From:	Chris Demmers
To:	info@slocleanair.org; Gary Willey; secretary@resources.ca.gov; Lisa.Mangat@parks.ca.gov;
	<u>Mat.Fuzie@parks.ca.gov;</u> John.Ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov; jim@oceanodunes.org; rwcarr@charter.net;
	ynelson@calpoly.edu; mshah_groverbeach.org; John Peschong; Bruce Gibson; Adam Hill; Lynn Compton; Debbie
	Arnold; rfonzi_atascadero.org; JHamon_prcity.com; bharmon_arroyogrande.org; hharmon@slocity.org;
	ewaage_pismobeach.org; jheadding@morrobayca.gov
Date:	Wednesday, March 21, 2018 8:38:26 AM

To Whom it may concern,

During the recent Oceano Dunes SVRA Public Works meeting, you told us to stay in touch with you and tell you how we want to see the ODSVRA used in the future. We want to see increased OHV riding area. The agreement State Parks is entering into with the SLO Air Quality Control Board is one-sided, biased and WILL ultimately eliminate 1,000 campsites and OHV riding at the Oceano Dunes SVRA. This is opposite of what millions of state park users want. How can you agree to this when science proves OHV activity is not the source of respirable dust issues? APCO, Gary Wiley, says the goal is to reduce violations/dust by 30%. However, he still expects there will be about 10 violations per year. Order #9 in the draft agreement says State Parks will reduce emissions below state and federal requirements. Which is it? 30% with 10 violations a year or below State and Federal requirements? At a minimum, State Parks must make sure the agreement accurately reflects the real expectation. Order #9 is simply unattainable in a natural coastal dune environment. Even the APCO recognizes this, as does the CARB executive Kurt Karperos from his testimony at previous APCD meeting presentations. Please stick to your word and listen to the public comment before agreeing to reducing the riding area further. We know OHV activity is not the primary source of these dust emissions, and science is delivering more insight every day to other sources. It is too early for State Parks to make the concessions in this draft agreement. State Parks must back out of this proposed agreement

best regards,

Chris Demmers