March 20, 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,

Our office has reviewed the Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) and the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) for the proposed Paraiso Springs Resort Development (“Project”) and respectfully submits the following comments. We request that you consider our comments prior to certifying the FEIR. We spoke with County Counsel and staff on March 20, 2019 and alerted them we would be submitting comments prior to your consideration of the FEIR at your March 27, 2019 Planning Commission meeting.

The Attorney General’s Office submits these comments pursuant to the Attorney General’s independent power and duty to protect the environment and natural resources of the State from pollution, impairment, or destruction, and in furtherance of the public interest. (See Cal. Const., art. V, § 13; Gov. Code, §§ 12511, 12600-12612; D’Amico v. Bd. of Medical Examiners (1974) 11 Cal.3d 1, 14-15.) In the wake of the State’s deadliest wildfires this past year and the increased occurrence of fires anticipated throughout the State in coming years, it is particularly important that local jurisdictions carefully review and consider new developments in fire prone areas. This is particularly important for new developments proposed in the wildland urban interface or in other relatively undeveloped and remote areas, like the area where the Project is proposed.

Paraiso Springs Resort, LLC, proposes to develop a spa resort along the floor of a canyon in the foothills at the end of rural Paraiso Springs Road in a “very high fire sensitivity

---

1 This letter is not intended, and should not be construed, as an exhaustive discussion of the FEIR’s and DEIR’s compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) or the Project’s compliance with other applicable legal requirements.
zone.” The Project site is bordered to the east by grazing and farm land, and to the north, south and west by the Santa Lucia Mountains. (DEIR 2-1.) The Project site was previously operated as a commercial hot springs resort beginning in 1874. (DEIR 3-137.) The site has seen several fires over the years that have destroyed various structures on the Property, including a fire in 1891 that destroyed one of the more substantial buildings on the property, a fire in 1928 that destroyed the hotel, the bathhouse, a garage, the dance hall, and some other smaller buildings, and another major fire in 1954 that destroyed the rebuilt hotel and annex. (DEIR 2-15, 3-137-3-138.)

Paraiso Springs Road, the sole ingress and egress to the site, is a narrow, two-lane road varying in width from 16 to 22 feet that dead ends at the Project site. (DEIR 2-45.) The road currently serves approximately 90 vehicles per day associated with single-family residences and local vineyards. (DEIR 3-329.) The Project would include the development of 103 hotel rooms, 77 multi-bedroom timeshare units, three restaurants, entertainment facilities, and various spa amenities at the end of this narrow two-lane rural road. (DEIR 2-17 – 2-18.) It is anticipated that there would be several hundred people at the resort on peak days. With the Project at 100% occupancy, there would be over 400 additional vehicle trips per day on the road. (DEIR 3-336.) Additionally, because of parking limitations at the proposed Project site and limitations with the capacity of the rural access road, the Project proposes to shuttle in many of the guests and 90% of all employees from a parking lot nearly two miles away. (DEIR 3-335 – 3-336.)

Monterey County, as the lead agency, has prepared a FEIR for the proposed Project. Despite the acknowledgment that the Project is located in a “very high fire sensitivity zone,” the FEIR fails to adequately address the risk of fire in several important respects.

---

2 In response to CalFire’s comments on the DEIR, the FEIR suggests that there is a service road for ingress and egress at the rear of the development. (FEIR, Response to comment letter No. 18, 2-12.) The response cites to maps within the DEIR. (Ibid.) These maps show service roads within the development, but these roads do not appear to provide ingress and egress to the Project site.

3 We note that several commenters questioned whether the traffic analysis for the Project underestimated the trips that will be associated with the Project. (See, e.g., FEIR, Comment Letter 10 (p 20-23).) While we have not evaluated the adequacy of the traffic analysis, we are concerned that the number of visitors accessing the site may be even higher than anticipated in the FEIR, which would exacerbate our concerns regarding the risks associated with wildfires and the FEIR’s inadequate analysis of those risks.

4 We understand that LandWatch submitted comments to the County on January 15, 2019 raising many of these same issues. The FEIR does not include a response to these comments.
I. **THE FEIR MUST ANALYZE THE INCREASED RISK OF WILDFIRE THAT WILL RESULT FROM THE PROJECT.**

The FEIR does not, but should, analyze the increased risk of wildfire that will result from siting the proposed development within a high fire sensitivity zone. The DEIR discussed emergency access to the site in the event of fire and onsite measures to provide fire protection. However, the DEIR did not disclose that locating new development in a high fire sensitivity zone will itself increase the risk of fire and, as a result, increase the risk of exposing existing residents in the area as well as guests and employees of the resort to an increased risk of fire. (See CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2, subd. (a) [requiring the evaluation of potentially significant environmental impacts of locating development in areas susceptible to hazardous conditions such as wildfire risk areas, especially as identified in hazard maps and risk assessments].) It is well-accepted that building in wildland areas increases the risk and severity of fires. The California

---

5 A preliminary fire protection plan was prepared for the Project. (DEIR 2-55.) Fire protection elements include hydrants, sprinkler systems, and the use of fire-resistant building materials. (DEIR 2-55 – 2-56.) The Project also includes vegetation management for defensible space. (See e.g., DEIR 3-81 – 3-80.) Cal Fire’s Department of Forestry and Fire Protection commented on, among other issues, the adequacy of the vegetation management discussed in the DEIR. (FEIR Comment Letter 18.) In response to these comments, the FEIR simply refers back to the DEIR and does not provide any additional commitments or project modifications. (FEIR, Responses to Comment Letter 18, 2-12.)

6 Our comments are based on the CEQA Guidelines in effect prior to the recent 2019 update, but it is worth noting that the update confirms and clarifies the need to consider wildfire risks as part of the environmental review for new developments subject to CEQA.

7 See, e.g., Rapid Growth of the U.S. Wildland-Urban Interface Raises Wildfire Risk (February 6, 2018) (https://www.pnas.org/content/pnas/115/13/3314.full.pdf); New York Times, Climate Change is Fueling Wildfires Nationwide, New Report Warns (November, 2018) (https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/11/27/climate/wildfire-global-warming.html); Scientific American, Living on the Edge: Wildfires Pose a Growing Risk to Homes Built Near Wilderness Areas (https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/living-on-the-edge-wildfires-pose-a-growing-risk-to-homes-built-near-wilderness-areas/); USDA, Wildfire, Wildlands, and People: Understanding and Preparing for Wildfire in the Wildland-Urban Interface (January 2013) (https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr299.pdf). While these articles and reports largely focus on the risks of locating housing within fire-prone areas, the same risks would appear to apply for commercial establishments offering overnight lodging. The issue with locating development in these areas is that most fires are human induced, so bringing people into wildland areas creates an increased risk that fire will occur. (Ibid.) In addition, the risks of fire are exacerbated because development in wildland areas alters the natural environment (e.g., it fragments native vegetation, introduces nonnatives species, and disturbs soils). (See Rapid Growth of the U.S. Wildland-Urban Interface Raises Wildfire Risk (February 6, 2018) (https://www.pnas.org/content/pnas/115/13/3314.full.pdf).) Further, fire management in developed wildland areas is more challenging because it is more difficult to fight fires in these
Supreme Court has confirmed that this kind of risk must be considered as part of the CEQA analysis for a proposed project. *California Building Industry Assn. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management Dist.* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 369, 388 [holding that while CEQA does not require consideration of the environment’s effect on a project, it does require analysis of the project’s impacts on the existing environment].

Concerns regarding the Project’s impact on the occurrence of wildfires were raised in public comments on the DEIR. For example, Lois Panzier noted that “[w]hen more people are added to a high severity fire area, the potential for fires will occur.” (FEIR, Letter 7, Comment 75.) In response, the FEIR simply refers back to the DEIR. (FEIR 2-58 – 2-59.) However, as explained above, the DEIR did not address the increased risk of fires that will result from locating new development within a high fire sensitivity zone. The County should address these issues prior to certifying the FEIR.

II. THE FEIR SHOULD ADDRESS EVACUATION IN THE EVENT OF FIRE.

Based upon the onsite fire fighting infrastructure (sprinkler systems, etc.) and the Project proponent’s commitment to develop a fire protection plan, the DEIR concludes that the “occupants would be protected to the extent possible in the case of fire” such that the potential impacts associated with wildfire hazards would be less than significant. (DEIR 3-215 – 3-216.) The DEIR describes emergency access to the site, but does not address: (i) the evacuation of employees and guests in the event of a fire, (ii) the increased challenges that existing users of the sole ingress and egress road will face in the event of an evacuation due to the added users on the road, or (iii) the increased challenges that firefighters and emergency responders would face accessing the site and preventing the spread of a wildfire due to the simultaneous evacuation of guests and employees from the Project and neighboring areas. The EIR should include a more robust discussion of the fire hazards and describe the evacuation plan for guests and employees, as well as neighboring residents and existing users of Paraiso Springs Road. (See *Clews Land & Livestock, LLC v. City of San Diego* (2017) 19 Cal.App.5th 161, 194 [discussing whether or not the EIR adequately considered the risk of fire to future users of the project site, including acceptable evacuation plans]; *California Clean Energy Committee v. County of Placer* (Cal. Ct. App., Dec. 22, 2015, No. C072680) 2015 WL 9412772 [concluding that the EIR failed to adequately evaluate evacuation issues associated with the project].)

In response to public comments, including from CalFire’s Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, asking about evacuation plans (see Comment Letter 18 starting on FEIR 2-11), the FEIR promises that a final Fire Protection Plan that includes evacuation procedures will be developed. (FEIR 2-12.) Meaningful analysis of the risk of fire and evacuation plans should not be deferred until after the FEIR is certified and the Project is approved. (See CEQA Guidelines landscapes and fire management strategies that allow natural fires to burn are not an option. *Ibid.;* see also *USDA, Wildfire, Wildlands, and People: Understanding and Preparing for Wildfire in the Wildland-Urban Interface* (January 2013) (https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr299.pdf).)
Section 15126.4(a)(1)(B). While the deferment of mitigation measures may sometimes be appropriate, here no basis has been provided for why the evacuation plan was not already prepared as part of the DEIR or FEIR, nor have any performance standards or potential mitigation measures been identified. (Ibid; see also, e.g., San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 645, 671.) A mitigation measure that included development of a post-FEIR management plan was found to be improperly deferred mitigation where no basis was provided for why the development of mitigation measures needed to be deferred to future plans and, no specific criteria, performance standards, or potential mitigation measures were set forth in the EIR. In addition, based on the discussion in the DEIR, we are concerned that the Fire Protection Plan, when it is developed, may not adequately address the totality of issues related to evacuation (see above).

III. THE PROJECT MUST COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR STATE RESPONSIBILITY AREAS.

The Project is located in a State Responsibility Area, which is an area for which the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection has designated the State to be financially responsible for preventing and suppressing fires. (Pub. Resources Code, § 4102.) Local jurisdictions may adopt standards for wildfire protections in State Responsibility Areas, but those standards must be at least as stringent as the State’s minimum standards and be certified by the State. (Pub. Resources Code, § 4117.) Monterey County has adopted standards for this purpose. (Monterey County Code, §§ 18.56.010 – 18.56.100.) The proposed Project does not appear to comply with these standards.

First, Paraiso Springs Road is a dead end road that terminates at the proposed Project location. Both the County and State standards limit dead end roads to a cumulative length not to exceed 5,280 feet. (Monterey County Code § 18.56.060(11); Cal. Code. Regs., tit. 14, § 1273.09.) The Paraiso Springs Road that would serve as the sole ingress and egress for the Project is 1.9 miles long or 10,032 feet according to Google maps, nearly double the allowable limit. The FEIR and DEIR do not address the Project’s failure to comply with the length limitation for dead end roads in State Responsibility Areas.

Second, the width of Paraiso Springs Road will not comply with the local or State standards. State standards generally require a minimum of two 10-foot traffic lanes. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 1273.01.) The Project proposes to widen “the majority of Paraiso Springs Road to either 18 or 20 feet wide.” (DEIR 3-340.) However, the FEIR explains that the road will only be widened “where feasible.” (FEIR 2-10.) The Project proponent should commit to widening not just a majority of the road, but the entirety of the road, to a distance that complies with the applicable standards.

---

8 The County requires that all roads have a minimum of two 9-foot traffic lanes. (Monterey County Code, § 18.56.060(3).) Therefore, the State’s more stringent requirement would control.
IV. THE PROJECT SHOULD PROVIDE PROXIMAL ACCESS TO A FIRE STATION.

Despite a request from the local fire district, the Project proponent has declined to construct a small fire station onsite, concluding that it would be “incompatible with resort operations.” (DEIR 3-307.) The closest fire station is nine miles away, which the program Google Maps reports is an 18-minute drive. The DEIR claims the fire station is within the 15 minutes recommended by the applicable Monterey County General Plan. (DEIR 3-307.) Public comments on the DEIR noted the Project site is not within a 15-minute response time from the Soledad fire station. (See, e.g., Letter 7, Comment 74 starting on FEIR 2-33 and Letter 8, Comment 5 starting on FEIR 2-61). Rather than provide factual support for the DEIR’s claim that the fire station is within 15 minutes from the Project site or revise the Project so that it complies with the Monterey County General Plan recommendation, the FEIR simply restates the DEIR’s conclusion that “the project would not warrant construction of new or expanded facilities in order to maintain ... response times....” (FEIR 2-11). The FEIR should be revised to accurately reflect the distance of the nearest fire station to the Project site and should require compliance with the policy prescribed by the General Plan—preferably with construction of a fire station onsite as requested by the local fire district.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments and respectfully request that you defer certification of the FEIR and approval of the Project until you more fully address the risks of wildfire associated with the Project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

NICOLE U. RINKER
Deputy Attorney General
HEATHER C. LESLIE
Deputy Attorney General

For XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General