



1300 I STREET, SUITE 125
P.O. BOX 944255
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2550

Public: (916) 445-9555
Telephone: (916) 210-7797
Facsimile: (916) 327-2319
E-Mail: Nicole.Rinke@doj.ca.gov

October 25, 2019

Planning Commission of Monterey County
Monterey County Resource Management Agency
Attn: Mike Novo
1441 Schilling Place – South, 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
Sent via email: novom@co.monterey.ca.us

Re: Paraiso Springs Resort, Project No. PLN040183

Dear Mr. Novo and Commissioners,

We appreciate your preparation of a Final Environment Impact Report (“FEIR”) responding to public comments on the previous two Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Reports (“RDEIRs”), including the comments we submitted on March 20, 2019 and July 9, 2019 regarding wildfire risks associated with the proposed Paraiso Springs Resort Development (the “Project”). After reviewing the additional information presented, we acknowledge and appreciate that you have provided more information regarding wildfire risks associated with the proposed Project and have revised certain mitigation measures to address some of those wildfire risks. While the additional information improves the Project and the environmental documents, we remain concerned that the Project still does not comply with state evacuation and fire suppression access requirements for development in a State Responsibility Area (“SRA”).¹ In addition, the FEIR’s discussion of the wildfire risks associated with the Project, particularly related to evacuation in the event of a wildfire, remains inadequate.

The Project does not comply with the state’s dead-end road limitations and road width limitations applicable to development within an SRA. (Cal. Code. Regs., tit. 14, §§ 1273.08 and 1273.01; adopted pursuant to Pub. Resources Code § 4290.) In response to our July 9, 2019 comments regarding the Project’s failure to comply with SRA regulations, the FEIR claims that Paraiso Springs Road is an existing road and thus exempt from such regulations. (FEIR, p. 617.) In support of such an exemption, the FEIR cites to Monterey County Code section 18.56.020(B)(2)(a) which states “[r]egulations contained in this chapter do not apply to the following building, construction, or development activities... (a) Existing structures, roads,

¹ This letter is not intended, and should not be construed, as an exhaustive discussion of the FEIR’s compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) or the Project’s compliance with other applicable legal requirements.

streets and private lanes or facilities.” (FEIR, p. 23.) However, neither the Monterey County Code nor the SRA regulations support an exemption for this Project for several reasons.

First, whether Paraiso Springs Road is an existing road is inconsequential. Paraiso Springs Road will now be the *sole* access to new commercial construction within an SRA. (February 2018 RDEIR, p. 2-45.) SRA regulations explicitly “apply to: (1) the perimeters and *access to* all residential, commercial, and industrial building construction within the SRA approved after January 1, 1991....” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 1270.02, emphasis added.) It is indisputable that the Project involves commercial building construction within the SRA approved after January 1, 1991. Thus, the Monterey County Code exemption for existing roads is inapposite – the Paraiso Springs Road is now “access” to a Project that falls within the scope of the SRA regulations. In addition, the SRA regulations do not expressly exempt all existing roads. (14 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 1270.02(d) [exempting “[r]oads used solely for agricultural, mining, or the management and harvesting of wood products”].) The Monterey County Code cannot be read to apply less stringent standards than the SRA regulations because counties that assume responsibility for fire prevention and suppression in SRAs must “provide[] the same or higher intensity of fire protection to these lands as is provided under existing levels of state protection in other comparable areas of the state.” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 1658.)

Second, contrary to the assertions in the FEIR (p. 22), the problems with the existing road cannot be cured through an exception pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 1270.06 (outlining a process to apply for an exception to the applicability of the SRA regulations). An exception under that regulation still must provide “the same practical effect as” the SRA regulations. As the FEIR acknowledges, “the Fire Protection Plan cannot modify the dead-end nature of the road” (p. 618). Accordingly, the practical effect of prohibiting dead-end roads of certain lengths in an SRA, which are important to timely evacuation and fire suppression access, cannot be achieved through an exception. In addition, the Project applicant has not applied for an exception. (FEIR, p. 23.)

Third, annexation of Project land into the Mission-Soledad Rural Fire Protection District will not cure violations of the SRA regulations (see FEIR, p. 23 [describing annexation].) Annexation does not exempt a project from SRA regulations. Land can be both within a fire protection district and within the SRA. (Health & Saf. Code § 13811.)


Finally, we note that exempting the Project from the SRA regulations simply because Paraiso Springs Road is a pre-existing road would undermine the intent of the SRA regulations. SRA regulations are meant to ensure that “[t]he future design and construction of structures, subdivisions and developments in the SRA shall provide for basic emergency access....” (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 1270.01(b).) Constructing a new resort that includes a nearly 150,000 square foot hotel, an over 18,000 square foot “hamlet” with a spa and retail buildings, and over 75 timeshare units (February 2018 RDEIR, pp. 2-20, 2-27) at the end of a narrow road that exceeds the dead-end road regulations undermines emergency access in the SRA. While this road may have been exempt from SRA width and dead-end road limitations prior to development

of the Project, there is no basis for an interpretation that allows construction within the SRA of a large new resort that would depend upon the use of that road for the sole emergency access to and evacuation from the Project. It is the construction of a new project that triggers the application of the SRA regulations; the fact that the Project is being constructed at the end of an existing road does not negate the triggering effect of the new construction. A contrary interpretation would incentivize development without adequate evacuation routes and emergency access in the SRA rather than prevent it.

From a CEQA perspective, the concerns with SRA non-compliance are exacerbated by the gaps that remain in the disclosures the County is providing related to the wildfire risks associated with the Project and specifically the risks associated with evacuation. We will not reiterate our previous comments here, but at this time note the following continuing concerns related to evacuation: (1) the analysis related to evacuees trying to leave the site while emergency response personnel are trying to access the site remains inadequate and conclusory (FEIR, p. 623 [citing back to the Fire Protection Plan and the Wildland Fire Evacuation Plan, which identifies the issue (June 2019 RDEIR, p. 164), but does not describe how it will be addressed]); and (2) the reasonableness of the evacuation time – estimated to be a minimum of 17-18 minutes - has not been defined or compared to a standard of significance, nor is it supported by substantial evidence (June 2019 RDEIR, pp. 61, 140, 141-142).²

We appreciate your consideration of our comments and respectfully request that you refrain from certifying the FEIR until it is revised accordingly and refrain from approving the Project until it complies with the SRA. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,



NICOLE U. RINKE
Deputy Attorney General
HEATHER LESLIE
Deputy Attorney General

For XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General

² We also note that some of our previous comments have not been as fully addressed as would be desirable to fully inform decision-makers and the public. For example, the FEIR assumes that the Project will exacerbate wildfire risk, but does not describe the risk in any detail, making it more difficult to evaluate and address that risk and the associated issues related to evacuation. (See June 2019 RDEIR, p. 64.)