

From: [Linda Reynolds](#)
To: [Alyssa Roslan](#)
Cc: [secretary@resources.ca.gov](#); [lisa.mangat@parks.ca.gov](#); [mat.fuzie@parks.ca.gov](#); [john.ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov](#)
Subject: Proposed Stipulated Order of Abatement
Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 5:31:11 PM

To Officials in charge of protecting the health of residents which includes monitoring of air quality and correcting issues which are hazardous to people's health:

Remember that old TV advertisement, Where's the beef?

Well, as I have read the proposed order of abatement I am looking for something other than 18 pages of ambiguity. In the corporate or business world such a document would never go anywhere except the shredder.

Starting on page 3, items a. thru g. are full of such terms as "conduct an educational campaign"(for whom?)

continue crystalline silica testing..how long? has it started? exactly when do you expect results?

What about other particulate matter? We know there is dangerous particulate matter now. Look at the data from the monitors.

Point e, "consider"....vague.

point f..."consider."...now, where would that go in??? Over Phillips 66 property?

What about ESHA?

move it south so the problem goes to other communities? Think about the years, years, and years and

more committees, Coastal Comm, hearings? What century time frame was thought of for this? And, why??

If that is a consideration with all these months already spent on this there should be some real concrete information or is it just more chatter?

The proposal dances around to hay bales, back to natural solutions with no real time for for serious results.

Page 7, natural solutions "might" include severely restricting rider activity. There's one of those strong words

again, might?? Where is the accountability? measurability?

I heard Mr. Fuzi say more than once that it is difficult to get the seeds, or there is a shortage of seeds, what??

This is California, a major source of agriculture.

Which brings me back to the lack of accountability, there are no penalties for noncompliance.

What exactly is a Scientific Advisory Group? This sounds like another bureaucratic waste of time. Does the public

get to give input on who serves on that board? Meeting only once annually? How about getting down to business and get this done now, make the meetings public and on a monthly basis.

Public Works Project? What?

All this waste of time...while I look at a another study sitting on my desk from the American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine showing the serious risks of air pollution on young children. Just like the families all over the Mesa. Not to mention the families south of the Mesa who would suffer immensely if the park is move south.

Who is benefiting from this delay? Not the citizens you are suppose to serve.

Regards,

Linda Reynolds

Nipomo Mesa