



*Planning for Success.*

REVISED  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

# SEASIDE RESORT

Subsequent to the Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR

State Clearinghouse Number 2001101059

PREPARED FOR

City of Seaside Community Development Department

May 2004

EMC PLANNING GROUP INC.  
A LAND USE PLANNING & DESIGN FIRM

301 Lighthouse Avenue Suite C Monterey California 93940 Tel 831-649-1799 Fax 831-649-8399  
[www.emcplanning.com](http://www.emcplanning.com)



# SEASIDE RESORT

Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report  
Subsequent to the Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR  
State Clearinghouse Number 2001101059

## PREPARED FOR

City of Seaside Community Development Department  
Mr. Lou Dell'Angela, Community Development Director  
440 Harcourt Avenue  
Seaside, CA 93955  
Tel 831.899.6220  
Fax 831.899.6211

## PREPARED BY

EMC Planning Group Inc  
301 Lighthouse Avenue Suite C  
Monterey, CA 93940  
Tel 831.649.1799  
Fax 831.649.8399  
[contactus@emcplanning.com](mailto:contactus@emcplanning.com)  
[www.emcplanning.com](http://www.emcplanning.com)

May 2004





**NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY**  
**Seaside Resort**  
**REVISED**  
**Draft Environmental Impact Report**  
**SCH# 2001101059**

A Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) has been prepared for the proposed Seaside Resort, a resort hotel, timeshare, and residential subdivision project located on the former Fort Ord in the City of Seaside. The proposed project is located on 84.88 acres within the 375-acre Bayonet and Black Horse golf courses, outside of the coastal zone, to the east of State Highway 1, between Monterey Road and General Jim Moore Boulevard. The proposed project is the subdivision of five parcels for development of a resort hotel with 170 guest rooms, restaurant, spa, and conference facilities, 160 bungalow hotel units, 170 timeshare units, and the subdivision of 125 residential lots. The clubhouse would be reconstructed on the same site, and the maintenance facility would be relocated. The golf courses would remain on a 290.25 remainder parcel. The proposed project is consistent with the Fort Ord Reuse Plan, the City of Seaside General Plan and the Seaside zoning ordinance. No changes have been made to the proposed project since circulation of the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR for this project, prepared subsequent to the Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR, was circulated for public review between August 19, 2002 and October 2, 2002. The Revised Draft EIR presents updated information and revised analysis of the proposed project's potential environmental impacts in the areas of water supply and traffic.

**Submit Written Comments to:** Richard James, AICP, EMC Planning Group Inc. 301 Lighthouse Avenue, Suite C, Monterey CA 93940. email: james@emcplanning.com

**The State Clearinghouse has approved a 30-day public review period for the Revised Draft EIR. The public review period begins May 6, 2004 and ends June 4, 2004.**

**The Draft EIR is available for public review at the following locations during their regular hours:**

Seaside City Hall, Community Development Department, (831) 899-6220  
440 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, California

Seaside Branch, Monterey County Public Library, (831) 899-2055  
550 Harcourt Avenue, Seaside, California

Marina Branch, Monterey County Public Library (831) 384-6971  
266 Reservation Road, Marina, California

Monterey City Library, (831) 646-3932  
625 Pacific Street, Monterey, California

Most documents referenced in the Revised Draft EIR are available for review at Seaside City Hall, Community Development Department, and all documents referenced in the Revised Draft EIR are available for review during regular business hours at EMC Planning Group Inc., 301 Lighthouse Avenue, Suite C, Monterey, California (831) 649-1799.

**More Information:** Richard James, AICP: (831) 649-1799

**Hazardous Materials Information:** The project site includes a hazardous materials site that is in the process of remediation with Department of Toxic Substances Control. The Draft EIR included information on this site. Because there are no significant changes to the setting or analysis regarding hazardous materials, the Revised Draft EIR will not address hazardous materials.



# Table of Contents

<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>S-1</b>
<b>1.0 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Draft Environmental Impact Report and Project Consideration History.....	1-1
1.2 Determination to Prepare a Revised Draft EIR.....	1-2
1.3 EIR Preparation Standards and Methods .....	1-6
1.4 Terminology Used in the EIR .....	1-7
<b>2.0 Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Water Supply.....	2-1
2.2 Traffic .....	2-4
<b>3.0 Related Environmental Issues .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Cumulative Impacts .....	3-1
3.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts .....	3-2
3.3 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes .....	3-3
3.4 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Environmental Impacts .....	3-3
3.5 Alternatives .....	3-3
<b>4.0 Documentation.....</b>	<b>4-2</b>
4.1 Persons Contacted .....	4-2
4.2 Literature Cited .....	4-2
4.3 Document Preparation.....	4-3

# Appendices

## Appendix A Transportation Impact Analysis

### List of Tables

Table S-1	Changes in Significant Unavoidable Traffic Impacts .....	S-4
Table 1	City of Seaside Fort Ord Water Allocation .....	2-2
Table 2	Projected Water Use .....	2-3
Table 3	Existing Conditions Intersection LOS .....	2-6
Table 4	Existing Conditions Highway Segments LOS .....	2-7
Table 5	Projects Approved But Not Yet Built .....	2-8
Table 6	Project Trip Generation by Component .....	2-9
Table 7	Background and Project Conditions Intersection LOS .....	2-10
Table 8	Background Conditions Highway Segments LOS .....	2-11
Table 9	Project Conditions Highway Segments LOS .....	2-12
Table 10	Pending Projects .....	2-13
Table 11	Cumulative Conditions Intersection LOS.....	2-14
Table 12	Cumulative Conditions Highway Segments LOS .....	2-15
Table 13	General Plan Build-out Conditions Intersections LOS .....	2-17
Table 14	General Plan Conditions Highway Segments LOS .....	2-18



---

# Summary

---

CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5(g) requires that when re-circulating a revised EIR, either in whole or in part, the lead agency must summarize the revisions made to the previously circulated draft EIR. This section provides that summary.

## Project Changes and New or Updated Information

### ***Project Changes***

No significant changes have been made to the proposed project since circulation of the Draft EIR.

### ***Changes to the Environmental Setting***

Since circulation of the Draft EIR, several significant changes have occurred with regard to the environmental setting for hydrology and traffic, and lesser changes have occurred with regard to other environmental issue areas. The most substantial changes to the setting are listed below. A more detailed description and discussion are included in Section 1.0 Introduction.

In addition, the City of Seaside has prepared the Draft *Seaside General Plan*, which is currently under consideration for adoption by the Seaside City Council.

### **Changes in the Water Supply Setting**

- The City's Fort Ord water allocation was increased; and
- The City approved The First Tee project and allocated water for it.

### **Changes in the Traffic Setting**

- The U.S. Army objected to the inclusion of the new Fort Ord interchange in the State Highway 1 Project Study Report (PSR), and the interchange has been de-programmed by Caltrans and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC);
- Imjin Parkway was extended to State Highway 1 at the existing Twelfth Street interchange (this connection provides a bypass of Marina for traffic between the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas);

- An extension of Second Avenue to connect Lightfighter Drive to Imjin Parkway is under construction; and
- The City approved The First Tee project along General Jim Moore Boulevard east of the project site, which will generate traffic not considered in the Draft EIR.

## **New or More Severe Environmental Impacts and New or Revised Mitigation Measures**

For a complete discussion of the impacts, and proposed mitigation of those impacts, refer to Section 2.0 Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures.

### ***Significant New Impacts and Mitigation***

**Significant Cumulative Impact – Intersection LOS Below Standards and Additional Delay at General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way and General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue.** Under cumulative conditions, additional turning delays would occur at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way and General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersections, even with planned improvements to General Jim Moore Boulevard. Turning movement level of service at these intersections would be LOS F and signal warrants would be met under cumulative conditions. FORA development impact fees would fund the widening of General Jim Moore Boulevard. However, the signal lights needed at McClure Way and Coe Avenue under cumulative conditions are not included in FORA's improvement plans. This would be a significant cumulative impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

### **Mitigation Measure**

48. The City of Seaside Public Works Director shall annually monitor the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way, General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue, and Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersections, and determine, based on the standard Caltrans analysis methodologies in effect at the time, whether signal lights are warranted at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way, General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersections, or additional turn lanes are warranted at the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection. If at the time the determination is made that such improvements are required, funding for the improvements has been provided by inclusion in FORA's CIP fee program or otherwise provided for by a City Assessment District, or other established funding mechanism, no payment shall be required of the project proponent or its successor(s). If funding for said improvements has not been provided by these programs, the project proponent or its successor(s) shall pay a pro rata share of the cost of the improvements within six months of the determination that the improvements are necessary.

**Party Responsible for Implementation:** Proponent of hotel and timeshare components.

**Party Responsible for Monitoring/Reporting:** City of Seaside Public Works Director.

### ***New Significant Unavoidable Impacts***

The following significant unavoidable impacts were identified. Changes in the significant unavoidable impacts compared to the Draft EIR are presented in Table S-1.

**Additional Project Delay at Intersections with Existing LOS Below Standards: Monterey Road/California Avenue, Monterey Road/Fremont Boulevard, and Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard.** The addition of project traffic would add about five to ten seconds to existing unacceptable delays at these intersections during peak hours. Implementation of the State Highway 1 PSR improvements would improve levels of service to acceptable levels at all but the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard interchange, which is expected to remain at unacceptable levels of service indefinitely. The project would pay a development impact fee to FORA. The FORA fee would be used, in part, fund the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. However, the timeframe for completion of the improvements is unknown and therefore this mitigation measure would not avoid levels of service below acceptable standards at these intersections during the interim period. Therefore, this is a significant unavoidable impact of uncertain duration. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**Additional Project and Cumulative Traffic on Highway Segment with Existing LOS F.** The addition of Project traffic to State Highway 1 south of Fremont Boulevard would exasperate already unacceptable levels of service on this section of highway during the PM peak hour. Implementation of the State Highway 1 PSR improvements would improve levels of service to acceptable levels on this segment. The project would pay a development impact fee to FORA. The FORA fee would be used, in part, to fund the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. However, the timeframe for completion of the improvements is unknown and therefore this mitigation measure would not avoid levels of service below acceptable standards on this highway segment during the interim period. Therefore, this is a significant unavoidable impact of uncertain duration. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**Cumulative Intersection LOS Below Standards and Additional Delay: Monterey Road/California Avenue and Fremont Boulevard/Monterey Road.** Cumulative traffic increases would result in operations below acceptable levels of service and increased delay at these intersections during both peak hours. The FORA development fee could be used, in part, to fund improvements to these intersections and the adjacent section of State Highway 1.

TABLE S-1

## Changes in Significant Unavoidable Traffic Impacts

Impact	Change	Explanation
<b>Additional Project Delay at intersection with LOS Below Standard</b>		
Monterey Road California Avenue	New impact	Different (Caltrans 2000) Analysis Methodology
Monterey Road Fremont Boulevard	No change	
Fremont Boulevard Del Monte Boulevard	No change	
<b>Additional Project and Cumulative Traffic on Highway with Existing LOS F</b>		
State Highway 1 south of Fremont Boulevard	No change	
State Highway 68 east of State Highway 218	Eliminated	Improvement in Background LOS (however, refer to General Plan impacts)
<b>Cumulative Intersection LOS Below Standards and Additional Delay</b>		
Monterey Road California Avenue	New Impact	Different (Caltrans 2000) Analysis Methodology
Fremont Boulevard Monterey Road	No change	
Monterey Road Coe Avenue	Eliminated	Necessary improvements already made by Seaside Highlands project
<b>General Plan Intersection LOS Below Standards</b>		
Lightfighter Drive General Jim Moore Boulevard	New impact	Higher traffic volumes
Fremont Boulevard Del Monte Boulevard	No change	
<b>General Plan Highway Decrease to LOS F</b>		
State Highway 68 east of State Highway 218	No change	
State Highway 218 east of General Jim Moore Blvd.	New impact	Higher traffic volumes

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates and EMC Planning Group Inc.

However, the timeframe for completion of the improvements is unknown and therefore this mitigation measure would not avoid levels of service below acceptable standards at these intersections during the interim period. Therefore, this is a significant unavoidable impact of uncertain duration. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**General Plan Intersection LOS Below Standards: Lightfighter Drive/General Jim Moore Boulevard and Fremont Boulevard/ Del Monte Boulevard.** Traffic increases through cumulative and/or general plan build-out would result in operations below acceptable levels of service at these intersections during both peak hours. Even with improvements suggested in the TIA and the State Highway 1 PSR, levels of service are expected to remain unacceptable indefinitely. A southbound and westbound left turn lane at the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection would improve levels of service but not to acceptable levels, and these improvements are not part of the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. This would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 48 would reduce impacts at the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection, but not to a less than significant level. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**General Plan Highway LOS Decrease to LOS F: State Highway 68 east of State Highway 218, and State Highway 218 east of General Jim Moore Boulevard.** These highway segments would operate at LOS F under general plan build-out conditions. The FORA development fee could be used, in part, to fund improvements to these highways. However, the timeframe for funding and completion of the improvements is unknown and therefore this mitigation measure would not avoid levels of service below acceptable standards on these roads during the interim period. Therefore, this is a significant unavoidable impact of uncertain duration. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

*This side intentionally left blank.*

---

# 1.0 Introduction

---

## 1.1 Draft Environmental Impact Report and Project Consideration History

The City of Seaside, acting as the lead agency, determined that the proposed Seaside Resort (hereinafter “Project”) may result in significant adverse environmental effects, as defined by the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) Guidelines section 15064. Therefore, the City of Seaside had an environmental impact report (EIR) prepared to evaluate the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the Project (hereinafter “Draft EIR”). Because the Project is consistent with and a furtherance of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* (FORA 1996), which addresses the redevelopment of the former Fort Ord army base, the City prepared the Draft EIR as a subsequent EIR to the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR* (EDAW, EMC Planning Group Inc. 1997).

CEQA Guidelines section 15152 allows environmental review for more specific projects within an area for which a broader EIR was prepared and certified, to be tiered from the more general document. For purposes of determining whether a military base reuse plan, or public or private activities taken pursuant to or in furtherance of a military base reuse plan, may have a significant effect on the environment, an EIR 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 *Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR* baseline conditions are those that were present in 1993. The City decided to take a conservative approach with the Draft EIR for the Project, and used existing baseline conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Draft EIR was prepared. The City is further updating the setting in this Revised Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR was circulated for public review between August 19, 2002 and October 2, 2002, and public comments received. An administrative Final EIR with responses to comments and revisions to the Draft EIR was prepared by the City but not released. The City of Seaside held the first of several planned public hearings on the Project before the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) on June 18, 2003. However, a lawsuit (not related to CEQA issues) was filed by one member of the project proponents against another, and the City suspended its consideration of the Project until the legal issues were resolved. No more of the planned public hearings were held. The applicant’s legal issues were resolved in March 2004, and the City resumed its consideration of the Project.

## 1.2 Determination to Prepare a Revised Draft EIR

### ***City's Consideration Process***

A year and a half had passed since circulation of the Draft EIR by the time the City resumed consideration of the Project. Therefore, the City determined that although the Project itself is unchanged, the Draft EIR should be reviewed to determine whether any changes had occurred that would require additional environmental analysis or public review under CEQA. The following steps were taken during that review:

- The City and environmental consultant met weekly with the Project applicant between March 16 and May 4 to determine if any changes to the project were proposed and to discuss the requirements of CEQA as they relate potentially changed conditions;
- The environmental consultant reviewed the Draft EIR and changes to the environmental setting since circulation of the Draft EIR, and recommended additional consideration of several environmental issue areas;
- The environmental consultant reviewed consistency of the Project with the Draft *Seaside General Plan* update that is currently under consideration for adoption by the Seaside City Council;
- The City reviewed its Fort Ord water allocation figures;
- The City reviewed the water demand factors in the Draft EIR and compared them with demand factors in other recent documents and studies;
- The City had new traffic counts taken and a new traffic impact analysis (TIA) prepared;
- At the City's direction, the applicant conducted additional biological surveys;
- The City considered the potential for a Mello-Roos community services district, proposed to encompass the project site and vicinity, to provide funding for needed services; and
- The City, after examining all the evidence in the record and the requirements of CEQA, concluded that all issues were adequately addressed in the Draft EIR and that, with the exception of water and traffic, there was no new significant information showing that the Project would have any significant effects not discussed in the Draft EIR or that significant effects previously examined in the Draft EIR would be substantially more severe than shown in the previous Draft EIR. However, because of new information regarding water supply and traffic, the City determined that this Revised Draft EIR should be prepared to present the updated information on these two topics.



## **CEQA Requirements**

CEQA Guidelines sections relevant to this revised Draft EIR are presented below with explanatory notes added.

### **Section 15088.5 Recirculation of an EIR Prior to Certification**

(a) A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:

(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.

(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.

(4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (*Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com.* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)

Note: In the event that none of the conditions listed above apply, then the following section is applicable, and no re-circulation is required.

(b) Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

Note: Under the option provided by the following section, the City of Seaside has chosen to re-circulate only two parts of the Draft EIR.

(c) If the revision is limited to a few chapters or portions of the EIR, the lead agency need only recirculate the chapters or portions that have been modified.

Note: The following reference is to the standard noticing and consultation required for all EIRs. The Notice of Availability for the Revised Draft EIR will be posted with the County Clerk and advertised in a newspaper of general circulation. The Revised Draft EIR will also be distributed for review to the State Clearinghouse and other agencies, and to persons or organizations that commented on the Draft EIR, and for whom the City has a valid address.

(d) Recirculation of an EIR requires notice pursuant to Section 15087, and consultation pursuant to Section 15086.

(f) The lead agency shall evaluate and respond to comments as provided in Section 15088. Recirculating an EIR can result in the lead agency receiving more than one set of comments from reviewers. Following are two ways in which the lead agency may identify the set of comments to which it will respond. This dual approach avoids confusion over whether the lead agency must respond to comments which are duplicates or which are no longer pertinent due to revisions to the EIR. In no case shall the lead agency fail to respond to pertinent comments on significant environmental issues.

Note: The City has elected to apply the following section in regard to responding to comments.

(2) When the EIR is revised only in part and the lead agency is recirculating only the revised chapters or portions of the EIR, the lead agency may request that reviewers limit their comments to the revised chapters or portions. The lead agency need only respond to (i) comments received during the initial circulation period that relate to chapters or portions of the document that were not revised and recirculated, and (ii) comments received during the recirculation period that relate to the chapters or portions of the earlier EIR that were revised and recirculated. The lead agency's request that reviewers limit the scope of their comments shall be included either within the text of the revised EIR or by an attachment to the revised EIR.

(g) When recirculating a revised EIR, either in whole or in part, the lead agency shall, in the revised EIR or by an attachment to the revised EIR, summarize the revisions made to the previously circulated draft EIR.

## **Changes since Circulation of the Draft EIR**

Several changes to the environmental setting have taken place since circulation of the Draft EIR. The significant changes to the setting are described below. Implications of the changes to the water supply and traffic settings are discussed in Section 2.0 Environmental Setting and Analysis.

### **Changes to the Project Description**

No significant changes have been made to the Project since circulation of the Draft EIR.

### **Changes in the General Setting**

The City of Seaside is currently conducting hearings on an update to its general plan. Adoption of the updated *Seaside General Plan* could happen prior to consideration of the Project by the City Council.

### **Changes in the Water Supply Setting**

- The City's Fort Ord water allocation was increased; and
- The City approved The First Tee project and allocated water for it.

### **Changes in the Traffic Setting**

- The U.S. Army objected to the inclusion of the new Fort Ord interchange in the State Highway 1 Project Study Report (PSR), and the interchange has been de-programmed by Caltrans and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC);
- Imjin Parkway was extended to State Highway 1 at the existing Twelfth Street interchange (this connection provides a bypass of Marina for traffic between the Monterey Peninsula and Salinas);

An extension of Second Avenue to connect Lightfighter Drive to Imjin Parkway is under construction; and

- The City approved The First Tee project along General Jim Moore Boulevard east of the project site, which will generate traffic not considered in the Draft EIR.

## **Focus of the Revised Draft EIR**

Based on its review of changes to the environmental setting, and additional investigation into potential effects of the Project, the City determined that significant changes in two issue areas merited additional disclosure and study in a revised Draft EIR. Although significant changes had occurred with respect to the water supply setting, the City determined that the changes did not result in new significant adverse environmental effects or more severe adverse environmental effects. However, because water supply at the former Fort Ord and throughout Monterey County is an important issue, and new information is now available regarding water supply, the City determined that inclusion of this new information would be appropriate. Because the analysis in the updated TIA resulted in a different range of traffic impacts than were considered in the Draft EIR, the City determined that a revised analysis of traffic conditions would be appropriate. Therefore, the City had this Revised Draft EIR prepared to present updated water supply information and to address the updated traffic analysis.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5(f)(2), the City is soliciting public comment only on the topics of water supply and traffic, and will respond only to comments addressing these topics. The City will respond to all comments received during the public comment period of the original Draft EIR, although earlier comments regarding water supply and traffic may be referenced to the new analysis in this Revised Draft EIR.

## **1.3 EIR Preparation Standards and Methods**

This Revised Draft EIR has been prepared by EMC Planning Group Inc. (hereinafter "consultant") under contract to the City of Seaside in accordance with CEQA and implementing guidelines. This Revised Draft 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 Revised Draft EIR will be used in concert with the Draft EIR, to inform public decision-makers and their constituents of the environmental impacts of the proposed project. This Revised Draft EIR, together with the previously circulated Draft EIR, constitutes the entire Seaside Resort Draft EIR.

As relevant to the topics covered, this Revised Draft EIR describes and evaluates the changes to the environmental setting of the project site and surrounding areas since circulation of the Draft EIR, identifies the environmental impacts of the proposed project, and provides feasible mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce or avoid identified adverse environmental impacts.

This Revised Draft EIR and previous Draft EIR are objective public disclosure documents that take no position on the merits of the project. Thus, the findings of this Revised Draft EIR and the previous Draft EIR do not advocate a position "for" or "against" the project. Instead, this Revised Draft EIR and previous Draft EIR provide information on which decisions about the project can be based. The Revised Draft EIR

and previous Draft EIR have 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.

## 1.4 Terminology Used in the EIR

### ***Characterization of Impacts***

This Revised Draft 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 a less than significant level m.

### ***Abbreviations and Acronyms***

BAR	Seaside Board of Architectural Review
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CMP	Congestion Management Plan
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FORA	Fort Ord Reuse Authority
LOS	Level of Service (traffic flow)
MCWD	Marina Coast Water District
MCWRA	Monterey County Water Resources Agency
NOP	Notice of Preparation

PSR            Project Study Report

TAMC          Transportation Agency for Monterey County

TIA            Traffic Impact Assessment

---

## 2.0 Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures

---

### 2.1 Water Supply

#### *Focus of Revisions*

Although significant changes had occurred with respect to the water supply setting, the City determined that the changes did not result in new significant adverse environmental effects or more severe adverse environmental effects. However, because water supply at the former Fort Ord and throughout Monterey County is an important issue, and new information is now available regarding water supply, the City determined that inclusion of this new information would be appropriate. Therefore, this section of the Revised Draft EIR presents updated information on the water supply for the Project.

#### **Water Supply Allocation**

Through an agreement between the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA) and the U.S. Army, and now transferred to the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD), 6,600 acre-feet of water per year is available from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin for uses on the former Fort Ord, provided that such provisions of water do not aggravate or accelerate the existing seawater intrusion in the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. The City of Seaside has an allocation totaling 748 acre-feet of this water for projects within its city limits at the former Fort Ord. [Table 1](#) provides a summary of the City's water supply allocation. Seaside's allocation was initially set at 710 acre-feet, but was modified in 2002 to 748 to reflect additional water previously allocated by the Army directly to the Brostrom mobile home area, which is located within Seaside (MCWD October 23, 2002 comment letter on the Draft EIR).

Although it does not figure into the City's allocations as shown in [Table 1](#), the City also has the potential to "borrow" an additional 150 acre-feet per year of water from FORA until an augmented supply is available to replace the borrowed water (March 1, 2004 letter from Michael J. Houlemard Jr. to Michael Armstrong). The City has not borrowed any water from FORA at this time. Water from the City's Fort Ord allocation is allocated by the City to developments on a first-come first-served basis. Allocations were made by Congress to the SunBay Apartments and Brostrom mobile home area that are within the City of Seaside, and these, along with allocations already made by the City, must be subtracted from the City's allocation when determining the available water. The Seaside Highlands (redevelopment of the Hayes Housing area) and The First Tee projects were recently approved by the City and have been allocated water.

TABLE 1

## City of Seaside Fort Ord Water Allocation

Land Use	Quantity	Balance
<b>City Water Allocation</b>		
Original allocation	710.00	
Brostrum allocation	38.00	
Subtotal:		748.00
<b>Existing Land Uses – 2003</b>		
MPUSD except Chartwell School	(110.00)	
SunBay Apartments	(66.00)	
Brostrom	(65.00)	
Seaside Highlands	(10.00)	
Subtotal:	(251.00)	497.00
<b>Prior Army Commitments to Seaside Land Uses</b>		
SunBay Apartments	(32.00)	
Brostrom	(19.83)	
Subtotal:	(51.83)	445.17
<b>Approved Projects</b>		
Seaside Highlands homes (adjusted for existing use above)	(115.40)	
Chartwell School buildings (in process)	(0.44)	
Monterey College of Law	(2.57)	
Seaside Highlands irrigation including Soper Field	(10.00)	
The First Tee buildings	(3.50)	
The First Tee irrigation	(106.43)	
Chartwell School irrigation (in process)	(5.00)	
Subtotal:	(243.34)	201.83
<b>Pending Projects</b>		
Seaside resort hotel component	(69.30)	
Seaside resort timeshare component	(34.00)	
Seaside resort residential component	(41.30)	
Seaside resort landscaping	(16.80)	
Seaside resort affordable housing at SunBay apartments	(22.00)	
Seaside affordable housing	(6.26)	
Subtotal:	(189.66)	12.17



- Notes:
- 1) City allocation is FORA allocation as amended to include Brostrom
  - 2) Existing use is MCWD 2003 meter records per M. Armstrong March 8, 2004 telcon
  - 3) Approved & pending projects based on project EIRs or best available water use factors
  - 4) Prior commitments based on Army grants and FORA/Brostrom 2001 agreement
  - 5) SunBay units projected at 0.22/unit based on existing 297-unit SunBay usage
  - 6) Brostrom units projected at 0.21/unit based on FORA/Brostrom agreement
  - 7) Seaside resort affordable housing is an anticipated condition of approval of the Project.

Source: City of Seaside

## **Project Analysis**

### **Water Demand**

The Project would increase withdrawals of water from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. The water allocated for use at the project would come from Seaside's 748 acre-foot allocation, which is part of the 6,600 acre-foot allocation to the former Fort Ord. Although the water to be used is from an existing allocation, it is not currently being pumped, so the Project would result in an increase in pumping from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. The Project would not use water from the Seaside Groundwater Basin, so it would not increase demand for water from that basin. No changes in the Project's water demand have occurred since circulation of the Draft EIR.

Projected water use is summarized in [Table 2](#).

**TABLE 2**

### **Projected Water Use**

<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Use Rate per Unit or Acre</b>	<b>Total Projected Water Use</b>
Residential (125 units)	0.33 acre-feet per year	41.3 acre-feet per year
Hotel (330 units)	0.21 acre-feet per year	69.3 acre-feet per year
Timeshare (170 units)	0.20 acre-feet per year	34.0 acre-feet per year
Landscaping (8.4 acres)	2.0 acre-feet per year	16.8 acre-feet per year
<b>Total Projected Water Use</b>		<b>161.4 acre-feet per year</b>

Note: These are estimates of water use; actual water use will be measured by metering.

Source: FORA, MCWD, MPWMD

The City of Seaside has adequate water remaining from its allocation of 748 acre-feet to supply the Project. However, the remaining water allocation is not sufficient to provide water to all of the future development planned for the Fort Ord portion of Seaside. Development within the Seaside portion of the former Fort Ord beyond that supplied by

the current allocation is dependent upon an augmented water supply. MCWD regulations require that water used for irrigation of commercial landscape areas be from a recycled water supply if a recycled supply is available (or becomes available) adjacent to the property. Project plans provide for the use of recycled wastewater for irrigation when a supply of recycled water becomes available and the City has indicated to the applicant that it will require conversion as a condition of project approval.

### ***Impacts and Mitigation Measures***

No new water supply impacts were identified in this Revised Draft EIR.

## **2.2 Traffic**

### ***Focus of Revisions***

A traffic impact analysis (TIA) was prepared for the Project by Higgins Associates in July 2001. Draft EIR Section 2.12 Transportation presented traffic analysis based on that TIA. An updated TIA was prepared by Fehr and Peers Associates in May 2004. The text and figures are provided in Appendix A. The full traffic report can be reviewed at the City of Seaside Community Development Department. The updated TIA included new traffic counts; an updated cumulative projects list; recent changes in the road network; and utilized a new regional traffic model, the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual methodologies, and Synchro analysis. The May 2004 TIA considered general plan build out with and without the new State Highway 1 interchange that had been part of the State Highway 1 Project Study Report (PSR).

This revised traffic section focuses on the level of service calculations for project vicinity intersections and highway segments.

Because the new information regarding traffic concerns only the level of service calculations, only that portion of the transportation section of the Draft EIR is being revised. Other transportation issues addressed in the Draft EIR (transit, bicycle, pedestrian, parking) have not been affected by changes to the project setting or updated analysis. Since the setting and analysis for these transportation issues has not changed, revision of those portions of the transportation section is not necessary. Refer to the Draft EIR for a discussion of the setting, analysis, and impacts related to these.

### ***Circulation Policies***

The Draft *Seaside General Plan* policy for level of service remained at LOS C, although the exceptions, which were not clearly set forth in the *1995 Seaside General Plan* (as studied in the Draft EIR), are spelled out in detail in the Draft *Seaside General Plan*. These standards are summarized in the Standards of Significance section of this Revised EIR. The Draft *Seaside General Plan* lists criteria with which exceptions to the LOS C

standard may be found acceptable. Refer to the *Seaside General Plan* Circulation Element for a full discussion of the City's traffic flow standards. Caltrans and TAMC Congestion Management Plan (CMP) standards are unchanged.

## ***Environmental Setting***

### **Changes to the Project Vicinity Roadway Network**

Two arterial streets north of the project site, which were not included in the roadway network in the 2001 TIA, have been completed or are under construction. Imjin Parkway has been extended to provide a through connection between State Highway 1 (at the existing Twelfth Street interchange) to Reservation Road. The extension of Second Avenue northward to Imjin Parkway provides a more direct connection between General Jim Moore Boulevard and Imjin Parkway, and an alternative route (avoiding State Highway 1) to Marina and Salinas from Seaside and the project site.

### **Status of State Highway 1 PSR Improvements**

Construction of a new interchange at State Highway 1 and Monterey Road, approximately midway between the Lightfighter Drive and Fremont Boulevard, had been Phase 1 of the State Highway 1 PSR. The Draft EIR relied, in part, on implementation of the State Highway 1 PSR for mitigation of project and cumulative impacts. The U.S. Army protested this new interchange, and the City is now negotiating with the U.S. Army to gain their support for the interchange. Caltrans and TAMC have deprogrammed the new interchange, so it is no longer in the agencies' funding cycles. Prospects for construction of the interchange are uncertain, and the outcome is primarily dependent upon the City's ongoing negotiations with the U.S. Army. The other phases of the State Highway 1 PSR are still programmed, though no funds have been allocated.

## ***Existing and Background Levels of Service***

The 2004 TIA updated existing conditions and background conditions. Existing intersection conditions reflect actual traffic measurements, which were taken during the last week of March 2004 and the third week of May 2004.

### **Existing Conditions**

**Intersections.** Current intersection levels of service, based on existing traffic data, are presented in [Table 3](#). Several intersections have existing unacceptable conditions at one or both peak hours. These are General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way, Monterey Road/California Avenue, Monterey Road/Fremont Boulevard, and Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard. In the Draft EIR the latter two intersections operated at the same unacceptable level of service.

TABLE 3

## Existing Conditions Intersection LOS

Intersection	Control	Peak Hour	Delay in Seconds	LOS AM/PM
General Jim Moore Blvd. Lightfighter Drive	Signal	AM	23.4	C
		PM	26.5	C
General Jim Moore Blvd. Normandy Road	Signal	AM	17.5	B
		PM	15.8	B
General Jim Moore Blvd. McClure Way	All-way stop	AM	52.1	F
		PM	12.8	B
General Jim Moore Blvd. Coe Avenue	Two-way stop	AM	30.6	D
		PM	14.1	B
General Jim Moore Blvd. Highway 218	Signal	AM	22.6	C
		PM	11.7	B
Monterey Road Normandy Road	All-way stop	AM	7.9	A
		PM	7.6	A
Monterey Road Coe Avenue	All-way stop	AM	9.7	A
		PM	10.6	B
Monterey Road California Avenue	Signal	AM	51.6	D
		PM	>100.0	F
Monterey Road Fremont Boulevard	Signal	AM	57.6	E
		PM	76.5	E
Fremont Boulevard Del Monte Boulevard	Two-way stop	AM	16.5	C
		PM	62.2	F

Notes: Whole intersection weighted average total delay for signalized and all-way stop-controlled intersections (expressed in seconds per vehicle). Worst approach control delay for two-way stop-controlled intersections (expressed in seconds per vehicle).

LOS calculations performed using the *2000 Highway Capacity Manual* delay methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Unacceptable operations are indicated in **bold** type.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates

Intersections along General Jim Moore Boulevard were identified as operating at acceptable levels in the Draft EIR. Increased traffic at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way intersection has increased turning delays to unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour.

The Monterey Road/California Avenue intersection was identified in the Draft EIR as operating acceptably. The change in level of service is not due to actual changes in

operation but rather a change in methodology for characterizing the interchange. The methodology used for the Draft EIR analyzed this intersection independently of the adjacent Monterey/Fremont interchange, and it operated acceptably. Under the current traffic analysis methodology, because the two intersections are so close together, they are analyzed as though they were a single intersection. When analyzed under this methodology as a single intersection, the level of service is unacceptable.

**Highway Segments.** Table 4 presents existing levels of service at studied road segments. Northbound State Highway 1 south of Lightfighter Drive, operates at LOS E, and northbound State Highway 1 south of Fremont Boulevard operates at LOS F during the PM peak hour. The segments on State Highway 68 and State Highway 156 operate at LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours. Other studied segments operate at LOS D or better.

---



---

TABLE 4

**Existing Conditions Highway Segments LOS**

Highway Segment	LOS Standard	AM Peak	PM Peak
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter NB	D	C	E
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter SB	D	C	C
Highway 1 south of Fremont NB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	C	F
Highway 1 south of Fremont SB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	D	D
Highway 218 south of Gen. Jim Moore EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	D	D
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 WB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E

1. Caltrans standard is LOS D; Monterey County Congestion Management Program Standard is LOS E.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates, May 2004 and Monterey County Congestion Management Program, March 1994.

---



---

## Background Conditions

**Intersection and Segment Levels of Service.** Background conditions include traffic from existing and approved development, and represent conditions expected immediately prior to development of the proposed project. Table 5 presents a list of approved projects that are included in the background conditions. Background intersection levels of service, based on forecast background traffic counts, are presented in the section on project analysis, to provide comparison data for the project conditions.

TABLE 5  
**Projects Approved But Not Yet Built**

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>AM Peak Hour Trips</b>	<b>PM Peak Hour Trips</b>
Seaside Highlands	Monterey Road/ Coe Avenue	268 houses Ball field 4,300 square-foot community center	208	311
San Pablo subdivision	1200 Block of San Pablo Avenue	12 houses	9	12
Village Green Phase I	Wanda Avenue/ Kenneth Street	8 houses	6	8
Monterey College of Law Phase 1	CSUMB Campus	200 students	42	42
The First Tee	Jim Moore Blvd./ Eucalyptus Road	Golf course	43	79
Chili's Restaurant	Highway 218/ Harcourt Avenue	6,000 square-foot restaurant	0	42
Sutter Heights	Lopez Street	9 houses	7	9
<b>Total Trips</b>			<b>315</b>	<b>503</b>

Source: City of Seaside (May 2004).

Under background conditions, delays and/or level of service at intersections will decline from existing conditions. The greatest drop in service will occur at the intersection of Monterey Road and Fremont Boulevard, with delays increased by about 20 to 25 seconds. The addition of approved project traffic will worsen the southbound segment of State Highway 1 south of Fremont Boulevard and the State Highway 218 segment east of General Jim Moore Boulevard to LOS E during the PM peak hour. All of the other highway segments will continue to operate at the same levels of service as with existing conditions. In order to better illustrate project effects, the background conditions are shown in the table in the project conditions section.

**Improvements Needed.** Under existing and background conditions, a number of roadway improvements would be necessary to provide acceptable levels of service. Realignment of the General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersection is needed.

The General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersection will be realigned as a part of the programmed FORA improvements to General Jim Moore Boulevard. State Highway 1 PSR improvements are necessary for acceptable operations at the two intersections near the State Highway 1/Fremont Boulevard interchange and at the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection. The PSR improvements would also improve conditions on State Highway 1 south of Fremont Boulevard.

## **Project Conditions Level of Service Analysis**

### **Trip Generation and Distribution**

The Project would add approximately 5,672 daily trips, with approximately 267 trips during the AM peak hour, and 362 trips during the PM peak hour. Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation*, (6<sup>th</sup> edition) rates were used to predict future traffic volumes. A rate of 90 percent of the standard resort hotel rate was used for the timeshare projection, based on observations made for the Highlands Inn hotel-to-timeshare conversion in 1998, and at several timeshare projects on the west coast in 1995. For the TIA project conditions, it was assumed that the entire project was constructed and that half of the timeshares would be used as single-room lock-off units (resulting in a maximum timeshare occupancy of 255 units and providing a worst-case traffic estimate). Trip distribution was based on, and consistent with, observed home-based patterns, and regional patterns as used in FORA traffic modeling. [Table 6](#) summarizes Project trip generation by land use. Trip distribution was assigned as in the Higgins 2001 TIA, with 40 percent of traffic using State Highway 1 south of Fremont Boulevard, 25 percent using State Highway 1 north of Lightfighter Drive, 15 percent using State Highway 68 east of State Highway 218, six percent using State Highway 68 west of State Highway 218, nine percent using either California Avenue, Del Monte Boulevard, or Fremont Boulevard, and five percent using either Gigling Road or General Jim Moore Boulevard. Refer to Figure 21 in the Draft EIR for a diagram of Project trip distribution.

**TABLE 6**

### **Project Trip Generation by Component**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>ITE Daily Rate</b>	<b>Total Trips</b>	<b>AM Peak</b>	<b>PM Peak</b>
Residential	125	9.57	1,196	94	126
Hotel	330	8.00	2,640	102	139
Timeshare	255	7.20	1,836	71	97
<b>Total Project</b>			<b>5,672</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>362</b>

Source: Fehr and Peers May 2004.

Project conditions represent the addition of all Project traffic at Project completion to background conditions. Because the Project would be built over the course of

approximately eight years, this is a somewhat theoretical scenario, since other projects not yet proposed are likely to be constructed before Project completion.

### Intersections (Project)

Table 7 presents background and project conditions intersection levels of service.

TABLE 7

#### Background and Project Conditions Intersection LOS

Intersection	Peak Hour	Background		Project Conditions	
		Delay in Seconds	LOS AM/PM	Delay in Seconds	LOS AM/PM
General Jim Moore Blvd. Lightfighter Drive	AM	23.5	C	24.0	C
	PM	30.2	C	27.6	C
General Jim Moore Blvd. Normandy Road	AM	17.5	B	16.3	B
	PM	15.6	B	15.2	B
General Jim Moore Blvd. McClure Way	AM	<b>57.7</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>&gt;100</b>	<b>F</b>
	PM	13.7	B	22.3	C
General Jim Moore Blvd. Coe Avenue	AM	30.3	D	<b>49.1</b>	<b>E</b>
	PM	20.3	C	26.2	D
General Jim Moore Blvd. Highway 218	AM	24.2	C	25.4	C
	PM	12.3	B	13.5	B
Monterey Road Normandy Road	AM	8.0	A	8.0	A
	PM	7.6	A	7.8	A
Monterey Road Coe Avenue	AM	11.0	B	11.8	B
	PM	15.0	B	17.7	C
Monterey Road California Avenue	AM	<b>58.0</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>E</b>
	PM	<b>&gt;100</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>&gt;100</b>	<b>F</b>
Monterey Road Fremont Boulevard	AM	<b>78.2</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>88.6</b>	<b>F</b>
	PM	<b>&gt;100</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>&gt;100</b>	<b>F</b>
Fremont Boulevard Del Monte Boulevard	AM	16.8	C	17.0	C
	PM	<b>69.4</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>F</b>

Notes: Whole intersection weighted average total delay for signalized and all-way stop-controlled intersections (expressed in seconds per vehicle). Worst approach control delay for two-way stop-controlled intersections (expressed in seconds per vehicle).



LOS calculations performed using the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual delay methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Unacceptable operations are indicated in **bold** type.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates May 2004

Under project conditions, levels of service would further degrade at the five intersections already operating at unacceptable levels under background conditions. Unacceptable operating conditions at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way and General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersections reflect difficulty in making turns onto and off General Jim Moore Boulevard. Delays at the intersection of General Jim Moore Boulevard and McClure Way would increase by more than 40 seconds (for the worst turning movement). No intersections operating acceptably under background conditions would degrade to an unacceptable level of service with the addition of Project traffic. Signal warrants would not be met at the General Jim Moore Boulevard intersections.

### Highway Segments (Project)

Tables 8 and 9 present background and project conditions level of service at studied highway segments. The addition of project traffic will not change the service levels when compared to background conditions.

TABLE 8

#### Background Conditions Highway Segments LOS

Highway Segment	LOS Standard	AM Peak	PM Peak
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter NB	D	C	E
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter SB	D	C	C
Highway 1 south of Fremont NB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	C	F
Highway 1 south of Fremont SB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	D	E
Highway 218 south of Gen. Jim Moore EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	D	E
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 WB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E

1. Caltrans standard is LOS D; Monterey County Congestion Management Program Standard is LOS E.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates, May 2004 and Monterey County Congestion Management Program, March 1994.

## Improvements Needed (Project)

To improve conditions to acceptable levels of service at the two intersections at the State Highway/1 Fremont Boulevard interchange, the State Highway 1 PSR improvements would be required, as they are under background conditions. The Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard interchange would remain at unacceptable levels of service with or without the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. A signal light would improve operations under project conditions, but since the intersection would be re-constructed when the PSR improvements are put in place and the signal would require removal with the re-construction, this would not be a feasible improvement. Construction of a second southbound left-turn lane and a second westbound left-turn lane would result in acceptable conditions, but the additional lanes are applicable only in conjunction with the intersection geometry proposed with the PSR improvements.

---



---

TABLE 9

### Project Conditions Highway Segments LOS

Highway Segment	LOS Standard	AM Peak	PM Peak
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter NB	D	C	E
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter SB	D	C	C
Highway 1 south of Fremont NB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	C	F
Highway 1 south of Fremont SB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	D	E
Highway 218 south of Gen. Jim Moore EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	D	E
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 WB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E

1. Caltrans standard is LOS D; Monterey County Congestion Management Program Standard is LOS E.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates, May 2004 and Monterey County Congestion Management Program, March 1994.

---

Widening of General Jim Moore Boulevard to four lanes would improve turning movements at the intersection with McClure Way. This improvement is already programmed by FORA, with funding identified for fiscal years 2003 through 2006, and could be completed prior to construction of the Project. This project is currently under design and funds are available for construction between Ardennes Way South and near Coe Avenue in late 2004 or early 2005. Realignment of the intersection from the current triangular arrangement to a standard four-leg arrangement is necessary at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersection. The realignment is expected with the General Jim Moore Boulevard widening project.

## Cumulative Conditions Levels of Service

Cumulative traffic conditions are developed by adding pending projects to project conditions trips. [Table 10](#) presents the list of pending projects.

**TABLE 10**  
**Pending Projects**

Project Name	Location	Description	AM Peak Hour Trips	PM Peak Hour Trips
Hotel	1350 Del Monte Blvd.	75-room hotel	50	53
Broadway/ Fremont	Broadway Avenue Fremont Blvd.	42,000 square-foot retail	58	199
Main Gate Shopping Center	Lightfighter Drive Highway 1	600,000 square- foot retail	402	1,463
Village Green Phase II	Wanda Avenue Kenneth Street	10 condominiums 6,000 square-foot retail	8	20
Monterey College of Law Phase II	CSUMB Campus	100 students	21	21
Cost Plus Center	Fremont Blvd. Playa Avenue	11,000 square-foot retail expansion	8	27
Del Monte/ Fremont	Del Monte Blvd. Fremont Blvd.	3,000 square-foot retail	6	10
Seaside Library	Broadway Ave. Terrace Street	32,000 square-foot library	34	228
Outback Steakhouse	Highway 218 Highway 1	6,000 square-foot restaurant	0	45
Starbuck's Coffee	Canyon Del Rey Rd./Del Monte Blvd.	1,400 square-foot restaurant with drive-thru	37	15
CSUMB Dorms	CSUMB Campus	400 dorm rooms	204	248
Army Housing	North of Seaside Resort site	110 Houses	83	111
Seaside Resort Affordable Housing at SunBay Apartments	Coe Avenue	100 Apartments	51	62
<b>Total Trips</b>			<b>962</b>	<b>2,502</b>

Note: Seaside resort affordable housing at SunBay apartments is an anticipated condition of approval for the Project.

Source: City of Seaside (April 2004).

### Intersections (Cumulative)

A summary of cumulative traffic intersection conditions is presented in Table 11. Under cumulative conditions, one additional intersection (General Jim Moore Boulevard/ Lightfighter Drive) degrades to an unacceptable level of service. This intersection degrades from LOS C under project conditions to LOS E in the cumulative conditions PM peak hour.

TABLE 11

#### Cumulative Conditions Intersection LOS

Intersection	Peak Hour	Delay in Seconds	LOS AM/PM
General Jim Moore Blvd. Lightfighter Drive	AM	28.5	C
	PM	<b>70.4</b>	E
General Jim Moore Blvd. Normandy Road	AM	16.4	B
	PM	12.6	B
General Jim Moore Blvd. McClure Way	AM	<b>&gt;100.0</b>	F
	PM	<b>48.3</b>	E
General Jim Moore Blvd. Coe Avenue	AM	<b>81.8</b>	F
	PM	<b>51.9</b>	F
General Jim Moore Blvd. Highway 218	AM	26.8	C
	PM	14.2	B
Monterey Road Normandy Road	AM	8.3	A
	PM	8.1	A
Monterey Road Coe Avenue	AM	12.7	B
	PM	20.5	C
Monterey Road California Avenue	AM	<b>66.1</b>	E
	PM	<b>&gt;100.0</b>	F
Monterey Road Fremont Boulevard	AM	<b>99.6</b>	F
	PM	<b>&gt;100.0</b>	F
Fremont Boulevard Del Monte Boulevard	AM	17.7	C
	PM	<b>&gt;100.0</b>	F

Notes: Whole intersection weighted average total delay for signalized and all-way stop-controlled intersections (expressed in seconds per vehicle). Worst approach control delay for two-way stop-controlled intersections (expressed in seconds per vehicle).

LOS calculations performed using the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual delay methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Unacceptable operations are indicated in **bold** type.

All LOS are calculated with existing road network and intersection controls.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates

The five intersections already operating at unacceptable conditions under background and project conditions would continue to worsen. The Fremont Boulevard/Monterey Road and General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersections would operate at LOS F during both peak periods. The Monterey Road/California Avenue and General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way intersections would operate at LOS E or F during both peak hours. The intersection of Fremont Boulevard and Del Monte Boulevard would continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak period. Signal warrants would be met at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue and General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way intersections.

### Highway Segments (Cumulative)

Table 12 presents cumulative conditions level of service at studied road segments. Under cumulative conditions, State Highway 218 drops to LOS E during the AM peak hour.

TABLE 12

#### Cumulative Conditions Highway Segments LOS

Highway Segment	LOS Standard	AM Peak	PM Peak
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter NB	D	C	E
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter SB	D	C	D
Highway 1 south of Fremont NB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	D	F
Highway 1 south of Fremont SB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	D	E
Highway 218 south of Gen. Jim Moore EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 WB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	E	E

1. Caltrans standard is LOS D; Monterey County Congestion Management Program Standard is LOS E.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates, May 2004 and Monterey County Congestion Management Program, March 1994.

### **Improvements Needed (Cumulative)**

Under cumulative conditions, in addition to the improvements identified for project conditions, the following improvements would be required: signal lights would be required at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue and General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way intersections, and the Lightfighter Drive/General Jim Moore Boulevard intersection would require an additional westbound through lane and an eastbound left turn lane. The Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection would continue to operate at unacceptable levels of service (even with PSR improvements and a second southbound or westbound left-turn lane recommended in the TIA).

### **General Plan Build-out Levels of Service**

Two general plan build-out (2020) scenarios are presented. The first scenario assumes that the proposed new interchange between Fremont Boulevard and Lightfighter Drive would not be built. The interchange is included in the State Highway 1 PSR, but has been opposed by the U.S. Army and deprogrammed by Caltrans and TAMC. The second scenario assumes that the interchange is constructed as proposed in the State Highway 1 PSR. The City of Seaside is negotiating with the U.S. Army to allow the interchange to be built.

### **Intersections (General Plan Build-out)**

Under general plan build-out conditions, the intersections near the State Highway 1 interchange with Fremont Boulevard improve to acceptable levels of service due to implementation of the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. Level of service at these two intersections is acceptable with or without the new interchange, although delays are slightly greater without the interchange. Under general plan build-out conditions with the State Highway 1 PSR improvements, conditions at the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection improve slightly in the PM peak hour (LOS F to LOS E), but AM peak conditions degrade from LOS C to LOS F. [Table 13](#) presents general plan build-out conditions.

### **Highway Segments (General Plan Build-out)**

[Table 14](#) presents project conditions level of service at studied road segments. With the State Highway 1 PSR improvements in place, State Highway 1 segments would operate at acceptable levels of service. All other highway segments would operate at LOS F if improvements are not made.

TABLE 13

## General Plan Build-out Conditions Intersections LOS

Intersection	Peak Hour	Without Interchange		With Interchange	
		Delay in Seconds	LOS AM/PM	Delay in Seconds	LOS AM/PM
General Jim Moore Blvd. Lightfighter Drive	AM	>100.0	F	>100.0	F
	PM	>100.0	F	>100.0	F
General Jim Moore Blvd. Normandy Road	AM	19.4	B	15.9	B
	PM	25.3	C	25.3	C
General Jim Moore Blvd. McClure Way	AM	>100.0	F	>100.0	F
	PM	>100.0	F	>100.0	F
General Jim Moore Blvd. Coe Avenue	AM	>100.0	F	>100.0	F
	PM	>100.0	F	>100.0	F
General Jim Moore Blvd. Highway 218	AM	18.7	B	18.7	B
	PM	29.9	C	29.9	C
Monterey Road Normandy Road	AM	11.0	B	11.7	B
	PM	10.1	B	10.6	B
Monterey Road Coe Avenue	AM	14.4	B	11.9	B
	PM	20.0	C	12.3	B
Monterey Road California Avenue	AM	26.0	C	23.5	C
	PM	24.6	C	24.1	C
Monterey Road Fremont Boulevard	AM	15.2	B	13.5	B
	PM	13.1	B	10.9	B
Fremont Boulevard Del Monte Boulevard	AM	>100.0	F	>100.0	F
	PM	62.8	E	55.3	E

Notes: Whole intersection weighted average total delay for signalized and all-way stop-controlled intersections (expressed in seconds per vehicle). Worst approach control delay for two-way stop-controlled intersections (expressed in seconds per vehicle).

LOS calculations performed using the 2000 *Highway Capacity Manual* delay methodology for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Unacceptable operations are indicated in **bold** type.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates, May 2004

TABLE 14

**General Plan Conditions Highway Segments LOS**

<b>Highway Segment</b>	<b>LOS Standard</b>	<b>AM Peak</b>	<b>PM Peak</b>
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter NB	D	C	D
Highway 1 south of Lightfighter SB	D	D	C
Highway 1 south of Fremont NB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	C	C
Highway 1 south of Fremont SB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	C	C
Highway 218 south of Gen. Jim Moore EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	F	F
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	F	F
Highway 68 east of Highway 218 WB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	F	F
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 EB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	F	F
Highway 156 west of Highway 101 WB	D/E <sup>1</sup>	F	F

1. Caltrans standard is LOS D; Monterey County Congestion Management Program Standard is LOS E.

Source: Fehr and Peers Associates, May 2004 and Monterey County Congestion Management Program, March 1994.

**Improvements Needed (General Plan Build-out)**

At general plan build-out, two intersections would remain unacceptable even with improvements proposed in the State Highway 1 PSR and in the TIA. The Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection is not expected to operate at acceptable levels of service with any proposed improvements, and will likely exceed acceptable standards indefinitely. The TIA recommends the addition of southbound and westbound left turn lanes at this intersection to improve it from LOS F and LOS E to LOS D, but notes that no other physical improvements are available to further improve levels of service. These improvements are in addition to the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. A new State Highway 1 interchange would reduce PM peak hour delays by about eight seconds. The Lightfighter Drive/General Jim Moore Boulevard intersection, even with the addition of northbound and southbound right-turn lanes, and overlap signal phasing, would continue to operate at LOS D.

As with cumulative conditions, a signal light would be required for acceptable operations at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way intersection, with or without the new State Highway 1 interchange. At other intersections, no additional improvements would be required. The general plan scenarios with and without the new State Highway 1 interchange differ slightly in terms of delays, but the levels of service are the same in either case.

Several State Highway segments that currently operate at poor levels of service already require or will require widening and/or other improvements under general plan build-



out. State Highway 68 and State Highway 218 in the project vicinity would require additional lanes. Improvements to these highways are included in the FORA fee program. Some improvement projects are currently proposed on State Highway 68, including intersection improvements at Ragsdale Drive, and two more lanes between State Highway 218 and Ragsdale Drive. Major improvements to State Highway 68 are not programmed. Caltrans proposes to add two lanes to State Highway 156 between Castroville and U.S. Highway 101, with construction to start between 2012 and 2015.

### ***Impacts and Mitigation Measures***

The *Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR* concluded that despite policies and programs in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*, and mitigation measures in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR*, the redevelopment of the former Fort Ord would have significant and unavoidable impacts on the regional transportation system. Mitigation measures presented below would reduce transportation effects to the extent feasible.

**Standards of Significance.** CEQA Guidelines Appendix G indicates that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it will:

- Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system;
- For State Highway or Congestion Management Program roadways, exceed, either cumulatively or individually, a level of service standard established by Caltrans or the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, for the roads or highways affected by the project;
- For a signalized study intersection in the City of Seaside:
  - ◇ Reduce level of service from an acceptable level (LOS C or better) to an unacceptable level (LOS D, LOS E, or LOS F), or
  - ◇ Increase the average delay more than 2.0 seconds at intersections operating at LOS D, or
  - ◇ Increase the average delay by more than 1.0 second at intersections operating at LOS E or LOS F.
- For an unsignalized study intersection in the City of Seaside:
  - ◇ Decrease level of service from an acceptable level (LOS E or better for two-way stop control, LOS C or better for all-way stop control) to an unacceptable level (LOS F for two-way stop control, LOS D for all-way stop control); *or*
  - ◇ Exacerbate the unacceptable operations (LOS F for two-way stop control or LOS D for all-way stop control), and meet Caltrans peak-hour volume signal warrant;

- For a roadway segment in the City of Seaside:
  - ◊ The addition of project traffic causes a roadway segment operating at an acceptable level (LOS C or better) to degrade to an unacceptable level (LOS D, LOS E, or LOS F), or
  - ◊ The addition of project traffic causes a roadway segment operating at LOS D or E to degrade one service level, or
  - ◊ The addition of one project trip to a segment already operating at LOS F.
- 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;
- Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment, golf carts, pedestrians);
- Result in inadequate parking capacity; and/or
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.)

**Less Than Significant Project Impact – Additional Delay at General Jim Moore Boulevard/ McClure Way and General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue.** The addition of Project traffic would increase already unacceptable turning movement delays at these intersections. However, because signal warrants are not met under project conditions, this would be a less than significant impact. In addition, FORA has funded and is currently designing a widening project for General Jim Moore Boulevard that would result in acceptable conditions at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way intersection. Construction of the improvements would be completed while the Project is still under construction. The First Tee project is expected to construct intersection improvements at General Jim Moore Boulevard and Coe Avenue.

**Significant and Unavoidable Project Impact – Additional Delay at Intersections with Existing LOS Below Standards: Monterey Road/California Avenue, Monterey Road/Fremont Boulevard, and Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard.** The addition of project traffic would add about five to ten seconds to existing unacceptable delays at these intersections during peak hours. Implementation of the State Highway 1 PSR improvements would improve levels of service to acceptable levels at all but the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard interchange, which is expected to remain at unacceptable levels of service indefinitely. The project would pay a development impact fee to FORA. The FORA fee would be used, in part, fund the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. However, the timeframe for completion of the improvements is unknown and therefore this mitigation measure would not avoid levels of service below acceptable standards at these intersections during the interim period. Therefore, this is a significant unavoidable impact of uncertain duration. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**Significant and Unavoidable Project and Cumulative Impact – Additional Traffic on Highway Segment with Existing LOS F: State Highway 1.** The addition of Project and cumulative traffic to State Highway 1 south of Fremont Boulevard would exasperate already unacceptable levels of service on this section of highway during the PM peak hour. Implementation of the State Highway 1 PSR improvements would improve levels of service to acceptable levels on this segment. The project would pay a development impact fee to FORA. The FORA fee would be used, in part, fund the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. However, the timeframe for completion of the improvements is unknown and therefore this mitigation measure would not avoid levels of service below acceptable standards on this highway segment during the interim period. Therefore, this is a significant unavoidable impact of uncertain duration. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**Significant Cumulative Impact – Intersection LOS Below Standards and Additional Delay at General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way and General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue.** Under cumulative conditions, additional turning delays would occur at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way and General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersections, even with planned improvements to General Jim Moore Boulevard. Turning movement level of service at these intersections would be LOS F and signal warrants would be met under cumulative conditions. FORA development impact fees would fund the widening of General Jim Moore Boulevard. However, the signal lights needed at McClure Way and Coe Avenue under cumulative conditions are not included in FORA's improvement plans. This would be a significant cumulative impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

### **Mitigation Measure**

48. The City of Seaside Public Works Director shall annually monitor the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way, General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue, and Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersections, and determine, based on the standard Caltrans analysis methodologies in effect at the time, whether signal lights are warranted at the General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way, General Jim Moore Boulevard/Coe Avenue intersections, or additional turn lanes are warranted at the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection. If at the time the determination is made that such improvements are required, funding for the improvements has been provided by inclusion in FORA's CIP fee program or otherwise provided for by a City Assessment District, or other established funding mechanism, no payment shall be required of the project proponent or its successor(s). If funding for said improvements has not been provided by these programs, the project proponent or its successor(s) shall pay a pro rata share of the cost of the improvements within six months of the determination that the improvements are necessary.

**Party Responsible for Implementation:** Proponent of hotel and timeshare components.

**Party Responsible for Monitoring/Reporting:** City of Seaside Public Works Director.

**Significant and Unavoidable Cumulative Impact – Intersection LOS Below Standards and Additional Delay: Monterey Road/California Avenue and Fremont Boulevard/Monterey Road.** Cumulative traffic increases would result in operations below acceptable levels of service and increased delay at these intersections during both peak hours. The FORA development fee could be used, in part, to fund improvements to these intersections and the adjacent section of State Highway 1. However, the timeframe for completion of the improvements is unknown and therefore this mitigation measure would not avoid levels of service below acceptable standards at these intersections during the interim period. Therefore, this is a significant unavoidable impact of uncertain duration. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**Significant and Unavoidable Cumulative (General Plan) Impact – Intersection LOS Below Standards: Lightfighter Drive/General Jim Moore Boulevard and Fremont Boulevard/ Del Monte Boulevard.** Traffic increases through cumulative and/or general plan build-out would result in operations below acceptable levels of service at these intersections during both peak hours. Even with improvements suggested in the TIA and the State Highway 1 PSR, levels of service are expected to remain unacceptable indefinitely. A southbound and westbound left turn lane at the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection would improve levels of service but not to acceptable levels, and these improvements are not part of the State Highway 1 PSR improvements. This would be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 48 presented above, would reduce impacts at the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersection, but not to a less than significant level. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**Significant and Unavoidable Cumulative (General Plan) Impact – Highway LOS Decrease to LOS F: State Highway 68 east of State Highway 218, and State Highway 218 east of General Jim Moore Boulevard.** These highway segments would operate at LOS F under general plan build-out conditions. The FORA development fee could be used, in part, to fund improvements to these highways. However, the timeframe for funding and completion of the improvements is unknown and therefore this mitigation measure would not avoid levels of service below acceptable standards on these roads during the interim period. Therefore, this is a significant unavoidable impact of uncertain duration. A statement of overriding considerations would be required in order to approve the Project.

**Less Than Significant (General Plan) Impact – Highway Decrease to LOS F.** State Highway 152 is projected to degrade to LOS F under general plan build-out conditions. However, this highway is expected to be widened to four lanes by approximately 2015. The additional lanes would result in acceptable operating conditions. Therefore, no significant impact is expected at general plan build-out.

---

## 3.0 Related Environmental Issues

---

### 3.1 Cumulative Impacts

#### ***CEQA Requirements***

CEQA Guidelines section 15130 requires a discussion of the significant cumulative impacts associated with the project. A cumulative impact is 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. This section contains an updated summary of cumulative hydrology and traffic effects. Further discussion of cumulative impacts is presented in Section 2.0 Environmental Setting, Analysis, and Mitigation Measures.

#### ***Cumulative Water Supply***

The cumulative water supply scenario for the Draft EIR and this Revised Draft EIR is based on build-out of the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*. Since circulation of the Draft EIR, several changes to the environmental setting for water supply have taken place that affect the cumulative water supply analysis.

The City's Fort Ord water allocation from FORA has been increased from 710 acre-feet to 748 acre-feet. The City approved The First Tee project and by City Council Resolution No. 03-06 assigned 110 acre-feet of the City's Fort Ord water allocation to that project. Based on an analysis of the City's Fort Ord allotment presented in Section 2.1 Hydrology and Water Supply, there is adequate water for the Project and some additional planned uses. It is expected that there will not be adequate water for all planned uses at build-out without an augmentation supply. Mitigation Measure 46 presented in Section 2.1 Hydrology and Water Supply in the Draft EIR requires use of recycled water to extend the current allocation to the extent possible.

In terms of cumulative water use, development of the former Fort Ord is restricted to what can be supported by the 6,600 acre-foot allocation, until a new supply source is available to augment the current groundwater allocation. No changes have taken place to the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan* land uses, so build-out demand is unchanged.

In April 2003, voters approved tax assessment funding for the Salinas Valley Water Project, which includes a Salinas River diversion and coastal recharge component that counters seawater intrusion in coastal Monterey County. Although the Project's water would come from the historic 6,600 acre-foot Fort Ord allocation, the diversion and recharge project reduces concerns about cumulative overdraft of the aquifer from this and other water demands on the aquifer.

## **Cumulative Traffic**

The Draft EIR traffic analysis was based on a cumulative projects list. Since circulation of the Draft EIR, several of the projects included on that list have been approved, built, or dropped. A new cumulative projects list was prepared by the City in April 2004 for use in preparing the revised TIA. Those approved and pending projects are listed in Tables 5 and 10 in Section 2.2 Traffic.

Several cumulative traffic scenarios were considered in this Revised Draft EIR: conditions with approved and pending projects; conditions at general plan build-out with the new State Highway 1 interchange, and conditions at general plan build-out without construction of the new State Highway 1 interchange. For the approved and pending projects scenario, it was assumed that the road network and intersection controls were the same as existing conditions. For the general plan build-out scenarios, it was assumed that the State Highway 1 PSR improvements were constructed (with and without the new interchange).

### **Conditions with Approved and Pending Projects**

Under this scenario, one additional intersection (General Jim Moore Boulevard/Lightfighter Drive) degrades to an unacceptable level of service compared to project conditions.

### **Conditions at General Plan Build-Out**

General plan build-out levels of service at studied intersections would be the same with or without the new interchange, although delays are slightly greater without the interchange.

Under this scenario, the two intersections near the State Highway 1 Fremont Boulevard interchange improve to acceptable levels of service. The Lightfighter Drive/General Jim Moore Boulevard and Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersections have unacceptable conditions that cannot be mitigated. The General Jim Moore Boulevard/McClure Way intersection would require a signal.

## **3.2 Growth-Inducing Impacts**

The changes in the environmental setting do not affect the analysis of growth-inducing impacts in the Draft EIR. The Project would not induce growth beyond that already planned in the *Fort Ord Reuse Plan*.

### **3.3 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes**

The changes in the environmental setting do not affect the analysis of significant irreversible environmental changes attributable to the Project.

### **3.4 Unavoidable Significant Adverse Environmental Impacts**

The Project would result in several significant unavoidable traffic impacts as determined by the revised traffic analysis. Although the Draft EIR identified a number of significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, the revised traffic analysis indicated that some of these impacts would not longer occur, and that some new significant impacts would occur. These changes are noted in Table S-1 in the Summary.

At the Monterey Road/California Avenue and Fremont Boulevard/Monterey Road intersections, the significant and unavoidable impact would be of unknown duration, until the State Highway 1 PSR improvements can be constructed. The significant and unavoidable effects at the Lightfighter Drive/General Jim Moore Boulevard and Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard intersections would be indefinite, since no feasible mitigation measures are available. Refer to Section 2.2 Traffic for further discussion.

### **3.5 Alternatives**

The alternatives studied in the Draft EIR remain viable alternatives. No feasible project alternative considerably different from those previously analyzed in the Draft EIR has been identified that would clearly lessen the significant impacts of the Project. The new information does not affect the analysis or ranking of the alternatives studied in the Draft EIR. No further study of alternatives is necessary.

*This side intentionally left blank.*



---

## 4.0 Documentation

---

### 4.1 Persons Contacted

Kristiann Choy, Engineer, Fehr and Peers

Steve Endsley, Fort Ord Reuse Authority

Jim Feeney, Fort Ord Reuse Authority

Tim O'Halloran, City of Seaside Engineer

Jeffery Morgan, Transportation Agency for Monterey County

Scott Phillips, Regional Water Quality Control Board

Terry Roberts, Director, Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse

### 4.2 Literature Cited

Denise Duffy and Associates. *The First Tee EIR*. February 2003.

EMC Planning Group Inc. and EDAW. *Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR*. 1997.

Environmental Protection Agency. *8-Hour Ground-level Ozone Designations*. April 2004.

Fehr and Peers Associates. *Seaside Resort TIA*. May, 2004.

Fort Ord Reuse Authority. *Fort Ord Reuse Plan, Volume 1 Context and Framework*. June 13, 1997 (as republished August 2001).

Fort Ord Reuse Authority. *Fort Ord Reuse Plan, Business and Operations Plan. Land Use Inventory and Demand Forecasts – Water PFIP 2-7*. 1997.

Fort Ord Reuse Authority. *Capital Improvement Program FY 2003/2004 Through 2021/2022*.

Higgins Associates. *Seaside Resort Traffic Analysis Study, Administrative Draft*. July 6, 2001.

Higgins Associates. *Seaside Resort, Parking and TDM addendum*. January 17, 2002.

Seaside, City of. *Seaside General Plan*. 1995, and 1998 Fort Ord Land Amendment.

Seaside, City of. Draft *Seaside General Plan*. September 2003 and April 2004 errata sheet.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County. *Traffic Congestion Management Program*. March 1994.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County. *Fort Ord Regional Transportation Study*. 1997.

Transportation Agency for Monterey County. *2002 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan*. February 27, 2002.

## 4.3 Document Preparation

### ***EMC Planning Group Inc.***

Michael J. Groves, AICP, Senior Principal  
Principal In Charge/Project Manager

Richard K. James, AICP, Senior Planner  
Report Preparation and Assistant Project Manager

EJ Kim, Desktop Publishing Specialist  
Document Production

### ***Fehr and Peers Associates***

Kristiann Choy, Senior Engineer/Planner III  
Traffic Impact Analysis

Eric Bollich, Engineer/Planner I  
Traffic Impact Analysis