

# **Appendix H. Summary Comparison of No-Action and Proposed Disposal Action**

---

Table H-1.1. Summary Comparison of No-Action and Proposed Disposal Action

| Issue Area                                     | Proposed Action (Disposal) Impact   | No-Action (Caretaker Status) Impact                                       |
|--|---|---|
| Land Use                                       | Potential temporary land use conflicts between interim uses allowed by Army and necessary remediation activities  | No conflicts  |
| Socioeconomics                                 | <p>Temporary population growth and an accompanying demand for housing compared to Army ownership of property (positive effect)</p> <p>Temporary generation of new spending and employment compared to Army ownership of property (positive effect)</p> <p>Increase in the county property tax base compared to Army ownership of property (positive effect)</p> <p>Decreased demand for community services and job opportunity programs compared to Army ownership of property (positive effect)</p> <p>Short term potential minor negative impact on local land markets compared to Army ownership of property</p> | No increase or decrease in socioeconomic factors                          |
| Soils, Geology, Topography, and Seismicity     | None  | None  |
| Public Services and Utilities                  | <p>Potential lack of adequate access to infrastructure facilities</p> <p>Degradation of services because of reduced facilities maintenance</p>  | Potential utility system deterioration<br>Reduced property maintenance    |
| Water Resources                                | None  | None  |
| Public Health and Safety                       | <p>Slight increase in demand for law enforcement, fire protection, and medical services</p> <p>Seismic safety risk for interim-leased structures (effect considered minor)</p>  | Reduced levels of security and emergency services                         |
| Traffic and Circulation                        | Interruption of access between the motor pool area and the POM Annex area   | No interruption of access   |
| Air Quality                                    | Exposure of the public to asbestos during building demolition or after transfer of buildings to third parties   | Exposure of the public to asbestos during building demolition             |
| Noise  | Potential for short-term excessive noise from remedial action activities (short term and considered minor)  | Potential increase in noise from building demolition                      |
| Hazardous and Toxic Waste Site Remedial Action | Potential risks to public health and safety associated with hazardous materials   | Potential risks to public health from asbestos during building demolition |

Table H-1. Continued

| Issue Area                                  | Proposed Action (Disposal) Impact   | No-Action (Carelaker Status) Impact                               |
|---|---|---|
| Ordnance and Explosives                     | Potential risks to public health and safety associated with unexploded ordnance and explosives  | No increased risk   |
| Vegetation, Wildlife, and Wetland Resources | Loss of federal protection for Monterey spineflower   | Decreased federal protection for all sensitive biological species |
| Visual Resources                            | None  | None  |
| Cultural Resources                          | None  | None  |
| Coastal Resources                           | None  | Reduced pollutant runoff to Monterey Bay Sanctuary                |
| Cumulative Impacts                          | Incremental increases in new properties on the market, structures available for interim lease that do not meet seismic safety construction standards, number of near-term remediation sites, acres of Monterey spineflower that would lose federal protection | No significant cumulative effects                                 |

Table H-2. Summary Comparison of No-Action and Potential Reuse Action

| Action (issue area) | Potential Reuse Action Impact  | No-Action (Caretaker Status) Impact   |
|---------------------|--|---|
| Land Use            | <p>Potential incompatibility of coastal zone development in parcels 13 and 14a with natural habitat resources</p> <p>Potential incompatibility of coastal zone development in parcels 13 and 14a with the Disturbed Habitat Zone</p> <p>Potential incompatibility of Natural Area Expansion with Office Park and Resort Hotel in Parcels 31b and 29a</p> <p>Potential incompatibility of Natural Area Expansion with Golf Course in Parcel 29a</p> <p>Public safety, noise, and light and glare risks associated with adjacent and conflicting land uses. (Public Safety Training Center and other public uses in parcels 11b, 17b and 25)</p> <p>Potential land use conflict from trespassing into impact areas with UXO and other OE</p> <p>Deviations from current local plans and policies on development and growth likely to affect the character of the Monterey Peninsula</p> <p>Conflicts between planned roadways and proposed land uses and between land uses</p> | <p>No potential land use incompatibilities or conflicts with existing plans</p> |
| Socioeconomics      | <p>Increase of approximately 41,500 residents (environmentally neutral effect)</p> <p>Development of approximately 13,800 housing Units (positive effect)</p> <p>Generation of approximately 58,500 jobs (positive effect)</p> <p>Generation of approximately \$7.0 billion in industrial output (positive effect)</p> <p>Generation of approximately \$2.8 billion in personal income (positive effect)</p>   | <p>No increase or decrease in socioeconomic factors</p>                         |

Table H-2. Continued

| Action (issue area)                                  | Potential Reuse Action Impact   | No-Action (Caretaker Status) Impact   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Socioeconomics (continued)</b>                    | <p>Net increase in Monterey County's population (environmentally neutral effect)</p> <p>Increased imbalance of jobs to housing ratio</p> <p>Economic growth in the Monterey Peninsula region (positive effect)</p> <p>Decreased demand for community services compared to the ROD, such as welfare payments and crisis intervention programs (positive effect)</p>  |   |
| <b>Soils, Geology, Topography, and Seismicity</b>    | <p>Loss of facilities to coastal erosion</p> <p>Severe engineering limitations because of sandy, unaggregated soils</p> <p>Existing and new structures susceptible to damage from ground shaking</p> <p>Disturbance or loss of existing soil resources through excavation, grading, paving, landscaping</p> <p>Increased hazard of wind and water erosion and landslide susceptibility</p> <p>Suppression of low-temperature natural wildfires, resulting in a buildup of fuel and eventual high-temperature wildfire</p> | <p>Loss of facilities to coastal erosion</p> <p>Existing structures susceptible to damage from ground shaking</p>                         |
| <b>Public Services and Utilities</b>                 | <p>Increased demand for services and utilities (wastewater treatment, solid waste, telephone, gas, electric, storm drainage, cable TV, water distribution, recreation sites, schools)</p>   | <p>No increase in demand for services and utilities</p> <p>Reduced property maintenance</p> <p>Potential utility system deterioration</p> |
| <b>Water Resources--Water Supply and Demand</b>      | <p>Increased demand for water</p> <p>Potential increases in groundwater recharge (positive effect)</p>  | <p>No increase in demand for water</p>  |
| <b>Water Resources-- Hydrology and Water Quality</b> | <p>Increases in site runoff</p> <p>Risk of flood damage from development in 100-year floodplain</p>   | <p>No change in hydrology or water quality</p>  |

Table H-2. Continued

| Action (Issue area)                                       | Potential Reuse Action Impact  | No-Action (Caretaker Status) Impact                                      |
|---|--|--|
| Water Resources-- Hydrology and Water Quality (continued) | Water quality degradation from urban development, construction-related erosion, and hazardous material spills                                      |  |
| Public Health and Safety                                  | Increased demand for law enforcement officers by local jurisdictions   | Reduced levels of security and emergency services                        |
|   | Increased demand for firefighters  |  |
|   | Increased demand for medical and emergency medical services  |  |
| Traffic and Circulation                                   | Increased travel on former Fort Ord and travel between former Fort Ord and surrounding communities   | No increase in travel  |
| Air Quality   | Uncontrolled PM10 construction emissions of 55 ppd (below significance thresholds)   | Exposure of the public to asbestos during building demolition            |
|   | Increase in CO concentrations from areawide vehicle trips compared to 7th IDL presence, but below significance thresholds                          |  |
| Noise   | Increase in noise along roadway segments, affecting noise-sensitive land uses (primarily residential)  | No increase in noise from traffic  |
|   | Increased and excessive noise from traffic on new noise-sensitive land uses  | Potential noise increase from building demolition                        |
|   | Potential exposure of the RV park/campground, residential land uses, and the NRMA to noise from the public safety and peace officer training areas |  |
| Hazardous Materials and Toxic Waste                       | Exposure to hazardous materials including asbestos and lead-based paints   | Potential risk to public health from asbestos during building demolition |
|   | Hazardous and toxic waste sites and associated plumes of VOC may affect groundwater  |  |
|   | Potential for increased soil and groundwater contamination and risk to human health or the environment associated with reuse of the landfill       |  |

Table H-2. Continued

| Action (issue area)   | Potential Reuse Action Impact   | No-Action (Caretaker Status) Impact  |
|---|---|--|
| Hazardous Materials and Toxic Waste (continued)                         | <p>Potential for increased hazardous waste generation associated with reuse of Fritzsche Army Airfield</p> <p>Planned road segments cross hazardous and toxic waste remediation sites</p>   | No increased risk  |
| Ordnance and Explosives   | <p>Exposure to unexploded ordnance and explosives</p> <p>Risk to construction workers at planned development sites bordering the inland range</p>   | No increased risk  |
| Vegetation Resources-- Common and Special Native Biological Communities | <p>Loss or Degradation of Common and Special Native Biological Communities due to development</p> <p>Loss of populations and habitat of special-status plant and wildlife due to development</p> <p>Losses of biological resources beyond those described in the original February 1994 HMP due to the proposed road network</p> <p>Overall losses of biological resources beyond those described in the original February 1994 HMP</p> | <p>Decreased protection for all sensitive biological species</p> <p>No losses of population or habitats for sensitive biological species</p> |
| Visual Resources  | <p>Reduced visual unity and intactness for some visually sensitive areas resulting from short- and long-term construction impacts</p> <p>Reduced visual quality of areas seen from SR 1</p> <p>Alterations of views of former Fort Ord from SR1 and 68 and the Salinas Valley</p> <p>Contribution to regional urbanization of the Greater Monterey Bay region.</p>  | None   |
| Cultural Resources  | Potential to adversely affect the visual character of National Register of Historic Places - eligible properties (Stilwell Hall; East Garrison)   | None   |
| Coastal Resources   | Potential inconsistency with California Coastal Act (e.g., impacts on traffic, noise, air and water quality, biological resources)  | Reduced pollutant runoff to Monterey Bay Sanctuary   |

Table H-2. Continued

| Action (issue area)           | Potential Reuse Action Impact   | No-Action (Carelaker Status) Impact |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Coastal Resources (continued) | Potential to alter landforms and remove habitat areas                   |                                     |
|                               | Potential inconsistency with State Parks General Plan                   |                                     |
|                               | Potential increase in urban pollutant loading of Monterey Bay sanctuary |                                     |