REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 27, 2015

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA	
School District: ..... LOMPOC UNIFIED	County:.....SANTA BARBARA
Application Number:.....58/69229-00-001	Facility Name: ..... CENTRAL KITCHEN
Total District Enrollment:..... 9,914	Project Grade Level: K-12
Financial Hardship: ..... NO	

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the Lompoc Unified School District's (District) request for Facility Hardship conceptual approval to rehabilitate the central kitchen facility.

DESCRIPTION

During a planned remodel of the central kitchen facility, the District discovered structural issues and mold. Further investigation identified significant dry rot that could result in total roof collapse and confirmed the existence of mold. The District submitted a request for conceptual approval under the Facility Hardship program to complete the repairs. Staff administratively denied the request because the central kitchen is not on a school site. The District submitted an appeal stating that the repairs were necessary to avoid interruption of the District's Free and Reduced Lunch Program which has a direct impact on the health of students. The District is requesting a conceptual approval of approximately $188,504 for the rehabilitation of the District's central kitchen facility.

AUTHORITY

See Attachment A.

BACKGROUND

The District received Division of the State Architect (DSA) plan approval to remodel and add space to the central kitchen in January 2014. The purpose of the remodel was to replace equipment to support "cooking from scratch" to provide healthy meals that may not be provided through the existing kitchens at the individual school sites. During construction, dry rot and mold were discovered. Due to the construction of the roof, the damage was not noticeable as part of the building's regular maintenance, and thus was not included in the original scope of the planned project.

The central kitchen facility is located adjacent to two school sites, a central warehouse, maintenance and operations facilities, and a print shop. The facility is approximately 15 years old.

The District submitted an application for conceptual approval under the Facility Hardship program in September 2014 for rehabilitation of the central kitchen facility to address the structural and mold issues found during the planned construction project. The Office of Public School Construction administratively denied the application on the basis that the School Facility Program (SFP) can only provide funding for health and safety issues on school sites. Because the central kitchen is part of the District office where there are no enrolled students, the rehabilitation of the facility could not be funded under the SFP.

The District responded by submitting the School District Appeal Request (Form SAB 189), which is included as Attachment B.

(Continued on Page Two)

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS

District Position

In the appeal, the District requests funding to rehabilitate its central kitchen facility because a serious threat exists to the health and safety of students and staff in a public school environment.

The necessary repairs were made to mitigate the health and safety threat and avoid additional interruption of the District's Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Over 64 percent of the Districts' students qualify for the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. However, the District maintains that not all of the individual school sites have or can afford to have kitchen facilities to prepare fresh food for this program. In the appeal, the District states, "the food prepared in the central kitchen has a direct impact on the health of students, especially those underprivileged students where meal(s) provided by the District is/are the only fresh food/meal of their day."

The District consists of 16 school sites and most contain kitchen facilities. The majority of the sites were designed and built in the 1960s and contain kitchen spaces designed to re-heat meals as opposed to preparing meals. The central kitchen facility serves all of the district school sites and provides approximately 5,000 meals a day. The District has indicated that it relies on the central kitchen facility for three main reasons.

1. The lack of physical space at each school site will not allow for the expansion of existing kitchens.
2. The substantial cost to expand the currently inadequate kitchen facilities.
3. The District does not have the operating budget to cover the additional Staff that would be required to maintain fully functioning kitchens at each school site.

EC Section 49550 requires all public school districts and county superintendents of schools to make available, free or at a reduced price, one nutritionally adequate meal to each needy student every single day. The District believes that the central kitchen facility is the most viable avenue for meeting this EC requirement.

The District is requesting funding approval for the repair and replacement of the conference room ridge beam, storage window area, and roofing damaged by dry rot within the District's central kitchen facility.

The full text of the District's position is included as Attachment B.

Staff Position

Staff is unable to administratively approve the District's request for Facility Hardship funding because the application does not appear to meet the program requirements. The central kitchen facility is on a plot of land designated for administrative functions and as a result does not house students. In addition, none of the reports or documents provided by the District has clearly established a direct health and safety threat to students by the inability to provide meals through the central kitchen.

Health and Safety Issues
Pursuant to School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.82, a District is eligible for Facility Hardship funding if the condition of the facilities is a threat to the health and safety of *pupils*. Since the central kitchen facility is not located on a school site, it does not appear that the structural deficiencies at the facility meet the requirements of this regulation section, as pupils are not at risk.

(Continued on Page Three)

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS (cont.)

The District hired the structural engineering company Stork, Wolfe and Associates to perform a site review. The report concluded that significant dry rot was found in the conference room ridge beam and the ends of the existing roof joists. It states, "These conditions created a very high-risk situation to the life-safety of the occupants" and that "The roof beam, if left in its current condition, will fail, resulting in total roof collapse." The report also detailed severe dry rot around a window in storage room 102 stating, "This area, if left in its current condition, could result in a loss of vertical load carrying capacity of the wall, resulting in a partial collapse of the roof structure and a risk to the life-safety of the occupants."

In addition the District hired FCG Environmental to conduct an inspection of moisture intrusion and mold contamination. Mold and fungal growth were found in multiple locations. The report indicated that "the wood rot noticed on the ridge beam and surrounding framing is typically the result of water intrusion and is growth of a type of fungus (Basidiomycetes family) which is not known to cause adverse health effects from exposure. This type of fungus causes structural damage not known to be pathogenic or 'toxic'… Wood rot fungus is primarily a structural hazard and does not typically pose a health risk from exposure to spores." The report recommended remediation work in all of the rooms containing water intrusion and mold issues.

The District provided a governmental concurrence from the Division of the State Architect (DSA) stating that the kitchen facility does not meet the structural safety standards for occupancy. The letter highlights that dry rot is significant in the conference room beam, rafters, and sheeting that need replacement. Presence of mold and the structural damage due to dry rot have caused the issues in the storage room window sill plate, studs, window header, top plate and structural sheeting.

The District provided a second concurrence letter from the County of Santa Barbara. This letter indicates that the components of the storage and conference rooms have "compromised the structural integrity and poses a health and safety threat." However, the letter does not address the presence of mold nor does it provide any reference to the FCG Environmental report.

Eligibility for Funding Under the SFP

The central kitchen facility is located on a site which includes an elementary school, a middle school, and District operations facilities. Even though the administrative operations campus shares a parcel of land with Mission Valley Middle School and La Honda Elementary School, the two school sites have individual California Department of Education County-District-School (CDS) codes. During any school day, students do not go on to the administrative operations campus.

Based on the structural engineers report, environmental report and governmental concurrences, the dry rot in the conference room ridge beam and window in storage room 102 caused structural safety concerns. The potential roof collapse may pose a safety threat to the staff in the building. However, these conditions do not appear to pose a direct threat to the safety of pupils and as such does not meet the requirements set forth in SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 as the central kitchen facility is not on a school site.

The report from FCG Environmental does not state or specify that any of the molds on the site is of the toxic or pathogenic variety. In addition, neither the concurrence letter from DSA or the County of Santa Barbara states that the mold in itself is a health and safety threat. The report stipulates that the mold found is of the type that can be structurally damaging, however none of the documentation specifically indicates that the mold is a health and safety threat or that it contributed to the structural damage in this building and as a result, does not meet the requirements of SFP Regulation Section 1859.82.

(Continued on Page Four)

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS (cont.)

Impact of Central Kitchen Closure

The District has indicated that the food provided by the central kitchen facility has a direct impact on the health of its students.

Below is a breakdown of the percentage of food (based on grade level) that is prepared by the central kitchen facility for schools within the in the District. In addition to the lunch numbers listed below, the District provides Free and Reduced Lunch Program meals to 64 percent of its students.

Type of Facility	Percentage of Food From Central Kitchen Facility	Number of Sites Affected
Elementary Schools	100 percent	10
Middle Schools	100 percent	2
High Schools	50 percent	2
Continuation High School	100 percent	1

According to the District, the elementary schools and the continuation high school are unable to fully provide their own meals due to a lack of the necessary equipment required of a fully functioning kitchen. These sites do not have prep sinks, freezers, adequate storage or receiving areas. The high school has some of the necessary equipment and only receives entrees from the central kitchen.

During the remodel, the District temporarily reopened a closed school kitchen. Through the temporary kitchen the District served cold box lunches to students. The District has indicated that this was a temporary fix and not a permanent solution.

The District received a governmental concurrence letter from the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department (Attachment C) supporting the District's activities to remodel and assure a safe and healthy environment for preparation of food. The letter details existing food related diseases and states that food must be prepared in a clean and sanitary manner to assure safety.

The Santa Barbara County Public Health Department has concerns about preparing food in a facility that has identified mold within the structure. However, the letter from the county provides only general statements and concerns about health and safety. The letter does not does not provide a direct link between the issues faced at the District's central kitchen facility and the health and safety of District students.

Pursuant to EC Section 49550, districts are required to provide one nutritionally adequate meal to each needy student every school day. However, this EC section falls outside of the statute governing the SFP. While the requirement may be in place for school districts, it may not be appropriate to award funds based on interpretations of EC Sections that are not related to facilities that are part of Chapter 12.5 Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998.

While the structural deficiencies and possibility of total roof collapse would not have caused a specific safety threat to the safety of district students, it is possible that the collapse of the roof would have caused the kitchen facility to close down and interrupt the District's ability to provide meals to students. Having a central kitchen is the method the District has chosen to provide meals to students; however, having a central kitchen on an administrative site that does not house pupils is not a requirement. The District may have other options to provide meals to students using existing facilities at the other school sites.

(Continued on Page Five)

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS (cont.)

Conclusion
It is the District's belief that due to smaller scale kitchens in most of the other schools, the central kitchen facility is integral in the District's ability to provide food as part of the Free and Reduced Lunch program.

In order to be eligible for Facility Hardship funding a district must show that the health and safety of the pupils is at risk. As the central kitchen facility is not on a school site it does not pose a direct safety threat to existing District pupils.

When the central kitchen facility closed for repairs, the District found alternative methods to provide meals to students. The District opened the kitchen at a closed school site and was able to meet the statutory requirements. The process was not identical to the District's previous process but they were able to provide meals to students. How the district provides meals and the requirements to provide meals do not fall within the scope of the Facility Hardship Program or the SFP. The SFP focuses on how the existing facilities themselves impact students. The reports provided by the District have not been able to establish a direct link between the inability to provide lunches through the central kitchen and a health and safety threat to students, nor is this clear in the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department concurrence letter provided by the District. For these reasons, Staff does not support the District's request.

RECOMMENDATION

Pursuant to the *Rules and Procedures of the State Allocation Board,* "Staff is providing the following option for the Board's consideration. A positive vote by six members is required for the Board to take action that is an alternative to Staff's administrative action. Absent a positive vote by six members of the Board, Staff's administrative action will stand and the school district's appeal will be considered closed."

Grant the District's appeal.

BOARD ACTION

In considering this Item, the SAB made a motion, and it carried, to approve the District's request for a Facility Hardship conceptual approval to rehabilitate the central kitchen facility.

ATTACHMENT A

EC Section 17074.25 states:

(a) A modernization apportionment may be used for an improvement to extend the useful life of, or to enhance the physical environment of, the school. The improvement may only include the cost of design, engineering, testing, inspection, plan checking, construction management, demolition, construction, the replacement of portable classrooms, necessary utility costs, utility connection and other fees, the purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment and insulation materials and related costs, furniture and equipment, including telecommunication equipment to increase school security, fire safety improvements, playground safety improvements, the identification, assessment, or abatement of hazardous asbestos, seismic safety improvements, and the upgrading of electrical systems or the wiring or cabling of classrooms in order to accommodate educational technology. A modernization grant may not be used for costs associated with acquisition and development of real property or for routine maintenance and repair.

EC Section 17075.10 states:

(a) A school district may apply for hardship assistance in cases of extraordinary circumstances. Extraordinary circumstances may include, but are not limited to, the need to repair, reconstruct, or replace the most vulnerable school facilities that are identified as a Category 2 building, as defined in the report submitted pursuant to Section 17317, determined by the department to pose an unacceptable risk of injury to its occupants in the event of a seismic event.

(b) A school district applying for hardship state funding under this article shall comply with either paragraph (1) or (2).

(1) Demonstrate both of the following:

(A) That due to extreme financial, disaster-related, or other hardship the school district has unmet need for pupil housing.

(B) That the school district is not financially capable of providing the matching funds otherwise required for state participation, that the district has made all reasonable efforts to impose all levels of local debt capacity and development fees, and that the school district is, therefore, unable to participate in the program pursuant to this chapter except as set forth in this article.

(2) Demonstrate that due to unusual circumstances that are beyond the control of the district, excessive costs need to be incurred in the construction of school facilities. Funds for the purpose of seismic mitigation work or facility replacement pursuant to this section shall be allocated by the board on a 50-percent state share basis from funds reserved for that purpose in any bond approved by the voters after January 1, 2006. If the board determines that the seismic mitigation work of a school building would require funding that is greater than 50 percent of the funds required to construct a new facility, the school district shall be eligible for funding to construct a new facility under this chapter.

(c) The board shall review the increased costs that may be uniquely associated with urban construction and shall adjust the per-pupil grant for new construction or modernization hardship applications as necessary to accommodate those costs. The board shall adopt regulations setting forth the standards, methodology, and a schedule of allowable adjustments, for the urban adjustment factor established pursuant to this subdivision.

EC Section 49550 states:

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each school district or county superintendent of schools maintaining any kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, shall provide for each needy pupil one nutritionally adequate free or reduced-price meal during each schoolday, except for family day care homes that shall be reimbursed for 75 percent of the meals served.

(b) In order to comply with subdivision (a), a school district or county office of education may use funds made available through any federal or state program the purpose of which includes the provision of meals to a pupil, including the federal School Breakfast Program, the federal National School Lunch Program, the

federal Summer Food Service Program, the federal Seamless Summer Option, or the state meal program, or may do so at the expense of the school district or county office of education.

School Facility Program (SFP) Regulation Section 1859.2 states:

"Facility" means all or a portion of any real property, site improvements, utilities and/or buildings or other improvements contained in the project.

"Facility Hardship" means new or replacement facilities authorized by Section 1859.82 (a) or (b).

SFP Regulation Section 1859.82 states:

A district is eligible for facility hardship funding to replace or construct new classrooms and related facilities if the district demonstrates there is an unmet need for pupil housing or the condition of the facilities, or the lack of facilities, is a threat to the health and safety of the pupils. A facility hardship is available for:

(a) New classrooms and/or subsidiary facilities (corridors, toilets, kitchens and other non-classroom space) or replacement facilities if either (1) or (2) are met:

(1) The facilities are needed to ensure the health and safety of the pupils if the district can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Board that the health and safety of the pupils is at risk. Factors to be considered by the Board shall include the close proximity to a major freeway, airport, electrical facility, high power transmission lines, dam, pipeline, industrial facility, adverse air quality emission or other health and safety risks, including structural deficiencies required by the DSA to be repaired, seismic mitigation of the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings as verified by the DSA, traffic safety or because the pupils reside in remote areas of the district and transportation to existing facilities is not possible or poses a health and safety risk. The total available funding for seismic mitigation related and ancillary costs for the Most Vulnerable Category 2 Buildings is $199.5 million.

(A) If the request is for replacement facilities, a cost/benefit analysis must be prepared by the district and submitted to the OPSC that indicates the total costs to remain in the classroom or related facility and mitigate the problem is at least 50 percent of the Current Replacement Cost of the classroom or related facility. The cost/benefit analysis may include applicable site development costs as outlined in Section 1859.76. The cost/benefit analysis shall not include increased costs associated with high performance related costs or components, with the exception of those high performance components that were pre-existing in the classroom or related facility. If the cost to remain in the classroom or related facility is less than 50 percent of the Current Replacement Cost, the district may qualify for either grant below, as applicable:

1. Modernization Excessive Cost Hardship Grant for Rehabilitation Costs pursuant to Section 1859.83(e), or
2. A grant not to exceed 50 percent of the cost estimate that has been reviewed and approved by the OPSC and approved by the board for seismic rehabilitation.

….

SFP Regulation Section 1859.83 states:

(e) Excessive Cost for rehabilitation of facilities the Board has determined are a health and safety risk to the pupils pursuant to Section 1859.82(a)(1) and the cost/benefit analysis to mitigate the problem and remain in the facility is less than 50 percent of the Current Replacement Cost of the facility. The cost/benefit analysis shall not include increased costs associated with high performance related costs or components, with the exception of those high performance components that were pre-existing in the classroom or related facility. If the district qualifies, the district is eligible for funding of Rehabilitation Costs as a modernization project. If the Approved Application is received on or before April 29, 2002, the grant amount provided is 80 percent of the amount of the cost estimate required in Section 1859.82(a)(1) that has been reviewed by the OPSC and approved by the Board. If the Approved Application is received after April 29, 2002, the grant amount provided is 60 percent of the amount of the cost estimate required in Section 1859.82(a)(1) that has been reviewed by the OPSC and approved by the Board. An additional grant may be provided for high performance incentive pursuant to Section 1859.77.4 provided that the high performance points attained are related to the scope of the Facility Hardship project. For any project funded in whole or in part from

Proposition 47 or Proposition 55 for which the construction contract is awarded prior to January 1, 2012, the district may be eligible for the funding provided to initiate and enforce a LCP as prescribed in Section 1859.78.1(a). For any project for which the construction contract is awarded on or after January 1, 2012, the grant may be adjusted in the manner prescribed in Section 1859.78.1(b) and subject to the limitations established in Section 1859.78.1(c).

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SCHOOL DISTRICT APPEAL REQUEST

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

SAB 189 (REV 10/09)

SCHOOL DISTRICT	APPLICATION NUMBER
Lompoc Unified School District	58/69229-00-001
SCHOOL NAME	COUNTY
Central Kitchen Facility	Santa Barbara
DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Dr. Sheldon Smith	smith.sheldon@lusd.org

Purpose of Request:

To ask for SAB's conceptual approval of a Facility Hardship Rehabilitation project at the District's Central Kitchen, application number 58/69229-00-001 because a significant and serious threat exists to the health and safety of students or staff in a public school environment. Necessary repairs would avoid interruption of the District's Free and Reduced Lunch Program, which provides meals to all of the District's school sites, including those sites that are not capable of providing fresh food for the students.

Basis of Request:

- [x] Law (Statute) SB 120 Child Nutrition Facilities Act of 1975
- [x] Regulation 1859.82(a)(1)
- [ ] Other (specify) _____

Description:

Over 64% of the District's students qualify for the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. However, not all of the individual school sites have or can afford to have kitchen facilities to prepare fresh food for the District's Free and Reduced Lunch Program. To remedy this problem, the Central Kitchen facility supports all of the school sites in the District and is essential to providing fresh food for these underprivileged students. The food prepared in the Central Kitchen has a direct impact on the health of students, especially those underprivileged students where meal(s) provided by the District is/are the only fresh food/meal of their day.

The District planned a construction project to replace equipment in the Central Kitchen, which is located on a site that includes an elementary school and an independent study program. During the project, the District discovered conditions that caused great concern about imminent structural failure and a severe health threat related to mold growth. Due to the unusual and concealed construction of the ceiling, and the lack of rain that California has experienced in recent years, the damage was not noticeable as part of the building's regular maintenance and therefore was not included in the scope of work for the planned project.

In addition to the structural concerns about the significant dry rot found in the ridge beam and roof joists, mold growth was detected near food storage and preparation operations. Mold remediation is a necessary precaution for the health and safety for staff who work in the building and to ensure that any mold contamination does not affect the food prepared for the students. Further, although the fungal growth on the ridge beam and surrounding framing is not known to cause adverse health effects from exposure, repairs to areas where moisture intrusion was discovered is necessary to prevent a recurrence of mold growth, especially since next occurrence of mold growth found could be pathogenic or "toxic."

Finally, the Field Report provided by Gregory H. Stork, SE at Stork, Wolfe & Associates Structural Engineers stated that "[t]he roof beam, if left in its current condition, will fail, resulting in a total roof collapse." A roof collapse would cause a high-risk situation to anyone in the building as well as stop the preparation of fresh food for the District's entire student population. As discussed above, the preparation of fresh food is integral to the health of the students.

Thus, the District is respectfully requesting that the SAB approve its facility hardship application to assist the District in making these critical repairs so that it can continue to safely provide healthy meals to its student population.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE	DATE
	February 11, 2015

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF PLANNING
SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION
2015 FEB 17 PM 1:36
MAIL ROOM

ATTACHMENT B

TREVOR MCDONALD, SUPERINTENDENT

Teach · Learn · Succeed

LOMPOC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ARTHUR HARWOOD ELEMENTARY
(805) 742-2300

BUENA VISTA ELEMENTARY
(805) 734-[illegible]

CLARENCE RUTH ELEMENTARY
(805) 734-[illegible]

CRESTVIEW ELEMENTARY
(805) 742-2050

LA CANADA ELEMENTARY
(805) 742-[illegible]

LA HONDA ELEMENTARY
(805) 742-[illegible]

LEONORA FILLMORE ELEMENTARY
(805) 735-[illegible]

LOS BERROS ELEMENTARY
(805) 742-[illegible]

MIGUELITO ELEMENTARY
(805) 742-[illegible]

LOMPOC VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL
(805) 742-[illegible]

VANDENBERG MIDDLE SCHOOL
(805) 742-[illegible]

CABRILLO HIGH SCHOOL
(805) 742-[illegible]

LOMPOC HIGH SCHOOL
(805) 742-3000

MAPLE HIGH SCHOOL
(805) 347-8750

MISSION VALLEY SCHOOL
(805) 735-[illegible]

LOMPOC ADULT SCHOOL
(805) 742-[illegible]

1301 NORTH "A" STREET
LOMPOC, CA 93436
(805) 742-3300
WWW.LUSD.ORG

February 6, 2015

State Allocation Board
Office of Public School Construction
707 Third Street
West Sacramento, CA 95605

Lompoc Unified School District appreciates the opportunity to present additional information regarding the facility hardship request for the Child Nutrition Services central kitchen. There are two important factors that necessitate the use of a central kitchen facility in Lompoc Unified School District. One is the lack of physical space at each site that will not allow for expansion of existing kitchens. The other is the substantial cost involved in facility expansion and the ongoing operations costs included with the additional staffing that would be required. The District does not have facilities funding to expand the existing tiny kitchen spaces that were designed in the 1960s at over a dozen individual school sites. Site maps of each school are attached to show the current tiny kitchen areas. Additionally, the District does not have the operating budget to cover the large number of staff that would be required to prepare and serve the food at each school site.

The central kitchen enables the District to efficiently and cost effectively:

- Provide "cook from scratch" healthy and wholesome meals to Lompoc students that may not be prepared in the existing kitchens at the school sites.
- Reduce the reliance on processed food and food that may be deemed of minimal nutritional value by the California Department of Education's Nutrition Services.
- Allow Lompoc Unified School District to continue to meet and exceed state and federal child nutrition regulations.

Lompoc Unified School District modernization dollars were not needed for these small site kitchens because 1) the central kitchen was already built and providing meals to District students, and 2) the lack of adequate space at any of the sites for the expansion of those kitchens to the level currently in place with the central kitchen.

During the central kitchen upgrade, the District was forced to temporarily re-activate a closed school kitchen. The small size of this kitchen did not allow the District to continue to provide the healthy "cook from scratch" meals so students received meals that contained more processed foods.

Thank you for taking the time to reconsider Lompoc Unified School District's facility hardship request. Lompoc Unified School District is committed to providing students with healthy meals and a positive learning environment.

Sincerely,

Sheldon Smith, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent
Business Services

Santa Barbara County
PUBLIC Health
DEPARTMENT

Community Health Administration
300 North San Antonio Road • Santa Barbara, CA 93110-1332
805/681-5439 • FAX 805/681-5200

Takashi M. Wada, MD, MPH *Director*
Suzanne Jacobson, CPA *Chief Financial Officer*
Susan Klein-Rothschild, MSW *Deputy Director*
Angela Gonzalez, MHA *Deputy Director*
Polly Baldwin, MD, MPH *Medical Director*
Charity Dean, MD, MPH *Health Officer*

April 24, 2015

Sheldon Smith, Assistant Superintendent
Lompoc Unified School District
1301 North A Street
Lompoc, CA 93436

Dear Dr. Smith,

The Santa Barbara Public Health Department is concerned with the health and wellness of our community. One area that contributes to health is the safe preparation of food.

Food-related diseases affect tens of millions of people and kill thousands annually. Tracking single cases of foodborne illness and investigating outbreaks are critical public health functions. In Santa Barbara County, we had 65 cases of salmonella and 27 cases of shigellosis in 2014. These are two examples of foodborne illness.

To assure safety, food must be prepared in a clean and sanitary manner in accordance with codes and regulations. There are strict regulations to support separate equipment sanitizing procedures, maintaining safe temperatures, storing food, and food along holding and handling of food.

An advantage of a central kitchen facility relative to safe food handling practices has to do with simplified management compared to managing food operations over multiple sites.

When concerns about the lack of a sanitary environment, including potential mold sites in the Lompoc central kitchen were described to the Public Health Department, we felt the need to express our concerns about preparing food in that facility. Viruses, bacteria and microorganisms can be transmitted when a safe and healthy environment is not maintained.

We support your activities to remodel and assure a safe and healthy environment for the preparation of food provided to children in Santa Barbara County.

Sincerely

Takashi Wada, MD, MPH