



Concerned Citizens for Clean Air

October 20, 2020

Dear Mr. Willey:

We have reviewed the State Parks OHV Division's 2020 Annual Report and Work Plan (ARWP), provisionally approved by the APCD. We are writing to express our serious concerns with what we view as unacceptable shortcomings in the plan. This plan is "too loose", lacking specificity in key areas and lacking FIRM deadlines. If the bottom line is compliance with the Stipulated Order of Abatement (as modified) and the Particulate Matter Reduction Plan, as it must, the plan seems to fall far short of actions necessary to meet compliance.

Specifically:

- 1) The Work Plan presents dust control activities that the State Parks OHV Division proposes to undertake and/or complete by July 31, 2021. What is becoming very clear is that there is a huge difference between undertaking an action and completing it. We note that several 2019 activities remain incomplete.
- 2) All of the new activities covering 90 acres are "temporary" or "seasonal." How can such measures support the timely achievement of SOA goals? One cannot tell from the proposed plan.
- 3) How can it be a "plan" that stipulates 90 acres will be mitigated without specifying where the 90 acres will be located and what mitigation will be implemented? This is not a "plan." It is hardly an outline.
- 4) If the OHV Division plans to work with the Scientific Advisory Group on a Public Outreach and Education Plan, why does the "plan" lack a plan? This should be part of what is approved. As it stands, it is sketchy and merely encourages further delays.
- 5) Section 3.1.5 states that since the exact locations of the new dust control measures are not final, it is premature to estimate outcomes, progress to be achieved, and potential emission reductions associated with the 2020 Work Plan activities. How can this be considered a PLAN? It reflects no more than wishful thinking and does not engender trust in the planning process.
- 6) There is language that indicates that SOA goals may be "unachievable" and poses alternatives. This is deeply troubling. After all these years, is there serious consideration to letting this continue ad infinitum? What, exactly, is "unachievable"?

- 7) Table 5-5, page 5-3 references Coastal Commission approval. The timing does not make sense. Since a determination of where mitigation will be located is to occur in November, the CCC Approval Task End Date is December and then shown as “complete” in February 2021, this is problematic. In theory, no work is supposed to start until CCC approval is in place.
- 8) Finally, inclusion of the language: “the foremost goal (of the SOA) is to achieve reductions in PM10 concentrations toward attaining state and federal air quality standards *while minimizing impacts to public recreation opportunities.*” The goal of the SOA is to attain state and federal air quality standards. Period. This language was explicitly rejected as unacceptable. So then, what changed?

While we understand that it is difficult for agencies with conflicting goals to develop a plan for progress, it is disheartening that year after year elapses with a lack of serious effort to protect public health. There can be NO question about the priority of public health vs. recreational opportunity. This proposal is rife with loopholes, wiggle room and lack of definitive milestones. We encourage you to approve the ARWP *after addressing the concerns outlined here*. Take a stand. Demand firm deadlines, identification of the 90 acres (it is known that remediation must be in the most emissive areas!) and further clarification of the document’s more troubling language/intent.

The State Parks OHV Division has acted as a rogue agency for far too long, and people are suffering for it.

Very truly yours,

Arlene Versaw & Rachelle Toti, Co-Founders
Concerned Citizens for Clean Air

Cc: Hearing Board Members and Alternates