

Alexander, Jacquelyne

From: Board Letters
Subject: FW: Mosby
Attachments: email from Jacoby.png; email from Jacoby.png

From: Sharyne Merritt <pinot@sandpointvineyard.com>
Date: June 21, 2015 at 7:05:13 PM PDT
To: "Salud Carbajal" <SupervisorCarbajal@sbcbos1.org>
Subject: Mosby

Hi Salud,

Mosby Rec Fields is coming up on Tuesday.

I've read enormous amounts of material related to this and crunched the numbers and I can assure you the project is not needed and is not consistent with County policy. The findings are excellent.

Here are a couple of points I'd like to emphasize:

1. There is no need for the project based on Quimby or my analysis using recreational needs per capita data from Santa Maria (let me know if you want me to send a copy)

2. Even if Lompoc did need more recreation area, which it doesn't, infill recreational area is available in Riverbend Park. Phase 3 of the Riverbend Park and Trail Draft Master Plan and EIR (Dec 2004), South Riverbend Park Project Elements, identifies "open recreational turf large enough for four little league practice fields, alternating with four soccer fields, is proposed. Cut-outs for little league fields and softball fields are not proposed, so as to maximize the playing field options. . . . Access to the South Park will be from McLaughlin Road. The parking area in the South Park will provide two connected lots with a maximum of 312 parking spaces to accommodate weekday and weekend maximum use." P 18. This has not been developed and they seem to have the money.

3. 10 acre parcels are viable agriculture if they have water available and these do. They can be rented to strawberry, broccoli, or flower growers or planted in vineyards. Small parcels of land with Lompoc's temperate climate and access to water is definitely viable.

4. Use of ag land as parking lots and for contact sports like soccer and football (yes, he rents to a semi-pro football league with no permit) will compact soil. The soil can be ripped and nutrients can be added, but it's not going to be "good" soil for many years at considerable expense; for practical purposes, impaired. This is minor compared to the other issues.

5. The pesticide use and buffers issues are convoluted. Some pesticides/herbicides/fungicides, when used near sensitive areas (depending on source, different definitions) need to have a buffer. According to the FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL CODE SECTION 14006.5. "Before issuing a permit for any pesticide the commissioner shall consider local conditions including, but not limited to, the following: (a) Use in vicinity of schools, dwellings, hospitals, **recreational**

areas (my emphasis), and livestock enclosures.” This means that the project is not consistent with Policy I.B. of the Agricultural Element: “The County shall recognize the rights of operation, freedom of choice as to the methods of cultivation, choice of crops or types of livestock, rotation of crops and all other functions within the traditional scope of agricultural management decisions. These rights and freedoms shall be conducted in a manner which is consistent with: (1) sound agricultural practices that promote the long-term viability of agriculture and (2) applicable resource protection policies and regulations.” By placing a recreational area and more people (who become bystanders) adjacent to an agricultural field, the adjacent farmer’s ability to farm using restricted materials will be more limited (my analysis).

6. If there is a need for a buffer, it is imposed on the property applying the pesticide. The idea that Mosby should have a buffer is inaccurate; the neighboring farmer would have to have the buffer, but that compromises the Ag Element, which protects farmers’ right to farm as they wish. (Odd for me, an organic farmer, to find this so key.)

7. Pesticide drift happens. That’s why there are very specific requirements for application of restricted substances. I can send you citations. That’s why it’s a bad idea to put lots of people near farms.

8. While Mosby’s lawyer says there is no discussion of winds, there doesn’t have to be because it is well established: the wind in Lompoc comes from WNW. I can send you citations. The study done of Pesticide Drift in Lompoc concluded: “The statistical analysis indicates patterns of meteorology in Lompoc that when compared to the 11 coastal CIMIS stations could lead to higher concentrations of pesticides in the air.” Let me know if you want the citation

9. References to conditions impacting the Riverbed Park Master Plan are irrelevant since that was prepared by Lompoc and the County is not responsible if they are sloppy or incompetent.

10. The idea that signs about pesticides are sufficient for protecting children is ridiculous. Young ones may not read; older ones are cocky and disregard. I can send you citations.

11. Yes, the SY River is a natural buffer between urban and ag uses, but Lompoc established Riverbend Park to be a “greenbelt,” a British planning concept from the 1960’s that provided a transition between rural and urban that stopped sprawl

As a greenbelt, River Park is a transition area between the City of Lompoc to the west and agricultural uses to the east that stops expansion of urban uses on one side and protects agricultural uses on the other while providing additional benefits in between. The proposed project pushes recreational use outside boundary of the transition area into the agricultural area the green belt is intended to protect.

12. Other non-agricultural uses beyond the River Park green belt are of a decidedly different character than the proposed project. The County Maintenance Yard supports agriculture by maintaining the road network necessary to delivery of inputs and distribution of agricultural products. Bridgehouse homeless shelter was originally permitted in the 1980’s as The Farmhouse, a 16 bed transitional facility with an agricultural greenhouse vocational component. (City of Lompoc General Plan, Housing Element 2003 p 72). Since that time, after several ownership changes, Bridgehouse serves as a homeless shelter that has no residents present during the day and brings far fewer visitors and bystanders than the proposed recreational fields will. The Moto-fun park is an **interim** facility established to make an application for a grant for a Motorsport Park (to be installed at an alternate site) more competitive. According to

staff recommendations, “[t]he location at River Park is intended to be a low cost
“interim” location and will be removed when the final location is developed within three years.”
Lompoc City Council Agenda Feb 26, 2013 p 3
<http://www1.cityoflompoc.com/councilagenda/2013/130226/130226n01.pdf>(emphasis added)

Call me if you want to discuss any of this. I will not be able to attend the hearing.

Sharyne

From: Jean Jacoby <jjc@hotmai.com>

Date: November 8, 2013 4:37:05 PM PST

To: "mebrooks@sbceo.org" <mebrooks@sbceo.org>

Subject: River Park

I was a member of the Lompoc City Council from 1966 to 1970. During that time there was a move to create a bypass around the city on the east side of the river. In that connection there had been an official survey and appraisal of the land to be acquired for the bypass.

The bypass project was abandoned and at that time there was a federal/state initiative to provide green belts in urban areas. With the surveys and appraisal finished (for the bypass project) we went to Sacramento and applied for funding to acquire the land for a "green belt." That land is now River Park.

It was in furtherance of the Green Belt Initiative that we qualified and were funded for the land acquisition.

I hope this is adequate. If you want more details, let me know.

Thanks for your work on this project.

Dick