Inside the Aquarium’s new Secret Life of Seahorses.

MUSIC The keys to the Jazz Fest’s Next Generation.

Is the proposed Sand City resort really green, or is that just the color of money?

By Kera Abraham
while others call the claim misleading. The world’s greenest eco-resort proposal, sand at what’s being lauded by some as bars for coastal development have risen the rise of the sea and the disintegration hotels on the shore, and those with a Hendrix lyrics, we keep developing science, biblical proverbs and Jimi their creations away. and then watch the rising waves wash T
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Tidal Swamp: Monterey Bay Coalition President Ed Tersol worries about the escoresort at Sand City and the loss of public beach access. Tersol says the group has fought repeatedly to protect beachfront access, particularly at Sand City, where Ghandour’s project is proposed. 

In 2008, Tersol says, he and other coalition members received a call from LandWatch, Environmental Law Project, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, the Monterey County Planning Commissioners, and Surfrider. “We’re having to monitor the entire shoreline,” he says. In this case, the project is a mixed-use resort with about 340 rooms, 100 townhouses, and about 50 condominiums. But according to Tersol, “There’s a lot of controversy about whether it’s a sound project.”

Ghandour has a history of developing resorts in Santa Cruz, California, and he’s been involved in disputes with local authorities over his projects. In the case of Sand City, the controversy has centered on the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. Tersol says, “We’re having serious issues with the public’s right to access and we’re trying to fight that.”

In 2010, Tersol and other coalition members, including LandWatch, Environmental Law Project, and Surfrider, filed a lawsuit against the Coastal Commission to stop the project. The lawsuit was later settled, and the project was allowed to move forward. However, in 2011, Tersol and other coalition members filed a new lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2012, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2013, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2014, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2015, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2016, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2017, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2018, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2019, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2020, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2021, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2022, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2023, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2024, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.

In 2025, Tersol and other coalition members filed a lawsuit against the project, citing concerns about the project’s environmental impact and its potential impact on beach access. The lawsuit was later dismissed, but Tersol and other coalition members continue to monitor the project.
MURKY WATERS

It would have been easy to mistake the March 18 Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster board meeting for a lawyers' convention. An attorney for Sand City, two for Seaside, one for the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District and another for SNG all had something to say about the water board's February denial of Ghandour's water distribution permit.

The water district was wrong to order a subsequent EIR addressing the water supply, according to four of the five attorneys. (The water district's counsel defended the action.) With the watermaster board's approval, the four lawyers prepared a letter asking the water district to reconsider.

But the water board held its ground March 26, setting the stage for yet another lawsuit. (SNG also appealed the water district's 2000 permit denial.)

SNG has a guaranteed right to 149 acre-feet of water and is only asking for 90. But rather than pump from the on-site well, which risks seawater intrusion, Ghandour has asked California American Water to deliver the resort's water supply.

"The question was, 'Is SNG always going to be delivered Seaside basin water?'" explains water district attorney David Laredo. "Cal-Am's answer was, 'No, that's not how the system works. There will be times that the Seaside pumps will not be turned on, and they will be delivered Carmel River water.' That's when the board said, 'Gosh, that's not what's in the EIR.'"

The state has ordered Cal-Am to reduce pumping from the Carmel River. If any of the resort's water comes from the river, the environmental impacts must be assessed, according to district Project Manager Henrietta Stern. "[Ghandour] can pump his own wells on his own parcel and we would not be having this conversation," she says.

The decision left the Peninsula mayors and landowners on the watermaster board worrying the water district would question their court-secured water rights too. "The fundamental issue for this board is the authority," said Seaside Mayor Ralph Rubio, the board chair. "It's well within our interests to ask the water board to reconsider its decision."

The watermaster maintains that, even if Seaside aquifer water mixes with Carmel River water in Cal-Am's storage tanks, SNG's total annual water supply will be drawn from the Seaside aquifer.

"It's hard to imagine a more secure, reliable water supply in California than what SNG holds," said Seaside water counsel Russ McGlothlin.

But Laredo isn't sold. "The fish don't work on averages," he says. "You have a day that there's [not enough] water in the stream, and the fact that there is castle continued on page 21"
twice as much water the next day...Tell that to the fish.”

Ghandour seems up for the fight. He's given up on three of the water board's seven members—Kristi Markey, Regina Doyle and Judi Lehman—but he thinks he has a chance with Dave Potter, known as the board's swing vote.

Potter's been calling the shots on Ghandour's permit applications for the life of the resort proposal. Not only has the county supervisor sat on the water district board for more than a decade; he's also been on the Coastal Commission since March 1997. In both capacities, he has consistently voted against Monterey Bay Shores.

“Ghandour sticks his straw in there and starts drawing water out, the whole system may be affected,” he says. “The Coastal Commission has denied any and all new developments using new water in North County for years, based on the fact that that area has an inadequate water supply. Ghandour has a right to use that water, but he can't do it without an analysis of the impacts of that use.

“I'm amazed he's kept this project alive,” Potter adds. “If it was on the other side of the highway, I don't think it would be an issue. I don't care if it's pink—it's how environmentally friendly it is in relation to the Coastal Act.”

*castle continued on page 22*
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**HOTEL HERCULES**

**TIMELINE OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT THAT WON'T DIE.**

By Kera Abraham

**1984:** The California Coastal Commission approves Sand City's Local Coastal Plan, which allows the city to issue its own coastal development permits.

**1986:** After 60 years, the Lone Star/Pacific Cement Aggregates sand mining operations in Sand City end. The land is zoned for a mixed-use resort of up to 650 units.

**1996:** State and regional park agencies enter into an agreement with Sand City leaders, known as the “Coastal Peace Accord.” The document sets most of Sand City's 1.5-mile coastline as open space except for two “building envelopes,” including the former sand mine now owned by Security National Guaranty, Big Sur Land Trust offers to buy the property but can't afford the high price.

**1998:** In December, Sand City approves SNG's coastal development permit for a 495-unit mixed-use resort and certifies the environmental impact report. The Sierra Club appeals to the Coastal Commission and later sues Sand City, alleging the resort's EIR is inadequate.

**2000:** State Parks offers to purchase the property from SNG but doesn't secure enough funds. In October, the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District denies SNG's water distribution permit, which involves digging wells into the Seaside aquifer. SNG appeals. Just before the New Year, the Coastal Commission denies SNG's development permit, citing 17 inconsistencies with Sand City's Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act, including lack of water supply, inadequate traffic mitigation, loss of dune habitat and disruption of endangered species. SNG appeals.

**2001:** The Superior Court upholds the water district board's permit denial. SNG appeals, but the Appellate Court affirms the district's decision.

**2002:** The Superior Court withdraws its lawsuit against Sand City and the final EIR is certified. In May, the Superior Court rejects SNG's legal challenge of the water district's 2000 denial.

**2003:** In August, SNG enters into Chapter 11 bankruptcy due to lender default and the Coastal Commission's permit denial.

**2006:** Superior Court Judge Roger Randall adjudicates the Seaside basin, finding that it has been overdrafted and pumping must be reduced to avoid seawater intrusion. He establishes a regional watermaster board to manage the basin, leaving permitting authority with the water management district. The ruling guarantees SNG the right to 149 acre-feet for its resort.

**2008:** SNG submits revised development plans for a 341-unit resort, incorporating a spectrum of sustainable features, to the Coastal Commission and Sand City. In April, the company emerges from Chapter 11 with a clean record. In May, the Appellate Court overturns the Coastal Commission's 2001 decision, ordering the commission to reconsider SNG's revised permit application based primarily on Sand City's Local Coastal Plan, which does not consider the hotel property ecologically sensitive habitat. In December, SNG distributes a lengthy addendum to the 1998 EIR (available at www.montereybayshores.com).

**2009:** In January, Sand City approves SNG's EIR addendum. The next month, the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District board denies SNG's water distribution permit and requires a subsequent environmental impact report on the resort's water supply. In March, the Coastal Commission postpones its hearing on Monterey Bay Shores at SNG's request. The watermaster board sends a letter to the water management district board, encouraging it to reconsider its February decision, but the water board does not.

Sources: SNG developer Ed Ghandour, water board attorney David Laredo, Sand City Administrator Steve Matarazzo, Coastal Commissioner Dave Potter, Sand City attorney Jim Heisinger, Big Sur Land Trust spokeswoman Rachel Saunders, newspaper articles.
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**MONTEREY, SAN BENITO AND SANTA CRUZ COUNTIES**

**TEACHER RECRUITMENT FAIR**

**MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2009**

**9:00 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.**

**HARTNELL COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

**COLLEGE CENTER**

Employment opportunities for public school teachers and other credentialed professionals

**Interviews held on the spot!**

For further information, contact teachmb@csumb.edu or 831-582-4628

**Registration begins at 9 A.M.**
CITY OF SAND

As far as Mayor Pendergrass is concerned, Sand City—population, about 350—has almost everything it needs. It’s got big-box shopping centers that generate millions of dollars in sales taxes per year. It has a new desalination plant, a growing arts community and a 1.5-mile coastline to inspire infinite paintings.

What it doesn’t have is a hotel.

The tiny city’s mayor was raised in the area by a land-owning family. He designed Sand City’s first seal at the age of 16, depicting industrial smokestacks at a time when sand mines, corporate yards and a garbage dump dominated the city’s beach. But in the mid-’90s, Pendergrass, a graphic designer by trade, doodled a new city seal depicting birds soaring over a pristine shoreline.

“I wanted to change the city from an image of industry to mixed-use,” he says.

For decades, Sand City and parks agencies bickered over use of the city’s coast. In 1996 they entered into an agreement known as the Coastal Peace Accord, establishing most of Sand City’s coastline as open space—with two “building envelopes,” including the Monterey Bay Shores property.

The decade of litigation over the resort’s fate stalled Sand City’s dreams of becoming a tourist destination. Now, Pendergrass feels vindicated by the appellate court’s May 2008 ruling that the city’s Local Coastal Plan trumps the Coastal Act. “The decision helped the entire coastline, jurisdiction-wise,” he says. “May not have helped the environmentalists, but they want nothing to happen on the coast at all.”

Pendergrass expects Monterey Bay Shores to generate hotel taxes of more than $1 million per year, a big boost to the city’s annual operating budget of about $5 million.

Other project supporters include Seaside Mayor Rubio: A revenue-sharing agreement between Sand City and its neighbor means Seaside gets 20 percent of the hotel’s taxes. “The only thing in return is not to object to any development we have,” Pendergrass says.

Ghandour is confident that his 16-year fight is coming to the final rounds. If officials clear SNG’s water distribution and coastal development permits, construction should be complete within three years, he says.

Meanwhile, Sand City officials aren’t forgetting that other pocket of coast zoned for visitor services. King Ventures, the developer of the controversial Marina Dunes resort, plans to build a hotel on what is now a construction yard at the end of Tioga Avenue.

“The Council and King Ventures are acutely aware that two projects should not go before the Coastal Commission at or near the same time,” read City Council meeting minutes from last fall. In other words, by testing the legal waters for future coastal developments, Ghandour is taking one for the team.

PIECE OF PARADISE

The coast is why many of us live here. The humbling blue infinity has inspired countless Monterey Peninsula residents to invest in expensive homes by the sea. Our oceanside aquarium, restaurants and hotels draw the tourists who sustain our economy; our world-famous experts on sea level rise pontifiecate from offices that practically teeter over Monterey Bay. Now that we’ve got our slice of coastal paradise, we have strong opinions about who and what should join us.

Ghandour’s ecoresort proposal is genius in its capacity to make even the greenest individuals question their values. As long as our bay is beautiful, wealthy people will travel here—and they’ll leave a smaller footprint at the ecoresort than they would just about anywhere else. On the other hand, lauding the sustainable features of a luxury resort built on some of the state’s last remaining snowy plover habitat and drawing from already depleted water sources seems somewhat disingenuous.

Monterey Bay Shores could be viewed as a prototype in sustainable hospitality—or a precedent exposing the state’s fragile shoreline to reckless development. It’s likely a little of both.

Meanwhile our fuels keep burning, the sea keeps rising, bluffs keep crumbling. And all along California’s coast, sandcastles are slipping into the sea. ■