

**From:** [Lori](mailto:Lori)  
**To:** [secretary@resources.ca.gov](mailto:secretary@resources.ca.gov); [Lisa.Mangat@parks.ca.gov](mailto:Lisa.Mangat@parks.ca.gov); [Mat.Fuzie@parks.ca.gov](mailto:Mat.Fuzie@parks.ca.gov);  
[John.Ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:John.Ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov); [info@slocleanair.org](mailto:info@slocleanair.org); [jim@oceanodunes.org](mailto:jim@oceanodunes.org)  
**Subject:** Oceano Dunes SVRA, "Dust" issue: MAKE NO AGREEMENT  
**Date:** Sunday, March 18, 2018 11:50:16 PM

---

March 18, 2018

Dear Dignitaries and Addressees of this letter,

My name is Lori Johnson and I live in Bakersfield, CA. I would like for you to address the following at the March 21 and April 30 hearings, with as much convincing reason and evidence as you can.

As I understand, the Air Pollution Control District alleges that they have " ...received 133 complaints from residents downwind of the park regarding dust from off-road vehicle activity." These complaints were received from "May 29, 2012 through October 19, 2017." This equates to approximately 2 complaints per month, during that period of approximately 65 months.

Has it been concluded how many of those complaints came from "repeat complainants"?  
Has it been concluded, from these complainants, how many of them had recently traveled to areas known to be of inferior air quality when compared to their home city or town? Maybe some of them had recently visited Bakersfield, where, in the February 14, 2016 edition, "The Guardian" reported that, "Bakersfield's average reading in one 24-hour period in late January was 40.5 micrograms per cubic meter;...". When speaking of fine particulate matter, (PM2.5), in the air, a main indicator of poor air quality.

In comparison to Bakersfield, (who was rated the worst for short-term year-round particulate matter pollution in the United States in 2016), Nipomo, (according to [airnow.gov](http://airnow.gov)), during the 65 month time frame as stated above, was, (and continues to be), in the "Good" range of PM2.5. I found these reports in the archived maps of regions section of [airnow.gov](http://airnow.gov). This objective evidence in all ways contradicts the 133 complaints received by your office.

As stated, in "The Tribune", on February 22, 2018, of the complainants, "They associate difficulty breathing, respiratory issues, exacerbation of pre-existing conditions, such as asthma and (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease), watery and stinging eyes, and other adverse effects, with particulate matter from ODSVRA", the abatement order says of the complaints.

Are any of the complainants Doctors, or were any of them treated by doctors for their "adverse effects"?

Were any of them smokers? COPD would indicate that they quite possibly could have been.

Did any of them have furry pets who may be a trigger to asthma?

Had they just been running prior to making their complaint, causing difficulty breathing watery or stinging eyes?

Had they been recently crying?

As you see, there is no evidence that what these complaints reference strictly comes from particulate matter from ODSVRA. Did they capture a sample of the air at the moment right before making their complaint so that they could prove that their complaints were based on particulate matter?

As stated, the archived reports of [airnow.gov](http://airnow.gov) would contradict those too.

Here's the reality. There is always a complainer in the mix. You know them and we all know them. When you consider that ODSVRA is capable of making 1000 reservations for overnight camping on the Dunes, each night, that's 30,000 reservations per month. Thirty percent of those, as per any abatement

agreement is 9,000 reservations. That's \$90,000 per month of lost revenue at \$10 per reservation. At an average of 5 persons per reservation, you have 45,000 people who will be affected by an abatement agreement between SLOCAPCD and the State Parks, PER MONTH! All for the 2 complainers, per month, of whom we know nothing of their previous conditions or what may or may not have caused them?

Common Sense, folks! Use your common sense. Those Dunes support this area. Beyond the support to the area, I'm sure most visitors are like my family and friends. We drive 300 miles round trip several times each year just to enjoy the clean air! Some of my family has relocated to Grover Beach just for that reason. If you considered the positive vs. the negative, you would have in one hand the 2 complainers per month and their complaints about all their alleged ailments. On the other hand, you would have people who may not take the time to write you a thankful letter for the wonderful and healing times they've had at the Dunes. But, who needs a letter when you can drive Sand Hwy and see all the people, daily, enjoying the State Beach and all it has to offer, possibly up to 5,000 people per day. That says it all. They are NOT complaining. If you were to make an agreement for the greater good, these people should have a voice, too. Just their presence on the Dunes should tell you that they are not complaining but just the opposite. They are thankful! Otherwise, they would not bring themselves, family and friends, to visit the Dunes. Weigh the difference: 5,000 people per day or 2 complainers per month.

There's so much more to be unhappy about than the alleged air quality of the Dunes. But, some people have nothing better to do. Maybe they just need a motivational speaker on lifestyle changes, but I am not the one to determine that.

Please consider the voiceless people just out there having fun, enjoying the Dunes, their families and friends, making memories. At the very least, the State Parks should judiciously be allowed to put on their defense.

I urge the APCD Hearing Board to reject any agreement. Let the State Parks and their visitors be heard, as well and any complainants. A few complaints shouldn't spoil it for the rest of us.

Sincerely,

Lori Johnson  
SnowLolli@yahoo.com  
7209 Rhone Dr  
Bakersfield, CA 93308