

Pebble Beach DEIR Comments

Submitted by: Marie White
3032 Sherman Road
Pebble Beach
831-656-0131

3/22/2004
#71

Date: 22 March 2004

Chapter 23.1, Land Use

Page 8, lines 23 through 26.

As part of the Spanish Bay development the disturbed parts of the Sawmill Gulch Site was to be revegetated. The DEIR states that the revegetation met with mixed success. The reasons for this "mixed success" need to be provided and explained. Also according to page 14, line 5: "Vegetation on the site consists primarily of many small trees and invasive species". This statement sounds less the "mixed success". Accountability for the past preservation and restoration by Pebble Beach Company as part of previous development permits is crucial in determining how stewardship has been handled in the past and how it will be handled in the future. Here are some questions that need to be answered.

1 a) Why was the revegetation unsuccessful? b) Was a revegetation plan developed, beyond the permit conditions mentioned on page 14, before revegetation began? c) If a revegetation plan was not developed, why not? d) Assuming a plan was developed, who developed the plan, were experts involved? e) Who reviewed and approved the plan? f) Who oversaw the plan? g) Were all parts of the plan completed? h) How long were revegetation efforts to continue according to the permits? i) When did efforts stop? j) What was laid out as an alternative to revegetation, if the plan was not successful? k) Has this alternative been implemented, at least to the extent that revegetation failed? If not, why has it not? l) If there was no alternative mitigation if the revegetation failed, why was there not? m) Compliance with the permits County (1984) and CCC (1985) permits for the existing Spanish Bay development should be fulfilled independent of the new Forest Plan. The mitigation discussed in the DEIR should only cover the new Forest Plan. If the mitigation for both developments is allowed to be coalesced into a single mitigation for the current plan, the conservation and preservation intent of the permits for the 1984 and 1985 permits is undermined. Please address this.

Chapter 3.3, Biological Resources

General

Throughout the DEIR, biological resource management is discussed. However, few details are provided on the management. Many of these are probably in the management plans but here are some general questions:

1) In all cases of mitigation, it seems that a qualified scientist, technical expert, or *in the DEIR* government representative should be involved. However, only in a few locations is it identified that such an individual will be involved. Will such an individual be involved in

all biological resource mitigation? If they will not, how will it be ensured that surveys, relocation, replanting, monitoring, etc. are done properly?

2) A government agency should oversee short-term and long-term management of the impacted biological resources. This agency should have the expertise to understand the biological resource involved and the mitigation proposed. What agency will provide this role? Where will agency funds come from in a time when resources are so limited?

3) In terms of biological mitigation, it should be laid out in the DEIR what will happen if resource management or mitigation is not successful. Based on the success of the Sawmill Gulch site for the Spanish Bay mitigation that is discussed in the DEIR, it can be seen that the mitigation is not always successful. Thus, this should be anticipated in all cases and addressed. Also, it should be identified how success will be determined.

4) From looking at the Satellite images in the DEIR, there will be very few areas of contiguous open space left in the Forest. Lack of contiguous open space impacts biological resources. I did not see any section in Chapter 3.3 that addresses the loss of contiguous open space. This issue needs to be addressed on the large-scale and not only on a species by species statement.

3 (cont.)

4

Page 3.3-16, lines 4 –5

“Implement an annual program of erosion control and trail maintenance along trails in the HHNA”. Many of the current steep trails have severe erosion from water. Although mountain biking is prohibited in the forest, it appears to occur on a daily basis, and during wet times of year this contributes to creating tracks which then accelerate erosion. With the center of the trails eroded, pedestrians, equestrians, and mountain bikers are widening the trails to get around the erosion. There is currently no maintenance of the erosion of the trails. 5 a) Who will be responsible for overseeing the trail under the HHNA RMP? b) Is trail maintenance currently required? If it is, why is it not done? c) When contacting Pebble Beach regarding the trail erosion in the past, it appeared that there were not funds to maintain the trails. Where will funds for trail maintenance come from now? d) Will funds be permanently allotted for trail maintenance? e) What office in the county will be responsible for overseeing the RMP and addressing any problems that may occur?

5

Page 3.3-16, 27 – 29

The DEIR states “the applicant shall develop a protocol for implementing monitoring, temporary trail closures, and periodic maintenance that will be incorporated into the HHNA RMP.” 6 a) The development of this protocol should be completed and available for public review as part of the EIR process. b) The protocol incorporated into the HHNA RMP should also be provided publicly so that individuals will know whom to contact with questions or comments.

6

Page 3.3-18, 31 –43.

The FMP estimates forest removal of .22-acre per lot. a) What is the average lot size for this estimate? b) Residents are currently not allowed to remove any Monterey Pine trees over 12 inches, I believe, with approval which is usually dependent on the trees being diseased. Even if buying an existing property that has not been maintained and is heavily forested, the potential buyer will not be allowed to remove trees to add landscaping. The personally conveyed attitude of the Pebble Beach Company and the Monterey County are

7

that we live in a forest and that atmosphere should be preserved. .22-acre per lot seems to be a removal that is far in excess of the regulations that are imposed on current property owners. How is this number justified? 3) Since owners are currently not allowed to remove trees from existing properties for landscaping, under the development plan, are new lots allowed to remove trees for landscaping? If new lots will be cleared for landscaping, then address why this policy is not consistent. 4) Assuming that the policy is not consistent, a new policy needs to be developed. One possible approach would be to allow a percentage of the lot, based on lot size, to be landscaped. This would apply to new lots and existing properties. The percentage would be smaller for larger lots. Please address this approach. 5) Another approach, consistent with current Pebble Beach Company policy, is that no trees are removed for landscaping only the footprint for the house, driveway, and garage. Please address this approach.

7 (cont.)

Page 3.3-40, lines 34 – 45

7 a) What will be done if the loss of habitat for Yadon’s piperia is greater than the predicted 20 acres? b) How would loss of habitat exceeding the predicted amount be mitigated? c) How will the loss of habitat be monitored? d) What government agency will be responsible for overseeing monitoring of Yadon’s piperia habitat?

8

Page 3.3-42, line 25

8 a) The DEIR states “this area would be managed for the long-term health and sustainability of the Gowen cypress/Bishop pine forest.” Details need to be provided on how this area will be managed and who will oversee it?

9

Page 3.3-43, lines 4 – 25

9 a) Protection of Gowen cypress on individual lots is discussed, including how landscaping can be done. However, after properties are bought, homeowners often fail to abide by, or do not even pay attention to restrictions, especially ones for landscaping. How will Pebble Beach Company assure that homeowners comply with protection of the Gowen cypress? b) Will the lots be inspected on a regular basis to assure compliance? If yes, how often and if no, how will compliance be ensured? c) What will be done if a homeowner is out of compliance?

10

Page 3.3-44, line 44

10 a) What is the mitigation plan if the success criterion is not met?

11

Page 3.3-46, line 19

11 a) If indirect impacts cannot be quantified, how cannot it be stated that there will not be an adverse effect? What is the baseline, for determining if there is an adverse effect?

12

Page 3.3-48, lines 41 – 42

12 a) Will a scientist or expert with experience with pine rose be involved in the design and implementation of the preconstruction survey? If not, how will it be ensured that an acceptable survey is designed and implemented? b) Where will results of the survey be maintained?

13

Page 3.3-49, line 19 – 21

13 a) Will a scientist or expert with experience with pine rose be involved in the design and implementation of the replanting the pine rose? If not, how will it be ensured that an acceptable survey is designed and implemented? b) Will monitoring be conducted to determine the success of the replanting? c) If yes, how long will monitoring be done? If not, how will it be determined if replanting was successful? d) What steps will be taken if replanting is not successful?

13 (cont.)

Page 3.3-49, lines 22 –23

14) This statement needs to have details provided. As it is currently stated, it has no real meaning.

Chapter 3.5 – Public Services and Utilities

Page 3.5-7, lines 27 – 37

1 a) Please clarify if any potential source of funding for the additional Deputy is being considered being imposed upon existing residents?

14

Page 3.5-12, lines 18 – 30

2 a) Does the definition of normal and drier concur with long-term records for rainfall that are available from various governmental agencies. If this has not been done, it should be done to compare if the Scenarios are truly representative. The short time span discussed in this section is insufficient to make generalizations about rainfall. In other words, how “normal” was “Scenario 1” and how “dry” was the “Scenario 2” compared to the long-term records. This is needed to be known to determined long-term future impacts.

15

Page 3.5-18, lines 11 – 34

3 a) This section discusses notifying utility owners, water purveyors, and the sewer agency before any outages. How will affected homeowners be notified? b) Will homeowners be notified not only of the impending outage but the duration?

16

Page 3.5-20, lines 18 –32

The loss of contiguous open space for recreation is indeed a loss of the quality and quantity of open space. As a resident of Pebble Beach, I frequently use the trails. One currently has the ability to go into many areas where one is away from development. The quiet and animal life is significantly different than in areas next to development. Many of the new and relocated trails are going to be next to houses, golf courses, and roads. Existing trails in contiguous open space are being removed. Thus, there will be a permanent loss of much of this type of recreation area in Pebble Beach, which is currently one of the unique parts of our community. 4 a) The impact of loss of contiguous space on recreation should be addressed.

17

Page 3.5-21, lines 32 –38

“The applicant provides additional protection by employing 72 security guards ... “ 5 a) Will the number of security guards be increased corresponding to the increased number

18

of anticipated visitors and new residents. b) If the number of security guards is not increased correspondingly, this will represent a true loss of service to existing residents.

18 (cont.)

Appendix 2 – Traffic

Questions:

1) There is no comment on vehicular speed control in Appendix 2. Workers rushing to work location within Pebble Beach appear to drive faster, and above the speed limit, in Pebble Beach. Contractors also appear to be some of the worst offenders. If you travel any of the major roads between 6 – 9 am and 3 – 6 pm, one can observe the flow of traffic and increased traffic. With the proposed development, increased numbers of workers driving at excessive speeds will add increased danger to Pebble Beach residents in other vehicles, residents walking on the roads, and wildlife. The high speed of these vehicles also reduces the quality of life in Pebble Beach by adding to noise pollution. a) How will Pebble Beach Company address enforcing speed controls for the contractors and subcontractors that Pebble Beach Company will employ for the development. b) One suggestion is that Pebble Beach Company has a condition of employment that all workers will obey Pebble Beach traffic laws as a condition of employment. Please address this suggestion.

19

2) Pebble Beach Company has failed to maintain some roads in the forest safely with the current number of residents and other users. For example, Congress Road from SFB Morse Gate to Bird ^{o.c.k.} consistently had potholes for the entire time that I have lived in the forest (since 1995). The potholes get filled with patch eventually but this is usually after multiple months of dangerous driving conditions. Then the following winter the patches wash out, new potholes develop, and the problem starts again. This situation has been very dangerous. Many times, I personally have encountered drivers on the wrong side of the road, as they dodge potholes. On Congress, this often happens on blind curves, as this section of Congress is very windy. This has prompted calls and letters to Pebble Beach but the problem has remained. Pebble Beach Company has cited the lack of funds to remedy the situation. a) With the increased traffic both due to residents and workers how will this problem be addressed of road maintenance? b) Assuming that there is an assurance that roads will be safely maintained, what recourse will residents have to assure road safety is maintained, if problems are not addressed?

20