/Monterey-Salinas Transit Center Project Greenhouse Gas Emission Assessment Monterey County, California, prepared by Illingworth & Rodkin, Inc. (2010). A copy of the greenhouse gas assessment can be found in Appendix K.

**Standards of Significance**

CEQA Guidelines appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

In accordance with State Senate Bill (SB) 97) OPR has certified and adopted guidelines for evaluation of the effects of GHG emissions and mitigation of those effects. The new climate change appendix G standards are noted above. The recent amendments to the CEQA Guidelines do not provide any methodology for analysis of greenhouse gases. Neither Monterey County nor the MBUAPCD have adopted standards of significance for global climate change impacts. Therefore, in lieu of state guidance or locally adopted thresholds, projected GHG emissions have been quantified, but a primarily qualitative approach will be used to evaluate possible impacts for the proposed project.

The MBUAPCD has not formally adopted thresholds to evaluate GHG emissions from land use projects. Although the CEQA Guidelines indicate that the evaluation include quantification of project-generated GHG emissions, there are no defined criteria against which direct and indirect project emissions can be compared to determine significance. Various agencies including the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and County of San Diego have released guidance on significance thresholds. OPR has asked CARB's technical staff to recommend a method for setting significance thresholds.
CARB released the Initial Significance Recommendations on October 24, 2008. CARB recommends that residential and commercial projects that qualify under existing CEQA statutory or categorical exemptions are presumed to have a less-than-significant impact related to climate change if:


2. Operational activities meet:
   - California Energy Commission’s (CEC) Tier II Energy Efficiency goal;
   - An interim CARB performance standard for water use;
   - An interim CARB performance standard for waste; and
   - An interim CARB performance standard for transportation.

3. The project would emit no more than a "to be determined" limit for metric tons CO₂ per year.

In January 2009, CARB issued a preliminary draft staff proposal for recommending approaches to setting significance thresholds to evaluate project GHG emissions under CEQA. For land use projects, the objective is to develop a threshold that will substantially reduce GHG emissions from new projects and streamline permitting of carbon-efficient projects. CARB staff proposed that a presumption of non-significance apply only to projects whose total net emissions, after meeting the performance standards to be established or equivalent, were below a specified level. To address project performance standards, CARB staff recommended reliance on the CEC’s Tier II Energy Efficiency standards for solar energy incentive programs. However, CARB has not completed the development of significance thresholds and they are not currently being utilized as guidance for assessing impacts of new development projects.

The BAAQMD (the adjacent air district) released draft thresholds of significance in September 2009 (these were updated in October, November and December 2009 to include performance standards for projects). BAAQMD proposes the two different project thresholds of significance for GHG emissions from plans: (1) compliance with a qualified Climate Action Plan or (2) annual emissions of 4.6 metric tons of CO₂ per service population. These thresholds apply to projects with emission of 1,100 metric tons of CO₂ or greater. The BAAQMD thresholds were develop specifically for the Bay Area, after considering the latest Bay Area GHG inventory and the effects of AB 32 scoping plan measures that would reduce regional emissions. BAAQMD intends to achieve GHG reductions from new land use developments to close the gap between projected regional emissions with AB 32 scoping plan measures and the AB 32 targets.
Therefore, these thresholds are regionally based. In addition, BAAQMD has revised their proposal several times during the process to adopt the GHG thresholds, so the current proposal is not ensured of being the final proposed thresholds. The Board of Directors is scheduled to consider the issue for adoption in April 2010. However, the project site is not within the San Francisco Air Basin, and the BAAQMD thresholds are not applicable to this project.

SJVAPCD recently adopted thresholds to assess significance of GHG emissions under CEQA. The District’s approach uses performance based standards, otherwise known as Best Performance Standards (BPS) to assess significance of project specific GHG impacts. Projects implementing BPS would be determined to have a less than cumulatively significant impact. Otherwise, demonstration of a 29 percent reduction in GHG emissions, from business-as-usual, is required to determine that a project would have a less than cumulatively significant impact. SJVAPCD has recently developed an interim GHG Emissions Reductions Calculator.

SCAQMD formally adopted interim CEQA significance thresholds; however, these thresholds apply only to stationary sources. SCAQMD has proposed thresholds for residential and commercial projects, but has deferred them to further define performance standards and coordinate with CARB staff’s interim GHG proposal. The initial threshold identified by SCAQMD is 3,000 metric tons of CO₂ emissions per year.

At this time, for a project to be a substantial source of new greenhouse gas emissions it would have to meet the following criteria:

- result in a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions, in terms of carbon dioxide equivalents, that could substantially impede local, regional or statewide efforts to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions.

Pursuant to Senate Bill 97, the California Office of Planning and Research has been developing guidelines for mitigating environmental effects of climate change. Proposed guidelines, in the form of amendments to the CEQA Guidelines, were approved in February 2010. These guidelines provide minimal guidance to local agencies regarding thresholds of significance. However, the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has also requested the CARB, the state agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, assist with the development of a method for setting statewide thresholds of significance that can be used by local agencies as a basis for developing/adopting their own thresholds of significance. CARB responded in October 2008 with the first draft of a recommended approach entitled *Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Significance Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases under the California Environmental Quality Act*. CARB has since received public input on the methodology and is continuing to refine it. In the absence of specific guidance from the state, some agencies have adopted their own thresholds of significance, while others have determined that for the time being, a determination of the significance of climate change impacts is too speculative.
Federal Regulations

The United States participates in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). While the United States signed the Kyoto Protocol, which would have required reductions in GHGs, the Congress never ratified the protocol. The federal government chose voluntary and incentive-based programs to reduce emissions and has established programs to promote climate technology and science. In 2002, the United States announced a strategy to reduce the greenhouse gas intensity of the American economy by 18 percent over the ten-year period from 2002 to 2012. To date, the United State Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has not regulated GHGs under the Clean Air Plan, although a 2007 Supreme Court ruling held that the U.S. EPA can regulate GHG emissions.

In July 2008, U.S. EPA issued an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) regarding the regulation of GHG emissions. The ANPR reviews the various Clean Air Act provisions that may be applicable to regulate GHGs, examines the issues that regulating GHGs under those provisions may raise, provides information regarding potential regulatory approaches and technologies for reducing GHG emissions, and raises issues relevant to possible legislation and the potential for overlap between legislation and CAA regulation. In addition, the ANPR describes and solicits comment on petitions U.S. EPA has received to regulate GHG emissions from ships, aircraft and off-road vehicles (e.g., farm and construction equipment). Finally, the notice discusses several other actions concerning stationary sources for which U.S. EPA has received comment regarding the regulation of GHG emissions. U.S. EPA’s analyses leading up to the ANPR have raised substantial concerns regarding the expanded regulatory scope of agency under this action.

As part of the commitments to UNFCCC, the U.S. EPA has developed an inventory of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of all greenhouse gases. This inventory is periodically updated, with the latest update being 2008. EPA reports that total United States emissions have risen by 14.7 percent from 1990 to 2006, while the United States’ gross domestic product has increased by 59 percent over the same period. A 1.1 percent decrease was noted from 2005 to 2006, which is reported to be attributable to: (1) climate conditions, (2) reduced use of petroleum products for transportation, and (3) increased use of natural gas over other fuel sources. The inventory notes that the transportation sector emits about 33 percent of CO₂ emissions, with 60 percent of those emissions coming from personal automobile use. Residential uses, primarily from energy use, accounted for 20 percent of CO₂ emissions.

As a part of U.S. EPA’s responsibility to develop and update an inventory of United States GHG emissions and sinks, U.S. EPA compared trends of other various United States data. Over the period 1990 to 2006, GHG emissions grew at a rate of about 0.9 percent per year. Population growth was slightly higher at 1.1 percent, while energy and fossil fuel consumption were more closely related at 1.0 percent GDP and energy generation grew at much higher rates.
State Regulatory Overview

California Senate Bill 375. This bill was signed into law by the Governor in September 2008. The bill sets forth a mechanism for coordinating land use and transportation on a regional level for the purpose of reducing GHGs. The focus is on reducing GHGs by reducing the number of vehicle miles traveled by passenger vehicles and light trucks. Under SB 375, CARB is required to set GHG reduction targets for each metropolitan region for the years 2020 and 2035. Regional organizations for each metropolitan area play a key role in implementing SB 375 as they are collaboratively responsible for working with CARB to set the reduction targets and for helping to implement programs to meet the targets. SB 375 aligns three critical areas of policy for regional and local agencies: 1) regional transportation plans and policies; 2) housing policies and housing allocations; and 3) GHG emissions reductions for the transportation sector (passenger vehicles and light trucks).

California Senate Bill 97. SB 97 was signed in August 2007. SB 97 directs OPR to prepare, develop, and transmit to the California Natural Resources Agency guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHG emissions by July 1, 2009. Amended CEQA Guidelines were completed prior to January 2010 and approved in February 2010. SB 97 describes the CEQA process as an appropriate tool for addressing and mitigating global warming impacts from new development projects that are subject to CEQA.

Executive Order S-01-07. This order was issued by the Governor on January 18, 2007. The order mandates that: 1) a statewide goal be established to reduce the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020; and 2) a Low Carbon Fuel Standard for transportation fuels be established for California. The California Environmental Protection Agency is the lead in coordinating implementation of Executive Order S-01-07 while CARB is identified in AB 32 as responsible for establishing statewide GHG emissions standards. Coordination between CARB and the California Environmental Protection Agency will be needed to implement the requirements of AB 32 and Executive Order S-01-07.

California Assembly Bill 32. Adopted by the State Legislature in 2006, AB 32 requires CARB to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve GHG emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020. Among its key components are:

- On or before June 30, 2007, make available a list of discrete early action GHG emission reduction measures that can be implemented prior to the adoption of the statewide GHG limit and the measures required to achieve compliance with the statewide limit.
- By January 1, 2008, determine the statewide levels of GHG emissions in 1990, and adopt a statewide GHG emissions limit that is equivalent to the 1990 level (an approximately 25 percent reduction in existing statewide GHG emissions);
- On or before January 1, 2010, adopt regulations to implement the early action GHG emission reduction measures;

- On or before January 1, 2011, adopt quantifiable, verifiable and enforceable emission reduction measures by regulation that will achieve the statewide GHG emissions limit by 2020, to become operative on January 1, 2012 at the latest. The emission reduction measures may include direct emission reduction measures, alternative compliance mechanisms, and potential monetary and non-monetary incentives that reduce GHG emissions from any sources or categories of sources as CARB finds necessary to achieve the statewide GHG emissions limit; and

- Monitor compliance with and enforce any emission reduction measure adopted pursuant to AB 32.

The first two of these actions have been completed and the state is actively working to meet the schedules set forth for the remaining actions.

AB 32 has focused intense statewide attention on climate change. It is driving a multitude of state actions and programs whose purposes are to achieve GHG reductions consistent with goals set forth in AB 32.

AB 32 does not specifically mandate action at the local level; however, because CEQA is defined by the state as a primary tool for addressing climate change, many local agencies are being proactive by developing policies and programs aimed at reducing GHGs generated within their jurisdictions to reduce climate change impacts identified in the CEQA process.

The major proposed statewide actions for reducing GHG emissions are embodied in CARB’s Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan (hereinafter “Scoping Plan”) which was adopted by CARB in December 2008. The Scoping Plan contains the main strategies California will pursue to reduce GHG emissions. The Scoping Plan includes a range of potential GHG reduction actions that include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as a cap-and-trade system, and an administration fee to fund the program.

The Scoping Plan also discusses the role of local governments in assisting with the implementation of AB 32. As stated on page 27 of the Scoping Plan:

In addition to tracking emissions using these protocols, ARB encourages local governments to adopt a reduction goal for municipal operations emissions and move toward establishing similar goals for community emissions that parallel the State commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 15 percent from current levels by 2020.
3.0 Cumulative Impacts

Executive Order S-3-05. California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger announced on June 1, 2005, through Executive Order S-3-05, GHG emission reduction targets as follows: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. Some literature equates these reductions to 11 percent by 2010 and 25 percent by 2020.

California Assembly Bill 1493. AB 1493, enacted on July 22, 2002, requires CARB to develop and adopt regulations that reduce GHGs emitted by passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks. Regulations adopted by CARB apply to 2009 and later model year vehicles. CARB estimates that the regulation will reduce GHG emissions from the light-duty/passenger vehicle fleet by an estimated 18 percent in 2020 and by 27 percent in 2030, compared to today (Association of Environmental Professionals 2007).

Title 24 Standards/Energy Conservation. Although not originally intended to reduce GHG emissions, California’s Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6) were first established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California’s energy consumption. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. The latest amendments were made in 2008 and became effective January 1, 2010. The premise for the standards is that energy efficient buildings require less electricity, natural gas, and other fuels. Electricity production from fossil fuels and on-site fuel combustion (typically for appliances) results in GHG emissions. Therefore, increased energy efficiency in buildings results in fewer GHG emissions on a building by building basis.

State Guidance on Climate Change

CEQA Guidelines Revisions. OPR prepared amendments to the CEQA Guidelines regarding GHG emissions. The amendments provide guidance about analysis and mitigation approaches to incorporate into environmental documents. Amendments were made to 14 sections of the CEQA Guidelines for this purpose. The proposed amendments have been submitted to the Natural Resources Agency and will be effective in March 2010.

Technical Advisory. In June 2008, OPR released a Technical Advisory entitled CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. The advisory provides direction for evaluating climate change impacts under CEQA. The advisory does not provide detailed methodological direction nor does it recommend approaches for developing thresholds of significance. OPR does, however, outline that compliance with CEQA for analysis of climate change impacts entails three basic steps: 1) identify and quantify GHG emissions from the project; 2) assess the significance of the impact on climate change; and 3) if the impact is found to be significant, identify alternatives and/or mitigation measures that will reduce the impact below significance.
California Attorney General’s Office. The California Attorney General’s office has been proactive in taking action to enforce the state's commitment to reducing impacts from global warming. The Attorney General’s office has filed numerous comment letters on CEQA documents prepared on a wide range of projects. The intent of the comment letters has generally been to provide guidance and to identify expectations for the analysis of global warming as part of the CEQA process. The Attorney General’s office has also provided consultative assistance to lead agencies. Written guidance has also been provided in the form of a document entitled The California Environmental Quality Act – Addressing Global Warming Impacts at the Local Agency Level (http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GW_mitigation_measures.pdf).

Environmental Setting

Science and Effects of Climate Change. The earth is warming. Temperatures at the Earth’s surface have increased by an estimated 1.4° Fahrenheit (0.8° Celsius) between 1900 and 2005. The past decade was the warmest of the past 150 years and perhaps the past millennium. The hottest 22 years on record have occurred since 1980, and 2005 was the hottest on record (Association of Environmental Professionals 2007).

The growing scientific consensus is the observed acceleration in the rate of warming is largely the result of emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases from human activities including industrial processes, fossil fuel combustion, and changes in land use, such as deforestation. Projections of future warming suggest a global increase of 2.5°F (1.4°C) to 10.4°F (5.8°C) by 2100, with warming in the United States expected to be even higher. In addition to warming, increases in sea level and changes in precipitation, including more frequent floods and droughts, are likely. Greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere. GHGs are emitted by natural processes and human activities. The accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere regulates the Earth’s temperature. Without these natural GHGs, the Earth’s surface would be about 61°F cooler. Emissions from human activities, such as electricity production and vehicles, have elevated the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere. The human-produced GHGs responsible for increasing the Greenhouse Effect and their relative contribution to global warming are carbon dioxide (CO₂) (53 percent), methane (CH₄) (17 percent), near surface ozone (O₃) (13 percent), nitrous oxide (N₂O) (12 percent), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) (five percent) (Association of Environmental Professionals 2007).

Unaddressed, global warming will have significant impacts across the United States and around the world. For instance, sea-level rise will add to the stresses coastal communities are already facing, including erosion, storms, and pressures from development. In the arid and semi-arid western United States, relatively modest changes in precipitation can have large impacts on already limited water supplies. Terrestrial, freshwater, and coastal ecosystems of the United States are particularly sensitive to climate change, threatening biodiversity and ecosystem goods
and services such as fisheries and recreation. Even human health may be threatened should heat waves, extreme weather, and vector-borne diseases become more prevalent.

While some of the effects of climate change may be positive, such as longer growing seasons in the northern United States and Canada that increase productivity of agriculture and forests, these positive impacts are unlikely to be sustained should the globe continue to warm. Furthermore, even if the nation as a whole were to benefit, certain regions or sectors, such as the southern United States, may suffer. Similarly, many developing countries are even more vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change and less able to adapt. As nations continue to grow more interdependent, the United States may not be immune from impacts experienced elsewhere. (www.pewclimate.org/global-warming-basics/basic_science)

The generalized potential effects of climate change for California were summarized by the California Environmental Protection Agency in its April 2006 report entitled *Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature*. Among the key effects discussed, starting on page 19 are:

- A decline in the Sierra Nevada snowpack, which in turn would result in substantially reduced availability of water supply given that a significant volume of the state’s supply is derived from snowpack;
- Economic impacts resulting from reduced winter recreation;
- Temperature increases projected at 8.0 to 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit under more severe emissions scenarios with a corresponding increase of 25 to 30 percent in the number of days that ozone pollution levels are exceeded in many urban areas;
- Exacerbation and acceleration of coastal erosion along the entire length of the California coast;
- Impacts on surface water quality from seawater intrusion into the Sacramento Delta that results from a rise in sea level;
- General decline in agricultural production resulting from increased scarcity of water supply;
- Increased vulnerability of natural areas and agricultural production from rising temperatures and increases in potential pest infestation;
- Increased growth rates and expanded ranges of weeds, insect pests, and pathogens with elevated temperatures; and
- Increased energy demand especially during hot summer months.
Since the 2006 Climate Action Team report was prepared, a number of additional studies have been prepared that evaluate the potential effects of climate change in California. Two of the more recent of these are the Climate Action Team Draft Biennial Report, prepared by the California Environmental Protection Agency in March 2009 and The Future is Now: An Update on Climate Change Science Impacts and Response Options for California prepared by the California Climate Change Center in May 2009 for the California Energy Commission. These and other studies continue to build on earlier work and report on results of evolving climate change impact models. Their conclusions about the potential generalized effects of global warming are largely consistent with the generalized effects described in the Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature.

Global Warming Potentials. Each type of GHG has a different capacity to trap heat in the atmosphere and each remains in the atmosphere for a different length of time. The ability of a GHG to trap heat is measured by an index called the global warming potential. Carbon dioxide is considered the baseline GHG in this index and has a global warming potential of one. Methane has a global warming potential of 21 times that of CO₂ and N₂O has a global warming potential of 310 times that of CO₂. The families of chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons and perfluorocarbons have a substantially greater global warming potential than other GHGs, generally ranging from approximately 1,300 to over 10,000 times that of CO₂. While CO₂ represents the vast majority of the total volume of GHGs released into the atmosphere, the release of even small quantities of high global warming potential GHGs can be an important contributor to climate change.

World/United States. Estimates of GHG Emissions. In 2004, total worldwide GHG emissions were estimated to be 20,135 teragrams (Tg) CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e), excluding emissions/removals caused by removal of vegetation and forestry. CO₂e represents “carbon dioxide equivalency.” It describes the global warming potential of a greenhouse gas or mixture of greenhouse gases in terms of the amount of CO₂ that would have the same global warming potential. A teragram equals one million metric tons. In 2004, GHG emissions in the United States were 7,074.4 Tg CO₂ equivalent. In 2005, total United States GHG emissions were 7,260.4 Tg CO₂e, a 16.3 percent increase from 1990 emissions, while United States gross domestic product has increased by 55 percent over the same period (EPA 2007).

California GHG Emissions Inventory. California, the eighth largest economy in the world, is a substantial contributor of global GHGs. It is the second largest contributor in the United States and the sixteenth largest in the world. Based upon the CEC’s Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004, June 2005 and December 2006, California produced 492 million metric tons (542,336,520 tons) of CO₂ equivalent in 2004, the latest year that emissions data is available.
The most common GHG is CO₂, which constitutes approximately 84 percent of all GHG emissions in California. Worldwide, the State of California ranks as the 12th to 16th largest emitter of CO₂ and is responsible for approximately two percent of the world’s CO₂ emissions. The CEC is charged with developing regular inventories of GHG emissions in the state. These inventories are used as a baseline from which statewide efforts to reduce GHG emissions can be measured. Within California, 82 percent of the GHG emissions generated in the form of CO₂ are from combustion of fossil fuel, primary in the transportation and electricity generation sectors. Another 2.2 percent are from other sources of CO₂. About 41.2 percent of all GHG gases emitted come from the transportation sector. Electricity generation is the second largest category of GHG emissions. Approximately 6.2 percent of emissions were from CH₄, 6.6 percent from N₂O, with other high global warming gases constituting the balance of emissions (CEC 2006).

2010 Monterey County General Plan. In 2008, as part of the draft EIR for the Monterey County General Plan update process, the County of Monterey completed a draft GHG emissions inventory for the unincorporated portions of the County. According to the inventory at the time, approximately 1,394,404 metric tons of GHGs were generated in the baseline year of 2006. Major contributors included on-road transportation (41 percent), natural gas consumption (14 percent), electricity consumption (15 percent), and industrial processes (14 percent) (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008). An inventory of all GHG emissions in Monterey County has not yet been conducted; however, partial information on such emissions does exist.

Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. The MBUAPCD is the agency responsible for regulating air quality in the region. The air district has adopted CEQA guidelines for assessing the air quality impacts of project. These guidelines have a placeholder for assessing impacts from GHG emissions; however, the air district has not adopted guidelines at this time. The air district provides estimates of GHG on-road emissions for each of the counties in the air basin in 2010. Monterey County is estimated to have CO₂ emissions of 2,377,000 metric tons per year.

Project Analysis

The impact analysis of the proposed project includes a projection of GHG emissions from the build out of the project site, a determination of impact significance, and a discussion of measures to reduce GHG emissions along with projections of GHG emissions reductions that would result from those measures.

Expanded transit service in the region, which would occur as a result of the project, is expected to result in lower overall GHG emissions. However, this study focuses on the impacts caused by the project and does not address these beneficial regional effects that cannot be assessed at this time based on available information.
Methodology. Emissions associated with the development of the proposed project were calculated as part of the project air quality study. CAPCOA has provided guidance for calculating project emissions. Emissions from area and mobile sources and electricity usage are recommended for analysis by CAPCOA. Net annual CO₂ emissions associated with build out of the project were predicted.

As recommended by CAPCOA, area and mobile source emissions were calculated using the URBEMIS2007 model. The inputs used for the modeling were the same as those used to calculate emissions of air pollutants. Emissions from additional bus travel were also calculated using the EMFAC2007 model. The URBEMIS2007 model was adjusted to assume that 100 percent of the new uses would consume natural gas for space and water heating.

Emissions associated with non-bus motor vehicle travel were based on the URBEMIS2007 predictions. These were the same predictions used to predict emissions of ozone precursor pollutants and PM_{10}.

The URBEMIS2007 model does not predict indirect emissions associated with electricity consumption. These emissions were based on commercial electricity consumption rates developed by a statewide residential saturation study prepared for the CEC. This report provides electricity usage rates for various commercial uses. According to this report, large office buildings (greater than 30,000 square feet) use 17.70 kilowatt hours annually and warehouse type buildings consume 4.45 kilowatt hours. PG&E would likely provide electricity to the proposed project. An emission rate of 523 pounds of CO₂ per 1,000 kilowatt hours was applied to electricity consumption rates.

Construction emissions, which would be temporary, were not predicted due to a lack of data at this time. The project would be developed in phases, using various types of equipment, material deliveries, and workforce. The URBEMIS2007 model can provide emissions from on-site construction activity, but specific construction schedules and activity should be known to make meaningful predictions. However, a large portion of construction related emissions would occur off-site and are not addressed using the URBEMIS2007 model. These mostly include GHG emissions associated with the manufacturing of materials used to construct the project. There are no recommended procedures for computing construction period GHG emissions.

GHG Emission Results. CO₂ is the primary GHG that would be emitted from the project. Although there are emissions of methane and nitrous oxide, which are more potent GHGs, their emissions are very small compared to CO₂ (i.e., less than three percent equivalent CO₂). As a result, these emissions were not calculated. The results are shown in Table 23, Annual CO₂ Emissions for the Proposed Project.
Table 23  Annual CO₂ Emissions for the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Basis for Calculation</th>
<th>Annual Emissions (in tons per year)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 1 in 2013</td>
<td>Phases 1-2 in 2016</td>
<td>Phases 1-3 in 2030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source</td>
<td>Natural gas and landscape equipment from URBEMIS2007</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mobile Source</td>
<td>Operational output from URBEMIS2007</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>11,564</td>
<td>12,039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Bus Travel</td>
<td>Increased bus travel applied to EMFA2007 factors</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>4,781</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Usage</td>
<td>Estimated for large office and warehouse uses combined with current PG&amp;E emission rates</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,887</td>
<td>12,504</td>
<td>15,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,887</td>
<td>20,391</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: EMC Planning Group 2010, Illingworth & Rodkin 2009*

The results in Table 23 are based primarily on a “business-as-usual” scenario, where current emission rates would apply. This will not likely be the case as AB 32 will require GHG emissions reductions in all sectors. This includes reductions from transportation through the requirement of more fuel efficient vehicles and lower carbon fuels, increasing the portfolio of zero- or low-carbon energy sources, and changes to forestry, dairy, agricultural and waste practices that produce GHG emissions. Transportation emission rates will likely decrease due to increased fuel efficiency and lower carbon content in fuels. The URBEMIS2007 model does not reflect future fuel efficiency very well. Fuel efficiency is regulated by the U.S. Department of Transportation and current CARB regulations that address climate change. Newer fuel standards would increase light-duty automobile and light-duty truck fuel efficiency by 10 miles per gallon (to 35 miles per gallon for cars sold in 2020). CARB proposes more efficient standards as part of the state's efforts to reduce GHG emissions. These standards would apply to new vehicles sold, and therefore, would gradually effect the overall fleet as these new vehicles replace older vehicles. The CO₂ project emissions estimates for vehicle travel do not accurately reflect future conditions, since it is likely that CO₂ emissions with a more fuel-efficient vehicle fleet would be less than those reported.
The majority of GHG emissions associated with the proposed project would come from motor vehicle use. Under the “business as usual” condition, vehicle travel associated with the project would make up almost 88 percent of the project GHG emissions. However, this figure is mostly attributable to the increased bus travel associated with centralizing buses that serve the entire MST service area. At 2030, the additional bus travel would make up about 55 percent of the total 2030 emissions. These calculations assume that additional growth in MST operations would continue to position buses at the appropriate existing transit facility without the project. This analysis does not assume that MST would adjust transit routes in the future to reduce bus travel to the transit routes. New routes for the expanded facility are not known, but would be meant to serve the population in an efficient manner that would likely have lower overall emissions.

The projections assuming increased future bus travel are meant to be a “worst-case” scenario. This assessment does not address the lower emissions that would occur as a result of having centralized functions, reducing trips that would be made between the two facilities and allowing MST to effectively keep more buses maintained, or lower overall regional emissions resulting from greater public transportation services provided by the MST project. The emissions factors developed for the project account for some conversion to compressed natural gas buses and improved fuel efficiency as predicted by the EMFAC2007 model. The URBEMIS2007 operational emissions for the MST operations and the Whispering Oaks Business Park do not include any adjustments for alternative modes of travel to the site such as transit, bicycle, or transit use.

Energy usage (natural gas and electricity usage combined) would generate about 12 percent of the proposed project GHG emissions. Features that reduce energy consumption and waste can be included in new development to reduce emissions. These would include energy efficient construction methods, inclusion of solar photovoltaic panels to produce energy, solar water heaters, passive solar design, appropriate landscape and water recycling systems, and other measures. For example, Energy Star rated buildings have \( \text{CO}_2 \) emissions that are about 25 percent lower than existing buildings of similar size and use. The emissions estimates reported are based on current energy consumption rates for existing uses. The proposed MST facility and Whispering Oaks Business Park propose to obtain Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification. Typically, LEED certification could provide at least a 20 percent reduction in energy related emissions; however, the specific design to meet LEED certification would be necessary to estimate emissions reductions that would be greater than 20 percent. The electricity-related emissions do not consider lower emission rates that are anticipated from the electricity generation sector.

The proposed project would necessitate the removal of numerous coast live oak trees. These trees are mostly short, with an average height of no more than 20 feet. The age of the trees is estimated at 60 to 80 years. The removal of these trees would result in temporary \( \text{CO}_2 \) emissions.
associated with the use of gasoline or diesel powered equipment during removal and potential increases in CO₂ from the lack of CO₂ sequestration as the result of the loss of trees. According to the Whispering Oaks GDP, tree removal would be minimized to the extent possible and trees would be replanted in the development areas. The replanting of trees would sequester CO₂ during the active growing period of the tree (i.e., within the first 25 years). After the active growing period is complete, the replanted trees would sequester CO₂ at lower rates, similar to the existing trees. This sequestration is often offset by pruning, tree death, and removal of replaced trees. Based on estimates from the U.S. Department of Energy, a mature coast live oak provides CO₂ sequestration of about 0.28 tons per year. The removal of an estimated 5,500 trees for project implementation would reduce CO₂ sequestration by about 1,500 tons per year. The replanting of new trees both on and off site could offset the lack of CO₂ sequestration that is currently provided at the project site, but there would be a significant reduction in the number of trees compared to existing conditions.

As previously discussed, there are no formally recognized methods under CEQA for quantifying GHG emissions from a proposed project, nor are there standards or thresholds in place to evaluate potential impacts on global climate change from a proposed project. Currently, compliance with AB 32 is the state’s plan to achieve reductions in GHG emissions to 1990 levels. This will not be an easy task, as the state is expected to experience population growth that would include increased vehicle usage and energy demand. As a result, long-term emissions would require substantial reductions to achieve the AB 32 goals. Reducing building energy use would further reduce potential GHG emissions. Without measures to achieve adequate reductions in GHG emissions equal to total GHG emissions, the proposed project would be considered to cumulatively contribute to GHG emissions.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Significant and Unavoidable Impact – Project Related GHG Emissions.** There are no existing local or applicable regional plans in place that identify thresholds of significance or mitigation approaches for reducing the impacts of local development on climate change. In the absence of such plans, AB 32 becomes the applicable plan with which the proposed project should be consistent in order to meet the threshold of significance identified earlier, which is as follows:

result in a net increase in greenhouse gas emissions, in terms of carbon dioxide equivalents, that could substantially impede local, regional or statewide efforts to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions.

The Scoping Plan discusses the role of local governments in assisting with the implementation of AB 32. Local governments are encouraged to set goals to reduce community emissions by approximately 15 percent from current levels by 2020. The GHG emissions generated by the proposed project would make the state’s ability to achieve reductions targets identified in AB 32
more challenging. In the absence of local, regional or state guidelines, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

Both the MST and Whispering Oaks Business Park general development plans include direction that would reduce GHG emissions, including facilitation of transit use and LEED certification for most buildings. Additional greenhouse gas reduction measures can be implemented that would reduce the operational emissions of the proposed project. However, the full GHG emissions reduction potential of the measures may not be realized due to economic and site constraints, overlapping or mutually exclusive nature of some of the measures, or other reasons. Therefore, reductions of GHG emissions to a less than significant level cannot be guaranteed, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A statement of overriding considerations would be required.

**Mitigation Measure**

CC-1. The project applicant and/or succeeding developers shall prepare a greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the project site to the extent feasible. The following specific measures shall be implemented as part of the general development plan, development agreement, final map, and/or development plans as applicable:

1. MST shall analyze future bus routes and modify these routes to effectively reduce daily vehicle miles travelled. For near term, the proposed project is expected to result in an average of 1,959 miles of additional travel each day to serve existing routes that are served by the two existing transit facilities. This assessment uses a worst case analysis that this mileage would increase proportionally with new bus routes in the future. However, MST has outgrown their existing facilities, so new facilities would be necessary to serve the future transit demands. Potential reductions: 20 percent of the daily increased vehicle miles travelled. This 20 percent reduction would equate to a reduction of 392 miles when the project first becomes operational (assuming 186 daily bus trips).

2. MST and Whispering Oaks employees and visitors shall be provided opportunities for using transit that would reduce travel to the site. Potential reductions: up to 15 percent according to the URBEMIS2007 model. This reduction is based solely on the transit service at the site (e.g., frequency of buses within one-quarter mile and regional transit service within ½ mile). With future transit routes, the project could achieve a 10 percent reduction in mobile (non-bus) GHG emissions.
3. MST and Whispering Oaks employees shall be provided incentives to use transit, such as discounted transit passes. Potential reductions: five percent of employee mobile source emissions.

4. Provide local retail uses. Retail services, such as restaurants, markets, and automatic teller machines located in proximity could substantially reduce employee vehicle miles travelled during the day (lunch period). One lot within the business park shall be designated for retail services only. Potential reductions: two percent of employee mobile source emissions according to the URBEMIS2007 model.

5. Provide amenities for bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel. Sidewalks and bicycle lanes shall be provided on both sides of all streets to serve the project site (except sidewalks on the north side of Engineer’s Equipment Road where it abuts open space). In addition, secure employee bicycle facilities, along with lockers and showers shall be provided at each lot, and at least one public bicycle parking space shall be provided at each lot. Signal light sensors shall be set to respond to bicycle traffic, and an automatic walk signal shall be provided with green lights. Potential reductions: up to nine percent of employee mobile source emissions, depending on the network of bicycle lanes and sidewalks serving the project site, according to the URBEMIS2007 model. An additional two percent could be achieved with on-site amenities that would encourage employees to bike or walk to work. The total combined reductions for these measures could reach 10 percent, depending on the network of developed sidewalks and bicycle lanes in the future. Note: this measure shall not be required on interim access driveways built within street rights-of-way.

6. LEED credits shall focus to the extent feasible on approaches that directly or indirectly reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Potential reductions: 20 percent or more by meeting LEED Silver design level.

The project applicant and/or succeeding developers may elect to utilize other measures not specifically listed, including measures to reduce dependence on gas or electrical space or water heating, and additional means to encourage forms of transportation that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Use of other methods may be credited toward fulfilling this measure based on anticipated emissions reductions.

Measures to be included in the general development plan(s) or development agreement(s) shall be prepared as part of project-wide emissions reduction plan for RMA – Planning Department review and recommendation prior to Board of Supervisors approval. Measures to be included as notes on or designs within a final map, site plan, or building plans, shall be prepared as part of a site-specific emissions reduction plan for
RMA – Planning Department review and approval prior to approval of the relevant permit. The applicant/developer may elect to prepare a consolidated greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan for two or more lots.

**Monitoring Actions**

Prior to Board of Supervisors approval of the development agreement or general development plan, the project applicant shall prepare a project-wide greenhouse gas reduction plan for the review and recommendation of RMA – Planning Department and shall include applicable measures from the greenhouse gas reduction plan in the general development plan and development agreement.

Prior to approval of a final map, the applicant/developer shall include applicable measures from the project-wide greenhouse gas reduction plan on the final map, subject to the review and approval of the RMA - Planning Department.

Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant/developer shall prepare a site-specific greenhouse gas reduction plan for the review and approval of the RMA - Planning Department, and shall include applicable measures from the greenhouse reduction plan in site plans, improvement plans, and building plans.

Table 23, Reduced Annual CO$_2$ Emissions for the Proposed Project, shows the reduced GHG emissions if all of the measures in Mitigation Measure CC-1 were implemented by 2030. Reductions are shown with and without the increase in bus travel emissions because these additional emissions would be affected by changes in routing that cannot be predicted in the future. Overall, a 20 percent reduction could reasonably be achieved. This reduction would be in addition to reductions that are expected from state and federal actions. Such actions would include a reduction in GHG emissions from motor vehicles (new vehicles and fuel reformulation) and reduction in GHG emission to produce electricity.

Note that Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would reduce the level of NO$_x$ emissions. NO$_x$, while not generally considered a direct GHG, is a precursor to ozone formation, and can have indirect global warming implications.

**Biological Resources**

The *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* established a land use and open space plan for the entire 28,000 acre former Fort Ord. Approximately 17,000 acres were set aside as permanent open space and habitat area, including about 1,800 acres of oak woodland. The project site was designated as a development site (with restrictions), with the loss of on-site habitat off-set by the preserved land within the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. Development on the project site is anticipated by the *Fort Ord*
### Table 24 Reduced Annual CO$_2$ Emissions for the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Basis for Calculation</th>
<th>Annual Emissions (in tons per year)</th>
<th>Percent Reduction</th>
<th>2030 Emissions (no increased bus travel)</th>
<th>2030 Emissions (with increased bus travel)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Reduction</td>
<td>2030 Emissions (no increased bus travel)</td>
<td>2030 Emissions (with increased bus travel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Source</td>
<td>Natural gas and landscape equipment from URBEMIS2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%$^1$</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mobile Sources</td>
<td>Operational output from URBEMIS2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%$^2$</td>
<td>11,564</td>
<td>9,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Bus Travel</td>
<td>Increased bus travel applied to EMFAC2007 factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15,723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Usage</td>
<td>Estimated for large office and warehouse uses combined with current PG&amp;E emission rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%$^1$</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>2,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>35,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,849</td>
<td>28,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** EMC Planning Group Inc. 2010, Illingworth & Rodkin 2009

**Note:**
1 LEED could provide greater reductions, but depends on building design and use.
2 Assuming transit service and bike/pedestrian/transit infrastructure are in place in 2030.

*Reuse Plan*, and the planned preservation of open space on the project site and elsewhere within the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* area allows development of the project site without cumulative biological resources impacts. The Reuse Plan EIR found that implementation of the resource conservation and habitat management requirements of the HMP and the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* policies and programs, including payment of the FORA fee, would compensate for the loss of sensitive species and habitats, including oak trees, addressed in the HMP and its Implementing/Management Agreement. Therefore, as mitigated, the proposed project would have a less than cumulatively considerable effect on biological resources.
**Geology and Soils**

Redevelopment of the former Fort Ord will disturb soil and remove vegetation from already developed as well as relatively undisturbed areas, which would increase the hazard of wind and water induced erosion. Development of the project site would contribute to a cumulative loss of soil resources due to erosion on the former Fort Ord. However, implementation of erosion control measures and permanent landscaping would reduce this to a less than cumulatively considerable impact. The proposed project would be designed using standard engineering and building practices as standard conditions of approval, thereby reducing proposed project geology and soils related hazards to a less than significant level. The Reuse Plan EIR found a less than significant impact for geology and soils. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative geologic conditions would be less than cumulatively considerable.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The former Fort Ord represents a large known source of hazardous waste and toxic materials. Development on former Fort Ord, including the project site, may result in the accidental discovery of hazardous materials, such as isolated munitions or explosives. Mitigation Measure H-1 requires construction supervisors and crews to attend a U.S. Army sponsored munitions and explosives safety briefing prior to the commencement of construction, thereby reducing proposed project related hazards to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials would be less than cumulatively considerable. With the Fort Ord Reuse Plan policies, and a mitigation measures ensuring that munitions clean-up levels are consistent with proposed land uses, the Reuse Plan EIR found that build-out of the former Fort Ord would result in less than significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts. The proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable hazards or hazardous materials impacts.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

The Reuse Plan EIR found that with implementation of Fort Ord Reuse Plan policies, and a mitigation measures requiring a regional planning approach to storm water run-off, build-out of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan would result in a less than significant impact to hydrology and water quality. In accordance with policies in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, redevelopment within the former Fort Ord is required to retain and percolate storm water run-off on-site. The proposed project would retain not only run-off from on the project site, but would also capture run-off from the area south of the project site. The proposed project is consistent with Fort Ord Reuse Plan policies regarding storm water run-off and would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on hydrology, water quality, and flooding.
Build-out of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* is constrained by water supply. Groundwater use is limited to the 6,600 acre-foot allocation that is based on historic U.S. Army use within the former base. The 6,600 acre-foot allocation is further broken out by jurisdiction, and limits the potential for development within each. The Reuse Plan EIR determined that the total water supply demand for build-out of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* would be 13,500 acre feet per year. The projected growth of the Monterey Peninsula would place even greater demand for water supply in the region, which could cumulatively affect the groundwater aquifers and cause further overdraft and saltwater intrusion. Additional water supplies are expected to be developed to supplement groundwater supplies, including recycled water and desalinated water. These additional supplies will allow additional development within the former Fort Ord, but still limit ultimate growth. The proposed project would use available water from the Monterey County water allocation, and would have a less than significant cumulative impact on groundwater supplies.

**Land Use and Planning**

Land use within the former Fort Ord is regulated by the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* and the several local general plans that have been determined to be consistent with the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. The proposed project includes commercial and industrial uses and preserves open space within an area with a *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* designation of Mixed Use Planned Development. FORA makes a consistency finding for each proposed development (through 2014 when FORA dissolves), which ensures that land developed within the former Fort Ord has been developed in consistency with the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. It can be expected that future growth will follow a similar pattern.

The Reuse Plan EIR determined that build-out of parcels within the County, when adjacent to open space, could result in significant land use conflicts. A mitigation measure in the Reuse Plan EIR requires buffers between developed land and open space areas. The proposed project provides on-site buffers to the north and south, where the project site adjoins permanent open space, and also provides a connection between these buffer area on the east side where the project site adjoins a residential development. The proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts regarding land use or planning.

**Noise**

The cumulative project scenario has been modified for noise. The Reuse Plan EIR determined that while build-out of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* would increase noise levels, it would not result in noise levels in excess of established noise standards, given policies within the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*.

Development of the proposed project would add traffic to nearby roads. The noise report used the traffic cumulative scenario (see below) to analyze cumulative noise conditions. According to
the noise report, an increase of five dBA resulting in an ambient noise level greater than the standard is a significant cumulative impact. A project that contributes one dBA or more to that five dBA increase is considered to make a cumulatively considerable contribution. There is one location, Inter-Garrison Road between Eighth Avenue and Abrams Drive where a cumulative five dBA increase would occur and where the proposed project would contribute at least one dBA to the increase. However, the noise standard is not exceeded in that location, so the effect is less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable noise impact.

**Transportation/Circulation**

**Cumulative Scenario**

The cumulative traffic scenario was developed to include traffic generated by major approved and anticipated developments in the Monterey/Seaside/Marina area anticipated to be built by 2030. These are described in Exhibit 19A (trip generation) and Exhibit 19B (locations) in the Hatch Mott McDonald traffic report. The cumulative projects would generate a total of 165,613 daily trips, with 9,906 trips (6,024 in, 3,882 out) during the AM peak hour, and 15,387 trips (6,812 in, 8,575 out) during the PM peak hour.

The cumulative condition road network assumes implementation of certain improvements currently included within the FORA Capital Improvement Program (CIP), the City of Marina CIP, and the *Seaside General Plan*. The cumulative scenario assumes completion of the following roadway improvements (shown on Exhibit 2C of the traffic report in Appendix H):

- Inter-Garrison Road connector to Reservation Road;
- Realignment of Imjin Road between Imjin Parkway and Eighth Street to align with Sixth Avenue;
- Eastside Parkway, between Eucalyptus Road and Inter-Garrison Road;
- Second Avenue extension between Imjin Parkway and Del Monte Boulevard;
- Patton Parkway extension between Second Avenue and just west of Crescent Street;
- Hilby Avenue and San Pablo Avenue extensions eastward to General Jim Moore Boulevard;
- State Route 1/Monterey Road interchange, to be located between the existing Light Fighter Drive and Fremont Boulevard interchanges; and
Consolidation and reconfiguration of the Del Monte Boulevard and Imjin Parkway interchanges with State Route 1.

The cumulative analysis also includes those roadway network improvements described in Section 2.9 Traffic and Circulation.

The above improvements would result in traffic reassignments and diversions from those previously depicted under earlier scenarios. This includes reassignments of existing trips, approved project trips, proposed project trips, and cumulative trips. The most notable change affecting proposed project traffic distribution would be due to the opening of the Inter-Garrison Road connector to Reservation Road. This new roadway would provide a more direct connection between the project site and Reservation Road, thereby shifting Salinas-bound traffic from Blanco Road onto Davis Road. This change would result in the reduction of project traffic at both the Imjin Parkway/Reservation Road and Blanco Road/Reservation Road intersections. The 11.8 percent of MST Employee trips that would use Imjin Parkway and Blanco Road would shift onto Inter-Garrison Road and Davis Road, for a total of 35.4 percent distribution to Blanco Road. Whispering Oaks Business Park trips on Blanco Road would be eliminated, with a corresponding five percent of trips shifted to an origination point within East Garrison. Bus trip distribution would not change under cumulative conditions.

**Cumulative Intersection Conditions**

Under cumulative conditions without the proposed project, 21 study intersections would fail to operate at acceptable levels of service. With the addition of project trips under the cumulative scenario, 23 study intersections would fail to operate at or better than their jurisdiction’s operational LOS standard. The two additional intersections would be Whispering Oaks Drive/Engineer’s Equipment Road and Whispering Oaks Way/Inter-Garrison Road. The proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution at 19 of these intersections, as listed in Table 25, Intersections with Significant Cumulative Impacts.

**Significant Cumulative Impact – LOS Below Standards.** The proposed project would contribute traffic to 19 intersections with level of service below standards during cumulative conditions. One additional intersection is listed for which Whispering Oaks Business Park would provide mitigation at Phase 2 and 3, but for which MST would represent a cumulatively considerable share of traffic. The proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to LOS degradation at the following intersections.

*Davis Road/Reservation Road.* Signalize Intersection; and add second westbound Reservation left turn lane.
### Table 25  Intersections with Significant Cumulative Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Cumulative LOS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>PM Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Road/Reservation Road</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Avenue – California Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard/Light Fighter Drive</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Avenue/Light Fighter Drive</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Avenue/Light Fighter Drive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Avenue – Eighth Street/Inter-Garrison Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whispering Oaks Drive/Engineer's Equipment Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whispering Oaks Way/Inter-Garrison Road</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer's Equipment Road/ Inter-Garrison Road</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Avenue-Engineer's Equipment Road/Eighth Street</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Parkway/Gigling Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Hatch Mott McDonald Inc. 2010

*Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road.* Add northbound Inter-Garrison right turn overlap signal phase; add second westbound Reservation Road left turn lane; add a second northbound Inter-Garrison right turn lane.
**3.0 Cumulative Impacts**

*Imjin Road/Imjin Parkway.* Add an eastbound Imjin Parkway right turn lane; add a second westbound Imjin Parkway left turn lane; add a northbound Imjin Road right turn overlap signal phase; and add third eastbound and third westbound Imjin Parkway through lanes.

*Fifth Avenue-California Avenue/Imjin Parkway.* Add a southbound California right turn lane.

*Third Avenue/Imjin Parkway.* Signalize intersection.

*Second Avenue/Imjin Parkway.* Add an eastbound right turn overlap signal phases.

*Northbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway:* Signalize intersection.

*Southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps/Imjin Parkway:* Signalize intersection.

*General Jim Moore Boulevard/Light Fighter Drive.* Add a southbound General Jim Moore Boulevard right turn lane; and add a second eastbound Light Fighter Drive left turn lane.

*Second Avenue/Light Fighter Drive.* Add a southbound right turn overlap signal phase.

*First Avenue/Light Fighter Drive.* Add a second northbound left turn lane.

*General Jim Moore Boulevard/Broadway Avenue.* Signalize intersection; add a northbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second northbound through lane; add a southbound General Jim Moore Boulevard left turn lane and a second southbound through lane; add an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane.

*Seventh Avenue/Inter-Garrison Road.* Add a northbound right turn lane.

*Engineers Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Drive.* Add northbound and southbound Engineering left turn lanes; signalize intersection; and add eastbound and westbound right turn lanes.

*Whispering Oaks Way/Inter-Garrison Road.* Add a southbound Whispering Oaks right turn lane; an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane; a westbound Inter-Garrison Road right turn lane; second eastbound and second westbound Inter-Garrison Road through lanes; and a median left turn acceleration lane on Inter-Garrison Road.

*Engineers Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road.* Signalize intersection; add a second southbound left turn lane; a westbound right turn lane; and a second eastbound Inter-Garrison Road through lane.

*Sixth Avenue/Eighth Street-Engineers Equipment Road.* Signalize Intersection; add a single northbound Sixth Avenue left turn lane, two southbound Imjin Road left turn lanes; two eastbound Eighth Street left turn lanes, a single westbound Engineer’s Equipment Road left turn lane; a southbound Imjin Road right turn lane, an eastbound Eighth Street right turn lane, a
westbound Engineer’s Equipment Road right turn lane; and southbound and westbound right
turn overlap signal phases.

*Eastside Parkway/Gigling Road.* Add an eastbound Gigling Road left turn lane; a westbound
Gigling Road left turn lane; a northbound Eastside Parkway left turn lane; a southbound
Eastside Parkway left turn lane; and a southbound Eastside Parkway right turn lane.

*Abrams Drive/Imjin Parkway.* Add second westbound and second eastbound Imjin Parkway
through lanes.

*Imjin Road/Eighth Street.* MST would contribute traffic to this intersection that would require
mitigation under Phase 2 and 3 conditions and be improved by the Whispering Oaks Business
Park (see Mitigation Measures T-4 and T-5).

Payment of the development impact fees and fair share fees as required by Mitigation Measures
T-1 and T-3, construction of improvements as required by Mitigation Measures T-2, T-4, T-5,
T-6, and T-7 in Section 2.9 Traffic and Circulation, and implementation of Mitigation Measures
T-9, T-10, and T-11 presented below would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

T-9. Prior to issuance of building permits, MST shall submit to the RMA – Planning
Department evidence of payment of the fees listed below (fair share costs for cumulative
impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to be adjusted annually on July 1 by the
Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).

County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road (1.8% of $612,100 = $11,056)
- Engineer’s Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Way (17.8% of $300,000 = $53,251)
- Engineer’s Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road (3.6% of $300,000 = $10,827)

City of Marina fair share costs for reimbursement to Whispering Oaks Business Park at
the following intersection (Note: this amount may be bonded or otherwise assured, and
the cost could change if an alternate improvement is constructed:

- Imjin Road/Eighth Street (21.8% of $1,136,064 = $247,689)
Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department.

Mitigation Measure

T-10. Prior to issuance of building permits, the Whispering Oaks Business Park developer or successor(s) shall submit to the RMA – Planning Department evidence of payment of the specific development’s pro-rata share of fees listed below (fair share costs for cumulative impacts based on estimated 2010 project costs to adjusted annually on July 1 by the Engineering Record’s Construction Cost Index).

County of Monterey fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- Inter-Garrison Road/Reservation Road (3.3% of $612,100 = $20,468)
- Engineer’s Equipment Road/Whispering Oaks Way (82.2% of $300,000 = $248,749)
- Engineer’s Equipment Road/Inter-Garrison Road (7.8% of $300,000 = $23,298)

City of Seaside fair share costs for improvements at the following intersections:

- General Jim Moore Boulevard/Light Fighter Drive (1.1% of $654,185 = $7.416)
- Second Avenue/Light Fighter Drive (0.9% of $18,000 = $159)
- First Avenue/Light Fighter Drive (1.1% of $102,600 = $1,141)

Monitoring Actions

Prior to execution of the development agreement, a pro-rata division of costs shall be assigned to each lot (lots 2-16) within the Whispering Oaks Business Park.

Prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit the required fees to the appropriate jurisdiction.

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall provide evidence of fee payment to the RMA – Planning Department.
Mitigation Measure

T-11. The Whispering Oaks Business Park developer shall construct the following improvements prior to acceptance of Phase 3 (lots 13-16) improvements:

- a southbound Whispering Oaks right turn lane;
- an eastbound Inter-Garrison Road left turn lane;
- a westbound Inter-Garrison Road right turn lane;
- second eastbound and second westbound Inter-Garrison Road through lanes; and
- a median left turn acceleration lane on Inter-Garrison Road.

Monitoring Actions

Prior to issuance of final maps for Phase 3 the applicant shall submit improvement plans for the identified improvements for review and approval.

Prior to acceptance of subdivision improvements for Phase 3, the applicant shall provide evidence of completion and acceptance of off-site improvements to the RMA – Planning Department.

Cumulative Freeway Conditions

Operations along three of the four freeway segments of State Route 1 would continue to operate at deficient levels of service under cumulative without project conditions. Specifically, during the PM peak hour, northbound State Route 1, between Light Fighter Drive and Fremont Boulevard, would operate at LOS F. Also during the PM peak hour, southbound State Route 1, between Imjin Parkway and Light Fighter Drive, would change in level of service from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS D with the addition of project traffic. During the AM peak hour, southbound State Route 1, between Light Fighter Drive and Monterey Road, would also operate at LOS F. The proposed project would add trips to three freeway segments projected to operate at LOS F. To achieve acceptable operations, State Route 1 would need to be widened to five lanes in the southbound direction between Imjin Parkway and Fremont Boulevard and in the northbound direction between Light Fighter Drive and Monterey Road, and to six lanes in the northbound direction between Monterey Road and Fremont Boulevard. However, the feasibility of widening State Route 1 to more than four lanes in any one direction is questionable, as the ability to obtain the necessary right-of-way is limited. Therefore, the proposed project would represent a significant, unavoidable impact along these freeway segments. Payment of FORA fees would mitigate the proposed project’s cumulative impacts towards regional improvements on State Route 1.
Cumulative Conditions with Sixth Avenue Access Restrictions

CSUMB has proposed limiting access to Sixth Avenue between Engineer’s Equipment Road and Inter-Garrison Road, allowing only CSUMB-based traffic to travel along this section of Sixth Avenue; all non-university traffic would be forced to use other routes. A review of the traffic volumes along Sixth Avenue projected within this analysis, along with their respective origins and destinations, found that the implementation of the various roadway network improvements within this analysis would shift nearly all east-west through traffic away from CSUMB, even without implementation of the Sixth Avenue restrictions. The principal improvement that causes this is the westward extension of Engineer’s Equipment Road to Inter-Garrison Road. This extension establishes the Eighth Street-Engineer’s Equipment Road corridor as the primary east-west corridor for through traffic within the central portion of the former Fort Ord, thereby taking traffic up and around the CSUMB campus. These improvements also remove through traffic from the Inter-Garrison Road corridor through the campus core.

The opening of the Inter-Garrison Road connector to Reservation Road would further reinforce Engineer’s Equipment Road as the primary east-west traffic corridor. While the opening of the Inter-Garrison connector would shift some traffic away from the Imjin Parkway and Reservation Road corridors, this traffic would shift to the Eighth Street and Engineer’s Equipment Road corridors, rather than Inter-Garrison Road and Sixth Avenue through the CSUMB campus.

Water Demand and Supply

Groundwater use is limited to the 6,600 acre-foot allocation that is based on historic U.S. Army use within the former base. The 6,600 acre-foot allocation is further broken out by jurisdiction, and limits the potential for development within each. The Reuse Plan EIR determined that the total water supply demand for build-out of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan would be 13,500 acre feet per year. The projected growth of the Monterey Peninsula would place even greater demand for water supply in the region, which could cumulatively affect the groundwater aquifers and cause further overdraft. Additional water supplies are expected to be developed to supplement groundwater supplies, including recycled water and desalinized water. These additional supplies will allow additional development within the former Fort Ord, but still limit ultimate growth. The proposed project would use water from the Monterey County water allocation, and therefore, the project’s contribution to this cumulative impact would not be considerable.

Wastewater Conveyance and Treatment

Future wastewater needs at Fort Ord are accommodated by an existing contractual agreement between the U.S. Army and the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA), whereby Fort Ord currently has 3.3 million gallons per day (mgd) treatment
capacity set aside. Full build-out at Fort Ord is projected to use 9.8 mgd, therefore there is a long-term wastewater capacity deficit for Fort Ord of 6.2 mgd. Based on the 9.8 mgd projection, FORA expects to incrementally expand its treatment capacity rights in the regional treatment plant by 4.0 mgd between 2005 and 2045. Two capacity expansions were pre-designed for the MRWPCA treatment plant when it was initially designed and constructed, and these could expand the plant from its current 29.6 mgd capacity to an ultimate capacity of 37 mgd. Therefore, it is likely that Fort Ord build-out could be accommodated at the MRWPCA facility. The proposed project is expected to generate about 72,000 gpd, of wastewater. The proposed project would pay the FORA development impact fee, which funds infrastructure improvements, including improvements to the wastewater system. The proposed project’s wastewater generation is anticipated by the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, and is not cumulatively considerable.

Emergency Services

Development of the proposed project would result in an increased demand for police and fire services to the project site. Funding for the Monterey County Sheriff’s Department and the Monterey County fire districts has exhibited a steady decline and it is likely that cumulative growth in the Monterey Peninsula area would necessitate increased funding sources in order to satisfy increased demand. The proposed project would pay FORA development impact fees, a portion of which would go to provide adequate fire and police protection services. The Monterey County Sheriff and the Monterey County Regional Fire District have both stated that they can provide service to the proposed project. The Reuse Plan EIR found a significant impact associated with the provision of emergency services at the former Fort Ord. However, the proposed project would result in no significant impacts on fire, police, or emergency medical services, and would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the impact determined by the Reuse Plan EIR.
This side intentionally left blank.
4.0 ALTERNATIVES

4.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a) requires a description of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. It also requires an evaluation the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project, but must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(b) further requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on those alternatives capable of eliminating any significant adverse environmental impacts or reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e) stipulates that a no project alternative be evaluated along with its impacts.

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(d) requires the EIR to present enough information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis and comparison with the proposed project. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed. CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e) requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative. If the "No Project" alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the environmentally superior alternatives amongst the remaining alternatives must be identified.
4.2 Alternatives Considered

The following alternatives to the project are considered:

- **Alternative 1: No project.** This alternative assumes no development takes place on the project site.

- **Alternative 2: MST Facility Only.** This alternative includes development of the MST facility only, without the Whispering Oaks subdivision portion of the proposed project.

- **Alternative 3: Seventh-Gigling/Light Industrial.** This alternative includes development of the MST facility on the land owned by MST at Seventh Avenue and Gigling Road, and development of the entire project site for Light Industrial uses.

- **Alternative 4: Seventh-Gigling/Recreational.** This alternative includes development of the MST facility on the land owned by MST at Seventh Avenue and Gigling Road, and a recreational use on the entire project site.

Each of these alternatives is described below, followed by an analysis of how each alternative may reduce impacts associated with the proposed project.

**Alternative 1: No Project**

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(e) requires the “No Project” alternative be evaluated along with its impacts. The “No Project” alternative analysis must discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

**Alternative Description**

The other project alternatives represent a reasonable expectation of what might occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based upon current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. Therefore, the “no project” alternative assumes that no development would occur at the project site. The project site would remain in its current state with oak woodlands and a few minor clearings, structures, and roads.

**Aesthetics**

The “no project” alternative would not affect aesthetics on the project site or in the project vicinity. The existing oak woodlands would remain in their current state. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of aesthetics.
Air Quality

The “no project” alternative would not affect air quality. No new trips or other air emission sources would be generated. The existing bus trips would continue from another location. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of air quality.

Climate Change

The “no project” alternative would not affect climate change. No new trips or other greenhouse gas emission sources would be generated. The existing bus trips would continue from another location. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of climate change.

Biological Resources

The “no project” alternative would not affect biological resources. No oak woodland or other habitat would be removed or disturbed. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of biological resources.

Geology and Soils

The “no project” alternative would not affect geology and soils. No development would occur on the project site. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of geology and soils.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The “no project” alternative would not affect hazards or hazardous materials. The “no project” alternative would not involve the transport or dispensing of fuel, or the potential for use of hazardous materials. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The “no project” alternative would not affect hydrology or water quality. Storm water would continue to flow on established patterns and no additional groundwater would be required. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of hydrology and water quality.
**Land Use and Planning**

The “no project” alternative would not affect land use or planning. The project site would remain undeveloped. The proposed project and the “no project” alternative would be similar in terms of land use and planning.

**Noise**

The “no project” alternative would not result in noise effects. No new trips or land uses would be developed, and no new noise would be created. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of noise.

**Transportation/Circulation**

The “no project” alternative would not affect transportation or traffic. No new trips would be generated. The existing bus trips would continue from another location. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of transportation and circulation.

**Water Demand and Supply**

The “no project” alternative would not affect water demand and supply. No new water-demanding uses would be created. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of water demand and supply.

**Wastewater**

The “no project” alternative would not generate wastewater. The “no project” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of wastewater.

**Emergency Services**

The “no project” alternative would have no effect on law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical services. The “no project” alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of emergency services.

**Alternative 2: MST Facility Only**

**Alternative Description**

This alternative includes development of the MST facility only, without the Whispering Oaks portion of the proposed project. Development of the MST facility is assumed to occur on the
same portion of the project site and in the same configuration as currently proposed. Phasing would be the same as proposed. Engineer’s Equipment Road would be improved between Sixth Avenue and the northern driveway and provide primary access for busses bound for points west or north. Whispering Oaks Drive and the eastern section of Engineer’s Equipment Road would not be constructed. The remainder of the project site would remain in open space.

Aesthetics

The “MST facility only” alternative would disturb less oak woodland along Inter-Garrison Road, thus resulting in a reduced change to the character of that area. The MST facility is the largest single use proposed, and it would remain in the same configuration; there would be no change in visual effects of the “MST facility only” alternative at the southwestern portion of the project site. The overall effect on visual resources would be reduced due to the smaller size of the alternative project. Therefore, the “MST facility only” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of aesthetics.

Air Quality

The “MST facility only” alternative would result in fewer trips and fewer associated air pollution. This alternative would also eliminate the potential for air pollution from future industrial uses. The “MST facility only” alternative would result in less air pollution compared to the proposed project, and therefore, be superior to the proposed project in terms of air quality.

Climate Change

The “MST facility only” alternative would result in reduced GHG emissions due to the smaller project size. The “MST facility only” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of climate change.

Biological Resources

The “MST facility only” alternative would reduce the loss of oak trees and habitat by about half. Although the project site is planned for development, this reduction in oak tree and habitat loss would nonetheless result in reduced biological impacts. The “MST facility only” alternative would be superior in terms of biological resources.

Geology and Soils

The “MST facility only” alternative would develop only about half as much of the project site as the proposed project. However, development of the project site does not result in geological
impacts that are not easily overcome by appropriate engineering. Because it is smaller in size, the “MST facility only” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of geology and soils impacts.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The “MST facility only” alternative would develop only about half as much of the project site as the proposed project. However, development of the project site does not result in significant hazards and hazardous materials effects. Although smaller in size, the “MST facility only” alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

The “MST facility only” alternative would reduce storm water run-off and water demand by about half compared to the proposed project. However, storm water run-off is adequately detained and percolated on the project site regardless of the size of the project. The “MST facility only” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of groundwater.

**Land Use and Planning**

The “MST facility only” alternative would develop only about half as much of the project site as the proposed project. The “MST facility only” alternative would remain consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The “MST facility only” alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of land use and planning.

**Noise**

The “MST facility only” alternative would reduce development on the project site by about half compared to the proposed project. However, the portion of the project site that would not be developed is the part that is the farthest from sensitive noise receptors. The proposed project is not anticipated to have significant noise effects in any case. The “MST facility only” alternative and the proposed project would be similar in terms of noise impacts.

**Transportation/Circulation**

The “MST facility only” alternative would reduce vehicular trips in and near the project site by about 80 percent. Although significant impacts would still remain at most of the impacted intersections (see the Phase 1 traffic scenario), the “MST facility only” alternative would result in significantly reduced trips and would eliminate impacts at some of the studied intersections.
The “MST facility only” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of transportation and circulation.

**Water Demand and Supply**

Water supply within the former Fort Ord is constrained, and the “MST facility only” alternative would result in a reduced demand on groundwater supplies. The “MST facility only” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of groundwater.

**Wastewater**

The “MST facility only” alternative would generate approximately 50 percent less wastewater. The “MST facility only” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of wastewater generation.

**Emergency Services**

The “MST facility only” alternative would have a smaller demand for services, but would not affect the need, or lack of need, for new emergency services facilities. The “MST facility only” alternative would have a similar effect on emergency services.

**Alternative 3: Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial**

**Alternative Description**

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would include development of the MST facility at the location identified in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*, and development of the entire project site as a light industrial business park.

The site planned for MST in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* consists of several parcels located north of Gigling Road and to the west and east of Eighth Avenue. A Finding of Suitability to Transfer has been issued for the western parcels, with a total of about 15.1 acres. A 1.6-acre parcel to the west of Seventh Avenue has an existing building. About half of a 13.5-acre parcel between Seventh Avenue and Eighth Avenue is covered in paved parking areas; the remainder of the parcel is covered primarily in ruderal growth and invasive plants such as ice plant. Two additional parcels to the east of Eighth Avenue are largely undeveloped and covered in oak woodland and central maritime chaparral, except for two disturbed areas near the center. The parcels east of Eighth Avenue comprise about 27 acres.
The majority of the MST site is in unincorporated Monterey County adjacent to the Seaside city limits; the existing building is within the City of Seaside, within an area designated in the *Seaside General Plan* for development of a business park. A portion of the site is within a planned business park and is adjacent to CSUMB on the north. A location map and photographs of the MST site are shown in Figure 22, MST Seventh Avenue/Gigling Road Site.

Bus maintenance, operations, and administrative facilities would be constructed on the open lot and the existing building would be used for offices. This alternative assumes that an area equal to the proposed project’s MST site would be developed for MST uses on this site; therefore, about nine acres of the undeveloped parcel to the east of Eighth Avenue would be developed, and about 18 acres would be left undeveloped. Access to the MST facility is assumed to be from Gigling Road or Seventh Avenue.

This alternative assumes that the entire area proposed for development at the project site (about 58 acres including streets) would be developed as a light industrial business park, and that the open space parcels would remain as open space. The project’s proposed street alignment would be constructed with the addition of a street extending through the proposed Lot 1 to provide access to additional smaller parcels. A second drainage basin parcel would be provided in the western portion of the project site.

**Aesthetics**

Much of the MST site is currently developed with parking lots dating to U.S. Army use of the site. The MST site is adjacent to existing and planned parking lots and open space within the CSUMB campus, and adjacent to a designated business park in Seaside. High density housing is designated to the southwest of the MST site, kitty-corner as opposed to adjacent, so direct views onto the MST site would be limited, and light intrusion and glare would be less evident than at the project site. Neither the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* nor the 1982 *Monterey County General Plan* designates the MST site as a scenic area, and the MST site is farther from heavily traveled roads.

Expansion of the light industrial business park on the project site would result in a development of a different character at the western end of the project site. Buildings and parking lots would be generally smaller and dispersed, and lighting would be less conspicuous. The security wall required for the MST facility would not be required with this alternative, and would not dominate views from Inter-Garrison Road. Parking lots would be smaller and more dispersed and planted areas would break up the paved areas to a greater degree.
MST site from Seventh Ave.

View from east
(MST building is out of view to the right)


Figure 22

MST Seventh Avenue/Gigling Road Site

MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR
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The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would relocate the most noticeable component of the proposed project to a less visible site, and result in more dispersed development at the western end of the project site. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of aesthetics.

Air Quality

The MST facility would result in the same air emissions as it would at the project site.

Expansion of the light industrial business park on the project site would result in increased mobile source air emissions, and potentially from stationary source emissions.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would have greater air quality impacts than the proposed project.

Climate Change

The MST facility would result in the same GHG emissions as it would at the project site.

Expansion of the light industrial business park on the project site would result in increased GHG emissions from mobile sources, on-site combustion, and off-site electrical generation, water pumping, and wastewater treatment.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would have greater climate change impacts than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

About half of the western portion of the MST site is previously developed, and occupied primarily by parking lots, and the other half, although it contains coastal scrub vegetation, is likely to have been disturbed. Development of the MST facility at that location could result in minor effects on biological resources. A nine-acre portion of the MST site would be developed east of Eighth Avenue on undeveloped land covered in oak trees and coastal maritime chaparral. A few trees along the edge of the developed MST site, as well as the oak trees on the nine acres east of Eighth Avenue, could potentially provide nesting sites for birds.

Expansion of the light industrial business park on the project site would result in similar biological resources effects as the proposed project, because development would occur within the same envelope. However, because the development would consist of smaller scale uses, additional trees could be preserved along the edges of the parcels or between buildings; the uses would not require large scale uninterrupted parking areas.
The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative and the proposed project would be worse in terms of effects on biological resources.

**Geology and Soils**

The MST site has the same Oceano loamy sand soil as the project site and is assumed to have similar geological and development constraints as the project site.

Expansion of the light industrial business park on the project site would not result in any new or greater geology or soils impacts.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of geology and soils.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The western portion of the MST site was found suitable for transfer to MST in 2001. The western portion of the site had an underground diesel fuel tank at one time, but that was removed and clearance granted by the Monterey County Department of Environmental Health in 1995. The western portion of the MST site is not classified as a potential munitions or explosives site, although the eastern portion of the site has that potential (U.S. Army 2001).

Expansion of the light industrial business park on the project site would not result in any new or greater hazards or hazardous materials impacts. Some uses, such as propane fuel sales, have the potential to involve transport of hazardous materials, but these uses are subject to specific safety regulations.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of hazards and hazardous materials.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

Development of the MST facility at the MST site would require on-site retention and percolation of storm water run-off. The MST parcel proposed for the maintenance facility is about equal in size as the proposed project’s MST site, and run-off would be similar.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative is assumed to provide adequate on-site storm water detention through the provision of a second drainage basin at the western part of the project site. Expansion of the light industrial park would increase demand for groundwater.

Filtering similar to that proposed for the project is assumed to be utilized in the design of all storm water facilities. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would have a greater effect on groundwater, and would in terms of storm water.
Land Use and Planning

The MST site is primarily in unincorporated Monterey County adjacent to a planned business park in the City of Seaside (the existing building is within the City of Seaside). The *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* designates the MST site Public Facility/Institutional. Adjacent land within the County is designated for CSUMB, Military Enclave, Business Park /Light Industrial/Office/R&D, and Low Density Residential. Adjacent land within Seaside is designated Mixed Use and High Density Residential. The site is identified for use by MST and development of the MST facility at the site would be consistent with the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. The MST site is within and adjacent to planned open space and parking lots at CSUMB, former military buildings, and open space.

Expansion of the light industrial business park on the project site would be consistent with the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*, and similar to the proposed project in terms of land use and planning issues.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative and the proposed project would be similar in terms of land use and planning.

Noise

The MST site is located kitty-corner from the nearest designated residential uses, an area to the southwest designated High Density Residential in the *Seaside General Plan*. Development of the MST facility at the MST site could result in greater noise effects at this designated housing area than would occur at residential areas near the project site. At the project site a large on-site buffer separates maintenance operations from residences; there is less room at the MST site to provide such a buffer.

The expanded light industrial uses on the project site would have similar noise effects on adjacent sensitive uses. It is not expected that the light industrial uses would result in significantly different noise levels compared to the MST facility.

Overall, the “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would result in more total noise generation, and the potential for increased noise impacts at a designated residential area in Seaside. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would result in worse noise impacts than the proposed project.

Transportation/Circulation

The MST facility would result in the same number of bus and employee trips if located at the MST site. Overall regional trip distribution would be similar, although significant numbers of new trips would be added to Seventh Street or Eighth Street between Gigling Road and Inter-Garrison Road, and to Gigling Road between Seventh Street and General Jim Moore
Boulevard. Due to increased volumes at these Inter-Garrison Road and General Jim Moore Boulevard intersections, additional improvements may be required at these locations.

Development of an industrial business park on 58 acres of the project site would result in a significant increase in traffic compared to the proposed project. Daily trips from the project site would increase from about 9,600 with the proposed project to about 15,300 with this alternative. The trip generation rate for the industrial business park uses is much higher than that of the MST facility.

Based on trip generation rates from the Hatch Mott McDonald report, overall trip generation from the “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would increase from about 9,600 daily trips to about 17,250 daily trips. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would result in worse transportation and circulation effects.

**Water Demand and Supply**

Water demand and use at the MST facility would be the same at the MST site as at the project site.

Water demand at the project site would not significantly change with the expansion of the light industrial uses to the entire site. The water supply assessment does not break out water use between the MST facility and the light industrial business park uses, and assumes the same demand factor for both.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would expand the total area of development and would proportionately increase water use, by about 30 to 50 percent. Therefore, water use would increase from about 80 acre-feet per year to about 104 to 120 acre-feet per year. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would have a greater effect on water demand and supply than the proposed project.

**Wastewater**

Wastewater generation at the MST facility would be the same at the MST site as at the project site.

Wastewater generation at the project site would not significantly change with the expansion of the light industrial uses to the entire site.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would expand the total area of development and would proportionately increase wastewater generation, by about 30 to 50 percent. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would have increased impacts on wastewater.
Emergency Services

The MST facility would result in the same emergency services demands as it would at the project site.

Expansion of the light industrial business park on the project site would increase demands for emergency services.

Although the “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would increase demand for fire, police, and medical response services, it would not result in the need for new or expanded facilities. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would be similar to the proposed project.

**Alternative 4: Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational**

**Alternative Description**

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Light Industrial” alternative would include development of the MST facility at the location identified in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*, and development of the entire project site as a light industrial business park.

The site planned for MST in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* consists of several parcels located north of Gigling Road and to the west and east of Eighth Avenue. A Finding of Suitability to Transfer has been issued for the western parcels, with a total of about 15.1 acres. A 1.6-acre parcel to the west of Seventh Avenue has an existing building. About half of a 13.5-acre parcel between Seventh Avenue and Eighth Avenue is covered in paved parking areas; the remainder of the parcel is covered primarily in ruderal growth and invasive plants such as ice plant. Two additional parcels to the east of Eighth Avenue are largely undeveloped and covered in oak woodland and central maritime chaparral, except for two disturbed areas near the center. The parcels east of Eighth Avenue comprise about 27 acres.

The majority of the MST site is in unincorporated Monterey County adjacent to the Seaside city limits; the existing building is within the City of Seaside, within an area designated in the *Seaside General Plan* for development of a business park. A portion of the site is within a planned business park and is adjacent to CSUMB on the north. A location map and photographs of the MST site are shown in Figure 22, MST Seventh Avenue/Gigling Road Site.

Bus maintenance, operations, and administrative facilities would be constructed on the open lot and the existing building would be used for offices. This alternative assumes that an area equal to the proposed project’s MST site would be developed for MST uses on this site; therefore, about nine acres of the undeveloped parcel to the east of Eighth Avenue would be developed,
and about 18 acres would be left undeveloped. Access to the MST facility is assumed to be from Gigling Road or Seventh Avenue.

Under this alternative, the project site would be used for recreational purposes, consistent with the *Marina General Plan* land use designation. A moderate-intensity recreational use is assumed, but some clearing and development is also assumed to provide for parking and user amenities. To provide a defined alternative description, the following specific recreational uses are assumed for this alternative:

- Hiking, cycling, and horseback riding trails;
- Trailhead and parking lot for 50 cars;
- Nature center with approximately 10,000 square-foot building and 5,000 square-foot service yard; and
- Recreational vehicle and tent campground with 50 spaces.

Access and visitor facilities are assumed to be located directly north of the intersection of Inter-Garrison Road and Eighth Street, utilizing the previously disturbed areas of the project site for development of amenities. The parking, nature center, and campground would occupy approximately 15 acres. The campground would be located outside the 1,000-foot landfill buffer. Figure 23, Conceptual Recreation Alternative, shows a conceptual arrangement for uses under this alternative.

**Aesthetics**

Much of the MST site is currently developed with parking lots dating to U.S. Army use of the site. The MST site is adjacent to existing and planned parking lots and open space within the CSUMB campus, and adjacent to a designated business park in Seaside. High density housing is designated to the southwest of the MST site, kitty-corner as opposed to adjacent, so direct views onto the MST site would be limited, and light intrusion and glare would be less evident than at the project site. Neither the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* nor the *Monterey County General Plan* designates the MST site as a scenic area, and the MST site is farther from heavily traveled roads.

The recreational uses would be developed largely within already disturbed areas of the project site. Although some tree removal would be required for new roadways, parking, buildings, and campsites, to a great extent these features could be designed to fit within existing openings.
Figure 23
Conceptual Recreation Alternative
MST Whispering Oaks Business Park EIR
The visitor center would be a relatively small one-story building, and all development would be set back from Inter-Garrison Road. Effects on the visual character of the site would be minimal.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of aesthetics.

**Air Quality**

The MST facility would result in the same air emissions as it would at the project site.

The recreational uses would generate significantly fewer trips and associated air pollutants compared to the proposed project. Based on Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation rates for campground and regional park, the recreational uses would result in about 36 PM peak hour trips. The campground could result in some air pollutants from campfires.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of air quality.

**Climate Change**

The MST facility would result in the same GHG emissions as it would at the project site.

The recreational uses would generate significantly fewer trips and associated GHG emissions compared to the proposed project. The campground could result in some GHG emissions from campfires.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of climate change.

**Biological Resources**

About half of the western portion of the MST site is previously developed, and occupied primarily by parking lots, and the other half, although it contains coastal scrub vegetation, is likely to have been disturbed. Development of the MST facility at that location could result in minor effects on biological resources. A nine-acre portion of the MST site would be developed east of Eighth Avenue on undeveloped land covered in oak trees and coastal maritime chaparral. A few trees along the edge of the developed MST site, as well as the oak trees on the nine acres east of Eighth Avenue, could potentially provide nesting sites for birds.

The recreational use would introduce human activity to the project site that does not currently exist. Trail development within the project site could provide access to locations that contain sensitive habitat or species, in particular in the area north of Engineer’s Equipment Road.
Although trails would be planned to avoid direct impacts to sensitive habitat, there could be indirect effects from facility users. These effects could be reduced through careful design of the trail system and education of trail users. The small footprint of the nature center, and relatively smaller roadway system compared to the proposed project, would result in less loss of trees. It is assumed some trees would be removed in development of the campground, but campground sites can often be fit between trees with vegetation removal primarily in the form of ground-level brush clearing. The nature center, parking lot, entry road, and many of the campsites would be located in an area that is already disturbed.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” would have fewer biological resources effects than the proposed project.

**Geology and Soils**

The MST site has the same Oceano loamy sand soil as the project site and is assumed to have similar geological and development constraints as the project site.

The recreational use would not include any significant structures and would not have any significant geology or soils concerns.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of geology and soils.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

The western portion of the MST site was found suitable for transfer to MST in 2001. The western portion of the site had an underground diesel fuel tank at one time, but that was removed and clearance granted by the Monterey County Department of Environmental Health in 1995. The western portion of the MST site is not classified as a potential munitions or explosives site, although the eastern portion of the site has that potential (U.S. Army 2001).

The recreational uses would be acceptable within the 1,000-foot buffer area. The campground, which is potentially unacceptable within the landfill buffer, would be located outside the landfill buffer in the southwest corner of the project site. A setback from the gas line may be required.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would not have significant hazards or hazardous materials effects, and would be similar to the proposed project in terms of hazards and hazardous materials.
Hydrology and Water Quality

Development of the MST facility at the MST site would require on-site retention and percolation of storm water run-off. The MST parcel proposed for the maintenance facility is about equal in size as the proposed project’s MST site, and run-off would be similar.

The recreational uses would not result in significant storm water run-off nor require significant amounts of groundwater. The recreational uses would not result in significant amounts of surface water pollutants.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of hydrology and water quality.

Land Use and Planning

The MST site is primarily in unincorporated Monterey County (the existing building is within the City of Seaside) adjacent to an area designated for a business park in the City of Seaside. The Fort Ord Reuse Plan designates the MST site Public Facility/Institutional. Adjacent land within the County is designated for CSUMB, Military Enclave, Business Park /Light Industrial/Office/R&D, and Low Density Residential. Adjacent land within Seaside is designated Mixed Use and High Density Residential. The site is identified for use by MST and development of the MST facility at the site would be consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The MST site is within and adjacent to planned open space and parking lots at CSUMB, former military buildings, and open space.

This alternative’s recreational uses would be consistent with the Marina General Plan. Although not consistent with the Mixed Use /Planned Development designation of the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, the recreational uses would be compatible with the adjacent open space uses, and would not significantly conflict with proposed university and business park uses on adjacent sites.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of land use and planning effects.

Noise

The MST site is located kitty-corner from the nearest designated residential uses, an area to the southwest designated High Density Residential in the Seaside General Plan. Development of the MST facility at the MST site could result in greater noise effects at this designated housing area than would occur at residential areas near the project site. At the project site a large on-site buffer separates maintenance operations from residences; there is less room at the MST site to provide such a buffer.
The recreational uses would not result in significant noise generation. The campground is a noise-sensitive use; however, if campsites are located an adequate distance from Inter-Garrison Road noise levels would be acceptable.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would have potentially greater noise impacts.

**Transportation/Circulation**

The MST facility would result in the same number of bus and employee trips if located at the MST site. Overall regional trip distribution would be similar, although significant numbers of new trips would be added to Seventh Street or Eighth Street between Gigling Road and Inter-Garrison Road, and to Gigling Road between Seventh Street and General Jim Moore Boulevard. Due to increased volumes at these Inter-Garrison Road and General Jim Moore Boulevard intersections, additional improvements may be required at these locations.

The recreational uses would generate trips associated with the trailhead, nature center, and campground. Based on Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation rates for campground and regional park, the recreational uses would result in about 36 PM peak hour trips. Peak use would be on weekends when overall traffic volumes are lower, and intersections generally less impacted by traffic. Traffic generation would be much less than that of the business park.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of transportation and circulation.

**Water Demand and Supply**

Water demand and use at the MST facility would be the same at the MST site as at the project site.

Primary water demands at the recreational uses would be restrooms and drinking water at the nature center and campground. The recreational uses would consume significantly less water than the business park.

The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of water demand and supply.

**Wastewater**

Wastewater generation at the MST facility would be the same at the MST site as at the project site.
The recreational uses would result in small wastewater demands related to restroom facilities. Wastewater could be treated on-site or conveyed to the Marina Coast Water District collection system.

Overall wastewater generation would be reduced compared to the proposed project. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be superior to the proposed project in terms of wastewater generation and treatment.

**Emergency Services**

The MST facility would result in the same emergency services demands as it would at the project site.

The recreational uses would result in a small increase in police, fire, and medical response demand.

No new facilities would be needed. The “Seventh-Gigling MST/Recreational” alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of emergency services.

### 4.3 Evaluation of Alternatives

The “no project” alternative would result in the least environmental impact, since it would not involve any new development. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” alternative and the “MST Only” alternative rank similarly, and although the “MST Only” alternative appears best in the alternatives summary table, the “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” ranks better in two important categories. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” alternative is superior to the “MST Only” alternative in terms of aesthetics and biological resources. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” alternative maintains the project site in low intensity recreational uses that do not result in significant loss of trees or introduction of light or glare. This alternative avoids these two primary adverse effects associated with development on the project site. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Recreational” alternative does result in potential noise effects in the vicinity of the MST site, but the “MST Only” alternative results in greater aesthetics and biological resources effects. The “Seventh-Gigling MST / Industrial” alternative involves a greater level of development and has greater environmental impacts than the proposed project and the other alternatives.

The alternatives are summarized and compared in a matrix format in Table 25, Alternatives Summary.
# Table 26: Alternatives Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Topic</th>
<th>Alternative 1 No Project</th>
<th>Alternative 2 MST Facility Only</th>
<th>Alternative 3 7th/Gigling MST Industrial</th>
<th>Alternative 4 7th/Gigling MST Recreational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of Alternative:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>MST only at Project Site</td>
<td>MST at 7th/Gigling and Industrial at Project Site</td>
<td>MST at 7th/Gigling and Recreational at Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Demand</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Srvs.</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranking</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* EMC Planning Group

*Note:* Table compares each alternative to the proposed project.
5.0

GROWTH INDUCEMENT, SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE, AND IRREVERSIBLE

5.1 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

CEQA Requirements

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(d) requires a discussion of the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed project. Growth inducement refers to the likelihood that a proposed project will foster growth in the surrounding area, either directly or indirectly. The most common factor in fostering growth is the removal of obstacles to population or economic growth. Potential growth-inducing impacts must be discussed in relation to both the potential impacts on existing community service facilities and the way a project may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental or of little significance to the environment.

Growth Inducing Impact Analysis

The proposed project would construct local-serving infrastructure, including on-site water and sewer lines, and on-site and adjacent roads. The proposed project would also make use of existing infrastructure located adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not develop new or over-sized utilities that would allow for unplanned growth in adjacent areas. The proposed project is within an area planned for development in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan. The proposed project would not be growth inducing.
5.2 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

CEQA Requirements

A significant adverse unavoidable environmental impact is a significant adverse impact that cannot be reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures. CEQA Guidelines section 15093 requires that a lead agency make findings of overriding considerations for unavoidable significant adverse environmental impacts before approving a project.

CEQA Guidelines section 15093(a) requires the decision-making agency (County of Monterey) to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.” CEQA Guidelines section 15093(b) states that when the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Significant Unavoidable Project Level and Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on aesthetics, climate change, and traffic.

Aesthetics

The proposed project would remove trees from nearly half the project site. Impacts to the overall visual quality of the site would be significant and unavoidable when viewed from Inter-Garrison Road and public areas at higher elevations overlooking the site.

The proposed MST facility has the potential to illuminate 15 acres of parking lots during the nighttime hours. This would result in significant and unavoidable light and glare impact.
Climate Change

Although no specific climate change threshold is available to use, the report prepared by Illingworth and Rodkin concluded that a project the size of the proposed project would exceed thresholds established by some other jurisdictions, resulting in a significant impact. The report further concluded that there was no assurance that adequate mitigation measures could be implemented to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, the impact on climate change is considered significant and unavoidable.

Transportation/Circulation

The proposed project would add new vehicle trips to the northbound and southbound State Route 1 Off-ramps at Imjin Parkway, which are already operating at LOS F. This would be a significant impact. The required mitigation measures are subject to approval by Caltrans, and Monterey County cannot be assured that the necessary improvements can be accomplished. Therefore, this impact has been determined to be significant and unavoidable.

5.3 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

CEQA Requirements

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.2(c) requires a discussion of significant and irreversible changes that would be caused by the project if implemented. The use of non-renewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible, since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse in the future unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement that provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Significant Irreversible Project Effects

The proposed project would remove oak woodland over approximately 50 acres of the project site and replace those with urban development. Once removed and developed, the oak woodland would not be restorable. This would be a significant irreversible change.
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